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Junko Otani

Introduction

Japan has a long experience of responding to disasters. Documents dating back to the 4th Century AD describe the emperor’s relief projects when the Yodo River, running from Biwa Lake in Shiga through Kyoto to Osaka Bay, flooded. Over the centuries, Japan has accumulated a vast store of experience, knowledge and technology for dealing with disasters. It can be said, however, that the 1995 Great Hanshin Earthquake was a turning point in the discussion of disaster-initiated social change and sociological disaster research in Japan. Several issues learnt in the Kobe experience were said to be useful for coping with disasters in subsequent years, such as the 2004 and 2007 Niigata Chuetsu earthquakes and 2005 Fukuoka West earthquake, as well as other disasters such as floods and typhoons. On the other hand, when the massive disaster of 2011 hit East Japan, some failures from Kobe were reportedly repeated, pointing out that the lessons learnt in 1995 had not been fully applied in emergency response and life reconstruction in 2011, such as issues pertaining to gender and shelter design.

It is in the context of Japan’s learning, and failing to learn, from its own disasters that this paper examines the country’s endeavors to internationalize its experiences and know-how. The paper will attempt to undertake a historical review of Japan’s response to disasters, focusing on its Overseas Development Assistance (ODA) efforts in the Asia-Pacific region, the most disaster-prone area in the world, with examples from Indonesia and the Philippines. In fact, although Japan was involved in the international response to the great 2004 Indian Ocean earthquake and tsunami, its involvement in technical assistance for disaster response in the Asia-Pacific region goes back much longer, including aid for floods in the Philippines. The paper will discuss examples of how Japan’s disaster experience has been utilized as international aid to countries such as the Philippines and Indonesia.

This paper will attempt a historical study of the work of the Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA), which has two departments for disaster response and mitigation in other countries. No other international aid agency has a specialized department only for disaster response. The
Asian Development Bank (ADB) has four staff in charge of disaster response, who were involved after the 2008 Wenchuan Earthquake in Sichuan, China, as well as the 2004 Indian Ocean earthquake and tsunami, but the Bank does not have a special unit in charge of disasters.²)

Disaster and Globalization

The World Bank report (see Figures 1 & 2), using the data of Munich Re, show that the incidence of natural disasters and the economic losses they caused increased exponentially in the 20th century.³) The natural disasters include floods, windstorms, earthquakes, volcanic eruptions etc.

Figure 1: Economic Losses from Natural Catastrophes in the 20th Century

![Figure 1: Economic Losses from Natural Catastrophes in the 20th Century](image)


Figure 2: Trends in Natural Catastrophes in the 20th Century
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The 21st century is the age of globalization. The causes of disasters are increasingly seen to be global rather than local or national. One perspective is that climate change is leading to the occurrence of more disasters. Another argument is the incidence of urbanization in developing countries (see Figure 3), where those who are most affected by disasters have been the urban poor and the socially vulnerable. Figure 4 shows that the effects of disasters also transcend national boundaries: the 2011 earthquake and tsunami in Japan and floods in Thailand had adverse effects on the automobile industry in Southeast Asia.

Figure 3: Urbanization by Population

Source: Presentation by Mikio Ishiwatari, World Bank (2012), at Osaka University, Japan, 14 December 2012.

Figure 4: Disasters in the Age of Globalization in the 21st Century

Source: Presentation by Mikio Ishiwatari, World Bank (2012), at Osaka University, Japan, 14 December 2012.
In this context, it is not only disasters that are becoming globalized, but also disaster response efforts. Now, lessons learnt from a disaster in one place are being propagated and applied to another situation far away. The translation of these ‘lessons of history’ can have differing expected and unexpected consequences. Disaster policy, then, should be understood not only as the domestic concern of the government of the affected country, but also becomes part of another state’s foreign policy.

**A History of Japan’s ODA Policy**

This section charts a brief history of Japan’s ODA. The scheme was first established in 1954. After the end of the Second World War, Japan was a recipient of ODA between 1946 and 1953. It received the US economic assistance until 1951, as part of America’s occupation and democratization of the country. In 1954, an economically rehabilitated Japan began to provide ODA to developing countries and obtained loans from the World Bank for the purpose. This experience provided a strong basis for the use of loans instead of grants as an essential vehicle of aid delivery to the developing world.

From 1954 to the 1960s, Japan was largely involved in the giving of overseas aid in the form of reparations. When Japan signed the San Francisco Peace Treaty with the victorious powers in 1952, only two countries, the Philippines and Vietnam, made reparation claims. Japan signed the Reparation and Economic Cooperation Agreement with these countries, and also with Burma (Myanmar) and Indonesia in 1954. Reparations continued until 1976. Major countries such as China, India, the US, and other victorious countries did not make reparation claims. Japan was allowed to make reparations in kind, i.e. in the form of goods and services it exported to other countries. In 1954, Japan also began practicing a different kind of ODA in the form of technical assistance, when it joined the Colombo Plan that involved the British Commonwealth. Japan also started to provide aid to Asian countries that had resigned their reparations; in 1958, it provided loans to these countries, and in 1968, grants. In the latter year, the Japanese Government decided to increase the volume of aid to 1% of GNP, leading Japan’s ODA to expand considerably in the 1970s and 1980s, doubling every three to five years. The overseas assistance was made possible by Japan’s rapid economic growth and to aid fatigue in many donor countries, but it was also a response to the demands for aid from recipient countries in the South. In this period, Asian countries began to criticize Japan’s economic success being linked to what they call an “economic invasion” by Japan. In the 1980s, the Newly Industrialized Economies in Asia and countries in ASEAN (the Association of Southeast Asian Nations) grew rapidly and provided major business opportunities.
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for Japan. Japan depended heavily on the import of raw materials and the export of manufactured products but the steep appreciation of the yen following the 1985 Plaza Agreement made Japanese exports very expensive. 5) As a result, many Japanese companies relocated their production sites to other Asian countries. One major obstacle in this relocation was the lack of economic infrastructure overseas, such as roads, ports, electric power and grids, and telecommunications. This led the Japanese Government to launch an ODA scheme for building infrastructure and facilitating the penetration of Asia’s industrial markets.

In 1989, Japan became the top donor in the world. However, its ODA policy has undergone a transformation since the mid-1990s, caused by a prolonged economic stagnation. In 1997, the Japanese Government decided not to set a quantitative target for overseas assistance any more. It was time to place less emphasis on quantity and more on quality.

In May 2002, Japan also expanded its approach to development cooperation, in the cases of ‘the consolidation of peace and nation-building in countries suffering from conflicts’, as expressed by the Japanese Government. This generated some controversy in Japan and in other Asian countries about the possible political and military role of Japan in international affairs. The term “consolidation of peace” was invented by the Japanese Government in the aftermath of 9/11 in 2001 in order to enlarge the traditional area of Japan’s ODA scheme (relief and reconstruction) to encompass peace-building, specifically new areas of security and administration facing the US-led coalition in Afghanistan.6) Since then, this ‘consolidation of peace’ approach has been applied to other conflict areas such as the Mindanao in the Philippines and Aceh in Indonesia, prior to the 2004 Indian Ocean earthquake and tsunami.7)

Subsequently, the Japanese Government also sent Self-Defense Forces (SDF) to Iraq to carry out peace-building duties and humanitarian assistance, which also divided public opinion in Japan. This linkage between the ODA and SDF activities was the first in Japan’s ODA history and raised concerns. For example, the SDF used special vehicles that were meant to transport water.8) Since the end of the Second World War, much of the Japanese public and media have had phobia towards overseas military involvement. It is a telling contrast that the Japanese media have never covered the constant active role of the SDF in disaster rescue in its own country when Japan is such a disaster-prone country, whereas the CCTV media in China constantly report on the efforts of the People’s Liberation Army in disaster-affected areas, supplemented by slogans of the Chinese leaders. However, things may be slowly changing with the 2011 Great East Japan Earthquake, when although the media still refrained from reporting on the work of the SDF, it became obvious to people at the disaster sites that the SDF was substantially involved. Several graphic booklets
were published which introduced the role and activities of the SDF in the disaster areas.

Over the last two decades, the top five recipient countries for Japan’s ODA have not changed: namely, China, India, Thailand, Indonesia, and the Philippines. These countries received almost half of the allocated bilateral ODA.\(^9\) The top recipient country is Indonesia, followed by China. The third is the Philippines but given the size of the country, the amount to the Philippines is no less in proportion.\(^{10}\)

In 1992, the Official Development Assistance Charter was approved by the Japanese Cabinet and has been the foundation of Japan’s aid policy for more than ten years. The world’s problems have changed dramatically since the charter was first adopted and it was revised in 2003. ‘Natural disasters’ were not included in the original charter but it has since been included. This change was part of a worldwide paradigm shift from traditional security to non-traditional security and human security in 1994, when the UNDP Human Development Report was published. The report discussed the problems of refugees, conflict, post-conflict reconstruction, poverty, human rights, environmental degradation, and infectious diseases (such as HIV/AIDS and malaria), mainly in developing countries. The Japanese Government soon adopted human security as a pillar of its foreign policy. Ten years on, the international discussion of human development issues has been extended to new problems such as disasters (Otani, 2014). At the time of the 2011 Great East Japan earthquake and tsunami, the concept of human security had started to include even developed countries. Japan is not the only country which undertakes disaster relief work as part of its foreign policy. In the aftermath of the 2004 Indian Ocean earthquake and tsunami, many governments competed to announce how much they would provide for disaster relief in the affected areas, without necessarily working out the actual budget allocation. Disaster relief also manifests political and diplomatic considerations. After the occurrence of the Haiti earthquake in 2011, the government of the People’s Republic of China provided rescue aid and expertise to the country, gained from its own experience after the Wenchuan earthquake three years earlier; this took place before the Taipei government managed to deliver aid to Haiti. China’s action was politically expedient: Haiti is one of the few countries in the world which has diplomatic relations with Taiwan, rather than with China.

Foreign policy and domestic factors influence disaster assistance allocations. Factors include the current budget deficit, the salience of the disaster and major disasters elsewhere (including in one’s own country). These factors do not only influence disaster aid. For example, the vaccination program in Tajikistan suffered in 2004 because Japan, a major donor, reduced its contribution in order to shift its commitment to the countries affected by the Indian Ocean earthquake and tsunami,
which precipitated a competition of sorts among donor countries to pledge their assistance. To create one budget, a state had to cut down another budget to relocate to new initiatives. The budget for the immunization program in Tajikistan was thus reduced. It was a blow for the health sector in Tajikistan, but it also led to international agencies working in the health sector, such as UNICEF and the World Bank, to discuss with the Tajikistan’s health ministry towards realizing the importance of basic health provision to the people, and of committing the national budget to the program, rather than depending on external sources. This may be a positive development for a country that has experienced a protracted civil war following its independence from the USSR in 1991. Crisis can be turned into an opportunity and a step forward.

**Inclusion of Disaster Response in Japan’s ODA**

Japan has a long experience in responding to various types of disasters, but now its knowledge, know-how and technology are being accumulated not only in Japan itself but also from its ODA projects overseas. Areas of Japan’s technical knowledge include building standards, seismic information and application, the Shinkansen (bullet train)’s detection system, public education in disaster prevention, fire drills, and firefighting teams. In addition, since disaster prevention is not only the work of the municipal or national government, but for each individual member of society, local community participation and empowerment are key for more effective disaster prevention and post-disaster reconstruction. Applied science methods were not always sufficient: one lesson learnt was that the hazard map, which was meant to help people evacuate in the event of a disaster, may actually do more harm by discouraging people from evacuating or leading to over-confidence and complacency. During the 2011 disaster in Japan, people living in areas not covered in the hazard map thus underestimated their risk when the tsunami alert was announced for certain areas only.

Japan’s ODA scheme not only focuses on the traditional type of aid and expertise, but also increasingly uses ‘soft-type’ aid. A traditional response to disasters, for instance, was to carry out civil engineering work like building dikes. From Japan’s experiences in the 1995 Great Hanshin earthquake, however, projects have been developed for providing mental health care for disaster survivors and victims. As disaster response evolves from traditional applied science and engineering efforts to disaster mitigation and risk reduction, community-based and participatory approaches, as well as public education, are important in coping with current hazards and future disasters. JICA opened its office in Chengdu for its long-term assistance in mental health care of five years beyond the emergency relief period. It is very exceptional for the case of China that such office can be opened outside Beijing.
Japan’s ODA Efforts in the Philippines and Indonesia

In Japan’s ODA efforts in the Philippines and Indonesia, disaster-related assistance is an important pillar. There are two reasons for Japan’s involvement in disaster response projects in the Asia-Pacific region. One is that Japan has the technology and know-how gleaned from its historical experiences coping with disasters. The other is that countries in the region such as Indonesia and the Philippines have a long-standing diplomatic relationship with Japan and are disaster-prone in need of assistance.

Japan’s ODA projects have made significant contributions to the development of infrastructure in the Philippines since 1969. Developments in roads and bridges, power and energy, potable water supply, airports, ports, and agriculture have had a positive impact on the environment, health, education, and flood control.11) All over the Philippines, as of 2004, 22 major flood control projects had been assisted by Japan. These projects included responses to the flash floods that killed an estimated 8,000 people in Ormoc in 1991. Subsequently, a Ormoc City flood mitigation project was carried out and completed in 2001, enabling the Philippine government to declare, ‘No more Ormoc disaster’. Soon after the project’s completion, Ormoc was hit by another massive typhoon that had the same intensity as the 1991 storm, but the mitigation Project prevented a recurrence of the similar devastation.

Japan’s disaster aid to the Philippines included not only responses to typhoons but also the 1990 Central Luzon earthquake and the eruption of Mt. Pinatubo the following year. In the latter case, Japan provided four instances of emergency aid to the Philippines between June 1991 and October 1993, including the transport of private-sector aid goods in December 1992. As a relative latecomer to the ODA scene, Japan could learn from the experiences of more established donor countries such as the US, Australia and Great Britain, particularly in working with local NGOs and in using social science approaches to disaster response. In January 2013, a proposal for flood control, The Manila Metropolitan Area Flood Control Planning: Study on Environmental and Social Considerations in the Philippines, was submitted, containing not only traditional civil engineering project proposals but also others that concerned social and individual aspects.

The ODA scheme also involves collaboration with academics, and not only engineers or scientists. For example, a pediatrician team at Kobe University, which had worked with children with disability after the 1995 earthquake, were also involved in an Integrated Mobile Rehabilitation Project sponsored by JICA project in Java, Indonesia. The team provided training in physiotherapy to local nurses for the disabled and dispatched a physiotherapist to households with the disabled children.
In December 2007, the Kobe Association of Social Welfare built Griya Lare Utami (the Children’s House) in Java.12) Children often do not have precise words to fully express their feelings so play therapy is usefully practiced with disaster-affected children, who play with clay, miniature gardens, doll houses, and who also use color painting with crayon. Other activities carried out at the Children’s House include story-telling, the wearing of uniforms, recycling of discarded materials, a discussion seminar at the local health clinic and other small seminars, and the exchange of students from Kobe University and Gadjah Mada University. The lessons learnt from such activities highlight the importance of sustainable community-based efforts with family support and participation. This is an example of sharing international and inter-disciplinary experiences and information on disaster response.13)

Typhoon Haiyan, known in the Philippines as Typhoon Yolanda, hit Tacloban, Leyte area on 8 November 2013. It was one of the strongest tropical cyclones ever recorded, killing at least 6,300 people in that country alone. Japan provided USD52 million of humanitarian aid and deployed the JDS Ise (DDH-182) and JDS Ōsumi (LST-4001) and Boeing KC-767 along with 1,180 members of the Japanese Self-Defense Forces. The Japan Disaster Relief team was also deployed. Japanese NGOs, such as AMDA Japan and IFRC Japan operated their medical teams. Not only such emergency relief, JICA provide mid and longer term assistance for the project on rehabilitation and recovery from Typhoon Yolanda, along with the Philippines national policy of “Build Back Better: Creation of cities toward better reconstruction after disaster”. It includes the quick impact projects such as livelihood development in fishery and market rebuild for women group. The assistance is not just financial but technical contribution such as preparing “JICA Hazard Map”. Other than the bi-lateral scheme of JICA, Japanese government provide assistance through multi-lateral schemes such as WHO, which regional office of Western Pacific (WPRO) is based in Manila, as well as ADB14), which headquarter is based in Manila. For example, among the ADB response to the Typhoon, “Emergency assistance and early recovery for poor municipalities affected by Typhoon Yolanda” of USD 20 million for 2.5 years is supported by the Japan Fund for Poverty Reduction (JFPR) Grant number 9175, approved on 13 December 2013, which was exceptionally quickly processed. It will help Local Government Unit (LGU) restore infrastructure, and provide access to emergency employment and livelihood support, through Department of Social Welfare and Development, Plan International, and National Electrification Administraion, and provide basic emergency maternal and child health care, through Department of Health and International Federation of the Red Cross, with improved resilience to future disasters.

Japan’s Initiatives in Disaster-struck Areas with UN Agencies

The United Nations designated the 1990s as the International Decade on Natural Disaster
Reduction (IDNDR) to draw public attention to the importance of disaster prevention efforts. In May 1994, the UN World Conference for Disaster Reduction was held in Yokohama in Japan. The conference showed the Asia-Pacific region to be especially prone to natural disasters. About 80% of all the people killed by natural disasters in the 20th century lived in the region.

In 2000, the United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction (UNISDR) was established as a follow up to the IDNDR for the 1990s. The UN’s aims are to achieve a substantive reduction of disaster-related losses and to build resilient communities as an essential condition for sustainable development. The UNISDR Secretariat serves as a catalyst and focal point for disaster risk reduction within the United Nations family of organizations and for the many partners of the UNISDR system. The secretariat advocates for disaster risk reduction and has been involved in the implementation of the 10-year Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA) to make the world safer from natural disasters.

In October 2007, the UNISDR Secretariat established a UNISDR Hyogo liaison office in Kobe, Hyogo prefecture in Japan. Hyogo Prefecture and Kobe city had been active in recruiting an office of an international organization as a symbol of their post-earthquake programs, promoting their own image of the phoenix rising from a disaster. As Kobe was already well-known as an international city before the 1995 earthquake, its disaster response initiatives reinforces this role and status. In January 2005, the tenth anniversary of the Great Hanshin earthquake, UNISDR organized the World Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction (WCDR) in Kobe. The conference produced the Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015: Building the Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disasters as a comprehensive policy guideline for action for disaster risk reduction. Subsequently, the HFA was endorsed by the UN General Assembly in Resolution A/RES/60/195. It became the first plan to describe, explain and detail the work that is required from different sectors and actors to reduce disaster-related impacts and losses. It had been developed and agreed on by the partners needed to reduce disaster risk, namely, governments, international agencies, disaster experts, and others, bringing them into a common framework. The HFA is currently the centerpiece of global efforts to promote disaster risk reduction initiatives around the world, with a goal to substantially reduce disaster-related losses by 2015 by building the resilience of nations and communities to disasters. It outlines five priorities for action and offers guiding principles and practical recommendations for achieving disaster resilience, which would enable countries to reduce the loss of lives and social, economic and environmental assets when disasters occur.

The UNISDR Hyogo Office also collaborates with a wide range of partners on disaster risk reduction in Asia, in particular the Japanese Government, academic and research institutions, and the private sector in Japan. Japan has experienced many natural hazards throughout its history and
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has developed expertise, policies and technologies in the area of disaster risk reduction, which are well recognized by the international community. Japan can thus play a leading role in meeting the global challenge of international cooperation towards disaster risk reduction through the United Nations. Japanese knowledge and expertise can be shared with other countries, who can then try to improve their own efforts to tackle natural hazards, reduce disaster risks, and minimize damage and loss of lives in disasters.

Subsequently, the Japanese Government announced that they were prepared to hold the United Nations World Conference on Disaster Reduction in Japan. This is a global conference hosted by the UN to discuss disaster recovery strategies. In the past, the conference had been twice held in Japan, in Yokohama City in 1994 and in Kobe City in 2005. In terms of scale, the Kobe conference involved 168 UN member states, 78 UN agencies and international organizations, and 161 NGOs. More than 4,000 participants attended the conference, and over 40,000 participants joined the public forum.

Accordingly, the authorities of Sendai City, one of the areas struck by the 3.11 earthquake, made the decision to hold the conference in the city in 2015. Plans have been drawn up to transform Sendai City into a world-class city with disaster prevention efforts at its core, drawn from the experiences of March 2011. This is a meaningful gesture as well as the responsibility of a disaster-affected area to explain its experiences and responses to the rest of the world. For example, at the 2012 annual meeting of the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank group, which was held in Tokyo, a field visit by the head of the international organizations was made to the disaster-hit areas in Tohoku.

In 2000, the UN commenced discussion of Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), with the target set for 2015. There is an ongoing discussion regarding post-MDG efforts after 2015. The MDGs were set in the African context, but current discussions have been to extend post-MDG targets to issues of ageing populations and universal health coverage. Since the Hyogo Framework for Action is also scheduled to end in 2015, there are discussions to integrate the concept of enhancing the resilience of nations and communities to disasters in the post-MDG initiatives.

**Japan Learning from its Overseas Experiences**

When Japan experienced the events of 3.11, this was an occasion when its international aid experiences, accrued both from ODA through like JICA and NGOs as well as from other international organizations, became useful for its own society. In the period following the disaster, conditions deteriorated for the survivors in the disaster-affected areas, such as living without electrical supply.
International organizations such as International Red Cross, Medicine Sans Frontiers, Save the Children, and UN agencies such as the World Food Program and UNICEF engaged in relief and recovery operations in east Japan. In fact, UNICEF could not operate in Japan due to its charter, but managed to find a solution. The Japan UNICEF Association, an NGO established in 1955, operated in the disaster zone using Japanese staff of UNICEF from around the world. They took leave from their jobs and came back to Japan to work in Tohoku in their own personal capacity. They were able to draw upon their experiences of working in disaster areas, mainly in developing countries such as Afghanistan, Nigeria, Honduras, Kenya, Somalia, and Vietnam.

Post-3/11, UNICEF’s main task was the distribution of emergency supplies through CO-OPoop (Japanese Consumer’s Co-operative Union). In April, with the beginning of the academic year in Japan coinciding with the cherry blossom season, UNICEF worked hard to support the reopening of schools by providing school materials. UNICEF has been developing a strategy of post-disaster response for children. The post-3/11 situation in Tohoku had often been described as bad as, or even worse than, those in developing countries, and worse than the areas affected by the Indian Ocean tsunami in Indonesia in December 2004. In Tohoku, water and electricity supply were disrupted for a long period of time. Fortunately, UNICEF had the resources and experience to help in this unprecedented catastrophe in Tohoku. For example, at disaster areas without electricity, UNICEF provided a refrigerator previously used in a developing country to transport and store vaccines for children. Following the emergency response, several exchange projects were started for the longer term to bring people together and share experience, for example, between Indonesia and Japan.

Conclusion

This paper began with an introduction of Japan’s long history of coping with disaster, calling the attention to disasters as an increasingly important issue in the era of globalization, especially in the Asia-Pacific region. It points out climate change and urbanization as two reasons why the damages caused by disasters have seen an exponential increase. This paper briefly reviewed Japan’s ODA policy within the country’s historical context. This paper then discussed Japan’s ODA efforts in the Philippines and Indonesia in the aftermath of several disasters. In 2003, disasters were placed on the agenda in the revised ODA Charter, in line with global developments. This paper also examined Japan’s initiatives in disaster response through the United Nations, such as United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction and the World Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction. It also highlights the Hyogo Framework for Action for 2005-2015 and the calls for disaster response to be incorporated in the post-UN Millennium Development Goals after 2015. I argue that disaster must be included in the post-MDGs plan. This paper also demonstrates that
Japan’s overseas engagements have been useful for dealing with its own responses to the Great East Japan earthquake, tsunami and nuclear disasters in 2011.
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12) S. Nakai, The Joint Program between Graduate School of Health Science, Kobe University Japan and School of Nursing, Faculty of Medicine, Universitas Gajah Mada Indonesia, Dec. 21-26, 2008 Activity Report, [Japanese].
13) Other examples of other Japanese disaster-related projects and press statements in the Philippines and Indonesia are included in the appendices to this paper.
14) All the ADB Presidents in its history are Japanese, and they have been from the top of the Japanese Ministry of Finance. The current President Takehiko Nakao visited Tacloban to open its extended office there in February 2014. He was the first President to visit outside Manila in the Philippines.
15) Asahi Shinbun, 19 March 2011.
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Junko Otani

Japan has a long experience of responding to disasters. The 1995 Great Hanshin Earthquake can be said a turning point in the discussion of disaster-initiated social change and sociological disaster research in Japan. So it was with the 2011 Great East Japan Earthquake, Tsunami and Nuclear disasters. This paper examines the Japan’s endeavors to internationalize its experiences and know-how. The paper will attempt to undertake a historical review of Japan’s response to disasters, focusing on its Overseas Development Assistance (ODA) efforts in the Asia-Pacific region, the most disaster-prone area in the world, with examples from Indonesia and the Philippines.