FRANCIS C. DOMINGO, PH.D.
CHARMAINE MISALUCHA-WILLOUGHBY, PH.D.

JAPAN-PHILIPPINES SECURITY COOPERATION IN A POST-CORONAVIRUS WORLD

stratbase +ADRi PUBLICATIONS

The Stratbase ADR Institute for Strategic and International Studies (ADRi) is an independent strategic research organization with the principal goal of addressing the issues affecting the Philippines and East Asia through:

1. Effecting national, regional, and international policy change or support

2. Fostering strategic ideas based on cooperation and innovative thinking

3. Providing a regional venue for collaboration and cooperation in dealing with critical issues in East Asia; and

4. Actively participating in regional debates and global conversations

With its international focus, ADRi believes that Philippine regional security and development can be achieved through the cooperation of the public and private sectors.

ADRi traces its roots to the Stratbase Research Institute (SRI) established in 2004. SRI focused on providing strategic solutions to domestic governance, socio-economic, and other policy concerns. It aimed to contribute to Philippine development through research and responsive policy alternatives.

As SRI sought solutions, East Asia's affairs frequently inserted themselves into the equation. There was and is a clear relation between domestic and regional affairs; movement in one reverberates in the other.

JAPAN-PHILIPPINES
SECURITY
COOPERATION
IN A
POST-CORONAVIRUS
WORLD

WRITTEN BY
FRANCIS C. DOMINGO, PH.D.
CHARMAINE MISALUCHA-WILLOUGHBY, PH.D.

ABOUT THE ORGANIZATION

Victor Andres "Dindo" C. Manhit is the President of Stratbase Albert Del Rosario Institute for Strategic and International Studies. Concurrently, he is the Philippine Country Head of the renowned BowerGroupAsia (BGA). He was a former Chair and recently retired Associate Professor of the Political Science Department of De La Salle University. Among the government positions he held include Undersecretary for External Affairs and Special Concerns of the Department of Education, Culture and Sports and Deputy Secretary for Administration and Financial Services of the Philippine Senate. Meanwhile, his legislative experience encompasses the 8th, 9th, 10th, and 12th Congress as the Chief of Staff of the late Former Senate President Edgardo Angara and senior policy research adviser in key senate committees.

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Ambassador Albert del Rosario was the Secretary of Foreign Affairs of the Philippines from 2011 to 2016. He also served as Philippine Ambassador to the United States of America from 2001 to 2006. Prior to entering public service, Amb. Del Rosario was on the Board of Directors of over 50 firms. He received numerous awards and recognition for his valuable contributions to the Philippines and abroad.

Manuel V. Pangilinan is CEO and managing director of First Pacific Company Limited. He is also the chairman of Metro Pacific Investments Corp., Philippine Long Distance Telephone Company, Manila Electric Co. (Meralco), and Smart Communications, among others. He is a recipient of several prestigious awards including the Ten Outstanding Young Men of the Philippines (TOYM) Award for International Finance in 1983 and the Presidential Pamana ng Pilipino Award by the Office of the President of the Philippines in 1996.

Edgardo G. Lacson is an honorary chairman of the Philippine Chamber of Commerce and Industry (PCCI). He is the Chairman of the Employers Confederation of the Philippines. He holds numerous leadership positions in various companies. He served as a Director of the Philippine Stock Exchange, Inc. and is an Honorary Member of the Rotary Club-Diliman.

Benjamin Philip G. Romualdez is the former president of the Chamber of Mines of the Philippines. He also holds, among others, the following positions: Chairman of MST Management, Inc., President of Oxford University and Cambridge University Club of the Philippines, Director at Philippine-Australia Business Council (PABC), Trustee/Vice President of Doña Remedios Trinidad Romualdez Medical Foundation, Inc, and Trustee/Vice President of Dr. Vicente Orestes Romualdez (DVOR) Educational Foundation, Inc.

Ernest Z. Bower is a senior adviser for Southeast Asia at the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS), having founded the first chair for the region. He is CEO of BowerGroupAsia (BGA) and a leading expert on Southeast Asia.

Renato C. de Castro, Ph. D is a full professor of International Studies at De La Salle University – Manila (DLSU). In 2009, Dr. de Castro became the U.S. State Department ASEAN Research Fellow from the Philippines and was based in the Political Science Department of Arizona State University. A consultant in the National Security Council of the Philippines during the Aquino administration, he has written over 80 articles on International Relations and Security.

Judge Raul C. Pangalangan, Ph. D is a judge of the International Criminal Court. He was previously the dean of the University of the Philippines College of Law and publisher of the Philippine Daily Inquirer. He has taught in many universities around the world, such as Melbourne University, Hong Kong University, and Harvard Law School.

Epictetus E. Patalinghug, Ph. D is a professor emeritus at the Cesar E.A. Virata School of Business, University of the Philippines (UP), Diliman. He received his doctorate degree in Agricultural Economics from the University of Hawaii. His works have been featured in various publications around the world.

Francisco A. Magno, Ph. D is the executive director of the Jesse M. Robredo Institute of Governance and former President of the Philippine Political Science Association. He is a professor of political science at DLSU and previously served as Chair of the Political Science Department and Director of the Social Development Research Center.

Carlos Primo C. David, Ph. D. is a licensed geologist and professor in UP Diliman having obtained his PhD in Environmental Science and Geology from Stanford University. He is a former Executive Director of DOST-PCIEERD. A project leader of the DOST's Project NOAH, Dr. David pioneers short term rainfall forecasting in the country and climate change-related research on water resources.

CONTENTS

———————————

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT

———————————

This paper explores the advantages of a strategic partnership as a guiding framework to expand the security cooperation between Japan and the Philippines. It argues that the strategic partnership needs to integrate new areas of mutual interest to become more durable in the twenty-first century.

The Japan-Philippines strategic partnership is an instructive example of an arrangement that adapts to the changing environment by updating its methods of addressing emerging security threats. Formally established in 2011 and upgraded in 2015, this paper makes the case that the partnership can be further strengthened by exploring new areas of mutual interest: cybersecurity, biosecurity, and food security.

In developing this argument, this study uses a conceptual framework that enables the systematic exploration of new areas of security cooperation between Japan and the Philippines. Due to the significance of networked technologies in society and the emergence of sophisticated cyber threats, it contends that the strategic partners should integrate cybersecurity as an area of cooperation.

Biological threats such as the coronavirus have grave implications to all facets of life, so both states must include biosecurity as an area of cooperation. Lastly, attacks against critical infrastructure and the spread of deadly pathogens constrain the production and distribution of food across populations thereby necessitating more extensive cooperation in the area of food security.

Given that Japan and the Philippines already have a strategic partnership, the integration of new areas of security cooperation can lead to a deeper and more sustainable bilateral relationship for the twenty-first century.

JAPAN-PHILIPPINES SECURITY COOPERATION IN A POST-CORONAVIRUS WORLD

FRANCIS C. DOMINGO, PH.D.
CHARMAINE MISALUCHA-WILLOUGHBY, PH.D.

Globalization both complements and complicates security cooperation. On one hand, increased interdependence is directly proportional to increased productivity. On the other hand, however, high instances of connectivity are linked to an increase in security threats. As such, while globalization makes it easier to establish security cooperation mechanisms, partners must be flexible to the changing environment and update their methods of addressing emerging security threats. This is precisely the underbelly of the notion of "entangled security," which is all the more relevant today as the world grapples with what the post-coronavirus world will look like.[1]

The Japan-Philippines strategic partnership is an instructive example of an adaptable arrangement. Interestingly, the strategic interests of the United States predominantly shaped the security cooperation between Japan and the Philippines. Both are long-term treaty allies of the U.S. and are part of the network of bilateral security arrangements that was created in the immediate post-1945 era to complement and strengthen the multilateral framework that the US created.[2] Japan and the Philippines are therefore the

"spokes" that benefitted from the security guarantees provided by the U.S as the "hub" of the system.[3] While this system managed to bring stability in the region, it was no longer adequate given the emergence of complex national security threats in the twenty-first century. The rise of China, the belligerence of North Korea, deadly terrorist attacks, disastrous natural calamities, and unique domestic circumstances compelled Japan and the Philippines to re-evaluate their national security strategies through stronger bilateral ties.[4] The strategy of linking the two "spokes" of the "hub" was developed through a range of diplomatic measures such as consultations, joint statements, and agreements that were completed in a systematic manner during the last fifteen years.[5]

The bilateral relationship has been described as "cozy," with Japan providing official development assistance (ODA) to the Philippines since the 1970s.[6] The passive nature of Japanese ODA during Ferdinand Marcos' era turned a blind eye on the repressive nature of the regime.[7] This then became the impetus for a massive aid package under Corazon Aquino's administration, where Japan paid closer attention to the promotion of democracy and a market-oriented economy. Alongside this turnaround in ODA policy, Japanese firms also began to invest heavily in the region. This allowed the creation of the Philippine Economic Zone Authority (PEZA) during Fidel Ramos' time to speed up deregulation and liberalization. This resulted in the increased inflow of Japanese foreign direct investment (FDI) to and an increase in the volume of capital in the Philippines. By integrating Japanese firms' operations in the Philippines to the value-added chain in East Asia, the economic structure of the bilateral relationship became stronger.[8] The 2008 Japan-Philippines Economic Partnership Agreement (JPEPA) marked the development of closer trade relations

between the two. Unique to the JPEPA is the clause on the movement of people, primarily because the Philippines heavily depended on the remittances of its Overseas Filipino workers (OFWs).

The 2011 Joint Statement, which established the strategic partnership, outlined the foundations of stronger bilateral ties between the two states.[9] To maintain and strengthen high-level bilateral relations, Japan and the Philippines agreed to focus on mutually beneficial cooperation in the economic field, including continuing the successes of the Japan-Philippines Economic Partnership Agreement (JPEPA), promoting and enhancing investments, development assistance, disaster prevention and management, and protecting the environment. Meanwhile, to ensure mutual trust in the political and security aspects, both countries agreed to convene multi-layered policy dialogues, cooperate in maritime affairs, and reaffirm the importance of peace in Mindanao. A third aspect of the strategic partnership is increasing mutual understanding at the people-to-people level with tourism and youth exchanges.

The strategic partnership was further reinforced in the 2015 Joint Declaration, which defined the scope and policy direction of the "strengthened strategic partnership" between Japan and the Philippines.[10] Security cooperation was boosted via the enhancement of security dialogues, the initiation of negotiations on the transfer of defense equipment and technology, the participation of Japan Self-Defense Forces in disaster relief activities in the Philippines, and the expansion of capacity building trainings and exercises. Maritime security is likewise an area of cooperation in the 2015 declaration, where both countries reaffirmed their commitment to ensuring safety and security in the South China Sea.

While the Japan-Philippines strategic partnership is indeed a

welcome initiative in security cooperation, this paper makes the case that such can be further strengthened by exploring new areas of mutual interest: cybersecurity, biosecurity, and food security. These three are illustrative of the ontological entanglements and the deep linkages that connect traditional and non-traditional security. Specifically, due to the current Japan-Philippines strategic partnership anchored in state-centric notions of security, it requires some calibration to make it better able to address future trends. This can be achieved by extending the current strategic partnership framework to include cybersecurity primarily because of the potential of networked technologies to improve biosecurity capacities. Consequently, better biosecurity depends on better and more efficient food security governance. Hence, all three areas of cooperation are crucial in ensuring that the Japan-Philippines strategic partnership remains nimble and agile in navigating the post-coronavirus world. Strategic partnerships persist because of continuous collaboration in different areas of mutual interest. Some studies suggest that strategic partnerships are cohesive because they combine the information, skills, and resources of partner states and allowing the risks to be shared.[11] In practice, partnerships are implemented through varying degrees of cooperation between states that do not involve security guarantees or formal treaties. The focus of this study is to explore the advantages of a strategic partnership as a guiding framework to expand the security cooperation between Japan and the Philippines. It contends that the strategic partnership between Japan and the Philippines needs to integrate new areas of mutual interest to become more durable in the twenty-first century.

In developing this argument, the study uses a conceptual framework that systematically explores new areas of security cooperation between Japan and the Philippines. The paper revisits

the various forms of alignments to situate the main argument that new areas of cooperation are the key to strengthening the established strategic partnership between Japan and the Philippines. After discussing the conceptual framework, the succeeding sections apply the four basic characteristics of strategic partnerships (system principle, objective-driven, informal commitment, and economic exchanges) as an organizing framework to explicate how complex security issues can be integrated within the partnership.[12] The objective is to demonstrate that the strategic partnership between Japan and the Philippines needs to incorporate cybersecurity, biosecurity, and food security as issue areas to strengthen its durability in the twenty-first century. The study considers these three areas as "new" because they are identified as areas of interest but are not yet considered as areas of national security cooperation.[13] As such, it intends to identify the factors that can potentially limit the development of cooperation in these areas within the existing strategic partnership. The study concludes by highlighting policy implications for Japan and the Philippines.

Strategic Partnerships in Theory

Security cooperation occurs when states align their efforts to advance their mutual national security interests. Alignments are central in security cooperation because they are agreements that define the "expectations of states about whether they will be supported or opposed by other states in future interactions."[14] In this sense, alignments are useful for powerful states because they can consolidate support from weaker states and mitigate the risk of developing future adversaries. On the other hand, alignments

are decisive for the national security of weak states because they have limited material resources and influence to advance their interests.[15] Previous studies offer several hypotheses on why states choose specific forms of alignment in pursuing their national security interests.[16] For this study, the focus will be on strategic partnerships, a less formal form of alignment that can strengthen the security cooperation between Japan and the Philippines.

Strategic partnerships are a relatively new form of alignment that prescribes a security arrangement that enables participating states to advance their mutual strategic interests without formal security guarantees. Defined as a "structured collaboration between states (or other actors) to take joint advantage of economic opportunities, or to respond to security challenges more effectively than could be achieved in isolation…," strategic partnerships have emerged as a prominent form of alignment given the rigidity required by formal alliances.[17] In exploring the utility of strategic partnerships, we find Thomas Wilkins' characterization of strategic partnerships instructive. To reinforce the paper's argument, it is necessary to explore the fundamental characteristics of strategic partnerships by comparing it to the most predominant form of alignment: alliances.

Strategic partnerships can be distinguished from alliances based on four fundamental characteristics.[18] First, strategic partnerships are organized around a general purpose or "system principle" rather than a specific task or operation. Alliances, on the other hand, are formed for a specific task: "to provide the means for an attack on some third party or intended as a mutual guarantee in the event that another state attacks one of the alliance members."[19] While both types of alignment are driven by common interests, alliances are also shaped by shared values between member states considering that it affects their internal cohesion.[20] Second, strategic

partnerships are mainly motivated by achieving specific goals while alliances are more focused on countering specific threats.[21] Specifically, strategic partnerships do not identify an "enemy state" as a threat and address security issues such as maritime security jointly.[22] Alliances, on the other hand, constrain state behavior to either balancing or bandwagoning depending on the source of threat.[23] Third, strategic partnerships are typically informal arrangements and involve low commitment costs. This arrangement allows partners to maintain a greater degree of independence and flexibility.[24] In comparison, alliances are defined by formal treaties and involve higher commitment costs for mutual military support. Fourth, since the idea of strategic partnerships originated from the private sector, economic exchanges are considered a key functional area of cooperation together with national security issues.[25] In contrast, alliances are primarily concerned with security cooperation, particularly developing stronger military capabilities against external threats.

These new areas of mutual interest can strengthen the existing strategic partnership between Japan and the Philippines. A framework of strategic partnership can facilitate stronger cooperation between Japan and the Philippines in areas that are currently not considered as security issues by both states: cybersecurity, biosecurity, and food security. Thomas Wilkins' work is useful in this part of the analysis.[26] First, strategic partnerships endure because they are guided by a system principle. Strategic partnerships are formed as a response to an uncertain environment and as a result, states find compatible and receptive partners and gauge their strategic fit with each other. Hence, a system principle or an overarching framework of mutual agreement and understanding then forms the crux of a strategic

partnership's formation.[27] Second, strategic partnerships are goal-driven rather than threat-driven. This is also the implementation stage of the partnership when the diffusion of an institutional structure that governs the interaction patterns between partners takes root. Here, partners maintain their respective organizational apparatuses and therefore remain separate entities as they work towards the achievement of a mutual objective. Third, strategic partnerships are informal and require low commitment costs. Fourth, economic exchanges are important to the maintenance of strategic partnerships.

The ensuing analyses on cybersecurity, biosecurity, and food security consider the abovementioned parameters of system principle, goal-driven orientation, informality, and economic exchanges to justify why these new areas need to be included in an expanded version of the Japan-Philippines strategic partnership. The objective is to highlight how the three areas can enhance security cooperation in the context of the Japan-Philippine bilateral relationship. Exploring new areas of security cooperation can lead to a more durable strategic partnership that can enable both Japan and the Philippines to better manage contemporary security challenges.

Strategic Partnerships in Practice

Strategic partnerships are a post-Cold War creation. The term first gained ground when Russia raised the idea of strategic partnerships as an instrument of foreign policy, which the U.S. later adopted to describe its relationship with the former Soviet Union.[28] This was at the time when "the former protagonists no longer viewed

each other as enemies, but had not graduated to the level of allies."[29] The launch of the European Security Strategy in 2003 not only established for the European Union the necessity of concluding strategic partnerships but also propelled numerous discussions about what strategic partnerships are and their characteristics.[30] However, nowhere is there a clear definition or a strategic purpose for these partnerships. While some would argue that the very ambiguity of the term can be to actors' advantage, this murkiness can overstretch the concept and create infeasible expectations.[31]

Hence, it was inevitable that various works were published in hopes of pinning down the parameters of strategic partnerships. Some see them as a goal-oriented relationship.[32] The "essential elements" of such a relationship include common values and interests, mutual understanding, and equality of size. These are problematic, not least because it is unclear which values and interests take precedence over others, how one is privileged over another, how mutual understanding is arrived at, and how the concept can reconcile the vast asymmetries between international actors in these kinds of partnerships. Others see strategic partnerships as an interest-based relationship: it is in the interest of partners to cooperate because otherwise, they are most vulnerable to each other should the partnership fail.[33] In view of such, the "main features" of strategic partnerships are common interests and expectations, a long-term view, a multidimensional perspective, a global range, and a distinction from other types of relations.[34]

While not discounting the valuable insights of the abovementioned works, it is nonetheless critical to underscore that when strategic partnerships are tagged simply as a type or a form of relationship that displays an assortment of elements or features, they are reduced to those properties alone. This results

in "a static category of association between international actors."[35] Furthermore, this approach to studying strategic partnerships draws a line between "real" ones and those that are not, and while in academia this merely points to taxonomic arbitrariness, this categorization will have dangerous consequences for policymaking. It is precisely for this reason that strategic partnerships deserve a more critical treatment.[36] Only by doing so can incorporating other areas of cooperation into the partnership – in this instance, cybersecurity, biosecurity, and food security – becomes justified.

Cybersecurity

Traditional security issues have re-emerged as a significant source of insecurity for Japan and the Philippines in the twenty-first century. China's assertive behavior in East China Sea (Senkaku Islands) and South China Sea (Spratly Islands) has compelled both states to refocus on maritime security as a key area of cooperation.[37] A prominent aspect of maritime security cooperation has been the capacity building, with Japan providing a substantial amount of assistance to the Philippines. This has materialized through Japan's significant contributions such as providing a loan for ten multi-role response vessels for the Philippine Coast Guard completed in 2018 and donating excess spare parts for military helicopters and maintenance equipment worth PhP 2.5 billion to the Philippine Air Force in 2019.[38] Another aspect of maritime security cooperation is the interoperability between military forces. Japan and the Philippines have addressed this concern by participating in joint military exercises such as Balikatan (2016-2018) and more recently, maritime training activity Sama Sama (2019).[39] In implementing

these initiatives, the objective of maritime security cooperation is to defend territorial sovereignty and to ensure freedom of navigation in the South China Sea.[40] While traditional security issues continue to be a key concern for both states, measures to address these issues have already been integrated within the strategic partnership. Since the objective of the study is to explore new areas of mutual interest, the focus will be on emerging security issues that cut across traditional and non-traditional security boundaries such as cybersecurity.

Cyberspace has emerged as an increasingly complex environment that state and non-state actors have utilized for espionage, sabotage, and subversion. Despite the prevalence of numerous criminal indictments, economic sanctions, and development of military and non-military capabilities, hostile actors continue to engage in disruptive activities in cyberspace. More significantly, these sustained attacks by perpetrators damaged targeted states without triggering significant retaliation.[41] While cybersecurity is considered a national security threat in Japan, it has yet to be prioritized in the Philippines.[42] Despite this difference, both states have adopted strategies that employ securitized responses to cyber threats, particularly during crisis situations, where intrusions against networks and critical infrastructures may disrupt critical government efforts to manage the spread of the coronavirus disease.[43] For instance, from 2007 to 2011, Japan experienced a series of cyber intrusions against leading corporations, research institutes, and government agencies.[44] The most prominent of this was the series of cyber intrusions against critical infrastructures, particularly Mitsubishi Heavy Industries (MHI), Japan's largest defense contractor, responsible for designing and manufacturing of guided weapons systems, fighter planes, and space launch vehicles.[45]

On the other hand, the Philippines has experienced at least two serious cyber incidents in the past five years, exposing its vulnerabilities to hostile actors. The first incident was in 2015 when hackers linked to China targeted the Philippine Department of Justice and two other organizations involved in the South China Sea arbitration. The objective of the hack was to collect intelligence relevant to the arbitration in the context of the favorable ruling awarded by the Permanent Court of Arbitration.[46] The second incident was in 2017 when the Department of Foreign Affairs was hacked by the OceanLotus Group, a threat group linked to Vietnam. The suspected objective of the group was to influence President Rodrigo Duterte to reconsider his posture towards China by releasing classified transcripts of telephone conversations between him and two prominent world leaders (U.S. President Donald Trump and Chinese President Xi Jinping) to the public.[47]

Following the elements of strategic partnerships, Japan and the Philippines are guided by an underlying system principle of "preserving a free and secure cyberspace." This principle is elucidated by four themes common to the strategies of both states: the free flow of information, rule of law, autonomy, and collaboration between multi-stakeholders.[48] Maintaining the free flow of information involves a commitment to providing equal access to the Internet as well as avoiding "unfair censorship." In this sense, both states strive to strike a balance between government monitoring of cyber threats and protecting the privacy of individuals. Adherence to the rule of law in cyberspace entails the application of domestic and international laws against malicious actors. While attribution is difficult in cyberspace, Japan and the Philippines emphasize the significance of equal enforcement of the law in both physical and digital environments.[49]

Preserving autonomy in cyberspace involves a constant reliance on self-governance as a mechanism for maintaining security in cyberspace. The self-reliant and responsible use of the Internet more than government intervention in cyberspace will strengthen the overall cybersecurity posture of the state. Both states recognize that a multi-stakeholder approach is the most feasible strategy to manage security threats in cyberspace. Cyberspace was repurposed to develop multiple connections between various stakeholders across all sectors society. Therefore, it can only be secured through sustained collaboration between these stakeholders.

Due to the complexity of cyberspace as a strategic environment, the goal of enhancing cyber defenses rather than targeting specific threats such as hostile states or hacktivist groups is a more feasible approach that Japan and the Philippines can pursue in the context of their strategic partnership. This is particularly imperative given the need to protect computer networks and critical infrastructures (energy, transportation, healthcare, finance, supply chain) from network intrusions while governments are preoccupied with mitigating the impact of the coronavirus disease pandemic.[50] Strengthening cyber defenses involves three main initiatives that are integral to the cybersecurity strategies of both states. The first initiative is strengthening the resilience of critical infrastructures so that they can endure complex cyber intrusions. This involves ensuring the compliance of critical infrastructure operators to the minimum standards recommended by standardization bodies such as the International Standards Organization and the International Telecommunications Union, among others.[51] In addition, a crucial part of compliance is the implantation of cyber exercises, which evaluates the existing standards and protocols in place for strengths and weakness.[52]

The second initiative is establishing a defensive posture in cyberspace. Japan is implementing a defensive strategy through a policy of "Proactive Cyber Defense," which call for a comprehensive set of preventive measures including "sharing and utilization of threat information," "using technologies to induce attacks to collect information on attackers," "conducting measures against botnets," and "reinforcement of international undersea cables."[53] The strategy of the Philippines centers on the development of "defense layers" that involve the participation of business, non-governmental organizations and other states. The objective is to significantly reduce the government's exposure to cyber intrusions thereby allowing them to protect critical infrastructures and to effectively orchestrate the countermeasures against cyber threats.[54]

The third initiative is developing capabilities for cyber threat information sharing. This capability is essential for cyber defense because it provides decision-makers with the relevant information about potential and current threats in cyberspace. Japan's efforts in this area are led by the Prime Minister's Office, which manages the systematic sharing of information among relevant ministries and agencies within government as well as allies such as the United States.[55] In the case of the Philippines, the government strategy is to build a Threat Intelligence and Analysis Operations Center that will function as a central hub for intelligence collection, technical research and development, testing laboratories, and threat scenario simulators. Moreover, this organization is also envisioned to collaborate with other government agencies with similar capabilities such as the Armed Forces of the Philippines, Department of National Defense, and National Security Council, especially during crisis situations like the current global pandemic where public health facilities are vulnerable to computer network attacks.[56]

A key element that makes strategic partnerships a strong framework for cybersecurity cooperation is that it is informal. In this regard, cybersecurity cooperation can progress effectively without a formal alliance treaty and the development of cyber capabilities does not require significant commitment costs to operationalize. Cybersecurity cooperation is generally institutionalized through informal agreements, policy dialogues, and joint statements that build on existing security arrangements between participating states.[57] In this sense, there are two reasons why informal agreements are advantageous for cybersecurity cooperation. First, the non-physicality of cyber operations makes it difficult to enforce formal defense treaties that guarantee a military action in response to computer network attacks.[58] Second, the difficulty of attribution in cyberspace makes it impractical to enforce formal defense treaties if the identity of the perpetrator remains highly contestable.

Another consideration is that strategic partnerships are defined by low commitment costs. This is consistent with the development of cyber capabilities given the limited commitment costs necessary for Japan and the Philippines to cooperate in the area of cybersecurity. There are at least two reasons that support this claim. The first is that both states already have existing capabilities as well as strategies to counter cyber threats. While there is a discrepancy between the capabilities of the two states, they can still build on common competencies and collaborate to refine the operational details of their cybersecurity cooperation.[59] The second is that defensive cyber operations require less resources than offensive cyber operations.[60] Since the priority of both states is to develop robust cyber defenses, they do not have any commitment to invest in significant resources based on a framework of strategic partnership.

The prominence of cyberspace as a strategic environment in the twenty-first century necessitates new strategies to maintain the national security of states. Cybersecurity is entangled or "intensely and densely connected" with larger sets of issues including biosecurity and food security, therefore cooperation is vital to addressing interconnected security threats that confront states in the post-coronavirus world.[61] In this sense, it is necessary to integrate cybersecurity as an area of cooperation within the existing strategic partnership of Japan and the Philippines. Aside from the clear dedication to the ideal of a free and secure cyberspace, both states have strong incentives to collaborate in strengthening their respective capacities for cyber defense. Since cyber operations lead to different strategic outcomes, informal security arrangements are sustainable and the commitment costs to develop cyber defenses are lower than investments in conventional military capabilities.

Biosecurity

The existential threat posed by the coronavirus pandemic immediately put it on top of the global security agenda. The first cases of the virus were reported in Wuhan, China and despite a lockdown that was imposed in January 2020, the outbreak quickly spread as 5 million residents were able to leave the city before the lockdown took effect.[62] At the end of March, over 500,000 cases and more than 23,000 deaths in 202 countries, areas, or territories have been reported.[63] Other countries have implemented lockdowns as well, thereby spurring the massive economic costs of the pandemic.[64] China's lockdown alone, consisting of 48 cities and 4 provinces, translates to the disruption of travel plans of

over 500 million people.[65] Alongside transportation, the hardest-hit sectors are tourism, restaurants, cinemas, and energy with a combined estimated loss of US$143 billion.[66] Manufacturing has also been hit, not least because Wuhan is a major hub. This supply-chain disruption means export demand fell significantly, which could cause China's first-quarter GDP to slide by 1.5 to 4.5% and the annual growth rate to be as low as 5.5%.[67] Shipping and port operations are similarly impacted, causing production delays and deliveries.[68]

Going by the elements of strategic partnerships, the coronavirus pandemic elucidates a system principle, i.e., a "new collective insecurity" that requires a move from state-centric to new forms of health governance.[69] Pandemics and health have been in the backburner of international relations for a long time, shoved under the umbrella of non-traditional security and classified as low politics.[70] With the outbreak of the coronavirus, however, pandemics are now seen as existential threats and have been effectively securitized while couched in "militarized language."[71] This is not unprecedented, considering that most countries responded the same way to the "war" on HIV/AIDS, SARS, H1N1, MERS, and the Ebola virus.

In the face of this threat, the immediate goal is containment, which is why securitizing the issue is justified. In the Philippines, the first case was reported on 30 January 2020 and increased steadily by the start of March with local transmission.[72] President Duterte placed the country under a state of public health emergency on March 8 but placed Metro Manila under community quarantine from March 15 to April 14.[73] Consequently, the entire island of Luzon (where Metro Manila is located) was placed on an enhanced community lockdown from March 17 to April 12.[74]

Both lockdowns entail restrictions on people's movement (strict home quarantine and social distancing) and travel, as well as the closure of major business establishments. Despite these measures, the number of cases spiked by 272 on March 28, bringing the total number to 1,075.[75]

Meanwhile, Japan's number of cases is low despite its proximity to China.[76] With a total of 1,387 cases as of 27 March 2020 and 46 deaths, Japan's numbers indicate that it has indeed avoided the worst of the pandemic so far.[77] There can be several reasons for this, including an ingrained culture of social distancing, bowing instead of shaking hands, and wearing masks as part of everyday life. Still, with testing only for serious cases and with the Olympics coming up, there is reason to be skeptical of the numbers.[78]

With the pandemic yet to reach its peak, it is difficult to ascertain which response, i.e., either the Philippines' securitized lockdown or Japan's soft lockdown, works best to contain the outbreak. However, it begs emphasis that securitization is effective only in the short term. In the long run, this national security response is more difficult to sustain than an incremental but directed move towards a more developmental response.[79] Moreover, securitizing any issue is steeped in politics and the exercise of power, and so the longer it is in effect, the harder it will be to maintain.[80]

Hence, with the clear and present danger that the coronavirus pandemic poses and to shift from a crisis mindset to long-term policy planning, Japan and the Philippines can explore the following options within the framework of their strategic partnership. These proposals are entry points based on the 2005 International Health Regulations (IHR), by far the most comprehensive legally binding instrument in cases of the spread of diseases and other health risks. While the IHR comes from a long

line of global health regimes, the 2005 version has the following key differences: the scope of diseases and health emergencies is expanded to include not only infectious diseases but also radiological or chemical incidents, health surveillance is more proactive and expansive, the scope of relevant parties that can provide information to the World Health Organization (WHO) is broadened, and human rights are to be considered and respected in contexts of health emergencies.[81] Against this backdrop, it is in the interest of Japan and the Philippines to leverage their strategic partnership and coordinate on overcoming the logistical difficulties that implementing the IHR guidelines entails.

First, given that the scope of diseases and emergencies is now expanded, Japan and the Philippines can, with their respective experiences in dealing with natural calamities, work on capacity building on disaster preparedness. Best practices from facing and addressing disasters, including this recent coronavirus pandemic, need to be learned, shared, and institutionalized. This can include funding basic health services and ensuring that the infrastructure for the provision of these services remains efficient.

Second, the 2005 IHR incorporates the necessity of surveillance to stop epidemics from becoming pandemics. Health surveillance is by no means simply an offshoot of the successes of countries like Singapore in dealing with the coronavirus; even though Singapore's actions can oftentimes conjure images of the panopticon, it is undeniable that the country has indeed managed to flatten the curve.[82] Japan and the Philippines can work on upgrading technical capabilities to improve Internet-based surveillance reporting systems. These are low cost, although providing internet access to smaller and far-flung communities can be expensive. Similarly, the strategic partnership can be a platform for information and

knowledge sharing to address epidemics and prevent new ones from emerging.

Third, the 2005 IHR embraces inclusivity in that non-state actors can now be contracted to provide information to WHO about public health emergencies. This potentially opens the political space to Track 1.5 and Track 2 collaborations, including the efforts of the Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA), as well as private entities like pharmaceutical companies. In this sense, the strategic partnership can, under the broader umbrella of the IHR, work alongside or subsume WHO's Pandemic Influenza Preparedness Framework (PIPF).[83] One of the Japan-Philippines strategic partnership's core features is the people-to-people connections that engage the youth and professionals in exchanges. This will be an important factor in putting the post-coronavirus world back together.

Finally, Japan and the Philippines can ensure that human rights are protected during times of health emergencies and amid extensive health surveillance. International human rights law provides that both states are expected to work on specific measures that strengthen respect for human rights in cyberspace. There are at least three "duties" that Japan and the Philippines need to address. First, they are responsible for ensuring respect by third parties for rights in cyberspace. For instance, states are obligated to confirm that the personal information stored in social networking sites are secure and not accessible to the public without the consent of the owners.[84] Second, they are responsible for protecting individual rights from violations originating from cyberspace. Specifically, states are obligated to criminalize violations against the freedom of expression online, such as "incitement of national, racial or religious hatred that leads to incitement to discrimination, hostility or violence."[85]

Third, they are also obliged to provide effective remedies to victims of human rights violations online. Effective remedies are not necessarily legal action and "can be obtained directly from Internet service providers, public authorities and/or national human rights institutions include inquiry, explanation, reply, correction, apology, reinstatement, reconnection and compensation."[86]

Hence, biosecurity is re-emerging as a – if not, the most – relevant aspect of international relations in the post-coronavirus world. As such, we need to come to grips with the so-called medicalization of insecurity: "Whereas we used to think of insecurity in world politics as being a fundamentally military and political problem…, security discussions about pandemic threats now suggest to us that insecurity can also have an underlying medical source or origin."[87] This also points us to the concept of security that is entangled and inextricably linked to and embedded in larger sets of issues.[88] Thus, since the nature of security itself is unfolding and evolving, then so should the Japan-Philippines strategic partnership in confronting and including biosecurity in its framework. However, this depends on effective food security governance.

Food Security

The United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) defines food security as a situation where peoples and societies have regular access to safe and nutritious food for normal growth, development, and an active and healthy life. Food is so fundamental to sustaining human life, but it is precisely because it is so basic that it is easy enough to take for granted.[89] This partly explains why food security and food governance are so unevenly distributed across disciplines.[90]

At best, attention is given to food security in a sporadic and episodic manner, as evidenced by the spate of literature that emerged following the food crises in the 1970s and 2008.[91] This notwithstanding, the importance of the provision, distribution, and access to food cannot be underestimated. This need becomes particularly acute during times of pandemics and as a systemic principle of strategic partnerships, both Japan and the Philippines have even more reasons to cooperate in overcoming the physical, social, and economic barriers to food.[92]

If the goal is good governance in food security, several factors preclude its attainment. The first is poor governance. Ironically, governance is both a challenge and a solution to food security.[93] Poor governance, in general, is characterized by weak institutional capacity, poor policy design, and lagging implementation.[94] All of these can impact food production and distribution. Thus, one can make the argument that good governance is directly proportional to food security.

The second factor that makes food security governance challenging is that the issue involves a multiplicity of actors and institutions across a broad range of drivers and food system activities, scales, sectors, and policy domains. This multi-dimensional character of food security governance, therefore, infuses it with a high degree of complexity, overlap, and confusion. An example of this dense network is seen in the following key policy domains of food security governance: nutrition and agriculture.[95] The policy area of nutrition is centered on setting international standards for nutrition and public health policy-making activities. The main institutions tasked to oversee the activities here are WHO, the FAO, the World Food Programme (WFP), and the Food Aid Convention (FAC). Food safety, which is another policy area classified under the domain of nutrition, is

likewise focused on setting international standards on food safety, preventing outbreaks, and promoting food hygiene and health. By far, this policy area is the most institutionalized with a global standard setting at Codex Alimentarius and co-managed by WHO and the FAO and with enforcement through the World Trade Organization's (WTO) Agreement on Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures. The human right to food is yet another policy area here, which monitors state action through the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) and the FAO.

The other broad policy domain in food security governance is agriculture which includes four policy areas. Agricultural production is about knowledge production and dissemination on food and agricultural production techniques, including applied research in plant breeding and disease eradication. The FAO, the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR), and the International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI) are the main actors here. Agricultural trade is another policy area with the main task to harmonize policies on customs and tariffs on the flows of food and agricultural products, foreign investments in the agricultural sector, and the trading of agricultural financial products. Given its nature, this policy area is within the auspices of the WTO, the International Grains Council (IGC), the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), and the World Bank. The third policy area is agriculture and its linkages with development. Here, organizations like the World Bank, the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), the Asian Development Bank (ADB), and the African Development Bank (AFDB) not only finance and monitor agricultural development projects, but they are also active in policy intervention to improve

the material living standards of peoples in developing countries. An emerging policy area here is agriculture's connection to climate change. The United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCC), the United Nations Environmental Programme (UNEP), the FAO, and IFPRI are tasked to find ways to transition to sustainable and low-carbon forms of agricultural production.

Evidently, the presence of these international organizations complicates food security governance. Adding to the complexity is the fact that there are no clear-cut distinctions among these international organizations and that there is no centralized authority.[96] As a result, food security governance today is in non-hierarchical clusters, better described as "polyvalent inter-organizational relationships" whose mandates overlap and conflict and rivalry dominate over interests, visions, and paradigms.[97]

An offshoot of this is the third major hurdle for food security, i.e., that while there are clusters of institutional architectures in place, non-state actors now proliferate the terrain as well. This new range of actors encompasses non-government organizations, new social movements like peasant organizations, philanthropic organizations, and private sector organizations.[98] Ultimately, food security governance has a notoriously fragmented effect.

Against this backdrop, a useful entry point for the Japan-Philippines security partnership is in harnessing the informal networks between them. The two countries have strong and deep people-to-people linkages and these networks can provide valuable information to policymakers. These personal linkages can bring food closer to the hungry in smaller and rural communities. At the same time, these efforts can lead to public support and bring legitimacy to official interventions. In working alongside government agencies and thereby extending the capacities of the government, these

linkages can create a multi-sector and multi-scalar approach to a more efficient and more effective food security governance. In the long run, good food security governance can place Japan and the Philippines and the rest of the international community in a better position to deal with (and ultimately prevent) the spread of diseases. Of course, these will depend on better cyber infrastructures that merge the technical and environmental dimensions with the social, economic, and political aspects of new security threats that we face.

Conclusion

The Japan-Philippines bilateral relationship is anchored on a strong strategic partnership and is in a unique position to "decenter" from the United States Alliance System developed to counter the expansion of communist states after the Second World War.[99] While the strategic partnership is progressive, its current structure needs to be calibrated to deal with complex security threats in the post-coronavirus world. The partnership can further evolve if both states acknowledge the fundamental notion that security is an entangled concept, that it is not mutually exclusive from other facets of life. Japan and the Philippines must realize that the strategic partnership, which is meant primarily to address traditional security threats, has deep linkages with non-traditional security issues such as cybersecurity, biosecurity, and food security. As such, the partnership can better adapt to the post-coronavirus world if cybersecurity is in the agenda to ensure the protection of computer networks and critical infrastructure, which can then be the foundational structure for dealing with future pandemics. To mitigate heightened security responses during times of crisis,

networked technology can be used to ensure that systems are in place to guarantee food security.

In the area of cybersecurity, it was emphasized earlier that a unilateral approach to countering hostile actors in cyberspace is not possible because of the global scope of cyber intrusions. Considering that secure networks and hardened critical infrastructure are the essential for all sectors of society to function properly, Japan and the Philippines can explore cybersecurity cooperation with the framework of their strategic partnership because the following reasons. First, both states share a strong dedication to the principle of a free and secure cyberspace, specifically advance the agenda of free flow of information, rule of law, autonomy, and collaboration between multi-stakeholders. Second, both states are focused on enhancing their cyber defenses by protecting critical infrastructure, adopting a proactive defense posture, and enabling in cyber threat information sharing. Third, Japan and the Philippines can benefit from collaborating in the area of cybersecurity because it can work under informal security arrangements and low commitment costs. Given these favorable conditions, we believe that integrating cybersecurity as a new area of cooperation within the existing strategic partnership of Japan and the Philippines is an imperative move that can deepen the security cooperation of both states.

In terms of biosecurity, this policy area is the most relevant aspect of international relations in the post-coronavirus world. Given the existential threat that the coronavirus pandemic poses, Japan and the Philippines can explore the following options within the framework of their strategic partnership. First, Japan and the Philippines can, with their respective experiences dealing with natural calamities, work on capacity building on disaster preparedness. Second, both states can work on upgrading technical

capabilities to improve internet-based surveillance reporting systems. Third, both states can engage non-state actors through Track 1.5 and Track 2 collaborations, for providing information the WHO about public health emergencies. Finally, Japan and the Philippines can ensure that human rights are protected during times of health emergencies and amid extensive health surveillance by fulfilling three "duties" of states based on international human rights law.

With respect to food security, the need for a reliable and stable food supply is particularly acute during times of existential threats such as pandemics. In this context, both Japan and the Philippines have even more reasons to cooperate in overcoming the physical, social, and economic barriers to food. In light of the grave impact of food shortages during global crises like coronavirus pandemic, Japan and the Philippines can explore the following options within the framework of their strategic partnership. First, both states can harness the informal networks between them. Since the two countries have strong and deep people-to-people linkages, these networks can provide valuable information to policymakers. Second, both states can develop these informal networks to work alongside government agencies, thereby extending the capacities of the government.

Strategic partnerships are a useful framework for security cooperation because it is flexible enough to include non-traditional security issues such as cybersecurity, biosecurity, and food security within its scope conditions. While the focus of the paper was on these three areas, it is important to recognize that there are other areas of cooperation, such as environmental security and energy security, that can benefit from strategic partnerships because of the flexible and non-binding nature of the framework. While Japan

and the Philippines already have an existing strategic partnership, integrating new areas of security cooperation can lead to a deeper, more sustainable bilateral relationship for the twenty-first century.

[1] Stefan Elbe and Gemma Buckland-Merrett, "Entangled Security: Science, Co-production, and Inter-active Insecurity," European Journal of International Security 4 (2019): 123-141.

[2] Charmaine Misalucha-Willoughby, "Contesting the Hub-and-Spokes Model in Southeast Asia," Asian Politics and Policy 12, 1 (2020): 57-70.

[3] Renato de Castro, "Exploring a 21st Century Japan–Philippine Security Relationship: Linking Two Spokes Together?" Asian Survey 49, 4 (2009): 691–715.

[4] Dennis D. Trinidad, "Domestic Factors and Strategic Partnership: Redefining Philippines-Japan Relations in the 21st Century," Asian Politics and Policy 9, 4 (2017): 613-635.

[5] Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan, "Japan-Philippines Relations," 18 June 2019, https://www.mofa.go.jp/region/asia-paci/philippine/archives.html.

[6] Maria Thaemar Tana and Yusuke Takagi, "Japan's Foreign Relations with the Philippines: A Case of Evolving Japan in Asia," in Japan's Foreign Relations in Asia, eds. James D. Brown and Jeff Kingston (New York: Routledge, 2017), 312-328.

[7] Temario Rivera, "The Politics of Japanese ODA to the Philippines, 1971-1999," in Philippine-Japan Relations, eds. Ikehata Setsuho and Lydia Yu Jose (Manila: Ateneo de Manila Press, 2003), 509-545.

[8] Tana and Takagi, "Japan's Foreign Relations with the Philippines."

[9] Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan, "Japan-Philippines Joint Statement on the Comprehensive Promotion of the 'Strategic Partnership' between Neighboring Countries Connected by Special Bonds of Friendship," 27 September 2011, https://www.mofa.go.jp/announce/pm/noda/joint_statement110927.html.

[10] Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan, "Japan-Philippines Joint Declaration A Strengthened Strategic Partnership for Advancing the Shared Principles and Goals of Peace, Security, and Growth in the Region and Beyond," 4 June 2015, https://www.mofa.go.jp/s_sa/sea2/ph/page4e_000280.html.

[11] Thomas S. Wilkins, "'Alignment', Not 'Alliance' – The Shifting Paradigm of International Security Cooperation: Toward A Conceptual Taxonomy of Alignment." Review of International Studies 38, 1 (2012): 67-69.

[12] Ibid., 53-76.

[13] Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan, "Action Plan for Strengthening of the Strategic Partnership (Annex of the Joint Declaration," 4 June 2015, https://www.mofa.go.jp/files/000083659.pdf.

[14] Glenn Snyder, Alliance Politics (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1997), 6.

[15] For distinctions between "great," "medium," and "small" states see Michael Handel, Weak States in the International System (London: Frank Cass, 1991).

[16] John S. Duffield, "Alliances," in Security Studies: An Introduction, ed. Paul Williams (London: Routledge, 2011), 343-346.

[17] Thomas S. Wilkins, "Russo-Chinese Strategic Partnership: A New Form of Security Cooperation?" Contemporary Security Policy 29, 2 (2008): 359-364.

[18] Ibid., 360-361.

[19] Stephen M. Walt, "Why Alliances Endure or Collapse," Survival 39, 1 (1997): 156-179.

[20] Thomas S. Wilkins, "Towards a 'Trilateral Alliance?' Understanding the Role of Expediency and Values in American–Japanese–Australian Relations," Asian Security 3, 3 (2007): 251-278.

[21] Stephen M. Walt, "Alliance Formation and the Balance of World Power," International Security 9, 4 (1985): 3-43.

[22] Wilkins, "'Alignment', Not 'Alliance'," 68-69.

[23] Walt, "Alliance Formation," 8-13.

[24] Wilkins, "Russo-Chinese Strategic Partnership," 360-261.

[25] Ibid.

[26] Wilkins, "'Alignment', Not 'Alliance.'"

[27] Wilkins, "Russo-Chinese Strategic Partnership."

[28] Sean Kay, "What is a Strategic Partnership?" Problems of Post-Communism 47, 3 (May/June 2000): 15-24.

[29] Vidya Nadkarni, Strategic Partnerships in Asia: Balancing Without Alliances (New York: Routledge, 2010), 46.

[30] European Council, A Secure Europe in a Better World: European Security Strategy (Brussels: European Union, 2003).

[31] Anne Schmidt, Strategic Partnerships – A Contested Policy Concept: A Review of Recent Publications, Working Paper FG 1, 2010/07, Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik, German Institute for International and SecurityAffairs, December 2010.

[32] Marius Vahl, Just Good Friends? The EU-Russian 'Strategic Partnership' and the Northern Dimension, Centre for European Policy Studies Working Document 166, March 2001.

[33] Giovanni Grevi, Making EU Strategic Partnerships Effective, Fundación para las Relaciones Internacionales y el Diálogo Exterior Working Paper 105, December 2010.

[34] Jonathan Holslag, "The Elusive Axis: Assessing the EU-China Strategic Partnership," Journal of Common Market Studies 49, 2 (2011): 293-313.

[35] Luis Fernando Blanco, "The Functions of 'Strategic Partnership' in European Union Foreign Policy Discourse," Cambridge Review of International Affairs 29, 1 (2016): 40.

[36] Charmaine Misalucha-Willoughby, How to Change the Game of Security Cooperation: The Case of the ASEAN-China Strategic Partnership, Working Papers on East Asian Studies No. 121, Institute of East Asian Studies, University of Duisburg-Essen, February 2018.

[37] Renato C. De Castro, "21st Century Japan–Philippines Strategic Partnership: Constraining China's Expansion in the South China Sea," Asian Affairs: An American Review, 44(2) (2017): 31-51.

[38] Jaime Laude, "Japan turns over P2.5-billion aid to Philippine Air Force" The Philippine Star, 20 March 2020, https://www.philstar.com/headlines/2019/03/20/1902969/japan-turns-over-p25-billion-aid-philippine-air-force ; Philippine Coast Guard, "PCG welcomes last 44-meter vessel from Japan", 20 August 2018, http://www.coastguard.gov.ph/index.php/11-news/2409-pcg-welcomes-last-44-meter-vessel-from-japan?tmpl=component&print=1

[39] Mico A. Galang, Strengthening Manila's Maritime Security Posture in the South China Sea: The Role of the Philippines-Japan Strategic Partnership NDCP Executive Policy Brief No. 2017-01 (October 2017), http://www.ndcp.edu.ph/wp-content/uploads/publications/3.%20EPB%20re%20PH-Japan_v11.pdf; Gregory Johnson, "US, Philippines, Japan Kick Off Maritime Training Activity Sama Sama" 13 October 2019, https://www.c7f.navy.mil/Media/News/Display/Article/1988338/ us-philippines-japan-kick-off-maritime-training-activity-sama-sama/

[40] Yoji Koda, Japan's Perceptions of and Interests in the South China Sea Asia Policy 21 (2016), 29-35.

[41] Benjamin Jensen, Erica Borghard, et al., U.S. Cyberspace Solarium Commission (Arlington, VA: USA Cyberspace Solarium Commission, 2020), https://www.solarium.gov/.

[42] For the literature on cybersecurity in Japan see Paul Kallender and Christopher W. Hughes, "Japan's Emerging Trajectory as a 'Cyber Power': From Securitization to Militarization of Cyberspace," Journal of Strategic Studies 40, 1-2 (2017): 118-145; Paul Kallender, "Japan, the Ministry of Defense and Cyber-Security," The RUSI Journal 159, 1 (2014): 94-103; Yoko Nitta, "National Cyber Security Strategy: Are We Making Progress? Japan's Efforts and Challenges,"

Georgetown Journal of International Affairs, Cyber IV (2014): 89-98. For the literature on cybersecurity in the Philippines see Francis Domingo, Strategic Considerations for Philippine Cyber Security (Makati City, Philippines: Albert Del Rosario Institute of Strategic and International Studies, 2016).

[43] Lily Hay Newman, "Coronavirus Sets the Stage for Hacking Mayhem," Wired, 19 March 2020, https://www.wired.com/story/coronavirus-cyberattacks-ransomware-phishing/.

[44] Kallender and Hughes, "Japan's Emerging Trajectory."

[45] Kallender, "Japan, the Ministry of Defense and Cyber-Security."

[46] David Gilbert, "Chinese Hackers Thought to Target Philippines Over South China Sea Dispute," Vice, 4 August 2016, https://www.vice.com/en_us/article/vv7zy3/chinese-hackers-thought-to-target-philippines-over-south-china-sea-dispute; Erka Koivunen, Nanhaishu: RATing the South China Sea (Helsinki, Finland: F- Secure Corporation, 2016), https://www.f-secure.com/documents/996508/1030745/nanhaishu_whitepaper.pdf.

[47] Brian Valeriano and Miguel Gomez, "Frustrated with the Philippines, Vietnam Resorts to Cyber Espionage," Council of Foreign Relations, 8 June 2017, https://www.cfr.org/blog/frustrated-philippines-vietnam-resorts-cyber-espionage.

[48] National Center of Incident Readiness and Strategy for Cybersecurity, Cybersecurity Strategy 2018 (Tokyo: Prime Minister's Office, 2018), 21-22; Department of Information and Communications Technology, Philippine National Cyber Security Plan 2016-2022 (Quezon City: DICT, 2016), 21.

[49] The primary statute that covers cybersecurity issues in Japan is the "The Basic Act on Cybersecurity" and the main statute in the Philippines is the "Cybercrime and Prevention Act 2012."

[50] David P. Fidler, "Cybersecurity in the Time of COVID-19," Council of Foreign Relations, 30 March 2020, https://www.cfr.org/blog/cybersecurity-time-covid-19.

[51] Steve Purser, "Standards for Cyber Security" in Best Practices in Computer Network Defense: Incident Detection and Response, ed. Melissa E. Hathaway (Amsterdam, Netherlands: IOS Press, 2014), 97-106.

[52] Department of Information and Communications Technology, "Philippine National Cyber Security Plan 2016-2022."

[53] National Center of Incident Readiness and Strategy for Cybersecurity, "Cybersecurity Strategy 2018," 32-33.

[54] Department of Information and Communications Technology, 41-42.

[55] National Center of Incident Readiness and Strategy for Cybersecurity, "Cybersecurity Strategy 2018, 58-59; Morgan Chalfant, "US, Japan Deepen Cyber Information Sharing," The Hill, 4 May 2017, https://thehill.com/policy/cybersecurity/331979-us-japan-deepen-cyber-information-sharing.

[56] Jon Viktor D. Cabuenas, "DICT calls on hospitals to employ emergency backup systems," GMA News, 24 March 2020, https://www.gmanetwork.com/news/news/nation/731023/dict-calls-on-hospitals-to-employ-emergency-backup-systems/story/.

[57] Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, "Cyber Norms Index," https://carnegieendowment.org/publications/interactive/cybernorms.

[58] Matthew Crandall, "Soft Security Threats and Small States: The Case of Estonia," Defence Studies 14, 1 (2014): 30-55.

[59] International Telecommunication Union, Global Cybersecurity Index 2018 (Geneva, Switzerland: ITU, 2019), https://www.itu.int/en/ITU-D/Cybersecurity/Pages/global-cybersecurity-index.aspx.

[60] Rebecca Slayton, "What Is the Cyber Offense-Defense Balance? Conceptions, Causes, and

Assessment," International Security 41, 3 (2017): 72–109; Jon R. Lindsay, "Stuxnet and the Limits of Cyber Warfare," Security Studies 22, 3 (2013): 365–404.

[61] Elbe and Buckland-Merrett, "Entangled Security," 126.

[62] "China Coronavirus: Three Cities Join Wuhan in Quarantine Lockdown as Beijing Tries to Contain Deadly Outbreak," South China Morning Post, 23 January 2020, https://www.scmp.com/news/china/society/article/3047278/wuhan-goes-shutdown-china-tries-contain-deadly-coronavirus; "5 Million Left Wuhan Before Lockdown, 1,000 New Coronavirus Cases Expected in City," South China Morning Post, 26 January 2020, https://www.scmp.com/news/china/society/article/3047720/chinese-premier-li-keqiang-head-coronavirus-crisis-team-outbreak.

[63] "Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19) Pandemic," World Health Organization, https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019.

[64] Lily Lee, Nectar Gan, and David Culver, "Lockdowns are Being Imposed Around the World. China's Example Highlights the Costs," CNN, 17 March 2020, https://edition.cnn.com/2020/03/16/asia/coronavirus-xi-wuhan-anger-intl-hnk/index.html.

[65] Yan Liang, "Coronavirus Batters China's Economy," East Asia Forum, 5 March 2020, https://www.eastasiaforum.org/2020/03/05/coronavirus-batters-chinas-economy/.

[66] Ibid.

[67] Vivek Mishra, "Chinese Economy Clobbered by Coronavirus But Set to Recover Soon: Reuters Poll," Reuters, 14 February 2020, https://www.reuters.com/article/us-china-health-economy-poll/chinese-economy-clobbered-by-coronavirus-but-set-to-recover-soon-reuters-poll-idUSKBN20801H.

[68] Mercy A. Kuo, "COVID-19: Impact on Global Shipping and China's Economy, Insights from Basil M. Karatzas," The Diplomat, 17 March 2020, https://thediplomat.com/2020/03/covid-19-impact-on-global-shipping-and-chinas-economy/.

[69] Timothy M. Shaw, Sandra J. Maclean, and David R. Black, "A Decade of Human Security: What Prospects for Global Governance and New Multilateralisms?" in A Decade of Human Security: Global Governance and New Multilateralisms, ed. David R. Black (London: Routledge, 2016), 3-18.

[70] Jeremy Youde, "High Politics, Low Politics, and Global Health," Journal of Global Security Studies 1, 2 (2016): 157-170.

[71] Colleen O'Manique and Pieter Fourie, "Security and Health in the Twenty-First Century," in The Routledge Handbook of Security Studies, eds. Myriam Dunn Cavelty and Victor Mauer (London: Routledge, 2010), 243-253.

[72] "Philippines Confirms First Case of New Coronavirus." ABS-CBN News, 30 January 2020,https://news.abs-cbn.com/news/01/30/20/philippines-confirms-first-case-of-new-coronavirus; Consuelo Marquez, "DOH: Deloitte PH Employee is 4th Coronavirus Case; 5th Case is from Cainta," Inquirer.Net, 7 March 2020, https://newsinfo.inquirer.net/1238159/doh-deloitte-ph-employee-is-4th-coronavirus-case-5th-case-is-from-cainta; Mara Cepeda, "Novel Coronavirus Cases in Philippines Spike to 20," Rappler, 9 March 2020, https://www.rappler.com/nation/253882-new-philippines-novel-coronavirus-cases-march-9-2020.

[73] Rambo Talabong, "Metro Manila to be Placed on Lockdown Due to Coronavirus Outbreak," Rappler, 12 March 2020, https://www.rappler.com/nation/254101-metro-manila-placed-on-lockdown-coronavirus-outbreak.

[74] Virgil Lopez, "Duterte Orders Luzon-wide 'Enhanced Community Quarantine,'" GMA News Online, 16 March 2020, https://www.gmanetwork.com/news/news/nation/729875/duterte-orders-lockdown-of-entire-luzon-due-to-covid-19-threat/story/.

[75] Aika Rey, "New PH Coronavirus Cases Spike by 272, Total Now at 1,075," Rappler, 28 March 2020, https://www.rappler.com/nation/256218-coronavirus-cases-philippines-march-28-2020.

[76] Martin Fritz, "Coronavirus: How Japan Keeps COVID-19 Under Control," DW, 25 March 2020, https://www.dw.com/en/coronavirus-how-japan-keeps-covid-19-under-control/a-52907069

[77] "Coronavirus Cases in Japan by Prefecture," Nippon.com, 27 March 2020, https://www.nippon.com/en/japan-data/h00657/coronavirus-cases-in-japan-by-prefecture.html.

[78] Motoko Rich and Hisako Ueno, "Japan's Virus Success Has Puzzled the World. Is Its Luck Running Out?" The New York Times, 26 March 2020, https://www.nytimes.com/2020/03/26/world/asia/japan-coronavirus.html; William Sposato, "Japan Hopes for a Post-Coronavirus Olympics," Foreign Policy, 27 March 2020, https://foreignpolicy.com/2020/03/27/cancellation-abe-japan-holds-out-post-coronavirus-olympic-hopes/.

[79] O'Manique and Fourie, "Security and Health in the Twenty-First Century."

[80] Simon Rushton, "Global Health Security: Security for Whom? Security from What?" Political Studies 59 (2011): 779-796; Jeremy Shiffman, "A Social Explanation for the Rise and Fall of Global Health Issues," Bulletin of the World Health Organization 87 (2009): 608-613; Jeremy Shiffman, "Knowledge, Moral Claims, and the Exercise of Power in Global Health," International Journal of Health Policy and Management 3 (2014): 297-299; Joao Nunes, Security, Emancipation, and the Politics of Health: A New Theoretical Perspective (London: Routledge, 2014).

[81] Mark W. Zacher, "The Transformation in Global Health Collaboration Since the 1990s," in Governing Global Health: Challenge, Response, Innovation, eds. Andrew F. Cooper, John J. Kirton, and Ted Schrecker (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007), 16-27; Jeremy Youde, "Mediating Risk through the International Health Regulations and Bio-political Surveillance," Political Studies 59 (2011): 813-830.

[82] Sara E. Davies, "Securitizing Infectious Diseases," International Affairs 84, 2 (2008): 295-313; A. Chong, "Governance for Global Pandemics," East Asia Forum, 26 March 2020. https://www.eastasiaforum.org/2020/03/26/governance-for-global-pandemics/#more-241074; Natasha Singer and Choe Sang-Hun, "As Coronavirus Surveillance Escalates, Personal Privacy Plummets," The New York Times, 24 March 2020, https://www.nytimes.com/2020/03/23/technology/coronavirus-surveillance-tracking-privacy.html.

[83] Adam Kamradt-Scott and Kelley Lee, "The 2011 Pandemic Influenza Preparedness Framework: Global Health Secured or a Missed Opportunity?" Political Studies 59 (2011): 831-847.

[84] Gabor Rona and Lauren Aarons, "State Responsibility to Respect, Protect and Fulfill Human Rights Obligations in Cyberspace," Journal of National Security Law and Policy 8, 3 (2016): 515-558.

[85] Ibid., 518-520.

[86] Council of Europe, "Effective Remedies," https://www.coe.int/en/web/freedom-expression/effective-remedies.

[87] Stefan Elbe, Security and Global Health: Towards the Medicalization of Insecurity (Cambridge: Polity, 2010); Stefan Elbe, "Infectious Disease and the Medicalisation of Insecurity," Political Studies 59 (2011): 848-866.

[88] Elbe and Buckland-Merrett, "Entangled Security."

[89] Jeroen J.L. Candel, "Food Security Governance: A Systematic Literature Review," Food Security 6 (2014): 585601.

[90] Anne Orford, "Food Security, Free Trade, and the Battle for the State," Journal of International Law and International Relations 11, 2 (2015): 1-67.

[91] Thomas G. Weiss and Robert S. Jordan, "Bureaucratic Politics and the World Food Conference: The International Policy Process," World Politics 28, 3 (1976): 422-439; Raymond F. Hopkins and Donald J. Puchala, "Perspectives on the International Relations of Food," International Organization 32, 3 (1978): 581-616; Donald J. Puchala and Raymond F. Hopkins,

"Toward Innovation in the Global Food Regime," International Organization 32, 3 (1978): 855-868; Henry R. Nau, "The Diplomacy of World Food: Goals, Capabilities, Issues and Arenas," International Organization 32, 3 (1978): 775-809; Jon McLin, "Surrogate International Organization and the Case of World Food Security, 1949-1969," International Organization 33, 1 (1979): 35-55; Helge Ole Bergesen, "A New Food Regime: Necessary but Impossible," International Organization 34, 2 (1980): 285-302; Michel Cépède, "The Fight Against Hunger: Its History on the International Agenda," Food Policy 9, 4 (1984): 282-290; Jennifer Clapp and Marc J. Cohen, eds., The Global Food Crisis: Governance Challenges and Opportunities (Waterloo: Centre for International Governance Innovation and Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 2009); Tim Lang, "Crisis? What Crisis? The Normality of the Current Food Crisis," Journal of Agrarian Change 10, 1 (2010): 87-97; Mohamed Behnassi and Sanni Yaya, "Food Crisis Mitigation: The Need for an Enhanced Global Food Governance," in Global Food Insecurity: Rethinking Agricultural and Rural Development Paradigm and Policy," eds. Mohamed Behnassi, Sidney Draggan, and Yaya Sanni (Netherlands: Springer, 2011), 93-125.

[92] Matias E. Margulis, "The Global Governance of Food Security," in The Palgrave Handbook of Inter-Organizational Relations in World Politics, eds. Rafael Biermann and Joachim A. Koops (London: Palgrave, 2017), 530-525.

[93] Candel, "Food Security Governance."

[94] Milton Boyd and H. Holly Wang, "Guest Editorial: The Role of Public Policy and Agricultural Risk Management in Food Security," China Agricultural Economic Review 3, 4 (2011): 417-422.

[95] Margulis, "The Global Governance of Food Security."

[96] Franck Amalric, "Strategically Speaking: The World Food Summit, Five Years Later," Development 44, 4 (2001): 6-16; Joachim von Braun, "Addressing the Food Crisis: Governance, Market Functioning, and Investment in Public Goods," Food Security 1, 1 (2009): 9-15; Mohamed Behnassi and Sanni Yaya, "Food Crisis Mitigation;" Nora McKeon, Global Governance for World Food Security: A Scorecard Four Years After the Eruption of the Food Crisis (Berlin: Heinrich-Böll Foundation, 2011.

[97] Margulis, "The Global Governance of Food Security;" Candel, "Food Security Governance."

[98] Matias E. Margulis, "Global Food Security Governance: The Committee for World Food Security, the Comprehensive Framework for Action and the G8/G20," in The Challenge of Food Security, eds., Rosemary Rayfuse and Nicole Weisfelt (Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 2012), 231-254; Matias E. Margulis, "The Regime Complex for Food Security: Implications for the Global Hunger Challenge," Global Governance 19, 1 (2013): 53-67; David Barling and J. Duncan, "The Dynamics of the Contemporary Governance of the World's Food Supply and the Challenges of Policy Redirection," Food Security (2015): 1-10; J. Duncan, Global Food Security Governance: Civil Society Engagement in the Reformed Committee on World Food Security (London: Routledge, 2015); Andrea Liese, "Explaining Varying Degrees of Openness in the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)," in Transnational Actors in Global Governance: Patterns, Explanations and Implications, eds. Christer Jönsson and Jonas Tallberg (London: Palgrave, 2010), 88-109; Kim Burnett, "Trouble in the Fields: Fair Trade and Food Sovereignty Responses to Governance Opportunities After the Food Crisis," Geopolitics 19, 2 (2014): 351-376; Nora McKeon, Food Security Governance: Empowering Communities, Regulating Corporations (London: Routledge, 2015); Priscilla Claeys, "Food Sovereignty and the Recognition of New Rights for Peasants at the UN: A Critical Overview of La Via Campesina's Rights Claims Over the Last 20 Years," Globalizations 12, 4 (2015): 452-465; Josh Brem-Wilson, "Towards Food Sovereignty: Interrogating Peasant Voice in the United Nations Committee

on World Food Security," The Journal of Peasant Studies 42, 1 (2015): 73-95; Sally Brooks, "Is International Agricultural Research a Global Public Good? The Case of Rice Biofortification," The Journal of Peasant Studies 38, 1 (2011): 67-80; Jennifer Clapp and Doris Fuchs, Corporate Power in Global Agrifood Governance (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2009); Matias E. Margulis and Tony Porter, "Governing the Global Land Grab: Multipolarity, Ideas, and Complexity in Transnational Governance," Globalizations 10, 1 (2013): 65-86; Helen E.S. Nesadurai, "Food Security, the Palm Oil-Land Conflict Nexus, and Sustainability: A Governance Role for a Private Multi-stakeholder Regime Like the RSPO?" The Pacific Review 26, 5 (2013): 505-529.

[99] Thomas S. Wilkins, "After a Decade of Strategic Partnership: Japan and Australia 'Decentering' from the US Alliance?" The Pacific Review 31, 4 (2018): 498-514.

[100] Page 29 image credit: usembassy.gov/us-philippine-and-japanese-forces-conclude-exercise-kamandag-3/

[101] Page 44 image credit: csoonline.com/article/3342036/enterprises-need-to-embrace-top-down-cybersecurity-management.html

[102] Page 46 image credit: young-diplomats.com/top-10-strongest-countries-in-asia

REFERENCES

Amalric, Franck. "Strategically Speaking: The World Food Summit, Five Years Later." Development 44, no. 4 (2001): 6-16.

Barling, David and Jessica Duncan. "The Dynamics of the Contemporary Governance of the World's Food Supply and the Challenges of Policy Redirection." Food Security 7 (2015): 415–424.

Behnassi, Mohamed and Yaya Sanni. "Food Crisis Mitigation: The Need for an Enhanced Global Food Governance." In Global Food Insecurity: Rethinking Agricultural and Rural Development Paradigm and Policy, edited by Mohamed Behnassi, Sidney Draggan, and Yaya Sanni, 93-125. Netherlands: Springer, 2011.

Bergesen, Helge Ole. "A New Food Regime: Necessary but Impossible." International Organization 34, no. 2 (1980): 285-302.

Blanco, Luis Fernando. "The Functions of 'Strategic Partnership' in European Union Foreign Policy Discourse." Cambridge Review of International Affairs 29, no. 1 (2016): 36-54.

Boyd, Milton and H. Holly Wang. "Guest Editorial: The Role of Public Policy and Agricultural Risk Management in Food Security." China Agricultural Economic Review 3, no. 4 (2011): 417-422.

Brem-Wilson, Josh. "Towards Food Sovereignty: Interrogating Peasant Voice in the United Nations Committee on World Food Security." The Journal of Peasant Studies 42, no. 1 (2015): 73-95.

Burnett, Kim. "Trouble in the Fields: Fair Trade and Food Sovereignty Responses to Governance Opportunities After the Food Crisis." Geopolitics 19, no. 2 (2014): 351-376.

Cabuenas, Jon Viktor D. "DICT calls on hospitals to employ emergency backup systems." GMA News, 24 March 2020. https://www.gmanetwork.com/news/news/nation/731023/dict-calls-on-hospitals-to-employ-emergency-backup-systems/story/.

Candel, Jeroen J.L.,"Food Security Governance: A Systematic Literature Review." Food Security 6 (2014): 585-601.

Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, "Cyber Norms Index." https://carnegieendowment.org/publications/interactive/cybernorms.

Chalfant, Morgan. "US, Japan Deepen Cyber Information Sharing." The Hill, 4 May 2017. https://thehill.com/policy/cybersecurity/331979-us-japan-deepen-cyber-information-sharing.

Cepeda, Mara. "Novel Coronavirus Cases in Philippines Spike to 20." Rappler, 9 March 2020. https://www.rappler.com/nation/253882-new-philippines-novel-coronavirus-cases-march-9-2020.

Cépède, Michel. "The Fight Against Hunger: Its History on the International Agenda." Food Policy 9, 4 (1984): 282-290.

Chong, A. "Governance for Global Pandemics." East Asia Forum, 26 March 2020. https://www.eastasiaforum.org/2020/03/26/governance-for-global-pandemics/#more-241074.

"China Coronavirus: Three Cities Join Wuhan in Quarantine Lockdown as Beijing Tries to Contain Deadly Outbreak." South China Morning Post, 23 January 2020. https://www.scmp.com/news/china/society/article/3047278/wuhan-goes-shutdown-china-tries-contain-deadly-coronavirus.

Claeys, Priscilla. "Food Sovereignty and the Recognition of New Rights for Peasants at the UN: A Critical Overview of La Via Campesina's Rights Claims Over the Last 20 Years." Globalizations 12, no. 4 (2015): 452-465.

Clapp, Jennifer and Marc J. Cohen, eds. The Global Food Crisis: Governance Challenges and Opportunities. Waterloo: Centre for International Governance Innovation and Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 2009.

Clapp, Jennifer and Doris Fuchs. Corporate Power in Global Agrifood Governance Cambridge: MIT Press, 2009.

"Coronavirus Cases in Japan by Prefecture." Nippon.com, 27 March 2020. https://www.nippon.com/en/japan-data/h00657/coronavirus-cases-in-japan-by-prefecture.html.

"Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19) Pandemic." World Health Organization. https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019.

Council of Europe, "Effective Remedies," https://www.coe.int/en/web/freedom-expression/effective-remedies.

Crandall, Matthew. "Soft Security Threats and Small States: The Case of Estonia." Defence Studies 14, no. 1 (2014): 30-55.

"Cybercrime and Prevention Act 2012." Official Gazette, 2012. https://www.officialgazette.gov.ph.2012/09/12/republic-act-no-10175/.

Davies, Sara E. "Securitizing Infectious Diseases." International Affairs 84, no. 2 (2008): 295-313.

de Castro, Renato C. "Exploring a 21st Century Japan–Philippine Security Relationship: Linking Two Spokes Together?" Asian Survey 49, no. 4 (2009): 691–715.

de Castro, Renato C. "21st Century Japan–Philippines Strategic Partnership: Constraining China's Expansion in the South China Sea," Asian Affairs: An American Review, 44(2) (2017): 31-51.

Domingo, Francis. Strategic Considerations for Philippine Cyber Security. Makati City, Philippines: Albert Del Rosario Institute of Strategic and International Studies, 2016.

Duffield, John S. "Alliances." In Security Studies: An Introduction, edited by Paul Williams, 343-346. London: Routledge, 2011.

Elbe, Stefan. Security and Global Health: Towards the Medicalization of Insecurity. Cambridge: Polity, 2010.

Elbe, Stefan. "Pandemics on the Radar Screen: Health Security, Infectious Disease and the Medicalisation of Insecurity." Political Studies 59, no. 4, (2011): 848-866.

Elbe, Stefan and Gemma Buckland-Merrett. "Entangled Security: Science, Co-production, and Inter-active Insecurity." European Journal of International Security 4 no. 2, (2019): 123-141.

Fidler, David P. "Cybersecurity in the Time of COVID-19." Council of Foreign Relations, 30 March 2020. https://www.cfr.org/blog/cybersecurity-time-covid-19.

"5 Million Left Wuhan Before Lockdown, 1,000 New Coronavirus Cases Expected in City." South China Morning Post, 26 January 2020. https://www.scmp.com/news/china/society/article/3047720/chinese-premier-li-keqiang-head-coronavirus-crisis-team-outbreak.

Fritz, Martin. "Coronavirus: How Japan Keeps COVID-19 Under Control." DW, 25 March 2020. https://www.dw.com/en/coronavirus-how-japan-keeps-covid-19-under-control/a-52907069.

Galang, Mico A. Strengthening Manila's Maritime Security Posture in the South China Sea: The Role of the Philippines-Japan Strategic Partnership NDCP Executive Policy Brief No. 2017-01 (October 2017), http://www.ndcp.edu.ph/wp-content/uploads/ publications/3.%20 EPB%20re%20PH-Japan_v11.pdf

Gilbert, David. "Chinese Hackers Thought to Target Philippines Over South China Sea Dispute." Vice, 4 August 2016. https://www.vice.com/en_us/article/vv7zy3/chinese-hackers-thought-to-target-philippines-over-south-china-sea-dispute.

Handel, Michael. Weak States in the International System. London: Frank Cass, 1991.

Holslag, Jonathan. "The Elusive Axis: Assessing the EU-China Strategic Partnership." Journal of Common Market Studies 49, no. 2 (2011): 293-313.

Hopkins, Raymond F. and Puchala, Donald J. "Perspectives on the International Relations of Food." International Organization 32, no. 3 (1978): 581-616.

International Telecommunication Union. Global Cybersecurity Index 2018. Geneva, Switzerland: ITU. https://www.itu.int/en/ITU-D/Cybersecurity/Pages/global-cybersecurity-index.aspx.

Japan National Center of Incident Readiness and Strategy for Cybersecurity. Cybersecurity Strategy 2018. Tokyo: Prime Minister's Office, 2018.

Jensen, Benjamin, Erica Borghard, et al., U.S. Cyberspace Solarium Commission. Arlington, VA: USA Cyberspace Solarium Commission, accessed: 4 April 2020. https://www.solarium.gov/.

Johnson, Gregory. "US, Philippines, Japan Kick Off Maritime Training Activity Sama Sama" 13 October 2019, https://www.c7f.navy.mil/Media/News/Display/Article/1988338/us-philippines-japan-kick-off-maritime-training-activity-sama-sama

Kallender, Paul. "Japan, the Ministry of Defense and Cyber-Security." The RUSI Journal 159, no. 1 (2014): 94-103.

Kallender, Paul and Christopher W. Hughes. "Japan's Emerging Trajectory as a 'Cyber Power': From Securitization to Militarization of Cyberspace." Journal of Strategic Studies 40 no. 1-2 (2017): 118-145.

Kamradt-Scott, Adam and Kelley Lee. "The 2011 Pandemic Influenza Preparedness Framework: Global Health Secured or a Missed Opportunity?" Political Studies 59, no. 4, (2011): 831-847.

Koda, Yoji. Japan's Perceptions of and Interests in the South China Sea Asia Policy 21 (2016), 29-35.

Koivunen, Erka. Nanhaishu: RATing the South China Sea. Helsinki, Finland: F-Secure Corporation, 4 August 2016, https://www.f-secure.com/documents/%20996508/ 1030745/ nanhaishu_whitepaper.pdf

Kuo, Mercy A. "COVID-19: Impact on Global Shipping and China's Economy, Insights from Basil M. Karatzas." The Diplomat, 17 March 2020. https://thediplomat.com/2020/03/ covid-19-impact-on-global-shipping-and-chinas-economy/.

Lang, Tim. "Crisis? What Crisis? The Normality of the Current Food Crisis." Journal of Agrarian Change 10, no. 1 (2010): 87-97.

Laude, Jaime. "Japan turns over P2.5-billion aid to Philippine Air Force" The Philippine Star, 20 March 2020, https://www.philstar.com/headlines/2019/03/20/1902969/ japan-turns-over-p25-billion-aid-philippine-air-force

Lee, Lily, Nectar Gan, and David Culver. "Lockdowns are Being Imposed Around the World. China's Example Highlights the Costs." CNN, 17 March 2020. https://edition.cnn.com/2020/03/16/asia/coronavirus-xi-wuhan-anger-intl-hnk/index.html.

Liang, Yan. "Coronavirus Batters China's Economy." East Asia Forum, 5 March 2020. https://www.eastasiaforum.org/2020/03/05/coronavirus-batters-chinas-economy/.

Liese, Andrea. "Explaining Varying Degrees of Openness in the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)." In Transnational Actors in Global Governance: Patterns, Explanations and Implications, edited by Christer Jönsson and Jonas Tallberg, 88-109. London: Palgrave, 2010.

Lindsay, Jon R. "Stuxnet and the Limits of Cyber Warfare." Security Studies, 22, no. 3 (2013): 365–404.

Lopez, Virgil. "Duterte Orders Luzon-wide 'Enhanced Community Quarantine'." GMA News Online, 16 March 2020, https://www.gmanetwork.com/news/news/nation/ 729875/duterte-orders-lockdown-of-entire-luzon-due-to-covid-19-threat/story/.

Margulis, Matias E. "Global Food Security Governance: The Committee for World Food Security, the Comprehensive Framework for Action and the G8/G20." In The Challenge of Food Security, edited by Rosemary Rayfuse and Nicole Weisfelt, 231-254. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 2012.

Margulis, Matias E. "The Regime Complex for Food Security: Implications for the Global Hunger Challenge." Global Governance 19, no. 1 (2013): 53-67.

Margulis, Matias E. and Tony Porter. "Governing the Global Land Grab: Multipolarity, Ideas, and Complexity in Transnational Governance." Globalizations 10, no. 1 (2013): 65-86.

Margulis, Matias E. "The Global Governance of Food Security." In The Palgrave Handbook of Inter-Organizational Relations in World Politics, edited by Rafael Biermann and Joachim A. Koops, 530-525. London: Palgrave, 2017.

Marquez, Consuelo "DOH: Deloitte PH Employee is 4th Coronavirus Case; 5th Case is from Cainta." Inquirer.Net, 7 March 2020, https://newsinfo.inquirer.net/1238159/doh-deloitte-ph-employee-is-4th-coronavirus-case-5th-case-is-from-cainta.

McKeon, Nora. Global Governance for World Food Security: A Scorecard Four Years After the Eruption of the Food Crisis. Berlin: Heinrich-Böll Foundation, 2011.

McKeon, Nora, Food Security Governance: Empowering Communities, Regulating Corporations. London: Routledge, 2015.

McLin, Jon "Surrogate International Organization and the Case of World Food Security, 1949-1969." International Organization 33, no. 1 (1979): 35-55.

Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan. "Japan-Philippines Joint Statement on the Comprehensive Promotion of the 'Strategic Partnership' between Neighboring Countries Connected by Special Bonds of Friendship," 27 September 2011. https://www.mofa.go.jp/announce/pm/noda/joint_statement110927.html.

Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan. "Japan-Philippines Joint Declaration A Strengthened Strategic Partnership for Advancing the Shared Principles and Goals of Peace, Security, and Growth in the Region and Beyond." 4 June 2015. https://www.mofa.go.jp/s_sa/sea2/ph/page4e_000280.html.

Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan. "Action Plan for Strengthening of the Strategic Partnership (Annex of the Joint Declaration," 4 June 2015. https://www.mofa.go.jp/files/000083659.pdf.

Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan. "Japan-Philippines Relations," 18 June 2019, https://www.mofa.go.jp/region/asia-paci/philippine/archives.html.

Misalucha-Willoughby, Charmaine. How to Change the Game of Security Cooperation: The Case of the ASEAN-China Strategic Partnership. Working Papers on East Asian Studies No. 121. Institute of East Asian Studies, University of Duisburg-Essen, February 2018.

Misalucha-Willoughby, Charmaine. "Contesting the Hub-and-Spokes Model in Southeast Asia." Asian Politics and Policy 12, no. 1 (2020): 57-70.

Mishra, Vivek. "Chinese Economy Clobbered by Coronavirus But Set to Recover Soon: Reuters Poll." Reuters, 14 February 2020. https://www.reuters.com/article/us-china-health-economy-poll/chinese-economy-clobbered-by-coronavirus-but-set-to-recover-soon-reuters-poll-idUSKBN20801H.

Nau, Henry R. "The Diplomacy of World Food: Goals, Capabilities, Issues and Arenas." International Organization 32, no. 3 (1978): 775-809.

Nesadurai, Helen E.S. "Food Security, the Palm Oil-Land Conflict Nexus, and Sustainability: A Governance Role for a Private Multi-stakeholder Regime Like the RSPO?" The Pacific Review 26, no. 5 (2013): 505-529.

Newman, Lily Hay. "Coronavirus Sets the Stage for Hacking Mayhem." 19 March 2020. https://www.wired.com/story/coronavirus-cyberattacks-ransomware-phishing/.

Nitta, Yoko. "National Cyber Security Strategy: Are We Making Progress? Japan's Efforts and Challenges." Georgetown Journal of International Affairs, Cyber IV (2014), 89-98.

Nunes, Joao. Security, Emancipation, and the Politics of Health: A New Theoretical Perspective London: Routledge, 2014.

O'Manique, Colleen and Pieter Fourie. "Security and Health in the Twenty-First Century." In The Routledge Handbook of Security Studies, edited by Myriam Dunn Cavelty and Victor Mauer, 243-253. London: Routledge, 2010.

Orford, Anne. "Food Security, Free Trade, and the Battle for the State." Journal of International Law and International Relations 11, no. 2 (2015): 1-67.

Philippine Coast Guard, "PCG welcomes last 44-meter vessel from Japan", 20 August 2018, http://www.coastguard.gov.ph/index.php/11-news/2409-pcg-welcomes-last-44-meter-vessel-from-japan?tmpl=component&print=1

Philippine Department of Information and Communications Technology. Philippine National Cyber Security Plan 2016-2022. Quezon City: DICT, 2016.

"Philippines Confirms First Case of New Coronavirus." ABS-CBN News, 30 January 2020. https://news.abs-cbn.com/news/01/30/20/philippines-confirms-first-case-of-new-coronavirus.

Puchala, Donald J. and Raymond F. Hopkins. "Toward Innovation in the Global Food Regime." International Organization 32, no. 3 (1978): 855-868.

Purser, Steve. "Standards for Cyber Security." In Best Practices in Computer Network Defense: Incident Detection and Response, edited by Melissa E. Hathaway, 97-106. Amsterdam, Netherlands: IOS Press, 2014.

Rey, Aika. "New PH Coronavirus Cases Spike by 272, Total Now at 1,075." Rappler. 28 March 2020, https://www.rappler.com/nation/256218-coronavirus-cases-philippines-march-28-2020.

Rich, Motoko and Hisako Ueno. "Japan's Virus Success Has Puzzled the World. Is Its Luck Running Out?" The New York Times, 26 March 2020. https://www.nytimes.com/2020/03/26/world/asia/japan-coronavirus.html.

Rivera, Temario. "The Politics of Japanese ODA to the Philippines, 1971-1999." In Philippine-Japan Relations, edited by Ikehata Setsuho and Lydia Yu Jose, 509-545. Manila: Ateneo de Manila Press, 2003.

Rona, Gabor and Lauren Aarons. "State Responsibility to Respect, Protect and Fulfill Human Rights Obligations in Cyberspace." Journal of National Security Law and Policy 8 no. 3 (2016): 515-558.

Rushton, Simon. "Global Health Security: Security for Whom? Security from What?" Political Studies 59, no. 4 (2011): 779-796.

Shaw, Timothy M., Sandra J. Maclean, and David R. Black. "A Decade of Human Security: What Prospects for Global Governance and New Multilateralisms?" In A Decade of Human Security: Global Governance and New Multilateralisms, edited by David R. Black, 3-18. London: Routledge, 2016.

Shiffman, Jeremy. "A Social Explanation for the Rise and Fall of Global Health Issues." Bulletin of the World Health Organization 87, no. 8 (2009): 608-613.

Shiffman, Jeremy. "Knowledge, Moral Claims, and the Exercise of Power in Global Health." International Journal of Health Policy and Management 3 (2014): 297-299.

Singer, Natasha and Choe Sang-Hun. "As Coronavirus Surveillance Escalates, Personal Privacy Plummets." The New York Times, 24 March 2020. https://www.nytimes.com/2020/03/23/technology/coronavirus-surveillance-tracking-privacy.html.

Slayton, Rebecca. "What Is the Cyber Offense-Defense Balance? Conceptions, Causes, and Assessment." International Security, 41, no. 3, (2017), 72–109.

Snyder, Glenn. Alliance Politics. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1997.

Sposato, William. "Japan Hopes for a Post-Coronavirus Olympics." Foreign Policy, 27 March 2020. https://foreignpolicy.com/2020/03/27/cancellation-abe-japan-holds-out-post-coronavirus-olympic-hopes/.

Talabong, Rambo. "Metro Manila to be Placed on Lockdown Due to Coronavirus Outbreak." Rappler, 12 March 2020. https://www.rappler.com/nation/254101-metro-manila-placed-on-lockdown-coronavirus-outbreak.

Tana, Maria Thaemar and Yusuke Takagi. "Japan's Foreign Relations with Asia: A Case of Evolving Japan in Asia." In Japan's Foreign Relations in Asia, edited by James D. Brown and Jeff Kingston, 312-328. New York: Routledge, 2017.

"The Basic Act on Cybersecurity." 2014. http://www.japaneselawtranslation.go.jp/law/detail_main?re=02&vm=02&id=2760.

Trinidad, Dennis D. "Domestic Factors and Strategic Partnership: Redefining Philippines-Japan Relations in the 21st Century." Asian Politics and Policy 9, no. 4 (2017): 613-635.

Valeriano, Brian and Miguel Gomez. "Frustrated with the Philippines, Vietnam Resorts to Cyber Espionage." Council of Foreign Relations, 8 June 2017. https://www.cfr.org/blog/frustrated-philippines-vietnam-resorts-cyber-espionage.

von Braun, Joachim "Addressing the Food Crisis: Governance, Market Functioning, and Investment in Public Goods." Food Security 1, no. 1 (2009): 9-15.

Walt, Stephen M. "Alliance Formation and the Balance of World Power." International Security 9, no. 4 (1985): 3-43.

Walt, Stephen M. "Why Alliances Endure or Collapse." Survival 39, no. 1 (1997): 156-179.

Weiss, Thomas G. and Robert S. Jordan. "Bureaucratic Politics and the World Food Conference: The International Policy Process." World Politics 28, no. 3 (1976): 422-439.

Wilkins, Thomas S. "After a Decade of Strategic Partnership: Japan and Australia 'Decentering' from the US Alliance?" The Pacific Review 31, no. 4 (2018): 498-514.

Wilkins, Thomas S. "'Alignment', Not 'Alliance' – The Shifting Paradigm of International Security Cooperation: Toward A Conceptual Taxonomy of Alignment." Review of International Studies 38, no. 1 (2012): 67-69.

Wilkins, Thomas S. "Russo-Chinese Strategic Partnership: A New Form of Security Cooperation?" Contemporary Security Policy 29, no. 2 (2008): 359-364.

Wilkins, Thomas S. "Towards a 'Trilateral Alliance?' Understanding the Role of Expediency and Values in American–Japanese–Australian Relations." Asian Security 3, no. 3 (2007): 251-278.

Youde, Jeremy. "Mediating Risk through the International Health Regulations and Bio-political Surveillance." Political Studies 59, no. 4 (2011): 813-830.

Youde, Jeremy. "High Politics, Low Politics, and Global Health." Journal of Global Security Studies 1, no. 2 (2016): 157-170.

Zacher, Mark W. "The Transformation in Global Health Collaboration Since the 1990s." In Governing Global Health: Challenge, Response, Innovation, edited by Andrew F. Cooper, John J. Kirton, and Ted Schrecker, 16-27. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Dr. Francis Domingo

Assistant Professor, International Studies Department
De La Salle University

Dr. Domingo is a tenured Assistant Professor and currently the Vice Chair of the International Studies Department at De La Salle University. His areas of research are networked technologies, military strategy, and covert interventions.

He received his Ph.D. in International Relations from the University of Nottingham in 2018, where he wrote his thesis on the strategic utility of cyber capabilities for small states in the Asia-Pacific, and was a recipient of the Michael Cowan Award for Outstanding PhD researchers. He was also a Teaching Fellow in Cybersecurity and International Relations at Victoria University Wellington, New Zealand in 2016. His work has been published in several peer-reviewed journals including Comparative Strategy, Defense & Security Analysis, and Strategic Analysis.

Before joining academia, he worked briefly as a research analyst of the Office of Strategic and Special Studies (OSS), Armed Forces of the Philippines where he worked on several research areas including irregular warfare, national intelligence, military strategy and cybersecurity.

In the private sector, Dr. Domingo coordinated nationwide field operations focusing on brand protection for several multinational companies as the Associate Managing Director of RVDBic, business risk and intelligence consultancy firm.

Dr. Charmaine Misalucha-Willoughby

Associate Professor, International Studies Department
De La Salle University

Dr. Misalucha-Willoughby is an Associate Professor in the International Studies Department of De La Salle University and Program Convenor at the Asia Pacific Pathways to Progress in Manila, Philippines. Her areas of specialization are ASEAN's external relations, security cooperation, and critical international relations theory. She was a Joint Fellow in the Institute of East Asian Studies and the Käte Hamburger Kolleg Centre for Global Cooperation Research at the University of Duisburg-Essen in Germany, an Advanced Security Cooperation Fellow (ASC15-2) at the Daniel K. Inouye Asia-Pacific Center for Security Studies in Honolulu, a Visiting Research Fellow under a Japan Foundation grant in the Osaka School of International Public Policy at Osaka University in Japan, and a recipient of the inaugural US-ASEAN Fulbright Program in the School of International Service at American University in Washington, DC. She received her PhD from the S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies at the Nanyang Technological University in Singapore.

stratbase **+ADRi PUBLICATIONS**

STRATBASE ADRi FOR STRATEGIC AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES