

The United States and Asian Security

Matthew Evangelista and
Judith Reppy, eds.
Peace Studies Program
Cornell University

CORNELL UNIVERSITY
PEACE STUDIES PROGRAM
OCCASIONAL PAPER #26

©May 2002

© 2002 Cornell University Peace Studies Program. All rights reserved.

ISSN 1075-4857

The United States and Asian Security

Matthew Evangelista and Judith Reppy, eds.

The Peace Studies Program was established at Cornell in 1970 as an interdisciplinary program concerned with problems of peace and war, arms control and disarmament, and more generally, instances of collective violence. Its broad objectives are to support graduate and post-doctoral study, research, teaching and cross-campus interactions in these fields.

Copies of Occasional Papers may be ordered from:

Peace Studies Program
130 Uris Hall
Cornell University
Ithaca, NY 14853-7601

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE	iv
INTRODUCTION: THE UNITED STATES AND ASIAN SECURITY	1
<i>Matthew Evangelista</i>	
PART I: THE ROLE OF THE UNITED STATES IN ASIA	
THE COMING ARMS RACE IN ASIA: CAN WE AVOID REPEATING THE COLD WAR WITH NEW PLAYERS?	8
<i>Randall Forsberg</i>	
THE TWO-WAR DOCTRINE AND REGIONAL ARMS RACE: CONTRADICTIONS IN U.S. POST-COLD WAR SECURITY POLICY ON KOREA	36
<i>Jae-Jung Suh</i>	
U.S.-JAPAN DIPLOMATIC AND SECURITY RELATIONS POST-1945: A HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE	66
<i>John Swenson-Wright</i>	
EAST ASIAN RESPONSES TO THEATER MISSILE DEFENSE	105
<i>Adam Segal</i>	
PART II: ASIAN SECURITY IN A REGIONAL PERSPECTIVE	
CHINA'S PERIPHERY POLICY AND CHANGING SECURITY ENVIRONMENT IN THE ASIA-PACIFIC REGION	132
<i>Suisheng Zhao</i>	
JAPAN'S REGIONAL SECURITY POLICY IN POST-COLD WAR ASIA	160
<i>Lisa J. Sansoucy</i>	
THE CHANGING SECURITY PICTURE IN THE RUSSIAN FAR EAST	176
<i>Cristina Chuen</i>	
CONTRIBUTORS	208

PREFACE

The papers collected here are the product of a workshop on “The United States and Asian Security” held on 9-11 March, 2001 at Cornell University in Ithaca, New York. The workshop brought together specialists in Asian security issues from the United States and England to discuss regional security issues from a variety of perspectives.

The rich discussion and debate during the workshop are reflected in the arguments presented in the following chapters, which we have grouped into two parts: The Role of the United States in Asia, and Asian Security in a Regional Perspective. This collection is one of the first to study 21st century Asian security policy both in its regional context and with regard to the major role played by the United States. It is the first to highlight the findings of the weapons data project of the Institute for Defense and Disarmament Studies and to examine their implications for Asian security. Finally, the collection features mainly younger scholars—graduate students and professors—at early stages of their careers, but with impressive regional expertise and analytic skills. The Peace Studies Program is grateful for their participation in the project. We would also like to thank the other participants in the workshop who wrote papers, served as discussants, and contributed comments that have improved the quality of this collection: Greg Brazinsky, Allen Carlson, Tom Christensen, Wade Huntley, Peter Katzenstein, Barry Strauss, Eric Tagliacozzo, Takao Takahara, and Joel Wit.

The workshop was sponsored by Cornell’s Peace Studies Program, with funding from an institutional grant to the Program from the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation. Matthew Evangelista and Judith Reppy organized the workshop, with help from Jae-Jung Suh and Allen Carlson. Elaine Scott and Sandra Kisner provided essential administrative support for the workshop, and Sandra Kisner contributed significantly to the editorial task of producing this publication.

**INTRODUCTION:
THE UNITED STATES AND ASIAN SECURITY**

Matthew Evangelista

George W. Bush came into office in January 2001 with a team of foreign-policy advisers largely inherited from his father. Their experience ranged from negotiating the Soviet Union's military withdrawal from Eastern Europe to forging a multinational coalition to wage war against Iraq and end its occupation of Kuwait. Expertise in Asian affairs was conspicuously absent from the collective résumé of the Bush team.

Not surprisingly, the administration's first initiatives towards Asia reflected both the experiences of its main foreign policymakers and a certain ambivalence about how to deal with issues that had not loomed large on their radar screens—at least not outside of the Cold-War context. Indeed, to refer to the early policy moves of the Bush administration as initiatives is perhaps inaccurate. Many were, rather, reactions to prior policies of the Clinton administration or to events that caught the Bush team by surprise.

In the first category was Korea. Clinton's State Department had attempted to deal with North Korea's pursuit of missile and nuclear-weapons technology essentially by bribery. In return for constraints on its missile tests and inspections of its nuclear facilities, the United States would provide food aid and technical assistance and give its blessing to efforts by the South Korean government at North-South rapprochement. Distracted by the controversy over who actually won the U.S. presidential election of November 2000, and giving priority to trying to secure an Israeli-Palestinian peace agreement, the Clinton administration failed to nail down the final details of a deal with North Korea.

The new Bush administration was divided over how to proceed. Secretary of State Colin Powell initially signaled that the administration would take up where its predecessor had left off. Officials in the Defense Department and National Security Council quickly repudiated that position. They preferred to put a freeze on relations with North Korea, even at the risk of undermining the "sunshine policy" of South Korea's President Kim Dae-Jung. The arguments put forward to justify a go-slow approach to the North held echoes of the Cold War and the Bush team's understanding of how the East-West confrontation in Europe had ended. Limiting North Korea's

nuclear capabilities would be insufficient without substantial cuts in its conventional military forces. Limiting military forces would be a reliable route to security only if accompanied by moves towards greater openness in North Korea's regime—otherwise, lack of trust would undermine further progress. Within months, however, the Bush administration had reconsidered its all-or-nothing approach, which had in any case been rejected outright by the North Korean government, and seemed willing to pursue the diplomacy that Clinton's State Department had initiated.

Diplomacy carried the day in the next major issue of Asian security to confront the new administration. On 1 April 2001, a fighter-interceptor jet of the People's Republic of China (PRC) collided with a U.S. Navy surveillance aircraft and forced it to land on PRC territory. The Chinese jet evidently crashed, killing the pilot. The PRC government detained the 24-member crew of the U.S. plane for 11 days while demanding an apology. The U.S. government won the crew's release by saying it was very sorry for the loss of the Chinese pilot's life and for landing without permission. It eventually managed to get the valuable EP-3 spy plane back, dismantled in crates, and it paid the Chinese government nearly \$35,000 for its expenses (China had demanded \$1 million). As one administration official explained, "as far as Defense Department accounting goes, this is pretty close to zero. It's cheaper than sending delegations back and forth to talk about it."¹

Thus the Bush administration was compelled to deal with the People's Republic of China in a diplomatic crisis, with military overtones, before it had successfully fashioned an overall China policy. The Republican Party was already deeply divided over China: one faction was extremely critical of the regime's record on human rights and still nostalgic for the days when the United States acknowledged only Taiwan as the legitimate representative of China. Another was willing to look the other way on human rights in order to pursue investment opportunities in China's vast potential market and to take advantage of its pool of low-wage labor. Some Republicans expressed concern about the emergence of China as the next major military threat to the United States, replacing the Soviet Union as a challenger to U.S. hegemony. Others were more complacent and believed that China could be smoothly integrated into a U.S.-dominated international system.

¹ Erik Eckholm, "China Agrees to Return Partly Dismantled Spy Plane as Cargo," *New York Times*, 29 May 2001, p. A8.

Relations between Japan and the United States were also strained during the first months of the Bush administration. On February 9, 2001, a Navy submarine, the USS *Greenville*, hit and sank a Japanese fishing boat off the coast of Hawaii during a rapid ascent, resulting in the death of nine Japanese, including high school students and teachers who were on a field trip. The subsequent investigation revealed that the submarine was playing host to a party of civilian observers, some of whom were actually at the controls when the commander ordered the emergency ascent because they were running behind schedule in returning to port. The commander was forced to resign from the Navy, but Japanese sentiment was outraged that he was not punished more severely. This incident, along with an alleged rape involving U.S. military personnel on Guam, stoked anti-American feeling in Japan, not least because they echoed earlier incidents in which the United States military has appeared insensitive to Japanese public opinion.

The crises with China and Japan and the Bush administration's contradictory approach to Korea came as surprises to everyone. Yet, within the scholarly community of Asia specialists, the broader questions about U.S. policy and Asian security have received considerable attention. In March 2001 the Peace Studies Program at Cornell convened a workshop on "The United States and Asian Security" to present some of the results of some of this academic research and to discuss its implications for future U.S. policy. One impetus for the workshop was the completion of a major data project on trends in Chinese military forces by Dr. Randall Forsberg's Institute for Defense and Disarmament Studies. Forsberg's paper, revised and published here, kicked off discussion at the conference with a controversial argument. She suggested that U.S. military activities in Asia, including deployments and arms sales, were difficult to justify on the basis of present or foreseeable Chinese military capabilities. She warned that U.S. actions threatened to recreate a Cold-War situation in Asia, including a costly and potentially dangerous arms race.

Other participants suggested that U.S. policy was not driven so much by Chinese military capabilities but rather by concerns that China not use force to reunite with Taiwan. Much of U.S. policy in Asia, in this view, revolves around the Taiwan issue. The United States has played a positive role in the dispute between Beijing and Taipei, especially compared to the alternative of letting regional powers sort things out themselves. Similarly, with respect to Japan, American efforts to encourage Japan to expand its military activities in the region risk alienating a number of countries, including the former Japanese colonies of Korea and Taiwan. From this perspective, a continuing U.S. presence is reassuring to most states in the region (including possibly China),

whose historical memories of Japanese expansionism in the 1930s would make them reluctant to countenance an increase in Japan's military role.

Debates about the proper role of the United States in Asian security lay at the heart of the March workshop. Indeed, the very title of the workshop—"The United States *and* Asian Security"—is deliberately ambiguous, as Peter Katzenstein pointed out in his opening remarks. Do we consider the United States to be part of Asia, and, thus, naturally concerned about the security of its own region? Such an interpretation might have been clearer if we had chosen the term "Asia-Pacific," for example. Or is Asia some other place, independent of the United States, with its own security concerns? In that case, the United States might expect to influence Asian security, for good or ill, but many of the key issues that concern Asian governments and people would be driven more by regional dynamics than by the behavior of the United States. Finally, aside from questions about the relevance of the United States, what do we mean by Asia? Which countries are within the purview of our discussion?

The last question was the easiest to answer. The papers presented at the workshop dealt primarily with the major countries of East Asia—China, Taiwan, Japan, and the Koreas—and with Russia, a country geographically situated in Asia, and, in the post-Soviet era, increasingly involved in matters affecting Asian security. No papers focused explicitly on southwest Asian states, such as Pakistan and India, but they and other countries were brought up when relevant to particular issues under discussion.

The question of the place of the United States in the region remained a difficult and controversial one, but we have sought to turn it to our advantage in presenting the findings of the workshop. We have divided this Occasional Paper into two parts. The first looks at the role of the United States in Asian security, and, in particular, how U.S. military deployments, strategy, and alliance relations have affected developments there. The second examines the dynamics of Asian regional security without according the United States a privileged role. The countries of the region share a long history of interaction, predating the rise of the United States as a naval and air power with worldwide reach. Moreover, the demise of the bipolar system that characterized the Cold War has given rise to many security issues that were not salient in the context of superpower conflict. They are better studied within their specific regional context.

The volume begins with Randall Forsberg's analysis of military developments in China and her warning about an emerging new Cold War in Asia -- the result, she argues, primarily of

U.S. military policies there. Jae-Jung Suh of Cornell's Department of Government follows with a study of U.S. military policy towards North and South Korea. His careful political and military analysis is congenial to Forsberg's in that he finds much of the U.S. policy of "contingagement" (a neologism combining containment and engagement) contradictory and counterproductive. It seems more likely to exacerbate security problems on the Korean peninsula than alleviate them. Professor Suh expresses particular concern that U.S. actions not inadvertently derail the process of North-South reconciliation, so unthinkable just a decade ago.

A more positive assessment of the role of the United States is found in the paper by John Swenson-Wright of Cambridge University. He traces the post-World War II history of the alliance between the United States and Japan and finds much to admire. He documents a number of incidents in which new scholarship suggests that the U.S. government was more sensitive to Japanese culture and political exigencies than is commonly thought and argues that public opinion in Japan is evolving to support a more realistic security policy for Japan. Finally, Alan Segal, now at the Council on Foreign Relations, discusses an issue that very much involves the United States: the plans for deployment of theater missile defense (TMD) systems in Asia. The U.S. government, since the Clinton administration, has described the threat that ostensibly drives the development of TMD in the region as stemming from North Korea's pursuit of the capability to launch long-range ballistic missiles. But the interpretation of that threat, as well as alternative means to deal with it (such as arms control), are determined to a large extent by the United States itself. Segal's chapter provides an assessment of the technical capabilities of the North Korean missile program, details on the proposed U.S. systems, and a country-by-country consideration of the military, political, and diplomatic consequences of TMD deployment.

The second part of the volume begins with an analysis of China's regional security policy by Suisheng Zhao of the University of Denver. The People's Republic of China, according to Professor Zhao, has in the post-Cold War era considered good relations with its neighbors a crucial component of its security policy. This orientation marks a change from the early years following the communist revolution, when the PRC, in striving for great-power status, was sometimes described as "a regional power without a regional policy." Professor Zhao's analysis covers relations between China and neighbors such as Vietnam, Mongolia, and Russia; questions of border disputes; China's longstanding rivalry with Japan; the extent to which the PRC poses a

threat to weaker countries in the region; and, finally, how relations with the United States affect China's regional policy.

In devising its regional security policy, Japan faces a choice, as Lisa Sansoucy, a PhD candidate in Cornell's Department of Government, discusses. It can emphasize its relationship with the United States and deal on a bilateral basis with its neighbors, or it can work towards the establishment of multilateral institutions for regional security. Since 1991, argues Sansoucy, Japan has pursued multilateralism, with U.S. blessing, through the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) Regional Forum. How Japan came to embrace regional multilateralism is best explained by an analysis of the domestic politics of Japanese security policy. In particular, Sansoucy shows how liberals in the Foreign Ministry promoted an understanding of Japan's national identity that made the "self-binding" restraints of multilateral cooperation seem compatible with Japan's security interests.

Although the end of the Cold War eliminated the factor of U.S.-Soviet rivalry in East Asia, it did not render Russia's influence insignificant. On the contrary, as Cristina Chuen of the Monterey Institute of International Studies argues, the provinces of the Russian Federation that make up what Russians call the "Far East" have become key elements in the overall Asian security environment. Conflicts between the Far Eastern regions and Moscow have international repercussions, not least because they concern such issues as control over former Soviet military bases, including nuclear facilities, and military industry. Questions of immigration, organized crime, and trade, especially for the regions that border China, are of particular concern. So are border disputes—particularly the long unresolved status of the southern Kuril Islands and Sakhalin, claimed by Japan as its "northern territories," but occupied by the Soviet Union in the wake of World War II, and still populated and controlled by Russians. Chuen's paper examines how domestic center-periphery relations between Moscow and its Far Eastern regions affect Russian policy towards its Asian neighbors, including the United States.

America's security interests have been reconstituted following the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon. The place of the United States in Asian regional security and of Asia in U.S. security calculations, however, remain as enduring issues. The papers in this volume serve as an introduction to the context and issues at stake, and are, we hope, a contribution to more informed public discussion and policy making.

PART I

The Role of the United States in Asia

THE COMING ARMS RACE IN ASIA: CAN WE AVOID REPEATING THE COLD WAR WITH NEW PLAYERS?

Randall Forsberg

The United States and the other major Western industrial nations have had a decade to adjust to the fact that none of them faces an imminent threat of major conventional war. The dissolution of the Warsaw Pact and the Soviet Union and the unification of Germany, along with the subsequent decline of the Russian economy and Russian armed forces, have created a situation in which, for the first time in over a century, no major industrial country faces another large, hostile industrial country with the capability to launch a military invasion.

Despite this revolution in international affairs, the military policies of the United States and its allies have remained stunningly unchanged. U.S. military spending has declined, but only back to the pre-Reagan Cold War norm: it remains as high today in real terms as it was during the Cold War (the peacetime years between 1950 and 1980). At over \$300 billion, the U.S. military budget is seven times larger than those of the next biggest spenders, Japan and Russia, whose annual military spending is about \$40 billion each. The next highest spenders—France, Germany, Britain, and Italy—are all major U.S. NATO allies. Military expenditures in these nations remain close to their Cold War peaks. The military spending of China is estimated to be about the same as that of Italy, around \$25 billion.¹

The continued high level of military spending is just one of several unchanging features of military policies in the West. Other features are:

- C *On-going quantity production and vigorous competition for export of high-tech weapon systems* previously justified as needed, either globally or regionally, to counter military threats from or originating in the Soviet Union or Russia;
- C *The expansion of facilities for U.S. forward military basing* in the Asia-Pacific region, with the support of Japan and despite the improving relations between the two Koreas and the admission of China to the World Trade Organization.

¹ SIPRI data. Available at http://projects.sipri.se/milex/mex_database1.html.

- C *The refusal of the United States to respond to Russian pleas to move rapidly toward deep cuts in nuclear weapons, a comprehensive test ban treaty, and other steps to reduce the risk of nuclear war and foster nonproliferation;*² and
- C *New efforts in the United States to build national and theater missile defenses and other weapons and equipment with which the U.S. military seek “full-spectrum dominance” across the range of potential forms of warfare in all parts of the world, from minor to full scale.*

The West’s failure to explore a new approach to military policy and military aspects of foreign policy is increasingly dangerous. The world is standing on the threshold of a new conventional and nuclear arms race in Asia, which is likely to be extremely dangerous in itself and to lead to a new Cold War-like armed confrontation between parts of Asia and the United States. This would divert financial resources, human energy, and channels of communication away from constructive projects, openness, and democratization in these nations and into self-perpetuating cycles of fear, secrecy, concealment, and hostility.

In this paper I begin by giving an overview of the likely lines of alliance and confrontation in a new Cold War in Asia—that is, an intensified, hostile stand-off chiefly between China (or China and Russia), on the one hand, and the United States, Japan, and South Korea on the other, with most other nations in East and Southeast Asia lining up on the U.S. side. I then survey trends in the development of China’s armed forces. Today China and other Asian nations stand at a fork in the road: Since 1980 “modernization” and growth in military spending and forces have been modest. Although the end of the Cold War did not lead to any major military cuts, the Asian economic crisis reduced planned rates of modernization in several countries. The question now is whether forces will remain roughly constant or, if relations between the two

² Over the period from 2002 to 2012, total U.S. nuclear warheads are expected to go down from 10,600 to 10,000. That total includes about 2,000 tactical warheads, of which 800 are active. Of the 8,000 strategic warheads, over 6,000 are active today, which just 2,200 are expected to be active by 2012. However, the other 5,800 will be held in reserve in a condition in which they can be pulled out relatively quickly (some very quickly; others would take weeks or months to get back into service). In the meantime, the U.S. nuclear weapon production complex is budgeted to be complete refurbished, so that all of the 10,000 weapons to be kept can be given their tritium replacements and kept in good working order. See “Faking Nuclear Restraint: The Bush Administration’s Secret Plan for Strengthening U.S. Nuclear Forces,” Natural Resources Defense Council, Washington, DC, 13 February 2002.

Koreas continue to improve, decline in size; or whether, as economic conditions permit, there will be substantial new increases in the quantity and quality of conventional armed forces in several countries and, in China, a significant expansion of the nuclear arsenal.

Next I look at the evidence that U.S. policy is, in fact, moving toward a strategy of military containment toward China, which is likely to evolve into a Cold War-like confrontation.

Finally, I look at the likely impact on China of the unchanging aspects of U.S. and other Western military policies, and the new U.S. policy of containment. I conclude that taken together, Western competition for exports of high-tech weapons and equipment, increased U.S. military presence in Asia, the U.S. refusal to make deep cuts in nuclear weapons, U.S. national and theater missile defense programs, and other systems for “full-spectrum dominance” are likely to foster the emergence of a new Cold War in Asia. This will involve new build-ups of conventional and nuclear forces and, as a direct consequence of these build-ups, deteriorating relations among China, Japan, the United States, and other nations.

The Concept and Meaning of a New Cold War in Asia

We can already identify not only the key players in a New Cold War in Asia, but also their roles—roles remarkably parallel to those of various nations at the outset of the Cold War in Europe. Despite having neither comparable armed forces nor a comparable strategic location relative to U.S. political and economic interests, China is being put in the position of playing the role of Russia, that is, “the bad guy.” Japan and South Korea have roles in Northeast Asia resembling those of Britain, France, and Germany in Europe: previously warring countries themselves, now trying to live at peace with each other while fending off the bad guy, but not fully trusting each other. Clearly Japan in Asia plays the role of Germany in Europe: this is the country most feared because of its tremendous economic base, the related potential for a major build-up of armed forces, and its history of military aggression and imperialism in the region. Meanwhile, Taiwan plays a role comparable to that of East Germany, where the issue of continued separation or unification was a persistent obstacle to the development of a stable long-term peace in the region.

As became increasingly clear over the course of the 50-year Cold War, the role of the United States in Europe was not only and perhaps even not mainly to help defend U.S. allies against the designated enemy—even though that was the purpose stressed for public consump-

tion. Given the low risk of a deliberate Soviet attack on NATO countries, the more basic role, in the view of decision makers, was to help preserve the peace against any form of unraveling—for example, Germany once again unifying and become a military threat to the rest of Europe, or any pair of countries among Britain, France, Germany, and Russia combining to threaten the others.

Now, even more than over the past half century, the United States is settling in to play the role of “power balancer” for the next 50-100 years in the Asia-Pacific region. This is clear from several recent steps to expand and entrench a dominant U.S. military presence in East Asia. These include the new U.S.-Japan Guidelines for Defense Cooperation, plans to maintain U.S. bases in Korea after unification, increased U.S. naval deployments in the Pacific, and on-going development of naval-based theater missile defenses for joint use with Japan and possibly Taiwan and Korea. The new U.S.-Japan Defense Cooperation Guidelines permit the United States to use Japanese naval and air ports and other infrastructure to support U.S. military deployments for any purpose, anywhere in the world, without prior consultation or agreement with Japan. This means that Japanese territory could be used as a base for U.S. military operations against China in the event of a conflict over Taiwan. The great bulk of U.S. military forces in Japan are already stationed in Okinawa, where the main airport is three hours distance by plane from Tokyo, but just one hour from Taiwan. At the same time, Japan’s participation in a joint project with the United States to develop and deploy a naval-based theater missile defense system poses a potential future threat to the viability of China’s strategic nuclear forces. These two new programs unite the United States and Japan in ways that cut right to the heart of China’s chief security concerns and must be perceived as threatening by China.

Regarding U.S. relations with South Korea, the private statement by North Korean leader Kim Jong Il in the June 2002 summit with South Korean President Kim Dae Jun that a continued U.S. military presence in Korea after unification would be acceptable may be an expression of the continued Korean fear of Japan as a potentially aggressive nation, which will be kept at bay by U.S. military presence. There is evidence that China supported this position in advance of the Korean summit meetings. Like Korea, China remains worried about the potential future evolution of Japan’s military and political ambitions.

This combination of interests and actions puts the United States in a classic power-balancing position, protecting Taiwan with the aid of Japan; protecting Japan from China directly; while protecting the Korea peninsula and China from Japan both by maintaining a large military

presence in Japan (mainly in Okinawa) and by retaining military bases in Korea. This role is explicitly recognized in the *Annual Report* for 2001 of outgoing Secretary of Defense William S. Cohen. In the section on U.S. Defense Strategy as it pertains to East Asia and the Pacific rim, the Annual Report states: “maintaining significant and highly capable forces in East Asia and the Pacific Rim . . . allows the United States to play a key role as regional balancer and security guarantor to Allies.”³

Similarly, a new *Annual Report on the Military Power of the People’s Republic of China*, issued for the first time by the Pentagon in November 2000 (in compliance with Congressional legislation), recognizes explicitly the likely impact on China of current U.S. policies. The first part of the report, on “Goals of Chinese Grand Strategy, Security Strategy, and Military Strategy,” accurately portrays the priority China has long given to economic development over military development, and describes China as having been relatively sanguine about continuing this emphasis until recently. Now, it says, U.S. policies and actions have begun to create a good deal of concern:

[Recent] developments . . . have prompted some Chinese elites to question seriously China’s longstanding benign security assessments that “peace and development” are the primary international trends, that world war can be avoided, and that [the] balance of global power is shifting from a bipolar to a multipolar structure.

. . . [Among other things] Beijing suspects that new US-Japan Defense Guidelines Review measures authorize Japanese military action beyond Japan’s previous defense posture and prompt Tokyo to improve its regional force projection capabilities. Beijing also calculates that US efforts to develop national and theater missile defenses will challenge the credibility of China’s nuclear deterrence and eventually be extended to protect Taiwan, a move that China would consider a gross intervention in Chinese affairs. . . .

In the aftermath of Operation ALLIED FORCE’s success in Kosovo, Beijing thinks it will have increasing difficulty managing potential U.S. meddling in internal Chinese affairs or military interventions in potential conflict scenarios involving China . . . China believes that [recent] trends indicate that it will be difficult for Beijing to develop a special relationship with Washington that would fundamentally moderate any US intent to “contain” China or that would encour-

³ Secretary of Defense William S. Cohen, *Annual Report to the President and the Congress (Annual Report)* Washington DC: U.S. Department of Defense, January 2001, p. 14, published at: <http://www.dtic.mil/execsec/adr2001/>.

age the United States to cooperate with China in offsetting Japan's growing power.⁴

The report goes on to discuss likely Chinese responses to U.S. efforts to "contain" China, concluding that for the near future, there are few practical options that China would see as being to its advantage:

Since the 7 May 1999 bombing of China's embassy in Belgrade, China's leaders reportedly have been discussing ways to offset US power, to include accelerating military modernization, pursuing strategic cooperation with Russia, and increasing China's proliferation activities abroad. However, none of these options is likely to improve fundamentally Beijing's position.

China does not appear to have concluded that any of these options would necessarily improve its security environment. Senior leaders resisted domestic pressures in the early- and mid-1990s to raise the importance of defense development in China's national development strategy because of concern that doing so would complicate efforts to ensure the growth and modernization of China's economy. Beijing believes that the economic growth is an important element in its strategy for maintaining the stability of its domestic social environment; moreover, foreign trade and investment links are central to China's development of the economic element of material (hard) component of national power. China's leaders also suspect that increasing the role of defense in national priorities would only reinforce Washington's efforts to contain China and justify Japan's intent to improve its force projection capability. Over the last decade, senior PLA strategists periodically have cautioned China's leaders to avoid being goaded by the United States into a lopsided arms race that could derail China's economic modernization.⁵

As discussed in more detail below, the limited options open to China derive not only from the self-imposed limits on China's military spending, but also from the lack of a technological infrastructure that would let China develop current-generation weapons and equipment or military capabilities needed for "power projection." Thus, it is not surprising that the *Pentagon Report* attributes relatively limited and peaceful goals to China's military policy:

China seeks to become the preeminent power among regional states in East Asia. Beijing is pursuing a regional security strategy aimed at preserving what it per-

⁴ *Report to Congress Pursuant to the FY2000 National Defense Authorization Act: Annual Report on the Military Power of the People's Republic of China* (hereafter referred to as *Military Power of China*), Washington DC: U.S. Department of Defense, June 2000, section I.A, published at <http://www.defenselink.mil/news/Jun2000/china06222000.htm>.

⁵ *Ibid.*

ceives as its sovereign interests in Taiwan, the South China Sea, and elsewhere on its periphery and protecting its economic interests, while at the same time promoting regional stability.⁶

In contrast to the political pundits and journalists who casually exaggerate China's military capabilities and ambitions, the Pentagon has offered a relatively realistic assessment. Thus, U.S. goals and policies in the region are not a product of deliberate or mistaken "worst-case analysis." Instead, the Clinton administration and now the Bush administration seem to be pursuing—with open eyes—a strategy of containment, confrontation, and arms deployment which could lead to an avoidable New Cold War.

Current and Likely Future Military Forces in China

The reason that U.S. and other Western military policies are likely to have a harmful impact on security in Asia lies in large part in the character of Asia's armed forces as they are today.

Unlike the countries of Europe, those in Asia have not yet built up large inventories of major weapon systems, diverse, technologically advanced military capabilities, or "power projection" forces. Instead of striving to prevent a repetition of the Cold War arms race in Asia, however, the current policies of the United States and other Western countries toward China and Russia are likely to foster conventional arms build-ups and arms races, a nuclear build-up on the part of China, continued reliance on nuclear weapons for deterrence of conventional war on the part of Russia, and even further proliferation of nuclear weapons.

The likelihood of fostering these developments is clearest in China, and the bare possibility of such developments in China in the not too distant future has already provoked concern and some increased arming in Japan, Australia, Taiwan, and several nations in Southeast Asia. For this reason, I will focus on China, describing the current state of Chinese armed forces in some detail, as a basis for then discussing the likely interaction between Western military policies and future Chinese arming.

There are three key weaknesses in China's armed forces as they are today: *First, in almost every area, China's inventory of major weapon systems remains at the level of technology*

⁶ *Military Power of China*, section I.B.

that was reached in the United States in the early to mid-1950s and in Russia and Europe soon after. As shown in Tables 1-5, which delineate the key features and trends of Chinese air, ground, and naval forces, the overwhelming majority of China's conventional weapon systems in service today were either designed before 1958 or are Chinese variants of U.S. and Russian systems designed by that time. China's introduction of combat aircraft with technology from the 1970s is just beginning today, with imports and licensed production of Sukhoi Su-27 aircraft, first flown in 1977. At the rate of procurement that has prevailed in China since the late 1980s—about 60 combat aircraft per year—it will be 2020 at best before China's air force is made up primarily of these relatively modern aircraft.

Table 1
China's Tank Force

Design Country	Design Era	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000
Russia	WWII/1950s (built '50s-'60s)	4,550	4,650	4,750	4,850	4,850	4,650	3,950	3,950	3,400
Russia	WWII/1950s (built '70s)	2,750	2,750	2,750	2,750	2,750	2,750	2,750	2,750	2,750
China	1950s Era (built '80s)	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	1,600	1,600	800	800	700
	Subtotal: 1950s Russian Technology	9,300	9,400	9,500	9,600	9,200	9,000	7,500	7,500	6,850
China	Chinese-designed Newer	250	325	400	500	600	700	800	850	910

Source: *IDDS World Arms Database 2001*, File 5A. Tank Holdings, Institute for Defense and Disarmament Studies, Cambridge MA, 2001.

The “at best” caveat relates to China's on-going effort to develop military-grade turbofan engines for advanced combat aircraft, which will permit the production of a new generation of Chinese-designed aircraft. So far, China's inability to build the powerful engines that drive modern aircraft, tanks, and ships has proven a prohibitive obstacle to domestic development and production of new systems. While China continues to pursue this goal, full conversion to even 1970s level technology—in combat aircraft, attack and ballistic missile submarines, tanks—will remain beyond reach, except through imports. And hitherto, China has refused to commit the exorbitant funds—probably doubling its defense spending—that would be required to import the bulk of its ground, air, and naval systems from Russia. This means that 2020 is the earliest date by which China is likely to be able to field a relatively modern air force. In the case of tanks and

Table 2
China's Current and Future Combat Aircraft by Design Era

Design Country	Design Era	Generic Name	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2005	2010
First Generation Combat Aircraft - Total													
Russia	Late '40s	MiG-15, MiG-17, Il-28	2698	2525	2335	1998	1646	1066	1036	1006	811	345	
Russia	Early '50s	MiG-19, Tu-16	1680	1606	1438	1121	946	916	886	856	811	345	
Second Generation Combat Aircraft - Total													
Russia	Late '50s	MiG-21, J-8	594	651	701	751	801	851	901	943	973	1217	1217
Third Generation Combat Aircraft - Total													
Russia	1977	Su-27	26	26	26	26	37	48	54	66	68	225	573
Russia	1977	Su-27/J-11	26	26	26	26	37	48	54	58	60	80	80
Russia	1977	Su-30								5	5	75	135
China	2000?	JH-7								3	3	30	123
China	2005?	FC-1											120
China	2005?	J-10											75

Source: *IDDs World Arms Database 2000*, File 1A. Military Aircraft Holdings, Institute for Defense and Disarmament Studies, Cambridge MA, 2001.

Table 3
Key Features of China's Combat Aircraft

Designing Country	Russian Technology Age	1st Flight or Service in China	Generic Name	Western Name	Military Role	Max Weight		Type	Engine		Thrust/engine (lbs)	Max Speed (Mach)
						(kg)	(kg)		No.	Manufacturer		
First Generation: Russian-Designed Late '40s & Early '50s												
Russia-FSU	1947	1950s	MiG-15/1-2,-3	Fagot	fighter	5,405	..	1 turbojet	Klimov	VK-1	5,004	subsonic
Russia-FSU	1949	1960s	MiG-17/1-4,5	Fresco-C	fighter	6,700	500	1 turbojet	Klimov	VK-1F	5,004	subsonic
Russia-FSU	1953	1960s	MiG-19/1-6	Farmer	fighter	8,900	500	2 turbojet	Tumansky	RD9B	5,732	transonic
									Tumansky	RD9B	7,165	
Second Generation: Russian-Designed Late '50s & Chinese Counterparts												
China	1984	J-8II			interceptor	17,800	4,500	2 turbojet	Liyang	WPI3AII	9,590	transonic
China	1996	J-8III			interceptor	18,879	..	2 turbojet	Liyang	WPI3B	10,582	transonic
Russia-FSU	1957	MiG-21/1-7		Fishbed-J	fighter-attack	9,400	1,500	1 turbojet	Tumansky	R-13-300	11,240	Mach 2
									Tumansky	R-11F-300	12,865	Mach 2
Third Generation: Russian-Designed Late '70s and Chinese Counterparts												
China	2001?	FC-1			fighter	12,700	4,000	1 turbofan	Klimov	RD-93	18,300*	Mach 1.6
China	1988	JH-7			lt bomber	28,475	5,000	2 turbofan	Rolls Royce	Spey Mk 202	20,515*	Mach 1.6-1.7
Russia-FSU	1977	Su-27/1-11		Flanker-C	fighter-attack	33,500	8,000	2 turbofan	Saturn/Lyulka	AL-31F	16,775**	Mach 2+
Russia-FSU	1977	Su-27		Flanker-D	fighter-attack	34,000	8,000	2 turbofan	Saturn/Lyulka	AL-31F	16,775**	Mach 2+
China	1998	J-10			fighter-attack			1 turbofan	Saturn/Lyulka	AL-31F	16,775**	Mach 2+

Sources: *IDDS World Arms Database 2000*, File 2. Military Aircraft Qualitative Features, Institute for Defense and Disarmament Studies, Cambridge, MA, 2001; *Jayne's All the World's Aircraft: 2001-2002* (Alexandria, VA: Jayne's Information Group, 2001), p. 65-66.

* with afterburner

** estimates

Table 4
China's Current and Likely Near Future Naval Forces

Design Country	Type, Design Era	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2005
Amphibious Landing, 4,000 tons - Total											
USA	WWII	26	25	20	21	20	17	17	17	19	16
China	03Jun05	20	19	12	12	8	3	3	3	3	0
Amphibious Craft, 1,500 tons - 1970											
China		25	23	28	30	33	33	33	29	24	17
Diesel-powered Submarines - Total											
Russian/China	Romeo/Ming 1950s	48	46	47	49	50	50	55	58	58	59
Russian/China	Kilo/Song 1980s	48	46	47	47	48	48	52	53	52	51
		0	0	0	2	2	2	3	5	6	8
Destroyers and Frigates - Total											
China	Frigates, 2000-4000 tons	200	186	191	198	204	183	220	233	234	238
China	Frigates & Patrol Ships, #1000-2000 tons	162	157	162	168	172	161	188	202	203	208
China		38	29	29	30	32	22	32	31	31	30

Source: *IDDS World Arms Database 2001*, File 3A. Ship Holdings, Institute for Defense and Disarmament Studies, Cambridge MA, 2001.

Table 5
Chinese Ships and Submarines in Development or Production

Class name	Type	Description	Displacement tons	Comment
Nuclear-powered Submarines				
Han	Type 091	attack submarine	5,550	5 built; only one now operational; unsuccessful design.
Xia	Type 092	ballistic missile submarine	6,500	1 built; never operational; may be undergoing disposal; unsuccessful design.
	Type 093	attack submarine	6,000	Under development with Russian assistance.
	Type 094	ballistic missile submarine	..	Under development with Russian assistance.
Surface Ships				
Sovremenny	Type 956E	Small cruiser/Large destroyer	7,940	Two bought new from Russia; two more may be acquired used from Russia.
Luhai		Small cruiser/Large destroyer	6,000	Chinese-designed ship, first deployed 1999; 2nd now under construction.
	New CV	Large cruiser with STOL* aircraft	20,000	May be developed with assistance of Russian or European producers.

Source: *IDDS World Arms Database 2001*, File 4A. Ship Holdings. Institute for Defense and Disarmament Studies, Cambridge MA, 2001.

* STOL = short take-off and landing

naval forces, and if there are continued problems with China's engine design and manufacturing, the actual date could be 2030.

A second key feature of China's current and likely future military forces is the extent to which, contrary to common speculation, they do not contain "power projection" capabilities, and show no prospect of doing so for the foreseeable future. There are many aspects of military forces which can provide, supplement, or support a power-projection capability. Aircraft carrier and amphibious landing battle groups, surrounded by naval means of defense against opposing aircraft, ships, and submarines, can bring ground attack aircraft and ground troops to distant lands. Large-scale, long-range air transport can land with tanks and heavily equipped ground forces; or they can drop in paratroopers and lighter equipment—assuming that they are operating in an environment with "air superiority," where they will not be shot down by ground- or air-based anti-aircraft systems. Aerial refueling, global networks of reconnaissance, command, control, and communications, the ability to keep sea lanes free of surface ships and submarines that could attack transport shipping—all are among the many features of an advanced military force that permits projection of military power far from home territory.

China has none of these things, nor any prospect of getting them sooner than, at best, 30 years out. China may acquire a large cruiser (20,000 tons) which can carry a few STOL (short take-off and landing) aircraft at some point between 2010 and 2020: no firm acquisition plan is in place yet. Such a ship bears no comparison to the 12 90,000-ton aircraft carriers in the current U.S. fleet. In fact, China is unlikely to acquire even one surface ship comparable to the dozens of Aegis cruisers which defend U.S. carriers, or a nuclear-powered attack submarine comparable to scores available to defend U.S. carriers against other submarines before 2010, and the date for acquisition of such sophisticated systems might well be 2020 or later. Similarly, huge air transports, air superiority, system-wide aerial refueling—none of these are in prospect for China.

In fact, those who raise the specter of China's acquiring a "power-projection" capability use the term in a very special sense, unlike its traditional sense in the United States. In the United States, the term means the ability to field armed forces in strength on a distant continent. In the context of China, it means being able to pose a serious threat of successfully attacking and occupying Taiwan, a part of China which lies not far offshore, with no intervening obstacle. Further in the background are intimations of Chinese military threats to Japan and Chinese naval forces guarding mineral resources in the South China Sea, but in political discussion, the exact

nature of these potential operations, and the kinds of forces China would have to acquire to pull them off are never described.

Today, China's armed forces are restricted almost entirely to operations over land and along the coast. China has large number of very small diesel-powered submarines, frigates, and destroyers, with limited supplies of fuel and munitions, capable of engagements only at very limited range. In the area of amphibious landing capability, which would be central to an attack on Taiwan, China has actually reduced its overall capacity in recent years. Starting with several dozen U.S.-made World War II era landing ships of about 4,000 tons each in the late 1940s, China began to build replacements of the same size in the early 1980s; but the rate of building has been so slow that today the landing capacity is just half the size it was in 1972. At the same time, China has built a number of much smaller (1,500 ton) landing ships, which gave some alternate capacity, but mainly for small scale operations around the coasts of China itself. It is helpful to consider again the most recent Pentagon assessment of China's military goals as "preserving what it perceives as its sovereign interests in Taiwan, the South China Sea, and elsewhere on its periphery and protecting its economic interests, while at the same time promoting regional stability."⁷

So far, China has not taken any overt steps to strengthen its capability to launch an invasion and forced take-over of Taiwan, much less to "project power" against Japan or any other, more distant nation.

Third, China's nuclear forces have been remarkably stable and modest, compared with those of the other four openly acknowledged nuclear-weapon powers. China developed its first force of around 20 nuclear missiles that could reach the United States 30 years ago. Since that time, China has developed two new generations of intercontinental nuclear missiles, missiles that were increasingly invulnerable to pre-emptive attack by the United States. Unlike the other nuclear-weapon states, however, it did not build ever-growing numbers of missiles, with an ever-expanding target list. Each generation was limited to a true "minimum deterrent" capability. To quote the Pentagon's *Military Power of China* report:

[China's] relatively small nuclear forces are intended for retaliation rather than a first strike. Beijing's objective is nuclear deterrence: to convince potential ene-

⁷ *Military Power of China*, section I.A.

mies that enough of China's strategic weapons would survive an attack to inflict unacceptable damage on the aggressor in a retaliatory strike. The only Chinese missile system capable of targeting the continental United States is the CSS-4 ICBM. China reportedly has built 18 CSS-4 silos.⁸

Given these limitations, what military threats does China pose today, or might it pose in future, that are a source of concern to the United States, Japan, Australia, and other countries? It is widely recognized that following territorial defense, the main purpose of China's armed forces is to pose a threat of attack on Taiwan sufficiently great and plausible to ensure that Taiwan does not attempt to declare independence. In the Fall 2000 issue of *International Security*, Brookings fellow Michael O'Hanlon gives a detailed analysis demonstrating the limits of China's ability to threaten Taiwan.⁹ Apart from being unable to mount a successful airborne and amphibious assault on Taiwan, China has only modest resources with which to try intimidate Taiwan short of a full-scale attack. The two most widely cited scenarios involve either some means of halting or impeding commercial shipping to the island (a naval blockade, or the threat of attacks on commercial shipping with land-based missiles), or else use of China's growing arsenal of short-range ballistic missiles to attack targets such as air fields or electric grids on Taiwan. O'Hanlon points out that even though China has about 200 missiles that can reach Taiwan and is increasing the force by about 50 missiles a year, these missiles "would generally miss their targets by several football fields, and almost always by the length of at least a single field." He concludes that even if China used all its missiles, it would still be limited to "a few hits or near hits against key targets" on land or at sea, but would then have no missiles left to maintain the coercive posture. Even against civilian populations, he points out, comparable missiles used against citizens in the Iran-Iraq war results in the deaths of 0-12 civilian deaths per missile.

O'Hanlon rates the potential for a Chinese blockade of commercial shipping a good deal higher, and comments that "Taiwan might not be able to break such a blockade by itself." But he argues that if the United States helped Taiwan "the tide of battle would be strongly against the

⁸ *Military Power of China*, section III.A.1.

⁹ Michael O'Hanlon, "Why China Cannot Conquer Taiwan," *International Security* 25:2 (Fall 2000): 51-86.

PRC,” and the blockade could be broken in a reasonably brief time and with small losses of commercial ships and naval vessels.¹⁰

U.S. Defense Department analyses stress that eventually—possibly as soon as 2010—China’s short-range ballistic missiles (SRBMs) may have the accuracy to pose a significantly greater threat to military targets on Taiwan.¹¹ The contention of this paper, however, is not that China will never develop military capabilities that are more threatening than those they have today, but, on the contrary, that the United States and its allies are setting out on the road of what is sure to become an intensively interactive arms race. China’s deployment of missiles that can reach Taiwan has already closely followed Taiwan’s acquisition of advanced combat aircraft over the past decade. In 1992, after Taiwan had developed an Indigenous Defense Fighter, the United States decided to drop its embargo of sales of advanced weapon systems to Taiwan and to provide 150 F-16s. France agreed to sell Taiwan 60 Mirage 2000-5s, supplementing Taiwan’s 130 IDFs. Taken together, these aircraft are superior in quantity as well as quality to the attack aircraft and interceptors with which China might have threatened an attack on Taiwan or provided air cover to naval ships heading for Taiwan. China protested against the sale of advanced aircraft to Taiwan, which in China’s view, might make Taiwan feel sufficiently invulnerable to move toward independence. From this viewpoint, China’s acquisition of M-9 and M-11 SRBMs, which cannot all be intercepted by existing Taiwanese air defenses, merely restored the relative balance of power that existed in 1990. The view from Taiwan, meanwhile, was that China was about to acquire Russian Su-27s and Su-30s, which would overmatch the older Taiwanese air fleet. But Taiwan’s acquisition of its new Taiwanese, U.S., and French aircraft has proceeded much more quickly than China’s acquisition of new Russian types.

Thus, it is not surprising that according to a recent Defense Department report, *The Security Situation in the Taiwan Strait*:

[B]y 2005, Taipei will possess a qualitative edge over Beijing in terms of significant weapons and equipment. The TAF will have over 300 fourth generation fighters. Six French-built Lafayette-class frigates, eight U.S. Knox-class frigates,

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ “Within the next several years, both the CSS-6 and the CSS-7 are expected to incorporate satellite-assisted navigation technology to improve their accuracy.” *Military Power of China*, section III.A.1.

and eight Perry-class frigates will form the nucleus of Taiwan's naval force. Taiwan will possess an advanced air defense network, comprising an AEW [airborne early warning] capability, an automated C2 system, and several modern SAM [surface-to-air missile] systems, which will provide Taiwan with an enhanced defensive capability against both aircraft and missiles. The mobility and firepower of Taiwan's ground forces will have been improved with the acquisition of additional tanks, armored personnel carriers, self-propelled artillery and attack helicopters.

Taiwan's primary security goal beyond 2005 will be to maintain the status quo. . . .¹²

As this brief overview suggests, an intensified arms race between Taiwan and China began in the early 1990s, with the acquisition on both sides, for the first time, of significant numbers of U.S., European, and Russian weapons developed after 1970. Supported by a Cold War mentality in the United States, the China-Taiwan arms race is likely to spiral upwards, with the deployment of increasingly expensive and deadly forces on both sides, and to spread, little by little, to Japan, the Korean peninsula, and Australia, as well as the United States.

Positioning China as the Key Enemy in a New Cold War

Given the slow pace of change, obsolete technology, and limited range of China's current armed forces, what are the grounds for treating China as a formidable military opponent? Equally important, what is the evidence that the United States has begun to turn in this direction?

It is widely recognized that the United States is pursuing a new kind of "double track" approach in its policy toward China: On one side, U.S. non-military government agencies and private corporations are rapidly increasing U.S.-China trade, as companies invest in cheap labor in China and hope to win a big share of the huge market for consumer goods that is beginning to emerge there. On the other side, U.S. military departments and agencies are gravitating more and more to China as the key "bogeyman" needed to justify and focus U.S. military forces, policy, and spending.

This bifurcated approach began under President Clinton with an emphasis on trade, but has flowered fully under President Bush, whose administration has given much more attention to

¹² *Report to Congress Pursuant to the FY99 Appropriations Bill: The Security Situation in the Taiwan Strait*, Washington DC: U.S. Department of Defense, 26 February 1999, section V, published at http://www.defenselink.mil/pubs/twstrait_02261999.html.

the military component of the policy. Increasingly, the U.S. government has depicted China as the key player in an Asian group of actual or potential military opponents that includes Russia (which is selling arms and military technology to China), North Korea (which has exported Russian Scud missiles and longer-range derivatives to many Third World nations), and, since May 2001, Pakistan (which is developing longer-range ballistic missiles with help from China and North Korea, and new nuclear reactors with help from China). Increasingly, the U.S. government is attempting to persuade other nations in East and South Asia to support the United States in cases where U.S. policy may conflict with that of China (or any of the other three nations).

Well before the November 2000 election Condoleezza Rice (later appointed Bush's National Security Adviser) and others in the Bush camp indicated that, if elected, Bush would take a harder line toward China and toward Russia and North Korea. In January 2000, for example, while acting as Bush's adviser on security matters, Rice argued in *Foreign Affairs* that the United States should confront China militarily: "Even if there is an argument for economic interaction with Beijing, China is still a potential threat to stability in the Asia-Pacific region. Its military power is currently no match for that of the United States. But that condition is not necessarily permanent. What we do know is that China is a great power with unresolved vital interests, particularly concerning Taiwan and the South China Sea."¹³

Rice defines future relations with China in terms of a zero-sum competition for power and influence in the Asia-Pacific region, saying that the United States should focus its energies "on comprehensive relationships with the big powers, particularly Russia and China, that can and will mold the character of the international political system extending even into South Asia."¹⁴

Later she continues:

China resents the role of the United States in the Asia-Pacific region. This means that China is not a "status quo" power but one that would like to alter Asia's balance of power in its own favor. That alone makes it a strategic competitor, not the "strategic partner" the Clinton administration once called it. . .

China's success in controlling the balance of power depends in large part on America's reaction to the challenge. The United States must deepen its cooper-

¹³ Condoleezza Rice, "Campaign 2000: Promoting the National Interest," *Foreign Affairs* 79:1 (January 2000): 45-55.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*

ation with Japan and South Korea . . . maintain its commitment to a robust military presence in the region . . . [and] pay closer attention to India's role in the regional balance. . . . India is not a great power yet, but it has the potential to emerge as one.¹⁵

Rice concludes that if the United States faces a conflict in dealing with China, containment should take precedence over cooperation: "It is important to promote China's internal transition through economic interaction while containing Chinese power and security ambitions. Cooperation should be pursued, but we should never be afraid to confront Beijing when our interests collide."¹⁶

The power-balancing approach that Rice advocated was elaborated in greater detail in a major study on the future of security in Asia published by the RAND Corporation early in 2001.¹⁷ (In May 2001, the lead author, Zalmay Khalilzad was appointed to Bush's National Security Council as special assistant for Gulf and Southwest Asia issues.) In a Research Brief summarizing the study, the RAND authors assert that "Central to [U.S. objectives in Asia] is the need to prevent the rise of a dominant power that might seek to undermine the U.S. role in Asia. . . ."¹⁸ To achieve this objective, they say, the United States should, among other things:

- C Complement its bilateral security alliances to create a broader security framework. This multilateralization could ultimately include Japan, South Korea, Australia, and perhaps Singapore, the Philippines, and Thailand.
- C Pursue a balance-of-power strategy among key Asian states that are not part of the U.S. alliance structure, including China, India, and Russia.

They argue that with secure U.S. military bases in Northeast Asia, the United States should put greater emphasis on Southeast Asia, "where a permanent U.S. combat presence is

¹⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁷ Zalmay Khalilzad, D. Orletsky, Jonathan D. Pollack, Kevin Pollpeter, Angel Rabasa, David A. Shlapak, Abram N. Shulsky, Ashley J. Telli, *The United States and Asia: Toward a New U.S. Strategy and Force Posture (United States and Asia)*, Rand Report MR-1315-AF, RAND Corporation, 2001. See also David A. Shlapak, David T. Orletsky, and Barry A. Wilson, *Dire Strait? Military Aspects of the China-Taiwan Confrontation and Options for U.S. Policy*, Rand Report MR-1217-SRF, RAND Corporation, 2000.

¹⁸ "A New U.S. Strategy for a Changing Asia," Rand Research Brief RB68 (2001), published at <http://www.rand.org/publications/RB/RB68/>.

currently lacking . . . [T]he United States should seek to solidify existing access arrangements and cement new ones with the Philippines, Indonesia, and possibly Vietnam.”¹⁹

They also suggest that it would be useful for the United States to establish military bases in South Asia, where, they say, “U.S. military forces currently lack reliable access.” Finally, they argue that the overall U.S. military posture in the Pacific should be strengthened through three additional steps: “First, Guam should be built up as a major hub for power projection throughout Asia . . . Second, the U.S. Air Force and Navy should work at developing new concepts of operations that would maximize the leverage of their combined forces in a future Pacific crisis . . . Third, the Air Force should continue to review its future force structure to see if it might benefit from a greater emphasis on longer-range combat platforms.”²⁰

In sum, the approach to China recommended by key advisers included four main components:

1. Preserving and strengthening existing U.S. military alliances in East and Southeast Asia and the Pacific;
2. Developing new alliances or military relationships in that region and in South Asia;
3. Adding new military bases and building up existing military facilities and access outside of Japan and South Korea; and
4. Developing and producing a combination of offensive and defensive high-tech weapons and related C3I systems that would give the United States an ever greater military edge over China than it has today, regardless of the expected future Chinese military modernization.

Combined, the effect of these steps would be to encircle China in a well-developed web of U.S. military alliances and forward military bases, “containing” the country both geographically and technologically in virtually the same manner that the United States attempted to “contain” the former Soviet Union throughout the Cold War—but due to China’s relative military weakness, with the prospect of even greater success.

By the spring of 2001, there was evidence that the United States was, in fact, pursuing a new policy of containment toward China and putting into effect all of the recommendations made in the recent RAND report. I will not review here the Bush administration’s heavy lobby-

¹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰ Khalizad et al., *United States and Asia*, p. 87.

ing of Congress, the public, and foreign governments to build support for a crash National Missile Defense (NMD) program, which appears to be aimed more at China than at so-called “rogue states.”²¹ This aspect of the administration’s Cold War approach to China has been extensively covered in the media.

Apart from its NMD drive, the first step in the Bush administration’s new China policy was to shift the emphasis of U.S. military operations from Europe and the Atlantic to Asia and the Pacific, as had been proposed for several years in the long-term joint services planning study *Joint Vision 2020*. In May, in the most detailed public comment to date on the administration’s still unpublished military strategy review, review director Andrew Marshall, long-time head of the Pentagon’s Office of Net Assessment, declared that in the future, the emphasis of U.S. policy will be on Asia. As a result, he said, the United States should rely increasingly on high-tech weapon systems to maintain U.S. military pre-eminence in the Asia-Pacific region in the face of growing threats to U.S. military bases and naval forces in the area posed by the growing Chinese force of short-range ballistic missiles (SRBMS) capable of reaching Taiwan and Japan.²² Greater reliance on long-range, high-tech weapons, favored by Marshall and by Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld but opposed by many senior military commanders, could help bring about several fundamental changes in the Pentagon: (1) a cutback in force size and operating costs appropriate to reduced post-Cold War threats of major war; (2) increased spending on R&D and production of high-tech weapon systems (including National Missile Defense) that might otherwise languish for lack of funds; (3) increased emphasis on China as a potential military opponent of the United States and its allies in Asia; and, finally, (4) a commitment to (and realistic method of) maintain-

²¹ Ronald H. Siegel, *The Missile Programs of North Korea, Iraq, and Iran*, IDDS Working Paper 3, Cambridge, MA: Institute for Defense and Disarmament Studies, September 2001. This paper shows that Iran and Iraq are unlikely to develop ICBMs before 2015; and that while in the worst case, North Korea might develop an ICBM a few years sooner, such a development could be prevented by a nationally monitored missile ban, which President Bush has refused to pursue. Even though the Bush administration has repeatedly stated that the National Missile Defense system is not aimed primarily at China, the early stages of all “rogue state” missile programs and the neglected opportunity to stop them suggest that China is the real target for NMD efforts. See also Spurgeon Keeny, “Preserving the North Korean Threat,” *Arms Control Today*, April 2001.

²² Michael Gordon, “Pentagon Review Puts Emphasis On Long-Range Arms in Pacific,” *New York Times*, 17 May 2001, p. 1.

ing a strong U.S. military presence in the Asia-Pacific region even if popular protests eventually lead to cuts in U.S. forces and military bases in Okinawa and South Korea.

The *New York Times* report about the review was further amplified by discussion in the military journal *Stars and Stripes* by Okinawa bureau chief David Allen and an interview with Marshall. The *Stars and Stripes* exchange begins with a comment by Allen that the (still unpublished) review appears to call for “the development of a missile defense system to shield U.S. bases in the Pacific while focusing on stealth bombers, unmanned aircraft and a larger Navy presence. It also calls for less reliance on U.S. bases in the West Pacific, vulnerable to missile attacks.”²³ In response, Marshall said that he does not favor reducing existing bases. “That characterization of the review is wrong,” he said. “What we called attention to is how great the distances are in this theater, and how we need to develop strategies to overcome this. We were certainly not saying the bases should be given up. We just ought to pay more attention to Asia and take into account its characteristics,” he said. “Actually, there’s nothing very novel about this. It’s the same thing various studies have been saying for the last decade or so.”²⁴

Also in May 2001, in an early signal of U.S. efforts to develop an improved relationship with India—a relationship that could eventually entail military cooperation—Deputy Secretary of State Richard Armitage went to New Delhi to “consult Indian leaders about American’s nuclear policies.” On the third anniversary of India’s nuclear tests, Armitage told Indian officials “that the United States was worried about Pakistan’s development of a nuclear arsenal, but he did not mention a paired worry about India’s own nuclear capacity,” suggesting that instead of continuing to condemn the nuclear weapon programs of India and Pakistan equally the United States may have accepted India’s claim to have a special right to its own minimum nuclear deterrent (given its self-defined role as the major power in South Asia).²⁵ In a press conference after the meeting, describing Libya, Iraq, and North Korea as countries against which U.S. missile

²³ David Allen, “Another Pentagon-sponsored Review Calls for Shift in Focus Toward Asia,” *Stars and Stripes*, 19 May 2001 (published daily in print at U.S. military bases worldwide and on line by the Office of the Secretary of Defense). This article is available on line at <http://ww2.pstripes.osd.mil/01/may01/ed051901b.html>.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, quoting Andrew Marshall in a personal interview.

²⁵ Celia W. Dugger, “U.S. Nurtures Growing Bond with India on Defense,” *New York Times*, 13 May 2001.

defenses will be aimed, Armitage added that “American concerns about Pakistan were well known,” as though Pakistan might be considered as close to the “rogue” group. And Indian officials announced that President Bush had accepted an invitation to visit India, at a time yet to be determined.²⁶ A change in U.S. policy toward India was confirmed in August, when unnamed Bush administration representatives announced that the United States is preparing to drop the economic and military sanctions imposed on India after its 1998 nuclear test explosions and “moving on a broad front to strengthen relations with India, a nation it views as a neglected and potentially important strategic ally and trading partner in Asia.”²⁷

Initial U.S. efforts to strengthen U.S. bilateral military alliances with South Korea, Japan, and Australia through a new multilateral, over-arching association were revealed in late July 2001, when Secretary of State Colin Powell capped a trip to Vietnam, China, Japan, and South Korea with a visit to Australia on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the ANZUS (Australia-New Zealand-U.S.) Treaty. Caught off guard by a press conference question concerning whether (as proposed in the Rand Report cited above) Australia, Japan, and South Korea would be cooperating with each other and with the United States more closely in the future, and if so why, Powell responded:

Interesting, we were talking about this subject earlier in the day, as to whether or not we might find ways of talking more in that kind of a forum. I don't think it would lead to any formal arrangement of the kind you suggest. But there might be a need for us to seek opportunities to come together and talk more often. So yes, we've talked about that, but not in the form of some formal kind of new organization. We just began speaking about that today.²⁸

Australian Foreign Minister Alexander Downer then hastened to reassure the press that the idea of multilateral consultation among the United States' most powerful military allies in the region was not a prelude a major military change in the region that China would undoubtedly perceive as a threatening form of containment:

²⁶ Ibid.

²⁷ Jane Perlez, “U.S. Ready to End Sanctions on India to Build Alliance,” *New York Times*, 27 August 2001.

²⁸ U.S. Defense Department published transcript of “News Conference after Australian Ministerials,” 30 July 2001, available at http://www.defenselink.mil/news/Jul2001/t07302001_t730ausm.html.

As Colin says, this is something that we have discussed, we've also informally discussed with the Japanese as well. So as not to allow a hare to rush away here, we obviously—I think it must be obvious—wouldn't want the sort of new architecture in East Asia which would be an attempt to kind of replicate NATO or something like that. We are talking here just about an informal dialogue and the question of whether we could do it at a more numerous level than two, that is, we obviously have a dialogue with the Japanese, the Japanese with the United States, the United States with us. Would there be a formulation where the United States and the Japanese, for example, might be able to sit down together—not necessarily, by the way at ministerial level, but perhaps at a lower level—to engage in some sort of dialogue. That is something that we've been talking about. I've spoken to the Japanese foreign minister, Mrs. Tanaka, about it as well, when I met with her recently in Hanoi. So it's really, at this stage, just an idea. I don't think too much should be interpreted.²⁹

Note that despite the questioner's original formulation including South Korea in the potential consultative group—and despite the recent RAND proposal that South Korea be included in such a group—Downer made no mention of South Korea. One reason for this might be that such consultations would be much more problematic for South Korea than for Japan, Australia, and the United States. Though more immediately vulnerable to a military attack by China, South Korea has little if any fear of such an attack, and tends to look on China as a friend and on Japan—which has invaded Korea many times and occupied Korea for the first half of this century—as a potential military opponent.

Many China experts in the United States have argued that China's military strength and the prospective for its actual use of armed force in the region should not be over-estimated—and that new Taiwanese political challenges or U.S. military challenges to China could be counter-productive, generating greater than expected military buildups, or actual use of force against Taiwan, or both.³⁰ Secretary of State Powell and other members of the Bush administration worked

²⁹ Ibid.

³⁰ See, for example, Kurt M Campbell and Derek J Mitchell, "Crisis in the Taiwan Strait," *Foreign Affairs* 80:4 (July/August 2001); Tom Christensen, "Posing Problems without Catching Up: China's Rise and Challenges for U.S. Security Policy," *International Security* 25:4 (Spring 2001); David Shambaugh, "Facing Reality in China Policy," *Foreign Affairs* 80:1 (January/February 2001); O'Hanlon, "Why China Cannot Conquer Taiwan"; and Phillip Saunders, "Supping with a Long Spoon: Dependence and Interdependence in Sino-American Relations," *China Journal*, Issue 43 (January 2000).

to improve U.S. relations with China in the wake of tension over the P-3 aircraft downing, the spying trials of U.S. citizens and residents in China, and China's strong objections to the National Missile Defense program. But the effort to keep diplomatic and trade relations on an even keel seems largely unrelated to the U.S. military strategy of containing China militarily by creating a ring of U.S. military alliances around it, and by keeping it at a permanent disadvantage with respect to the military technology incorporated in U.S. and allied military forces. To the extent that this strategy has rational underpinnings and is not just a rationale for high military spending, it is the product of a 19th century view of the world, in which China's loss of power and influence is the United States' gain, and vice versa. In this view, the specific military threats that China might be able to pose outside its own territory, and the stakes at issue in potential military confrontations between China, the United States, and other nations in the Asia-Pacific region have little bearing on U.S. military deployments and policy. What is important in shaping U.S. policy is the geographic range and political depth of intangible, unmeasurable Chinese and U.S. spheres of influence.

The Likely Impact of U.S. and Western Policies on Conventional and Nuclear Arming in China

The features of U.S. and other Western military policies that have failed to show an appropriate change in the post-Cold War period, along with the new U.S. strategy of containing China militarily, are likely to spur more rapid and threatening new arming in China than would otherwise occur. In combination, China's reactions could be very serious indeed.

The policy area which most directly involves Europe as well as the United States is on-going quantity production and vigorous competition for export of high-tech weapon systems. It is likely to contribute directly to speeding up technological advances in China's conventional forces, and possibly in its nuclear delivery systems. On-going and likely future arms exports to Taiwan, Japan, and South Korea will put pressure on China to match their ever-improving technology. China has long tried to import Western engines for its military aircraft and other platforms: currently, Britain is providing Rolls Royce engines for China's latest tank—its first really modern tank—and China hopes to obtain Rolls Royce engines for its JH-7 light bomber.

Of course, the principal supplier of weapons and military technology to China is Russia; but to some extent, this, too, is a product of Western policies. When NATO added former Soviet

allies as new members while refusing to consider Russia as a potential near-future member, and when, at the same time, the West offered no political, military, or financial incentive to stop exports as a source of income for maintaining the Russian arms industry, pressure for Russian arms exports to China was bound to be high. Generally speaking, Western markets do not want Russian arms, former Soviet allies in Europe prefer Western arms (if they can afford them); and Iraq and Syria are out of the picture as export clients—the former because of the UN sanctions, the latter because it cannot afford to pay for new arms. This leaves just India and China as major clients for Russian exports.

By failing to develop a global approach to security that would include Russia and dampen down the industrial pressure for arms exports during a period of declining domestic demand, the West both insured that potentially threatening Russian military technologies would be released to China, and, in more direct ways, has participated in advancing China's military-related technology.

Given the actual state of China's armed forces and the inability of China (shared with all other developing nations) to develop an independent defense-industrial base without a great deal more help from the industrial countries, it is safe to say that decades would be added to the periods suggested above for China's acquisition of modern military forces—let alone limited "power projection" forces—were it not for the international arms trade.

The new U.S.-Japan Defense Guidelines, which give the United States free rein to use Japanese bases for any foreign intervention and commit Japan to provide maintenance and refueling infrastructure to support such missions, have made Japan a virtual partner in the quasi-explicit U.S. commitment to defend Taiwan against an attack by China. China must perceive the greater involvement of Japan in putting a potential barrier between China and Taiwan not only as threatening in itself, but also as encouraging Japan to re-assert a broader, more dominating approach to security relations in East Asia. This remilitarization of Japanese foreign policy is one of the greatest fears of China and of other countries in the region, particularly North and South Korea. Given this likely reaction on the part of China and the lack of new security threats in East Asia, it is hard to understand why the new Guidelines were adopted.

The refusal of the United States to respond to Russian pleas to move rapidly toward deep cuts in nuclear weapons, a comprehensive test ban treaty, and other steps to reduce the risk of nuclear war and foster nonproliferation have, for the time being, eliminated any prospect that

China would seriously consider moving toward the abolition of nuclear weapons, in a joint effort with India, Pakistan, and the other nations of East and South Asia.

The U.S. plan to proceed with national and theater missile defenses, which could nullify China's minimum deterrent and thereby pose a prohibitive obstacle to China's ability to deter the United States from potential military involvement in Taiwan is likely to provoke an expansion of China's intercontinental nuclear forces. China is currently attempting to acquire improved strategic weapon technology from Russia; and it is putting greater emphasis on imports of Russian naval technology, which will help put TMD ships deployed by Japan and other countries at greater risk.

Given the non-existent ICBM from North Korea,³¹ the decision by the United States to deploy a light national missile defense in the region most convenient for intercepting missiles from China—and from nowhere else—seems almost determined to provoke a substantial increase in China's intercontinental nuclear missile force. In addition, the decision by the United States and Japan to proceed with a naval-based TMD system that would be more useful against missiles from China than against missiles from North Korea could be problematic for China if TMD systems become part of a larger, integrated NMD-TMD network. (For example, the TMD radars could feed information into the NMD detection and localization system.)

In the next few years, it seems likely that China will feel caught between a rock and a hard place. On the one hand, if it does nothing much to respond to arms sales to Taiwan and Japan, the U.S.-Japan Defense Guidelines, and the on-going TMD and NMD programs, then by Chinese standards—that is, its ability to protect its claim of sovereignty over Taiwan and its access to mineral resources in the South China Sea—its security will be considerably diminished. On the other hand, if China substantially increases military spending and uses hard currency to

³¹ Ronald Siegel, *Missile Programs*, shows that North Korea's existing missiles are short- and medium-range missiles, with poor accuracy. North Korea has conducted only one test of a missile at a range over 1000 miles—a 1998 test in which the missile passed over Japan—and that test failed when the missile's third stage exploded. Siegel also shows why, even with the most favorable assumptions, North Korea is unlikely to be able to develop an ICBM sooner than a decade after it resumes missile tests. North Korea suspended all missile tests in 1999, to facilitate talks with the United States on a permanent missile development ban; and it has promised to sustain the test moratorium until 2003 even though talks with the United States have not resumed since President Bush was elected.

increase the rate of weapon and technology imports from Russia and other countries, and to build a considerably larger long-range nuclear force, then it will divert funds from economic developments, it will be attacked by the United States and countries in Asia as developing a threatening, power-projection oriented military policy, and it will may provoke further military build-ups threatening to China in Japan, Taiwan, and the United States.

In the midst of this thicket of uncertainty and wasted opportunity, one question stands out: Given that outside the declining risk on the Korean peninsula, there is no threat of major war in the Pacific today, why aren't the United States and Japan taking a pro-active approach to regional security and peace-building? Why not invite China to join them in taking a different path from the one followed by Europe for a half-century, and build a regional security system in which "modernization" and "power projection," along with TMD and NMD are set aside in favor of regime of transparency, arms limitation, and confidence-building measures. Such a regime, similar to the one associated with the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, would hold the promise of eventual demilitarization and disarmament throughout the region.

THE TWO-WAR DOCTRINE AND REGIONAL ARMS RACE: CONTRADICTIONS IN U.S. POST-COLD WAR SECURITY POLICY ON KOREA*

Jae-Jung Suh

Since the end of the Cold War, the United States has been pursuing a foreign policy whose ends and means are marked by a lack of consistency, as many analysts have noted.¹ Nowhere is this more striking and dangerous than in Northeast Asia, where the United States is engaged in inconsistent, even contradictory, projects to adapt to the post-Cold War Asia with Cold War means and within a Cold War mindset. Washington is talking peace with North Korea, one of a few Cold War leftover enemies, while at the same time strengthening its own and allies' military capabilities in the region. These contradictory projects, if implemented uncritically, can undermine not only Seoul's "sunshine policy," but also the fragile regional peace.

U.S. policy toward Korea and Northeast Asia stands on two legs. On what we may call the engagement leg, the United States, after many years of isolating the DPRK, began a series of negotiations in the early 1990s. American diplomats sat down with their North Korean counterparts to negotiate a peaceful end to Pyongyang's nuclear program and succeeded in reaching an agreement, the Agreed Framework, which laid out a comprehensive road map to a peaceful development of the two countries' relationship. In the past several years since the Geneva agreement of 1994, the State Department has spearheaded the efforts to implement the agreement on schedule, at times twisting the arms of its recalcitrant allies.² On what we may call the contain-

* Earlier versions of this paper were presented at the Conference on Alternative Security Systems in the Asia-Pacific, Bangkok, March 27-30, 1997 and at the workshop on The United States and Asian Security, Peace Studies Program, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York, March 9-11, 2001. A substantially revised version will appear in the Fall 2002 issue of *Critical Asian Studies*. I gratefully acknowledge the competent research assistance provided by Il-Hyun Cho.

¹ See, for example, Barry R. Posen and Andrew L. Ross, "Competing Visions for U.S. Grand Strategy," *International Security* 21, 3 (Winter 1996/97): 5-53; Richard Haass, "Paradigm Lost," *Foreign Affairs* 74, 1 (January/February 1995): 45-55; and Sheldon W. Simon, "Alternative Visions of Security in the Asia Pacific," *Pacific Affairs* 69 (Fall 1996): 381-96.

² While the Clinton administration advocated upholding the Framework Agreement, South Korea's Kim Young-Sam government was reluctant to go along with the U.S. measures; now the

ment leg, however, the United States continued to pursue confrontational policies. Washington has been strengthening its own and its allies' military capabilities in the region in an effort to militarily intimidate North Korea. The Pentagon, moreover, in 1993 adopted as its post-Cold War global strategy the two Major Theaters Contingency (MTC) doctrine that required the American military to be prepared to fight two simultaneous wars, in Korea and the Middle East. During the same period that American diplomats were laboring to implement the Framework, Pentagon officers were leading the drive to translate the MTC doctrine into a reality, reconfiguring and building up its and its allies' capabilities to militarily confront North Korea. In short, the American government has simultaneously sought to contain and engage North Korea: we may dub these contradictory elements of U.S.-North Korea policy "containingagement."

A peace regime in a real world may well grow out of a compromise between a realist power strategy and liberal institution-building. In that sense, the American policy of "containingagement" may represent an effort to integrate the two contradictory policy measures in a complex Asian security environment. Although containment and engagement may not be mutually exclusive, they can, if indiscriminately mixed, create confusion and result in counterproductive outcomes, for they may entail fundamental disagreements about strategic goals, priorities, and means. In other words, the apparent contradiction between the two means of containment and engagement may embody irreconcilable social understandings of regional actors and strategic environment. If the disagreements apparent in "containingagement" reflect fundamental irreconcilability, both cannot be sustained for long. I argue that the policy of "containingagement" is constituted by irreconcilable understandings of the identities of self and other, and thus has the potential of imploding America's strategic goal of "building a durable peace on the Korean Peninsula."

On a more immediate policy level, the containment side of U.S. policy imposes a structural constraint on the extent to which engagement can progress. Not only does it hamstring Seoul's "sunshine policy" and Washington's engagement, but it has also led to a regional arms

Bush administration remains half-hearted about the agreement, while the Kim Dae-Jung government has insisted on dialogue and exchanges. Despite its initial dismissal of negotiations with the DPRK, however, the Bush administration recently announced a willingness to resume talks with the North. Main issues on the negotiation table will be the implementation part of the Agreed Framework, the verification of North Korean ballistic missile development as well as conventional arms reduction. See "U.S. Welcomes N. Korea Overture," *Washington Post*, April 8, 2002.

build-up. America's two-war strategy has taken, in East Asia in particular, the form of new U.S.-led efforts to integrate and modernize U.S., South Korean, and Japanese forces in preparation for a potential conflict with North Korea. The strategy, predicated on designating the North as "the major threat" and "the country most likely to involve the United States in a large-scale war," lays down the force requirement that American and its allies' militaries must meet. Given that the North's military capabilities have been in decline throughout the 1990s, the regional arms build-up is strategy-driven, not threat-driven. Although the "China threat" may lurk behind the arms build-up and the "North Korean threat" may be a mere justification for the arms build-up designed for the "China threat," it is currently the "North Korean threat" that the strategy is designed to confront and that American and its allies' militaries are geared to fight.

Extensive press coverage has focused on Washington's diplomacy over Pyongyang's nuclear program, Seoul's engagement policy, and four-party peace talks, while much less attention has been paid to U.S. military measures. To redress this imbalance, I examine the military strategy and place it in the context of overall American policy toward the region. Only when seen from this comprehensive perspective, do the tension and danger inherent in the U.S. approach become clear. In the next section, I delineate the overall structure and implementation of the American strategy, demonstrating that its provocative nature is driving the arms build-up in the region. In the concluding section, I propose ways to formulate and implement a peace regime on the Korean peninsula.

U.S. Policies on Korea

As I have argued elsewhere, the North Korean nuclear crisis has produced in the United States two mutually incompatible outcomes: the Agreed Framework and the Two Major Theaters Contingency (MTC) strategy.³ The Framework represents a roadmap for building peace in the region; the strategy entails a plan for waging war. These two are not just contradictory, but the latter has the potential to undo everything the former envisions. American officials have been busy implementing these fundamentally incompatible policies over the past several years as if one group of them is oblivious to what the other is doing. The Clinton administration was tilted

³ Jae-Jung Suh, "North Korean 'Nuclear Threat' and Cold War Hangover: Northern Exposure or Explosion?" *Bulletin of Concerned Asian Scholars* 28, 1 (1996): 13-26.

toward the engagement leg and came close to resolving most of the outstanding security issues with the North, which, should it have been successful, could have undermined the containment leg. The Bush administration, which inherited the self-contradictory policies is, however, showing preference for the containment leg, the success of which would undo all the achievements made by the engagement and the sunshine policies. In this section, I will lay out the duality of U.S. policy toward the Korean peninsula, emphasizing the military strategy that has, despite its enormous political implications, received much less attention than diplomacy.

Geneva Agreed Framework

The 1994 Agreed Framework, and the subsequent negotiations it engendered, have received worldwide attention. At the global level of nuclear non-proliferation, they are viewed as an important test case of the potential for positive inducements to obtain compliance from potential proliferators. At the regional level, they represent an important step toward creating a new peace regime based on a carefully crafted series of tit-for-tat measures. They constitute a milestone that specifies the mutually agreed goal to “move toward full normalization of political and economic relations” between the United States and North Korea, the long-time adversaries who fought a war five decades ago and have since maintained a state of war. The Framework and negotiations represent a commitment by both sides to ending the war and replacing the enmity with amity, a commitment that neither had been willing to make during the Cold War period.

A central factor that led to the groundbreaking Agreed Framework is crucial to forging a new peace regime on the peninsula. Washington and Pyongyang were able to produce this historic document mainly because each listened to the other side and accommodated its concerns. North Korean leaders showed an understanding and sensitivity to American concerns about nuclear proliferation at a time when Washington was leading an international effort to renew the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). Pyongyang made it clear that it would never yield to what it regarded as an unfair power play, while at the same time showing a willingness to compromise. American negotiators also listened to their North Korean counterparts and displayed an equal flexibility in accommodating their primary security concerns. Pyongyang agreed to return to the NPT regime to allay America’s proliferation concerns; Washington pledged not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against the North to alleviate its security worries. Pyongyang agreed to freeze its graphite-moderated reactors and eventually dismantle them to further sub-

stantiate its commitment; Washington committed itself to working to compensate the North for economic loss that would result from its freeze. The two also agreed to move toward normalization of their relations as progress was made on issues of concern to each side.

In other words, there was in their negotiations an element of reciprocity that enabled both to come to an agreement on an issue that seemed intractable. And it is this principle of reciprocity that is required of all parties involved if a new regime is to be built that goes beyond the Agreed Framework to guarantee peace on the Korean peninsula. The reciprocity entailed an understanding of the core security concern that the other side held. As the following discussion demonstrates, however, the United States has instead been engaged in unilateral moves that can undermine the foundation of reciprocity on which the Agreed Framework stands.

Win-Win Strategy and Its Regional Implementation

It is ironic that the United States adopted the two MTC strategy and passed the first budget for it approximately at the same time as the 1994 Geneva Agreed Framework. In the early 1990s, immediately after the collapse of the Soviet Union, the Pentagon had introduced as a post-Cold War strategy the “win-hold-win strategy,” but had shortly thereafter replaced it with the “win-win strategy” in the midst of the crisis triggered by charges about North Korea’s nuclear weapons program.⁴ The much-publicized North Korean “nuclear threat” provided the last push needed to reverse the strategy from the win-hold-win to the two-war doctrine (the two MTC doctrine). The Pentagon articulated the new strategy in its *Report on the Bottom-Up Review* (BUR) as follows:

U.S. forces will be structured to achieve decisive victory in two nearly simultaneous major regional conflicts and to conduct combat operations characterized by rapid response and a high probability of success. . . . Our forces must be sized and structured to preserve the flexibility and the capability to act unilaterally, should we choose to do so.⁵

⁴ The two strategies postulate the United States being engaged in two regional wars almost simultaneously. In the win-hold-win formula, the U.S. military will fight one of the regional wars to win while holding the other war; after a victory on the first front, it will concentrate its forces on the second. In the win-win strategy, however, the “hold” part is left out, requiring the U.S. military to fight the two wars at the same time with equal force.

⁵ *Report on the Bottom-Up Review*, Department of Defense, October 1993.

The strategic vision, which remained unchanged throughout the Clinton administration and was reconfirmed by the Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) of 1997, began to take shape in 1994 when the U.S. Congress passed the FY 1995 military budget designed for the strategy. In the following years, the strategy guided the Pentagon—and also South Korean and Japanese forces—in reconfiguring the military to get prepared for a Korean conflict. It is ominous for the region's peace that the American military has found eager partners in South Korea and Japan in its efforts to put into effect the two-war doctrine in this part of the world, whereas American allies have dragged their feet in implementing the Agreed Framework.⁶

In September 2001 the Bush administration released the Quadrennial Defense Review, which continued the two-war strategy, along with the requirement to be able to conduct multiple smaller-scale contingencies world-wide and provide homeland defense.⁷ The new strategy, however, is unlikely to bring about a major change in the Asia-Pacific theater that the Pentagon views as posing a most serious near-term threat. In Bush administration's "new" strategic vision, North Korea remains the "enormous conventional threat" that the American military needs to be prepared to fight, just like in the "old" two-war doctrine.⁸ The main difference is that the Pentagon now accepts that Iraq is little likely to pose the same kind of threat and much less likely to initiate a war at the same time as North Korea. Instead of overstressing the American military to get ready for unlikely two-war contingencies, therefore, the Pentagon is focusing on a strategy to "win decisively" in a single major conflict.⁹ Given that North Korea is singled out as a main near-term threat, that "single major conflict" seems to point to the Korean peninsula. Therefore, few substantial changes can be expected in the force posture of the United States and its allies in the region, even if the United States reduces its forward military presence as a way to lessen its

⁶ Now with Kim Dae-Jung in the Blue House and George W. Bush. in the White House, the situation is reversed. While South Korean government desires the continuation of the engagement policy, U.S. administration is not so keen on it.

⁷ The Quadrennial Defense Review is available at <http://www.defenselink.mil/pubs/qdr>.

⁸ "Paul Wolfowitz Discusses the Pentagon's Funding Problems," CNN Evans, Novak, Hunt & Shields, Transcript # 072800CN.V38, July 28, 2001 at <http://web.lexis-nexis.com/universe/> (retrieved on August 7, 2001).

⁹ Thom Shanker, "Military Scuttles Strategy Requiring '2-War' Capability," *New York Times*, July 13, 2001.

burden and to channel the savings to missile defense and other programs in the revolution in military affairs. If the Pentagon decides to reduce its force size in the theater without modifying its threat assessment, American allies—Japan and South Korea—will face increasing pressures to shoulder more of the defense burden.

U.S. Forces in the Asia-Pacific. The first Bush administration had planned to reduce its military presence in Korea in three stages and had completed first stage withdrawal by 1991. Citing the North's suspected nuclear weapons development, however, the Pentagon put a stop to the plan. Furthermore, its review at the end of 1993 of the preparedness of its forces in Korea revealed that the current state of its military was not adequate to defend against the North's threat. Based on the review General Gary Luck, commander of U.S. Forces in Korea (USFK), requested reinforcements. The Pentagon immediately took a number of rearmament measures. It placed under the USFK's command the Seventh Fleet, which included an aircraft carrier, and it deployed the following to Korea: 130 M1A1 Abrams tanks, Patriot missiles, one heavy artillery division, mine sweepers, amphibious landing ships, AH-64 Apache helicopters, Bradley armored personnel carriers, and a mobile ground satellite station.¹⁰ A few days after the Clinton administration agreed to hold a meeting with Pyongyang in Geneva in 1994, the U.S. House of Representatives approved \$250 million in new military spending to strengthen the USFK. In 1996, in order to enhance surveillance capability, the United States replaced the existing fleet of OV-10 Mohawk surveillance aircraft with Airborne Reconnaissance Low aircraft, equipped with advanced surveillance payloads that would allow them to see at night and in bad weather.¹¹ In 1997 the U.S. Army also installed satellite communications equipment that would speed the delivery of signals intelligence data to the USFK and South Korean war-fighters.¹² As if an iota of the USFK's

¹⁰ "U.S. brings advanced main battle tanks to S. Korea," *Reuters North American Wire*, May 12, 1995.

¹¹ The plane also can monitor the movement of enemy ground troops and report their location in real time. Michael Sperting, "Spy Aircraft Will Assist U.S. Troops in S. Korea," *Defense News*, April 29/May 5, 1996, p. 2.

¹² Only a small number of American allies, including Canada and Great Britain but not Israel, have access to U.S. satellite data. "U.S. - army seeks SATCOM to speed Korean SIGINT," *Journal Of Electronic Defense*, April 1996. Cited in *Periscope Daily Defense News Capsules*, April 4, 1996.

strength could not be compromised even after these rearmament measures, President Clinton went so far as to exempt South Korea from his order to clear all active U.S. mines when he announced support for a world-wide mine ban in 1996.¹³

While the USFK was being strengthened, the mobility requirement study that assessed the requirements of the two-war doctrine in light of the Gulf War experience pointed out the need to “pre-position” military hardware in-country. The Gulf War demonstrated to American military planners the enormity of the logistical tasks involved in dispatching to a regional theater personnel and hardware sizable enough to ensure a quick victory that minimized U.S. casualties. They devised a plan to preposition military hardware, both afloat in the sea and in-country, so that American soldiers could be rapidly transported to a theater without the logistical burden of simultaneously moving the hardware needed to equip them. The brigade afloat, two armored battalions, and two mechanized infantry battalions that the Army has as the core of its AWR5 pre-position capability gives the American military both in the Gulf and in Northeast Asia the capability to put ashore a potent brigade combat capability. As part of this “pre-po,” the United States in the fall of 1996 brought into South Korea sufficient military hardware, including tanks, armored vehicles, and communication equipment, to supply a brigade. This makes possible rapid arming of reinforcements to be sent to the South in the event of a contingency.

The USFK and South Korean militaries have held an RSOI (reception, staging, onward movement, and integration into the combat force) exercise annually since 1994 to rehearse the actions that they have to take to receive reinforcement forces, to equip them with prepositioned material, and then to integrate them into combined forces. It is interesting to note that the exercise was first staged in 1994 just when the Team Spirit exercise was canceled,¹⁴ a change that

¹³ William Neikirk, “In bid for international pact, U.S. will remove weapons by 1999 except in Korea; Clinton urges immediate ban on land mines,” *Chicago Tribune*, May 17, 1996.

¹⁴ Although Team Spirit has not been staged since 1994, there have been other military exercises. The “Ulchi-Focus Lens” (UFL), a command post exercise that resulted from combining two separate exercises, Ulchi and Focus Lens in 1994, has been staged every year since its inception. On the South Korean side the 12-day-long UFL is attended by administrative officers of the county and district and above, as well as military units of army corps, naval fleet and air force of the wing-class and above. From the U.S. side, the U.S. Forces Korea (USFK) and subordinate units of the Eighth U.S. Army command participate in the exercise. On the other hand, “Hoguk,” staged from March to April annually, involves South Korea’s army, navy and air force only. Involving two corps deployed near the DMZ, “Hoguk 96” was the largest military drill since the

reflects more a doctrinal shift than a transformation in American policy toward Korea. The implementation of the two-war doctrine in Korea culminated in March 1996 when the U.S. Third Corps and South Korean forces staged a war game called “a joint mock combat training” in Texas. Noting that the United States had decided after the Security Consultative Meeting in November 1995 to airlift U.S. First and Third Corps to Korea in case of an emergency to double the size of the Flexible Deployment Force (FDF), a Korean-American analyst argued that this was an exercise to enhance the coordination between the South Korean military and the American Third Corps that would be added to the FDF.¹⁵

South Korean Force Modernization and U.S. Strategy. If the United States has moved somewhat cautiously to strengthen its forces in Korea because of its fiscal and domestic political considerations, South Korea forged ahead with its ambitious military modernization projects. Although engaged in military modernization since the 1970s, Seoul agreed in a 1994 meeting with Defense Secretary William Perry to accelerate the process. At the meeting, it also agreed to buy an array of sophisticated American military equipment, including Apache attack helicopters and Maverick antitank missiles. A strong synergy was clear between the dictates of the Pentagon’s two-war doctrine and the desires of South Korea’s military to strengthen itself. The American strategy requires a heavy reinforcement of its allies’ military in order to hold the front line until American reinforcements arrive with sufficient firepower to assure a decisive victory. The force requirement that American strategy dictates bodes well for the South’s force modernization plan, as both require high-tech, mobile forces.

Over the past three decades South Korea has built a formidable military industry that now produces a variety of ground weapons under licensed production agreements. In addition to licensed production, Korean weapons contractors are also producing indigenous armaments such as K3 machine guns, K-900 and K-2000 armored personnel carriers, and K-1 tanks, KDX

Korean War. “U.S., S. Korea to hold joint military exercise,” *Japan Economic Newswire*, April 15, 1995.

¹⁵ Han, Ho-Sok, “Pyonghwa hoedam jeankwa kunpujungkangui mosun,” *Center for Korean Affairs*, 1996.

destroyers, and Chang Bogo submarines.¹⁶ In the 1990s, Seoul's force modernization placed increasing importance on achieving air supremacy and acquiring surveillance capability, both of which are also required by the two-war doctrine. Seoul is projected to spend \$24 billion by 2010 on fighter jets, surveillance planes, and air defense equipment. In addition to the 120 F-16 fighters that the South's air force acquired from the United States under its Korea Fighter Program, it plans to purchase another 120 planes under a next generation fighter program, known as the FX program.¹⁷ To strengthen its intelligence capability, South Korea is purchasing approximately 10 Hawk 800XP state-of-the-art reconnaissance planes worth \$450 million from the United States. Flying 40 to 50 km south of the Military Demarcation Line, the aircraft can acquire video images of objects as small as 30 cm by 30 cm in North Korea.¹⁸ With the new military intelligence-gathering systems, the South Korean military will be capable of processing real-time information on North Korea's military movements.¹⁹

The South Korean government has spent 2.2 trillion won since 1992 under the force modernization project dubbed the "Yulgok" project, and continues to spend massive funds to buy state-of-the-art weapons. In 1995, South Korea's military purchases from the United States totaled \$957.4 million. In the same year, it became the world's second largest importer, behind China, of conventional weapons, spending \$1.7 billion on arms procurement. For fiscal year 1996, Seoul purchased military equipment and services worth \$1.8 billion from the United States alone, becoming the biggest client for American weapons. Furthermore, \$26.5 billion is budgeted for new weapons purchases in 2002, the year that marks the first part of a five-year force

¹⁶ Kwang-II Baek, Ronald D. McLaurin, and Chung-in Moon, *The Dilemma of Third World Defense Industries: Supplier Control or Recipient Autonomy?* (Boulder: Westview Press, 1989), pp. 160-61.

¹⁷ Katherine Bruce, "Fighter jet makers compete at Seoul air show," *Reuter Asia-Pacific Business Report*, October 21, 1996.

¹⁸ Although the deal was temporarily suspended in 1998 due to corruption charges, the delivery of 8 RH-800XPs is expected to be completed in 2001. See *SIPRI Yearbook 2000: Armaments, Disarmament and International Security* (NY: Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, Oxford University Press, 2000), p. 404.

¹⁹ "Defense Ministry to purchase military reconnaissance planes from USA," *Yonhap News Agency*, June 29, 1996.

improvement program.²⁰ According to SIPRI estimates, South Korea ranked fourth among the recipients of conventional weapons during the 1996-2000 period, importing weapons worth \$5.6 billion, while North Korea was dropped from the list of the 15 leading arms purchasers and ranked 63rd during the same period.²¹ On the Korean peninsula, the South maintained a high volume of imports of major conventional weapons across the period 1986-95, whereas weapons deliveries to the North fell by 98 percent during the same period.²²

Not satisfied with the sum of money spent on arms procurement, in July 1995 the South Korean Defense Ministry released a report, “ROK’s Defense Towards the 21st Century,” arguing that an investment of a minimum of 110 trillion won in the defense budget was “inevitable” to guarantee the South’s security for the next six years.²³ Although the South cut its defense budget by 3.5 percent in 1998 following the financial crisis of the previous year, it will raise the “proportion of allocations for ‘force improvement programmes’—primarily for import of high-cost weapons’— . . . at the expense of allocations for O&M” over the 2000-2004 period.²⁴ Moreover, on June 28, 2001, the South’s Ministry of National Defense (MND) announced a record-high \$12.72 billion defense budget for year 2002, a 6.2 percent increase from the previous year, reaffirming the Kim Dae-Jung administration’s commitment to increasing government spending on national defense.²⁵ In an ironic turn of events, in 2000 while Washington was negotiating with the North to curtail its long-range missile development, the South succeeded in having Washing-

²⁰ Darren Lake, South Korea announces record high budget, *Janes Defense Weekly*, July 4, 2001, p. 3.

²¹ Bjorn Hagelin, et. al., The volume of transfers of major conventional weapons: by recipients and supplies, 1996-2000, *SIPRI Yearbook 2001* Project. For more details, see <http://projects.sipri.se/armstrade/apx5a.pdf> (accessed July 21, 2001).

²² *SIPRI Yearbook 1996*, p. 466; “‘Hangyore Shinmun’ questions quantity of weapons imported from USA,” *BBC Summary of World Broadcasts*, May 29, 1995; and Barbara Starr, “North Korea redeploys aircraft closer to DMZ,” *Jane’s Defense Weekly*, April 3, 1996.

²³ “Defense Ministry releases defense report for 21st century,” *Chosun Ilbo*, July 10, 1995.

²⁴ *SIPRI Yearbook 2000*, p. 247.

²⁵ Darren Lake, *Janes Defense Weekly*, July 4, 2001, p. 3.

ton reverse its long-held policy of capping the South's missile capability at 180 km to allow the development of a missile with a range up to 300 km.

After the global bifurcation of the Cold War era became blurred, Seoul—which had relied exclusively on the United States for weapons imports—found an unexpected supplier of weapons systems: Russia. Moscow's importance rose quickly, especially after it reached an agreement with Seoul to settle Russia's debt of \$1.89 billion with transfers of weapons systems. Following the agreement, in 1996 Russia provided South Korea with weapons valued at \$150 million, including the first transfer of 30 upgraded T-80U tanks, 30 BMP-3 armored combat vehicles, hundreds of IGLA portable anti-aircraft missiles, and METIS-M portable antitank equipment.²⁶ Russia agreed to deliver by the end of 2001 weapons worth \$500 million, including air-refueling planes, transport helicopters/aircraft, and other military equipment.²⁷ Formalizing the military cooperation between Moscow and Seoul, South Korean Defense minister Kim Dong-Jin and his Russian counterpart Igor Rodionov signed a military cooperation memorandum in November 1996, citing exports of weapons and military technologies as the two most beneficial areas of cooperation. The military cooperation was further reconfirmed by Russian President Vladimir Putin's visit to Seoul in 2001. The South's imports of Russian weapons systems can undermine the tight integration between the U.S. and Korean militaries, if the Russian systems constitute a large share of the South's military hardware, but so far they make up such a small portion that they complement the U.S.-ROK alliance and pose complications for the North more than for the U.S.-ROK alliance.

After taking the Blue House in 1998, President Kim Dae-Jung initiated the policy of engagement, commonly dubbed the "sunshine policy," which led to the historic North-South summit in June 2000. The meeting was followed by a series of exchanges: reunion of separated families, exchanges of cultural groups, increases in cross-border economic activities, and even a

²⁶ Vladimir Nadashkevich, "Russian tank battalion to reinforce south Korean armed forces," *TASS*, January 18, 1996; Pyotr Yudin, "Moscow Pays Debt With Arms; Diverse Asian Supply Drills Poses Threat to U.S. Market Share," *Defense News*, August 26/September 1, 1996; Mikhail Shevtsov, "Russia, S. Korea sign military cooperation memorandum," *Tass*, November 4, 1996; and Aleksandr Sychov, "Attempts Being Made To Crowd Out Arms Makers—And Not Just From Cyprus," *Izvestia*, January 10, 1997, p. 3

²⁷ Korean *Kyunghyang Daily*, February 6, 2001, p. 2.

project to reconnect a railroad/highway that involves clearing mines in part of the DMZ. Also, South Korea's defense budget, which had increased at about 10 percent annually since the early 1970s, decreased for the first time in 1999, although the decrease reflected the South's economic difficulties and overall reduction of its government budget rather than a change in its military policy. Despite the political rapprochement and the economic hardship of recent years, however, the South has taken few meaningful measures to restrain its force modernization. Rather, it is continuing most of its force enhancement projects. In 2000, for example, the South's Ministry of National Defense allocated \$4.7 billion for R&D and acquisition to develop unmanned spy planes and to buy a military satellite, attack helicopters, naval destroyers, AWAC aircraft, and fighter jets. The "Medium-Term National Defense Plan," approved by President Kim in 1999, budgets \$35 billion for weapons purchases for the next five years to develop the capability to operate within 500 km from Korea.²⁸ On balance, military containment far outweighs political engagement even in South Korea. In 2000, for example, South Korea spent \$12.8 billion to prepare to fight the North—about 100 times as much as the \$114 million it allocated for humanitarian aid for the North Koreans who were suffering and continue to suffer a severe food shortage.²⁹

Japanese Integration in U.S. War Plan. If the Pentagon's win-win strategy promotes, if not drives, South Korea's force modernization, the war doctrine further accelerates the process of integrating American and Japanese forces with the USFK and South Korean military, completing the circle of tripartite militarization. A smooth operation of the American doctrine requires a seamless integration of American and its allies' forces and bases in the region. That is being achieved by a number of measures: the Tokyo security declaration of 1996, the 1997 revision of the "Guideline," the agreement on military goods provision, joint development of such

²⁸ Kim Jong-Dae, "The Reality of U.S. Weapons Imports," paper presented in Seoul on July 21, 2001, p. 8.

²⁹ *Military Balance 2000-2001* (London: Oxford University Press, 2000), p. 203. In 2000, South Korea provided North Korea with \$113.8 million, whereas the international community offered \$181.8 million to the North. For more information, see South Korea's Ministry of Unification web site at <http://www.unikorea.go.kr/kr/load/C34/C3470.htm> (accessed July 20, 2001).

weapons system as theater missile defense (TMD) and support fighters (F-2), and tripartite military exercises.³⁰

If the Bottom-Up-Review (BUR) formalized the win-win strategy in 1993, its application to the Asian theater was established two years later by the East Asia Strategy Review (EASR, commonly known as the Nye Initiative), which effectively reversed the first Bush administration's East Asia Strategy Initiative of 1990 to reduce the American military presence in Korea and Japan. The EASR set the number of American soldiers in the Asia-Pacific at 100,000, and emphasized the importance of its nuclear umbrella and existing alliances, setting the stage for further implementation of the two-war doctrine. It was followed by Japan's new National Defense Program Outline, adopted in November 1995, which underscored the fact that Japanese military capabilities should play appropriate roles in the security environment after the Cold War. Five months later, Washington and Tokyo signed an agreement on the provision of logistics support and military goods and services between the two. These measures culminated in the Japan-U.S. Joint Declaration on Security (New Security Declaration) that President Clinton and Prime Minister Hashimoto issued in April 1996 after a summit meeting, emphasizing the centrality of their alliance to maintaining "a stable . . . environment *for the Asia-Pacific region*." After confirming the status quo vision contained in the EASR, the two leaders agreed in the declaration to review the 1978 Guidelines for Japan-U.S. Defense Cooperation for the purpose of promoting bilateral coordination in "dealing with situations that may emerge in *the areas surrounding Japan*."³¹ The purpose was well served in 1997 when the Guideline itself was revised to authorize U.S.-Japan military cooperation outside Japan.

The new security arrangement created by these measures represents an effort to bring U.S. forces in Japan and the Japanese contribution in line with the dictates of the U.S. strategy. Most significantly, the arrangement allows American forces to use Japanese bases for operations outside Japan, including the Korean peninsula—a radical departure from the previous arrangement, which prohibited precisely such an operation. It also provides the *gaiatsu* ("outside pres-

³⁰ With its military R&D budget cut by 20 percent in 1998, Japan agreed to join the U.S. Navy Theater Wide (NTW) missile defense research program. See *SIPRI Yearbook 1999*, p. 351.

³¹ Emphasis added. The Joint Declaration is available at <http://www.mofa.go.jp/region/n-america/us/security/security.html>.

sure”) that the Japanese government needs to change its laws banning military operations outside Japan. Citing American pressure, for example, Japan’s Defense White Paper stated in 2000 that it was “necessary to legislate a contingency law,” which was drawn up in an effort to specify the steps Japan will take in the wake of armed attack in the vicinity of Japan’s territory.³² This step represented a departure from the 1999 version that saw it only as “desirable.” The cooperative measures between the United States and Japan reflect the degree to which the triangular military alliance justifies Japan’s expanded military role on the Korean peninsula.

These measures are buttressed by the steps that Tokyo has taken to improve its military capabilities. The Japanese Self-Defense Force received the Aegis air defense system for four Kongo Class destroyers in 1998,³³ and decided two years later to purchase four more Aegis ships with PAC-3 capability.³⁴ The Japanese Defense Agency, which has already been operating four Boeing E-767 AWACS aircraft, also plans to improve missile defense by upgrading its radar and introducing airplane infrared detectors.³⁵ Most significantly, Japan decided in 2000 to acquire air-refueling planes, an important step in expanding its long distance “force projection capability.”³⁶

The trilateral military cooperation, whose foundation is laid down through shared doctrines and common hardware, is being perfected through a set of bilateral exercises that are held concurrently among the three countries. The “Team Spirit” exercise, which North Korea had long denounced as a test nuclear war exercise against it, had not been held since 1994, creating an atmosphere conducive to dialogue with Pyongyang. The United States, South Korea, and Japan, however, have staged a number of other military exercises. The one that best demonstrates trilateral military cooperation is “Keen Sword” between the United States and Japan, which is held nearly at the same time as “Foil Eagle” between the United States and South

³² *The ROK Defense White Paper 2000*, Chapter 2 Security Situation in Northeast Asia (Seoul: Ministry of National Defense, Republic of Korea, 2001).

³³ *SIPRI Yearbook 1999*, p. 474.

³⁴ *Chosun Ilbo*, October 3, 2000, p. 4.

³⁵ *Military Balance 2000-2001*, p. 201.

³⁶ *Hangyore Shinmun*, June 7, 2001, p. 1.

Korea. For Foal Eagle, troops from the U.S. 2nd Army Division were transported from the U.S. mainland to Korea, while American soldiers stationed in Japan took part in Keen Sword with Japan's Ground, Maritime, and Air Self-Defense Forces. The Japanese Self-Defense Force deployed 130 aircraft and eleven warships, while the U.S. Forces in Japan mobilized 170 aircraft and six warships, including the aircraft carrier USS *Independence*. The 1997 exercise marked the first time a U.S. aircraft carrier was used in a joint drill with Japan in the Sea of Japan, demonstrating the extent to which American and Japanese forces were integrated to implement the two-war strategy in Northeast Asia. It should also be noted that during the 1997 exercises, the United States and Japan carried out their first practice in providing each other with military goods and services, a procedure provided by the logistics support agreement reached in April 1996. In November 2000, the United States also conducted a joint military exercise with Japan to enhance its cooperation with Japan's Self Defense Forces in the event of a military contingency in areas surrounding Japan.³⁷

Duality of U.S. Approach to Peace

In sum, the United States is containing the North with its classical Cold War methods while also being engaged in negotiations to ease tensions and to terminate Pyongyang's nuclear development program. As part of its worldwide effort to limit weapons of mass destruction and their delivery systems, Washington is spearheading the international consortium to implement the Agreed Framework and has engaged in various dialogues with Pyongyang. Even the current Bush administration, which avowedly harbors no trust in the North Korean leadership, also reaffirmed its willingness to negotiate with the North.³⁸ At the same time, however, the United States remains the driving force in implementing its two-war doctrine. It is building up its own as well

³⁷ *Donga Ilbo*, November 9, 2000, p. 15.

³⁸ President Bush had initially put on hold U.S. talks with North Korea, ordering a review of U.S. policy toward Pyongyang, virtually scrapping whatever had been achieved in dialogue with the North under the Clinton administration. In a slight modification of his initial position, however, President Bush said in June 2001 that he was willing to negotiate with Pyongyang on a wide range of issues, including reductions in North Korea's armed forces. Thus far Pyongyang has made it clear that it is not interested in discussing the wider agenda. *Chosun Ilbo*, June 9, 2001, p. 4; and Zeno Park, "North Korea urges United States to drop Cold War hostility," *Agence France Presse* (English Wire), August 9, 2001.

as its allies' military in the region. It is also the United States that is producing and propagating the mantra that North Korea is a threat to be fought, not a partner to have a dialogue with. The contradictory nature of American policies is brought into stark relief when the regional arms build-up is juxtaposed with the North's declining economic and military capabilities. Even South Korean government statistics show that the South's military spending surpassed the North's by 20 percent in 1985, an advantage the South subsequently increased to a 10 to 1 ratio by the year 2000.³⁹ As early as in 1988, Yi Young-hui, a leading South Korean intellectual, argued in Korea's parliamentary testimony that the South's military was stronger than the North's, a view that South Korea's own military acknowledged in 1990.⁴⁰ *Hangyore Sinmun* reiterated the view in a 1995 editorial that "given the capability of South Korea's state-of-the-art weapons, the South's military strength is a match for the North's or, as some people estimate, is superior to it."⁴¹ Nevertheless, the United States is allocating nearly a third of its defense spending to the Asia-Pacific region, where North Korea is designated the chief threat, and enlisting Japanese support for its endeavor as well.

To better understand why the United States is pursuing the two-war doctrine and regional militarization despite its apparent overwhelming military superiority, it may be necessary to situate the doctrine in a wider regional context that takes into account the tenuous Sino-U.S. relationship. To better understand why the Pentagon has so easily succeeded in selling its Asian strategy under the "North Korean threat," however, it is necessary to situate the material capability in the context of a social reality that is constituted by discursive politics. As the United States

³⁹ "N. Korea 1994 military spending \$2.2 billion-report," *Reuters North American Wire*, March 22, 1996; and "Nambukhan kyongjesahoisang Pigyo" [Socio-Economic Comparison between South-North Korea], *T'onggyoch'ong* [Bureau of Statistics] (South Korea), November 28, 1995. Quoted from *Hangyore Sinmun*, November 29, 1995. See, for the latest numbers, The International Institute for Strategic Studies, *The Military Balance 2000-2001*, pp. 202-3.

⁴⁰ Yi, Young-hui, "Nambukhan chonjangnungryok pikyoyongu: hanpando p'yonghwat'odaewi kuch'ukul wihan mosaek" [Comparative Study of South and North Korea's War Capability: An Exploration to establish a foundation for Korea peninsula's peace], Kyungnam University Far East Institute, ed., *Nambukhan Kunbigyonjaengkwa Kunch'uk* [South-North Korea's Arms Race and Disarmament] (Kyungnam University Press: 1992), pp. 117-44.

⁴¹ "Hangyore Sinmun' questions quantity of weapons imported from USA," *BBC Summary of World Broadcasts*, May 29, 1995.

implements its doctrine, it has produced a stream of analyses and reports that single out the Korean peninsula and the Persian Gulf as the most dangerous and strategically important places. According to George Tenet, director of the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), “[a] Korean war scenario remains our primary near-term military concern,”⁴² a view that the National Defense University reinforced with its annual report on the national security threat. The security concern is justified in a number of ways. In 1999, when the North was still struggling with the widespread famine, Lt. Gen. Patrick Hughes, director of the Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA), argued that “North Korea remains the country most likely to involve the United States in a large-scale regional war scenario over the near term.”⁴³ By 2000, when its economic crisis seemed to bottom out, however, Tenet suggested that “the North Korean military appears, for now, to have halted its near decade-long slide in military capabilities” and that “we have not yet seen a significant diminution of the threat from the North to American and South Korean interests.”⁴⁴ In other words, these two short snippets show that North Korea remains a constant threat no matter what its material condition is like.

The concerns about the North’s conventional military capabilities are furthered by worries about its missiles. One of President Bush’s three overarching military goals is “to develop the capabilities to defend against missiles,” which in turn is based on the Rumsfeld Commission’s report on missile threat. The Commission to Assess the Ballistic Missile Threat to the United States, headed by now Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld, concluded in its report to Congress in 1998 that “They [North Korea, Iran and Iraq] would be able to inflict major destruction on the

⁴² Statement by Acting Director of Central Intelligence George J. Tenet before the U.S. Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, *Hearing on Current and Projected National Security Threats to the United States*, 105th Cong., 1st sess., February 5, 1997; Jim Adams, “U.S. Agencies See India-Pakistan, Korea Dangers,” *Reuters World Service*, Washington, DC, February 5, 1997.

⁴³ Statement by Patrick Hughes before the U.S. Senate Armed Services Committee, *Hearing on Current and Future Worldwide Threats to the National Security of the United States*, 106th Cong., 1st sess., February 2, 1999.

⁴⁴ George Tenet, Director, Central Intelligence Agency, statement before the U.S. Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, *Hearing on World-wide Threat to National Security*, 107th Cong., 1st sess., February 7, 2001.

[United States] within about five years of a decision to acquire such a capability.”⁴⁵ No sooner was the report released than the North fired a rocket over Japan, fanning a fear. Such a fear about the North’s long-range missiles is further buttressed by concerns about its shorter-range missiles, as reflected in George Tenet’s testimony in February 2001 before the Senate Select Intelligence Committee on Worldwide Threats to National Security.

The way in which the United States understands the situation is well captured in the Defense Secretary’s recent report on the Korean situation:

North Korea remains the major threat to stability and security in Northeast Asia and is the country most likely to involve the United States in a large-scale war. While the historic summit between the North and South leaders holds the promise of reconciliation and change, no evidence exists of the fundamental precursors for change. There is little or no evidence of economic reform or reform-minded leaders; reduction in military forces; or a lessening of anti-US rhetoric. A decade of steep economic decline has not deterred the North’s leaders from allocating precious resources to improving their military forces. The DPRK maintains a dogged adherence to a “military first” policy even against the backdrop of a nation facing severe economic and social challenges.⁴⁶

Thus the North’s missiles and conventional forces are framed in terms of an offensive capability that can inflict major damage on the United States. Excluded from the framing is an alternative, and more plausible, possibility: the North is providing for its security in the face of the overwhelming power of its adversary. The logic of the security dilemma suggests that just as the North’s military represents a security threat to the United States and its allies, the forces of the latter are a threat to the North. Just as the United States, South Korea, and Japan are building up their capabilities to defend against their adversary, so is the North. Such a simple understanding, however, is out of the question for all of them because the vicious cycle of insecurity is embedded in fifty years of confrontational interaction, making the enmity seem part of the natural

⁴⁵ The Rumsfeld report was a major reversal of a previous study of missile threats. Titled “Emerging Missile Threats to North America During the Next 15 Years,” the NIE of 1995 had concluded that “no country, other than the major declared nuclear powers, will develop or otherwise acquire a ballistic missile threat in the next 15 years that could threaten the contiguous 48 states and Canada.” The unclassified summary is available at <http://www.fas.org/spp/starwars/offdocs/nie9519.htm>.

⁴⁶ Secretary of Defense, *Military Situation on the Korean Peninsula*, 2000 Report to Congress, September 12, 2000.

order of things. To either side of the confrontation, the enmity seems to derive directly and immediately from the “anarchic” nature of the international system, and the threat from the “essentially” hostile nature of the other party. Neither is capable of rising above the enmity; neither is able to see itself and its adversary caught in the security dilemma that they themselves have produced.

On the other hand, a critical analysis of American attempts to restrain the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction reveals an element of power politics, as the American efforts reflect a new focus in Pentagon’s weapons development strategy. First, these efforts are directed at freezing the capacity of *other countries* to develop weapons of mass destruction. Although non-proliferation is a praiseworthy goal, American moral leadership is being undermined by its own nuclearism. For while Washington is preaching to the world about the dangers of nuclear weapons, it is at the same time leading in maintaining the myth that nuclear weapons are the guarantor of peace. For while Washington argues that a new nuclear weapon acquired by non-nuclear states would pose an immense threat to humanity, it is protecting its own overkill capacity of an unrivaled nuclear arsenal. For while keeping its own nuclear materials beyond international inspections and control, it is demanding intrusive inspections on others’. Nowhere is America’s contradictory position more apparent than in Korea. On the Korean peninsula, Washington’s duality has led to the self-contradictory position that it guarantees, under the Agreed Framework, not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against North Korea, while at the same time maintaining, under its Defense Treaty with South Korea, a nuclear umbrella over the South, threatening a nuclear retaliation against the North.

Second, America’s leading role in nonproliferation reflects a change in the Pentagon’s weapons development strategy. While maintaining the overwhelming superiority of its mass-destruction power, the U.S. military is determined to forge ahead with its efforts to develop “smart weapons” technology as well as missile defense systems, which most countries are simply incapable of catching up with. The United States is simultaneously the leading advocate of the doctrine of nuclear deterrence and the leader in the development of precision-guided weapons. The new focus in American weapons development strategy, coupled with the efforts to curb worldwide proliferation, smacks of the duplicity of SALT I in the early 1970s. Although SALT I was ostensibly intended to limit the increase in the number of missiles, it was criticized by some for providing a cover under which to justify the new generation of nuclear armaments, particu-

larly the multiple-independently targetable-reentry-vehicles (MIRVs). U.S. weapons production is moving toward next generation weapons systems, e.g., smart bombs and missile defense systems, while other countries, including China and North Korea, are still grappling with such World War II technologies as ballistic missiles. The United States is trying to freeze the weapons development in the rest of the world at the current primitive level of precision while continuing to develop more precise and effective weapons systems. Again, nowhere is America's contradictory position more apparent than in Korea. The United States remains the unrivaled number one supplier of missiles and other state-of-the-art weapons systems to Seoul; at the same time it is leading the international efforts to have Pyongyang terminate its missile exports. Washington is vigorously pursuing its missile defense programs while accelerating its "revolution in military affairs"; at the same time it is leading the international charge against Pyongyang's programs of outdated weapons.

This is not to suggest that it is meaningless for Washington to try to control worldwide proliferation of weapons of mass destruction; my purpose is rather to point out that the U.S. effort for non-proliferation will remain ineffective as long as Washington is engaged in contradictory policies. For others will view American non-proliferation initiatives with skepticism, and greet its weapons programs with their own weapons programs. If the United States wants to eradicate the temptation of smaller, poorer countries to develop weapons of mass destruction, it must lead an international effort to redress the doctrine of nuclear deterrence and nuclear threat. For many countries—such as North Korea—are tempted to develop weapons of mass destruction for fear of the U.S. nuclear weapons. If Washington wishes to prevent proliferation of high-tech weapons and their technology, it must lead an international effort to curb arms exports, including its own. Many nations—such as North Korea—import or develop weapons systems precisely to defend against American exports. The United States must squarely face the dilemma that arises from its reluctance to envision a fundamentally different concept of peace and security; it must come to terms with the imperative that its nonproliferation efforts must be coupled with restraints on itself.⁴⁷

⁴⁷ For a different vision that is based on equity and reassurance, rather than on dominance and deterrence, see, for example, John D. Steinbruner, *Principles of Global Security* (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press, 2000).

Designing a Peace Regime

The Korean peninsula might prove an excellent ground for testing a policy genuinely geared toward peace, resting on curbing rather than stoking the arms race. Nuclear proliferation concerns drove the Clinton administration to the negotiating table on which the Agreed Framework was signed. But the potential for nuclear proliferation on the Korean peninsula will linger as long as Korea remains a dangerous tinderbox with a short fuse. In order for a non-proliferation regime on the peninsula to be effective and robust, therefore, it needs to be complemented by a mechanism that would reduce the conventional military threat felt by either side of the DMZ. At a minimum this requires ending the Korean War, which was only suspended by the Armistice Agreement. To ensure non-proliferation and to allay security concerns, radical disarmament taken by the two Koreas with the support of the four surrounding powers is also needed. To ultimately defuse the Korean powder keg, Korea has to be peacefully reunified, and it has to be reunified in a form that would not upset the power balance among the four powers. In this section, I turn to some of specific issues that stand in the way toward these goals.

Missiles, Soldiers, and Armistice

If Clinton made it clear that he would link progress in the missile negotiations to lifting the economic sanctions and improving U.S.-North Korean relations, Bush has made it one of the cornerstones of his policies toward the North. Any substantial progress in the peace talks and the normalization of the North Korean diplomatic and economic relations with the West, therefore, depends on whether the two parties can achieve a constructive compromise on the missile issue. Clinton began a series of negotiations on the missile issue and Kim Jong-Il agreed in September 1999 on a moratorium on missile testing while the negotiations were under way. Kim has since repeatedly confirmed his willingness to maintain it until 2003. Clinton was apparently on the verge of making a breakthrough in his final days: he and Kim Jong-Il exchanged highest level envoys to arrange a summit where they would seal an agreement to shut down the North Korean missile program.⁴⁸ But currently Bush and Kim are at a stalemate. Bush wants to prevent the

⁴⁸ Wendy R. Sherman, "Talking to the North Koreans," *New York Times*, p. A19, March 7, 2001; and Michael R. Gordon, "How Politics Sank Accord on Missiles With North Korea," *New York Times*, p. A1, March 6, 2001.

development and export of missiles by the North, while Kim insists that the development and deployment of missiles inside North Korea is a matter of its sovereign right to self-defense.

The fundamental difference between Clinton's near success and Bush's stalemate lies not in Bush's unwillingness to talk or his proposal to expand the agenda, but in his refusal to end the enmity between the two nations. The last U.S.-North Korea joint statement shows that it was precisely because the two governments made a commitment to end hostile policies toward each other that the North was ready to scrap its missile program:

Recognizing that improving ties is a natural goal in relations among states and that better relations would benefit both nations in the 21st century while helping ensure peace and security on the Korean Peninsula and in the Asia-Pacific region, the U.S. and the D.P.R.K. sides stated that they are prepared to undertake a new direction in their relations. As a crucial first step, the two sides stated that neither government would have hostile intent toward the other and confirmed the commitment of both governments to make every effort in the future to build a new relationship free from past enmity.

Building on the principles laid out in the June 11, 1993 U.S.-D.P.R.K. Joint Statement and reaffirmed in the October 21, 1994 Agreed Framework, the two sides agreed to work to remove mistrust, build mutual confidence, and maintain an atmosphere in which they can deal constructively with issues of central concern. In this regard, the two sides reaffirmed that their relations should be based on the principles of respect for each other's sovereignty and non-interference in each other's internal affairs⁴⁹

It is precisely this commitment "to build a new relationship free from past enmity" that is required to peacefully defuse the missile issue. Pyongyang is not likely to give up the production and deployment of missiles unless Washington shows a willingness to address its security concerns. Hence a possible solution seems to lie in a set of reciprocal concessions whereby Bush provides a security guarantee in exchange for Pyongyang's termination of its missile program. Only when Bush comes to a realization that his non-proliferation policy is riddled with contradictions and that the United States-North Korea relationship is entrenched in the security dilemma would such a solution become possible. Given the North's deep economic problems, one might be tempted to think that it will give in to the American pressure if the United States offers economic incentives such as removing sanctions. But this may well prove wishful thinking because Pyongyang is likely to maintain that its military and missiles are the only guarantor of its

⁴⁹ U.S.-D.P.R.K. Joint Communiqué, Department of State, October 12, 2000.

survival. To treat what it considers the “life-or-death” issue as an economic bargaining chip is to put the cart before the horse. Such an approach turns a blind eye to the stubborn reality that the North’s missiles are a byproduct of the enmity between the two nations and that a solution to the missile issue therefore can begin only with a reciprocal recognition that both sides of the DMZ share the common responsibility for the persistent military tension and arms build-up. Without this sense of reciprocity, the hawks in the United States and South Korea as well as in North Korea may find many a chance to halt and reverse a peace process and to maintain the status quo of armament.

In addition to the growing ballistic missile capabilities, North Korea’s forward deployment of its massive infantry units near the DMZ represents a major source of concern for the United States and South Korea. South Korean and American militaries estimate that two thirds of North’s 1.1 million military personnel is deployed within 100 kilometers of the DMZ. In 1996 North Korea also redeployed its combat aircraft to locations near the DMZ that are only 6 minutes’ flying time from the heart of Seoul. *The 2000 ROK Defense White Paper* shows that 55 percent of North Korean military force is deployed near the DMZ.⁵⁰ The North’s conventional forces are buttressed by greatly improved special forces that number 100,000 and are trained to filter rapidly into key political, industrial, and other sectors within the South. Most statistics on the military balance show that the North maintains a quantitative advantage in the number of soldiers and various weapons systems, whereas the South has a qualitative edge in its weapons and training, making it extremely difficult to compare their military capabilities.

Force comparison may be difficult to make, but the logic of the security dilemma is easy to see. Just as the United States and South Korea are concerned about the North’s force deployment near the DMZ, so is the North equally concerned about the South’s and America’s posture that deploys 90 percent of their military within 50 km of the DMZ. Each side claims its own forces to be defensive while viewing the other’s to be offensive; each justifies its own force posture on the basis of its perceived threat from the other’s force posture. It is time for both sides to acknowledge that they are entrapped in a vicious cycle of security dilemma. That acknowledg-

⁵⁰ For more information regarding North Korean force deployment, see the South Korean *Defense White Paper 2000* at http://www.mnd.go.kr/mnden/sub_menu/w_book/2000 (accessed June 21, 2001).

ment would constitute the first step out of the dilemma. For just as the security dilemma is a by-product of practices of enmity that the United States and North Korea have been engaged in, so does its resolution begin with practices that would replace the enmity with amity. If Pyongyang or Washington argues that its forces are purely defensive, it should also be prepared to accept the other side's claim that its forces are also defensive. Given Seoul's growing military superiority over Pyongyang, by the same token, the South should be prepared to scrap its weapons purchase and modernization plans in exchange for Pyongyang's halting its missile programs and a commitment to limiting its arms purchases. Washington, the major weapons supplier to the South, should also be prepared to support Seoul's decision to stop arms imports and to stop reinforcement of the USFK in exchange for Pyongyang's pledge not to export or import weapons. Once arms limitation is agreed upon and implemented, the two Koreas can start the process of building-down their arms stockpiles.

Some of these steps had been taken or were at least in the works under the Clinton administration. The Agreed Framework of 1994 laid down the political framework that would allay, in a step-by-step, reciprocal manner, America's concerns about the North's nuclear program and the North's concerns about U.S. military posture. The Clinton administration was apparently on the verge of negotiating away the missile problem in its final days precisely because it acknowledged the security dilemma dynamic on the Korean peninsula, as clearly reflected in Perry's admission that North's missiles might be a weapon of deterrence: "[North Korean missiles'] primary reason . . . is deterrence . . . They would be deterring the United States."⁵¹ On the basis of this acknowledgment, the Clinton administration moved to give North Korea a guarantee of no nuclear threat and a political normalization; the Kim Jong-Il regime reciprocated by freezing its nuclear and missile programs. The Bush administration halted these processes, allegedly for a review. But it has thus far stubbornly refused to acknowledge that the United States and North Korea are entrapped in the vicious cycle of a security dilemma, preferring instead to demonize the North; it has thus far resisted the need to adopt reciprocal measures, preferring instead to take unilateral steps. This refusal and resistance contradict the premises underlying the Agreed Framework and other joint statements, and thus have the potential to undo the achievements made through negotiations.

⁵¹ Harrison, Selig S., "Time to Leave Korea?" *Foreign Affairs* 80, 2 (2001): 64.

Pyongyang has long demanded the replacement of the Armistice Agreement with a peace treaty with the United States and normalized relations between the two countries. Washington, however, regards the Korean armistice as the cornerstone of the U.S. alliance system in Northeast Asia and therefore untouchable. It is “virtually heresy even to raise the issue, let alone discuss a detailed road plan toward ending the armistice,” as insightful observers have noted.⁵² The North Korean leadership seems to understand now that the United States will not end the Korean armistice and sign a peace treaty for some time. It has dropped its long-standing objections to U.S. troops in the South, and begun to seek what it terms “an interim peace mechanism” to replace the armistice. One possible way to resolve the differences seems to lie in a set of simultaneous non-aggression pacts between the parties to the Korean War that would establish a new, truly peacekeeping function for UN forces.

Who is party to the war is a tricky question, and there are various answers to it.⁵³ There seems little disagreement that Washington and Pyongyang are parties, while there is little agreement on Seoul’s and Beijing’s status. Despite the four-party talk proposal made by Presidents Clinton and Kim, I argue that China is not a *de facto* or *de jure* party because the state of war that had existed between China and the United States and South Korea ended when Beijing opened diplomatic relations with both. Also despite Pyongyang’s insistence that Seoul is not a party, I argue that Seoul’s *de facto*, if not *de jure*, status has to be reckoned with. A peace regime on the Korean peninsula could not be built if the South is not involved as a full party. Therefore, Washington, Seoul and Pyongyang can perhaps adopt a document that would lay out a comprehensive set of measures, perhaps in a form similar to the Agreed Framework, which each commits itself to taking to end the state of war. As Seoul and Pyongyang have made progress on this front—they signed a non-aggression pact in 1991 and held a summit last year—the Bush administration remains the only party yet to take a meaningful measure to end the state of war with the North.

⁵² Peter Hayes and Stephen Noerper, “The Future of the U.S.-ROK Alliance,” in Young Whan Kihl and Peter Hayes, eds., *Peace and Security in Northeast Asia* (Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe, 1997), p. 266.

⁵³ See for example, Pat Norton, “Ending The Korean Armistice Agreement: The Legal Issues,” The Nautilus Institute, Northeast Asia Peace and Security Network, Policy Forum Online, March 1997 (http://www.nautilus.org/napsnet/fora/2a_armisticelegal_norton.html).

On a regional level, Washington needs to recognize that Beijing and Moscow would find intolerable the idea of a reunified Korea in which the United States remains the sole foreign military presence, just as it would be unfathomable for Washington or Tokyo to accept a reunified Korea under Chinese or Russian influence. All four powers have a vital stake in peace on the peninsula, and none would prefer a unified Korea under the lopsided influence of one of them to a divided Korea that no single power controls. The international system in Northeast Asia, in other words, has an interest in maintaining the status quo, even at the price of continued instability and risk of conflagration. Furthermore, the United States, Russia, China, and to a lesser degree Japan, remain the major sources of weapons and their technology for the two Koreas, giving them further incentive to perpetuate the fragile division. A peace regime on the peninsula, therefore, needs an international component that would 1) constrain arms transfers from the four and 2) alleviate the concerns that each might have over upsetting the power balance on the Korean peninsula.

A regional factor that could adversely affect the peace process on the Korean peninsula is the ever-increasing emphasis on military preparedness and joint arms build-up among the three countries under the leadership of the United States. In itself, it promotes a vicious cycle of power political rivalry, if not an arms race, between Japan and China, which may affect negatively the relationship between China and the United States and the peace process on the Korean peninsula. First, it increases a sense of military pressure and isolation on the part of the North Korean leadership, hampering the process of military confidence building and arms control. The increasing military cooperation between the United States and Japan means a codification of the triangular military alliance that justifies Japan's military role on the Korean peninsula. In the eyes of the North Koreans, in particular, this development will exacerbate militarization of the Korean peninsula, as well as providing a powerful indication of the rising influence of a reemerging Japanese militarism in the region. Hence a peace regime needs to be buttressed by a regional framework that would neutralize any adverse international factors over which the Korean people have no control.

Second, the increasing militarization of the American tripartite alliance can contribute negatively to peace building on the Korean peninsula by arousing more power-political reactions from China and Russia. When Winston Lord, Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs, was asked in April 1996 if he expected a positive reaction from Beijing to the

joint security declaration in Tokyo, he replied that “the U.S. is confident that Beijing should have every reason to welcome a reaffirmation of our alliance. It is not directed at any one country, and Beijing, I think, understands that close U.S.-Japan relations make for stability and predictability in the region.”⁵⁴ But the actual reaction from Beijing and Moscow was to move to develop a “strategic partnership” between the two in a summit meeting immediately after the U.S. and Japan joint security declaration. The Chinese and Russians seem to define the new development of the U.S.-led military alliance among the three as another a form of American hegemony. On July 16, 2001, the two countries finally formalized their concerns about the U.S. hegemony by signing a treaty of friendship and cooperation, which aims to oppose the U.S. missile defense and consolidate Russian support of China’s sovereign right over Taiwan.⁵⁵

The peace process among the three parties needs to be complemented by a regional regime because arms control and disarmament requires a wider participation of the regional states, including China, Russia, and Japan. The involvement of all three is essential for a Northeast Asia-wide regime of restraints in arms transfers to the Korean peninsula and for a regional agreement to make the peninsula a nuclear-weapons-free zone. An excellent way to work on this regional regime is to build on the non-nuclear declaration that the North and South signed in 1991. In the declaration, the two pledged not to develop nuclear weapons, but their pledges are not accompanied by commitment by any of the four major powers to respect and support them. In order to make the declaration more effective, North and South Korea can add a protocol, which the four powers then sign and ratify. This could pave the way for a more ambitious demilitarization system where the four commit not to transfer weapons or weapons-related technology to, or through, either of the Koreas.

The final stage of the peace process can result from successful progress of the above mechanisms. If the peace process is intensified, the two Koreas may be able to enter a qualitatively higher level of inter-Korean dialogue. That may produce a political commonwealth, possibly a confederal form of political integration, between the two Koreas. At this juncture, the multilateral peace talks, which began as a specific forum for peace on the Korean peninsula, can

⁵⁴ USIA material, “Transcript: Lord Briefing on Clinton Trip to Japan, Korea,” White House Briefing Room, 96041105.EEA, p. 9.

⁵⁵ *New York Times*, July 17, 2001, p. A1.

develop into a region-wide security forum for Northeast Asia in general. The formation of a loose political commonwealth on the peninsula should be an indication that a mature and stable peace regime has emerged in Korea. Therefore, in this stage, the focus of the multilateral forum for Korea will be able to shift to a higher level of peace mission for East Asia.

Conclusion: Out of Security Dilemma to Reciprocity

E.H. Carr, the consummate realist, succinctly summarizes realism in his seminal work.⁵⁶ As he articulates it, realism places an emphasis on facts and their analysis, and tends to downplay the role of purpose. Realism emphasizes the irresistible strength of existing forces and the inevitable character of existing tendencies, and insists that the highest wisdom lies in accepting and adapting oneself to these forces and tendencies. Yet Carr warns that such an attitude, though advocated in the name of objective thought, might be carried to a point where it results in the sterilization of thought and the negation of action. He recognizes that there is a stage where realism is the necessary corrective to the exuberance of utopianism, just as there is a period when utopianism must be invoked to counteract the barrenness of realism. Immature thought is predominantly purposive and utopian; thought without purpose is “the thought of old age.” In a final synthesis, therefore, he proposes that mature thought combines purpose with observation and analysis: “Utopia and reality are thus the two facets of political science. Sound political thought and sound political life will be found only where both have their place.”⁵⁷

The question here is how to combine the two elements, reality and utopia, in designing a course toward a peace regime on the Korean peninsula. The challenge lies in envisioning a creative amalgam of brute power politics and liberal institution-building. In Northeast Asia, a simple acceptance of power politics of major states provides no guarantee of peace, as I have shown. The tripartite militarization would only precipitate negative reactions from North Korea, China, and Russia, intensifying the already tense environment of the region, possibly triggering an arms race and even a war. As long as the United States, South Korea, and Japan are complacent about prolonging the power-political strategy of strengthening and integrating their military alliances,

⁵⁶ Edward Hallett Carr, *The Twenty Years' Crisis, 1919-1939: An Introduction to the Study of International Relations* (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1939, 1964).

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 10.

the international system in the region will continue to be fraught with the tensions they are bound to create with other powers. At the same time, South Korea and Japan may become prisoners of their own complacency, unable to develop their own vision of a new regional order that could lessen the arms race and promote a peaceful interaction among the countries of Northeast Asia. However, this vicious cycle was breached for the first time by the Agreed Framework, in which each side to the confrontation not only recognized its adversary's security concerns, but also took measures to allay them. The breached hole was made wider as Kim Dae-Jung and Kim Jong-Il held a summit in 2000, moving closer to amity between the two Koreas. The final breakthrough was about to be made when Clinton prepared his own summit with the North Korean leader. Clinton's contradiction-ridden "containingengagement" policy was taking a decisive turn toward engagement, only to be stopped and reversed by Bush. Thus far Bush has succeeded in pushing back the achievements and closing the breached hole. Now the containment leg stands to gain momentum and eclipse the engagement leg, which will only exacerbate the tension that the United States' two-war strategy has created.

To resolve the missile issue and to build peace in the region in general, we need a new security framework that emphasizes less the centrality of power politics and more the importance of multilateral interactions among countries of the region. We need to find the best balance between alliance politics and a multilateral peace endeavor. The continued arms transfers from the United States to South Korea, the accelerating arms build-up by South Korea, and the cooperation in arms production—particularly of the ballistic missile defense systems—among Washington, Seoul, and Tokyo would only make the peace proposal a barren gesture. An initiative for peace talks must be coupled with a blueprint for reducing the centrality of military transactions within the military alliances. To acknowledge the reality of the security dilemma and the necessity of reciprocity may well constitute the first step toward the peace initiative.

U.S.-JAPAN DIPLOMATIC AND SECURITY RELATIONS POST-1945: A HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

John Swenson-Wright

Introduction

As former British Prime Minister Harold Wilson famously observed, “a week is a long time in politics.” Wilson’s uncontentious observation, capturing succinctly the vagaries of parliamentary politics, is rarely applied to the U.S.-Japan alliance, but recent events seems to have confirmed its relevance even in the case of the long-standing post-war security and diplomatic relationship between Washington and Tokyo. For example, in the protracted political stalemate preceding the inauguration of President George W. Bush, media commentary on both sides of the Pacific, optimistically highlighted new, positive trends in the bilateral relationship. In contrast to the sometimes tension-fraught and even acrimonious dialogue that surfaced periodically throughout the 1990s during the stewardship of Bill Clinton, the new Republican administration seemed intent on smoothing ruffled feathers in Tokyo and on encouraging a strong, co-operative and genuinely reciprocal partnership with Tokyo. With the appointment of prominent experienced Japan hands, such as Richard Armitage as Deputy Secretary of State and Robert Zoellick as U.S. Trade Representative (USTR), and in the wake of an important bipartisan report calling for “renewed attention to improving, reinvigorating, and refocusing the U.S.-Japan alliance,”¹ the prognosis for an improving relationship seemed unusually positive. Yet, within the space of a few weeks, this favorable picture seemed entirely obscured by a plethora of press reports in Tokyo critical of the U.S. government, reinforced by high-level Japanese official criticism and widespread Japanese public discontent.² The trigger for this sudden shift in attitudes was the

¹ Bipartisan Study Group on the U.S.-Japan Partnership, *The United States and Japan: Advancing Toward a Mature Partnership* (Institute for National Strategic Studies, National Defense University, October 11, 2000), available online at: http://www.ndu.edu/ndu/sr_japan.html. Accessed October 1, 2001.

² See, for example, “Bei, yukue fumeisha no sÇsaku wo danzoku,” [U.S. Searches Intermittently for Whereabouts of Disappeared], *Yomiuri shinbun*, February 16, 2001, morning edition, p. 1; “Nattoku no iku chÇsa to setsumeï ga hitsuyou da,” [Need for a Convincing Investigation and

collision on February 10, 2001 (less than a month after Bush's inauguration as president) between a U.S. nuclear powered submarine, the USS *Greenville*, and a Japanese fishing boat, the *Ehime Maru*, resulting in the sinking of the Japanese vessel and the disappearance, presumed drowned, of nine of the ship's 35 passengers and crew.

The sudden eruption of a diplomatic crisis highlights a point frequently observed by historians, namely that contingencies and chance occurrences—as Harold Macmillan put it in another apposite prime ministerial aphorism, “events dear boy, events”³—frequently intervene in ways that all too often derail the best laid plans either of national policy makers or of social scientists eager to use parsimonious, but supposedly rigorous, models to impose predictive order on the chaotic world of international relations. A cursory glance back over the post-1945 history of U.S.-Japan relations reveals a number of such unwelcome surprises, particularly in the early years of the bilateral alliance. Notable, for example, during the 1950s were the irradiation of the *Fukuryu Maru* (or “Lucky Dragon”) a Japanese fishing vessel, following U.S. hydrogen bomb tests in the south-west Pacific in 1954; the Girard Incident of 1957 in which an American GI shot and killed a Japanese civilian; and, in 1960, the attack on the motorcade of James Hagerty, President Eisenhower's press assistant in Tokyo by a crowd of Japanese protesters demonstrating against the revision of the U.S.-Japan Security Treaty. Events of more recent vintage, such as George Bush senior's unexpected collapse and vomiting fit at a state banquet in Tokyo in December 1992, or the deeply disturbing rape by U.S. marines of a 12 year old Okinawan school girl in 1995, have similarly, albeit to a varying degree, threatened to spark a major rift in relations between the United States and Japanese governments.

Important as such crises undoubtedly are, focusing on temporary difficulties in the bilateral relationship can sometimes obscure deeper undercurrents suggestive of a more stable and healthy partnership. Moreover, there is a real danger that the immediacy of a particular crisis, particularly its coverage in the national media (both Japanese and American), can distort our

Explanation], *Yomiuri Shinbun*, February 16, 2001, morning edition, p. 3; “Bei kaigun shinmon —fushin no megumi dÇmei kyÇka no doryoku wo,” [U.S. Naval Hearing Makes Efforts to Strengthen Alliance While Distrust Begins to Emerge], *Yomiuri Shinbun*, February 22, 2001, morning edition, p. 3.

³ Peter Hennessy, *The Prime Minister. The Office and its Holders since 1945* (London: Penguin, 2000), p. 258.

understanding of the reaction of individual government officials in both capitals. This becomes increasingly clear as more of the diplomatic record detailing the post-war evolution of relations between Washington and Tokyo has become accessible. Much of the historiography on post-war U.S.-Japan relations has painted a picture of a U.S. leadership inclined either to take Japan for granted,⁴ or in some cases to actively ride rough-shod over the sensibilities and political and diplomatic priorities of its junior and, therefore, weaker alliance partner.⁵ In recent years, the criticism of U.S. policy has become more sharply focused, and in some cases, particularly strident in tone. Chalmers Johnson—never one to shy away from controversy—has suggested that the post-war American relationship with Japan was coercive and fundamentally anti-democratic, equivalent to the Soviet domination of the satellite states of Eastern Europe, and intended actively to limit Japan’s ability to chart its own political and diplomatic destiny.⁶ Less polemically perhaps, John Dower and Michael Schaller have argued recently that the security relationship with Japan can best be likened to a pattern of “double containment” in which Washington supported Japanese rearmament in order to check Communist, primarily Soviet, expansionism, but also located U.S. forces on Japanese territory in order to prevent the resurgence of an independent and powerful Japan.⁷

⁴ See, for example, Roger Buckley, *US-Japan Alliance Diplomacy, 1945-1990* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1992), p. 69.

⁵ John Dower, “Peace and Democracy in Two Systems. External Policy and Internal Conflict,” in *Postwar Japan as History*, ed. Andrew Gordon (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993), p. 11; Bruce Cumings, “Japan’s Position in the World System,” in Gordon, *Postwar Japan as History*, p. 34. Similarly, Reinhard Drifte, in his account of the early security relationship, has claimed that America was disinclined to listen to Japanese views, intent instead on securing a position of “hegemony” in Japan. See Reinhard Drifte, *The Security Factor in Japan’s Foreign Policy* (Ripe, East Sussex: Saltire Press, 1983), p. 135. Among Japanese writers, Kataoka Tetsuya has provocatively denied that there was any genuine “mutuality” in the alliance. See Kataoka Tetsuya, *The Price of a Constitution* (New York: Crane Russak, 1991), p. 8. In more muted, but still critical tones, Iwanaga KenkichirÇ, in *Sengo Nihon no seitÇto gaikÇ* [Post-war Japan’s Political Parties and Democracy] (Tokyo: TÇkyÇdaigaku shuppankai, 1985), p. 31, criticised the United States for forcing Japan to participate in the U.S. security system.

⁶ Chalmers Johnson, *Blowback. The Costs and Consequences of American Empire* (New York: Metropolitan Books, 2000), p. 20.

⁷ Remarks by Dower and Schaller at the January 2001 American Historical Association annual conference panel discussion entitled, “The US-Japan Relationship at 50: Retrospect and Pros-

The strength of these claims is clearly dependent on the archival evidence. However, it is also legitimate to consider to what extent contemporary developments may have colored and influenced the perspective of those inclined to be critical of U.S. policy towards Japan, sometimes to a degree that seems unwarranted in terms of the actual historical record, or at least in a manner that runs the risk of over-emphasizing particular short-comings on the United States side of the relationship. Just as the experience of Vietnam may have encouraged “new left” historians writing in the 1960s and 1970s to be particularly critical of early Cold War U.S. diplomacy, so too writers analyzing the U.S.-Japan relationship from the vantage point of the 1990s—a decade that witnessed, particularly in its early years, a marked increase in bilateral tension and an apparently poorly co-ordinated and ad hoc approach by the American government towards Japan—may have been overly quick to stress the weaknesses rather than the strengths of the U.S. government’s Japan policy.

Some suggestion that this may indeed be the case emerges from the diplomatic files, both existing and recently released material, particularly that relating to the late 1940s and throughout the 1950s. The following analysis highlights a number of instances in which a second look at the record suggests we might want to reconsider our previous judgements. The approach here is necessarily illustrative rather than exhaustive since the purpose is primarily to provoke discussion. After documenting those events that are candidates for re-examination, the analysis continues with a chronological overview of the security relationship in the remainder of the post-war period, highlighting some of the key turning points in relations, before focusing on contemporary developments and speculating on the likely direction of alliance relations in the immediate future.

pect.” Among scholars of the U.S.-Japan relationship, Dower and Schaller, along with Walter LaFeber, have written some of the most illuminating, detailed and thought-provoking of recent studies. See John Dower, *Embracing Defeat. Japan in the Wake of World War II* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1999); Michael Schaller, *Altered States. The United States and Japan since the Occupation* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 1997); Walter LaFeber. *The Clash. U.S.-Japanese Relations Throughout History* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1997).

1945-1952: Laying The Foundations For Co-operation

In the immediate aftermath of the Second World War, American policy-making on Japan was carried out at arms-length from Washington. State Department forward thinking on matters Asian was largely the preserve of China specialists—men such as Owen Lattimore, Andrew Ross and Stanley Hornbeck—inclined, either out of geopolitical calculation or a sympathy for America’s longstanding missionary-inspired preoccupation with the “middle kingdom,” to identify America’s post-war role in the region with what seemed in 1945 to be an emerging continental power. A newly installed and relatively inexperienced (at least where foreign affairs was concerned) President Truman was preoccupied with confronting possible Soviet expansion in the Middle East or Europe,⁸ and eager, where feasible, to promote troop demobilisation and bring America’s battle-weary troops back home. Against this backdrop, detailed management of Japan’s affairs was the preserve of General Douglas MacArthur in his capacity as Supreme Commander of the Allied Powers (SCAP), based in Tokyo.

SCAP headed a diverse Occupation administration of U.S. military officials and progressive, “New Deal” reformers committed to a far-ranging set of social and political initiatives intended to safeguard and advance new democratic institutions and principles while avoiding any return to the disastrous and destructive militarism of the 1930s. Temperamentally, MacArthur brooked no opposition to and little interference in his administration and faced at best only periodic and ineffectual challenges from his nominal administrative overseer—the 11-member Far Eastern Commission in Washington as well as the smaller, but equally ineffectual Allied Council for Japan in Tokyo.

In February 1946 George Kennan (at that point, a Foreign Service Officer stationed in Moscow) warned prophetically, in his “long telegram” of the dangers of Soviet expansion and the need for a strategy of “containment.” It was only then that Washington began to move decisively but gradually towards a policy of “patience and firmness” in confronting Soviet influence.⁹ In turn, this would create a context in which Japan would begin to intrude on the con-

⁸ Melvin P. Leffler, *A Preponderance of Power. National Security, the Truman Administration and the Cold War* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1992), p. 127.

⁹ John Lewis Gaddis, *Strategies of Containment* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982), pp. 22-23.

sciousness of Washington-based policy makers, although even at this stage the process was a gradual, evolutionary one.

The catalyst for a more pronounced shift in U.S. government attitudes came in the spring of 1947, when MacArthur surprised opinion within Japan and also his superiors back home by calling publicly for an end to the Occupation and the rapid conclusion of a peace treaty. Washington was irritated by the Far Eastern general's unilateralism, suspecting that he might have been grandstanding on the peace treaty issues in order to boost his standing with U.S. public opinion back home with a view to advancing his personal presidential ambitions, something which he had apparently been promoting since as early as 1944.¹⁰ Despite these misgivings, the Truman Administration explored the possibility of an early peace, via discussions within the four power Council of Foreign Ministers (comprising Britain, France, the USSR and the United States—the principal wartime allies). However, the Soviet Union's objection to a general peace conference, and disagreements on the role of Nationalist China as well as over the location of the conference, conspired to block any rapid progress on the issue. Nonetheless, MacArthur's initiative had clearly raised the profile of Japan-related issues among senior Washington officials. These issues were quickly addressed from the summer of 1947 as a matter of some urgency by a newly established Policy Planning Staff (PPS), charged by Secretary of State George Marshall with responsibility for ensuring more coherence and focus in policy-making and headed by a recently reassigned George Kennan.

Kennan and his colleagues broke new ground by seeking for the first time in the post-war period to examine Japan in a wider geopolitical context, while also downplaying the long-standing emphasis on the importance of China. Surprised, if not dismayed, by the past reluctance seriously to examine Japan's strategic importance to the United States, the PPS planners challenged MacArthur's peace initiative as premature and were sharply critical of the way in which the occupation had been administered in its early years. Kennan, in particular (especially following his visit to Japan in early 1948), was appalled by MacArthur's management style and his apparent inability to appreciate the extent to which the wholesale imposition of U.S.-authored political and social norms (particularly via the new 1947 Constitution), as well as the consider-

¹⁰ Michael Schaller, "MacArthur's Japan: The View from Washington," *Diplomatic History* 10 [1] (1986).

able privileges enjoyed by Occupation personnel, might be generating resentment among broad swathes of Japanese political and public opinion—both on the left and right of the political spectrum.

At a practical level, Japan lacked a coherent, centralized police force, was economically weak and, therefore, remained vulnerable to “Communist political pressures . . . and a Communist take-over.” Equally important, the early Occupation purge of Japanese officials had been carried out “with a dogmatic, impersonal vindictiveness for which there were few examples outside the totalitarian countries themselves” and had disproportionately affected individuals predisposed to be sympathetic to the United States, and as a consequence had potentially jeopardized long-term U.S.-Japan relations.¹¹

Confronted by these problems, Kennan recommended a halt to the reform process of the Occupation, to be replaced by a focus instead on promoting the rapid recovery of the Japanese economy, and in the long-term steps to ensure a “brief, general and non-punitive” peace treaty with Japan.¹² Perhaps the most significant aspect of Kennan’s recommendations was his emphasis on the psychological dimension of the relationship between Japan and the United States. While recognizing that the immediate peace treaty was inappropriate, Kennan was quick to stress the need to encourage Japanese independent responsibility, to return decision-making authority to the Japanese government, and to minimize the Occupation presence. This was clear from his proposals for the stationing of American troops in Japan, in which he emphasized the need to be sensitive to potential slights to Japan’s national pride and independence. Locating U.S. forces away from major population centers and restricting interaction between American troops and ordinary Japanese would, “reduce to a minimum the psychological impact of the presence of occupational forces on the Japanese population.”¹³ Similarly, promoting cultural exchange between Japan and America and ending press censorship could also be seen as measures intended to correct the earlier impression that Western political and social customs were being foisted on Japan at the expense of Japanese traditions.

¹¹ George Kennan, *Memoirs 1925-50* (London: Hutchinson, 1968), pp. 388-90.

¹² Kennan, *Memoirs 1925-50*, pp. 391-92.

¹³ “Recommendations with Respect to US Policy toward Japan,” NSC 13/2, RG59, PPS, Country and Area Files “Japan,” 1947-1953, box 19, National Archives (NA), Washington, DC.

Kennan's recommendations for Japan eventually formed the basis for NSC 13/2, approved by President Truman on October 9, 1948. It represented a significant shift in thinking and can be seen as the first major redefinition of America's Japan policy since 1945. Kennan himself regarded his role in shaping this new policy (with the exception of his involvement with the Marshall Plan), as his most significant achievement during his time in government. By contrast, in later years some Japanese writers were critical of this change of direction (often referred to as the "Reverse Course"), arguing that it represented a subordination of popular left-wing majority sentiment in Japan to a narrowly defined American goal of co-opting Japan into the Cold War struggle with the Soviet Union. Such criticisms, while perhaps understandable from the vantage point of the 1990s and frustration over tension in contemporary U.S.-Japan relations, can be challenged on a number of grounds. First, they ignore Japanese government and bureaucratic support for the new approach as well as mischaracterizing Japanese sentiment at the time, overlooking the eagerness with which a people that had endured three years of Occupation would have actively welcomed Kennan's initiative. Second, they exaggerate the scope of change. NSC 13/2 envisaged a gradual restoration of authority to the Japanese government, rather than the emasculation and overturning of earlier reforms.¹⁴ Third, they seriously misrepresent U.S. strategic thinking at the time. The militarization of American security policy was still a future development, and Washington had not yet embarked on a conscious alliance-building strategy.

Despite the undoubted tension between the superpowers, the American government's perspective was limited rather than global in scope. For example, rhetoric notwithstanding, the U.S. government in supporting Europe via the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan, was attempting to bolster the confidence and position of its Western allies via economic aid and political support rather than launching a world-wide struggle against international communism.¹⁵ Even following the Czech coup of early 1948, Washington emphasized reassurance for Europe rather than retaliation against a Soviet threat which American intelligence reports suggested was

¹⁴ NSC 13/2, p. 3.

¹⁵ Robert A. Pollard, "The National Security State Reconsidered: Truman and Economic Containment, 1945-1950," in *The Truman Presidency*, ed. Michael J. Lacey (New York: Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars), p. 214.

unlikely to develop into military aggression.¹⁶ Moreover, Congress rejected military (as opposed to economic) aid to Europe and resisted the establishment of a formal alliance with the West Europeans. Against such a background, Kennan's immediate goal involved simply denying Japan to the Soviet Union—preventing Asia's potentially most powerful industrial country from drifting into the Communist orbit rather than enlisting an active ally in the defense of the Free World. Indeed, Kennan's thinking at this stage echoed the balance of power philosophy of the nineteenth century, and involved creating separate, independent power centers rather than the division of the world into two ideologically opposed, super-power dominated spheres of interest. A neutral Japan would not constitute, in Kennan's view, a threat to American interests, and Washington, in 1948, was willing to see a middle-of-the-road government in Tokyo centered on the Socialist Party, rather than a more explicitly conservative, right-wing administration.¹⁷

Kennan's initial speculation regarding a neutral Japan was soon eclipsed by the intensification of Cold War tensions both globally and particularly in East Asia. The emergence of communist government in China in 1949 and the articulation of NSC 68 in April 1950 both encouraged a shift towards a more explicitly adversarial relationship between East and West in which both Moscow and Washington were anxious to create and maintain a network of dependable allied support. With Paul Nitze replacing George Kennan as head of the PPS in January 1950, the political and economic character of America's containment strategy was increasingly overshadowed by an emphasis on a military response to the Soviet threat. The past tendency to rely on a strategy of strong-point defense was replaced by a much more wide-ranging and ultimately indiscriminating policy of resisting Soviet expansion whenever it might occur. The new policy called for a major U.S. rearmament campaign, eschewing Kennan's psychological subtlety in favor of rhetoric of bipolar conflict and representing the Soviet threat in terms of readily quantifiable Soviet military capabilities rather than the hard to define but nonetheless important intentions of the men in the Kremlin.

¹⁶ Leffler, *A Preponderance of Power*, p. 210.

¹⁷ Watanabe Akio, "KÇwa mondai to Nihon no sentaku" [The Problem of the Peace Treaty and Japan's Choices] in *San Furanshisuko KÇwa*, ed. Watanabe Akio and Miyasato Seigen (Tokyo: TÇkyÇdaigaku shuppankai, 1986), p. 37.

Where Japan was concerned, the consequence of this important shift in attitudes, was gradual rather than immediate. Even following the outbreak of the Korean War in June 1950, any instinct to militarize the relationship with Japan was muted rather than explicit. While Washington policy-makers feared that Japan might be vulnerable to communist infiltration and subversion—and therefore should take steps to bolster its internal security by strengthening its recently created National Police Reserve—a direct attack on Japan was considered improbable in the immediate future.¹⁸ In parallel with such practical initiatives, senior U.S. officials, particularly within the State Department, remained conscious of the importance of addressing the political as well as the strictly military dimension of relations with Tokyo. While the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Pentagon, preoccupied with the need to maintain and solidify the U.S. base presence in Japan, were inclined to block moves to bring the Occupation of Japan swiftly to a close, their civilian colleagues—men such as Dean Rusk, Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, John Allison, Director of the State Department's office of Northeast Asian Affairs, and perhaps most important, John Foster Dulles, Truman's specially appointed consultant on Japan—shrewdly recognized the danger of dictating terms to Japan and the importance of winning a committed and active ally. Delaying a peace treaty would jeopardize, possibly fatally, the delicate task of wooing Japan as a long-term partner.

This stress on co-operation, in the context of the constraints imposed by the international situation as well as domestic political conditions both in the United States and in Japan, runs like a leitmotif through State Department thinking on Japan both in the final years of the Occupation and throughout the 1950s. As early as July 1950, even amidst the chaos and confusion of North Korea's seemingly irresistible pressure to swallow its southern rival on the Korean peninsula, Kennan was urging on Dulles the need to act cautiously and with restraint towards Japan.¹⁹

Dulles, it soon became apparent, took Kennan's advice to heart. In the critically important and difficult process of negotiating a Peace Treaty between Japan and the former wartime allied powers, he employed his considerable intellectual and diplomatic skills to offset pressure from countries such as Britain and Australia, inclined towards imposing on Japan a binding,

¹⁸ NSC 73, July 1, 1950, *Foreign Relations of the United States (FRUS)*, vol. 1, 1950, pp. 332 and 338.

¹⁹ Kennan to Dulles, July 20, 1950, State Department decimal files, 694.001/7-250, NA.

overly legalistic, and in certain cases punitive settlement. The Labor Government of Clement Attlee, for example, lobbied early on in the peace treaty process for a variety of restrictions, including the inclusion of a war-guilt clause in the preamble to the treaty, formal limits on Japan's right to rearm, specific limits on Japan's shipbuilding capacity, and the abrogation of Japan's preferential trading rights in Africa.²⁰ Dulles, in part as a consequence of his experience as a delegate to the Versailles Peace Conference of 1918, where he witnessed at first hand the dangerous consequences of imposing excessively restrictive terms on a defeated opponent, had become sensitized to the importance of establishing a secure and long-term foundation for post-war relations with Japan.²¹

This constructive approach required avoiding restrictive measures and slights to Japan's leaders and their desire for sovereign independence within the protective mantle of America's military presence in the Far East. It also involved creating opportunities for a genuinely equal dialogue and exchange of ideas between two strikingly different cultures—a process in which Dulles played an important, initiating role, particularly via his support for the creation of the International Christian University of Japan (IUCJ) and later, the establishment of International House, a center for visiting, foreign academics and researchers in the heart of Tokyo.²² This emphasis has persisted throughout the post-war period and arguably explains the longstanding personal ties that have helped the bilateral relationship weather periodic crises and tensions.

Despite Dulles's recognition of the need to avoid antagonizing Japan unnecessarily, the United States would inevitably face significant obstacles in developing a constructive and reciprocal relationship with Japan in the years ahead. Part of the problem, it has to be said, was of America's own making. The new 1947 Japanese Constitution, drafted in effect by the SCAP reformers under MacArthur's direction, had put in train a host of important politically progressive reforms, but it had also, notably, via article nine—the famous “peace clause”—ruled out the possibility of major rearmament, or at the very least rearmament that might be used for anything other than purely defensive purposes. Moreover, under the leadership of Prime Minister Yoshida

²⁰ A.J. Maddocks, FO371/92554, FJ1022/516, Public Record Office (PRO), Kew Gardens, UK.

²¹ “Peace in the Pacific,” FO371/92539, FJ1022/225, PRO.

²² Dulles to Hoffman, September 11, 1951, John Foster Dulles Papers, General Correspondence and Memoranda Series, Dwight D. Eisenhower Presidential Library (EL), Abilene, Kansas.

Shigeru, the Japanese government shrewdly avoided moving rapidly to promote rearmament of a type favored by the Americans. In part this was a matter of simple self-interested calculation. Japan could rely on the U.S. military presence in post-Occupation Japan—a presence provided for (although not, it should be said guaranteed) under the terms of the U.S.-Japan Security Treaty of 1952—and which reflected wider American strategic priorities. Given the conflict in Korea and the potential threat posed by Communist China, the United States was not about to abandon its basing privileges in Japan. Against such a backdrop, Japan was able to focus its immediate energies on economic reconstruction, while minimizing the risk of a return to the militarism that had proven so destabilizing during the 1930s, a point on which Yoshida (who had himself been incarcerated by the Japanese authorities in the final years of the war) was especially sensitive.

Yoshida's motivation in resisting rapid rearmament also reflected wider domestic political realities. As leader of the right of center Liberal Party, he found himself caught between two critical political extremes. On the left, he faced the Socialist and Communist parties, fiercely critical of the relationship with the United States and advocating either alignment with the Communist bloc, or in the case of the Socialists, a policy of strict unarmed neutrality. On the right, Yoshida confronted both the Democratic Party and a smaller group of disgruntled Liberals associated with Hatoyama Ichirō, two groups that embraced a range of policy options, including a preference for traditionalism and Japanese political and social mores—loosely defined—as well as support for a more rapid pace of rearmament than that favored by Yoshida. Traditionalism encouraged a degree of scepticism regarding the new Constitution, which was seen as foreign and imposed rather than the product of genuine consultation. This, in turn, contributed to a long-running campaign throughout the 1950s by the political Right to revise the Constitution, a position that, it should be noted, Yoshida identified with, although rarely in public.

It is important to stress (particularly since this point is largely under-reported in the academic literature) that the Americans—at least within the State Department—were well aware of the difficulties that this situation presented, particularly in finding a political constituency, either among the country's leadership or within the general public which would readily and unambiguously align itself with the United States. As the Occupation drew to a close, moderate conservatism increasingly became linked to the re-emergence of a commitment to nationalist ideals as well as criticism of the Occupation and the Constitution, a trend that State Department officials

recognized, with considerable foresight, would develop into powerful pressure for constitutional revision.

This growing resentment of the imposition of foreign concepts and practices also influenced and was capitalized on by the Left, and by 1951, the Japanese Communists had “already attempted to exploit the alien, un-Japanese character of American life and its utter irreconcilability with Japan’s native culture and traditions.”²³ Moreover, this pattern was prominently reflected in ideological debates among Japan’s left-wing intellectuals, as many Marxist academics and commentators increasingly sought to replace class-based analysis and criticisms of modernity defined in Western and European terms with a more distinctly Japanese, nativist tradition. Indeed, a wide body of opinion throughout Japan appears to have been increasingly predisposed either to question the legacy of the Occupation or to try and find some legitimate means of re-connecting with or reasserting a coherent sense of national identity (for example, by supporting neutralism or looking to China as an Asian and therefore culturally familiar model). This was a trend that was likely to complicate the development of post-Occupation alliance relations. In the words of one State Department official:

Many Japanese are discontented and frustrated because ideals and traditions of a lifetime have been rudely brushed aside. Others are irked by specific Occupation reforms and controls. Some are alarmed by the way the Occupation has set organized labor and other liberal forces into motion. Thousands were purged and regardless of their present re-instatement will never forget or forgive the humiliation of their pariah-like disqualification. A few, but perhaps a very important few, have bitterly resented the war crimes trials and the execution of Japan’s former top leaders. . . . It is most essential, therefore, that we recognise that the post-peace treaty position of the United States in Japan will be vulnerable at many points to anti-American agitation on the part of rightists as well as leftist elements.²⁴

Here, in this analysis, was both an echo of Kennan’s 1948 criticisms and an emphasis, paralleling Dulles’s observations, on the importance of culture in shaping political behavior and alliance relations. For the Americans, addressing this situation involved a basic difficulty. Endorsing either the Communists or Socialists was clearly not a viable option, given the former’s hostility

²³ “Japanese Conservative Forces and the Future United States Position,” report enclosed in McClurkin to Nitze, October 18, 1951, RG59, Country and Area Files, Japan, 1847-8 [sic]. NA.

²⁴ “Japanese Conservative Forces,” NA.

to the United States, and the latter's support for neutrality. At the same time, backing moderate conservative opinion (represented in 1951 by Yoshida's liberals) ran the risk of making the United States appear unprincipled and self-serving, both in the eyes of the Left and, it should be emphasized, of the Right. In the ideologically charged environment of post-war Japan, an American endorsement of constitutional revision could easily seem like political opportunism, given the parallels between the 1947 Constitution and the ideals of America's own Founding Fathers. MacArthur's provision of a new Constitution—both the manner in which it was introduced and the foreign tenor of some of its political terminology—had, to some degree, created a policy-making straightjacket for post-war U.S. administrations in their dealings with Japan. Stable and strong government in Japan arguably required the creation of an effective consensus on national political values, both within the governing elites and amongst the populace as a whole. Nationalism extended across the political spectrum and was expressed in different forms; both the Right and Left could bolster their claim to be promoting Japanese interests by criticizing the United States.

Dulles, to his credit, both as special consultant on Japan during the Truman Administration and later as Secretary of State under Eisenhower, recognized the importance of working sensitively within these constraints. While he was not averse, in private conversations with Japanese officials, to making the case forcefully for rearmament, he was careful to avoid any suggestion that America was intent on intervening in Japanese domestic politics. In autumn 1953, for example, Vice-President Nixon, while on a visit to Tokyo, had unexpectedly announced publicly that it had been a mistake during the Occupation for the United States to seek a permanently demilitarized Japan—a suggestion that had been positively received by conservative Japanese political opinion, but which also had implied U.S. endorsement of constitutional change and which had been quickly criticized by left-wing and media opinion. Although a revision of article nine might have aided U.S. rearmament plans, Dulles preferred to justify Japan's right to self-defense in terms of article 51 of the United Nations Charter and was insistent that the State Department would “never say a word about amending the Japanese Constitution.”²⁵

²⁵ Telephone conversation with Mr. Robertson, October 12, 1953, Dulles Papers, Chronological Series, Box 5, EL.

In light of the evidence that key policy-makers on the U.S. side recognized the dangers of imposing terms on Japan and the need to solicit active co-operation from Japanese government officials, it remains puzzling that the literature has tended to stress the alleged shortcomings on the American side. In part, this reflects a failure to distinguish between short-term initiatives and long-term objectives. The 1952 U.S.-Japan Security Treaty, for instance, was criticized for lacking an explicit U.S. guarantee to come to the defense of Japan and for including a provision allowing U.S. forces to intervene, at the request of the Japanese government, to quell domestic unrest. Undoubtedly these two points were a point of contention amongst Japanese political parties, especially in the latter part of the 1950s. They were, however, addressed as part of the process of revising the security treaty between 1957 and 1960. Moreover, it should be stressed that the San Francisco settlement was viewed by both sides as provisional in character. Stress was placed on reaching an early settlement in an effort to diffuse domestic tensions associated with the Occupation, and certain issues, principally territorial ones relating to both Japan's northern islands as well as the so-called article three territories of Okinawa and the Ryūkyūs, were intentionally left unresolved. Moreover, the bilateral security treaty was open-ended. Japan made at best only a general nod in the direction of rearmament rather than an explicit commitment, and with the treaty itself free from any time limit, both sides anticipated revisiting the issue at some unspecified point in the future.

1952–1960: Alliance Pragmatism Versus Domestic Division

With the formal ending of the Occupation in 1952 and the emergence in 1953 of the new Republican administration headed by Dwight Eisenhower, the U.S.-Japan relationship was in some respects in a relatively healthy state. There were continuities from the previous administration, since Dulles was now Secretary of State and John Allison was soon to take up the position of Ambassador to Japan. Not unexpectedly in light of this, the past stress on building an active alliance partnership continued as a dominant theme in the thinking of State Department officials involved in Japan-related affairs. Yet, moving from identifying to realizing this objective remained problematic, not least because of the problems of creating consensus among a Japanese populace and leadership that remained sharply divided over the question of Japan's role in the Cold War. On the rearmament issue, the Yoshida government continued to drag its feet, and even when it was replaced by the Hatoyama administration of 1955 (strengthened by the formal

merger of the Liberal and Democratic Parties into the new Liberal Democratic Party (LDP), and more committed to building up the country's military capabilities), rapid progress remained elusive. Although the formal creation of Japan's Self-Defense Forces in 1954 and the establishment of a National Defense Council in 1956 had represented important advances, economic difficulties continued to discourage the government from devoting extensive resources to rearmament. Moreover, personal rivalries within the Japanese cabinet frequently conspired to prevent the articulation of a clear government position, not only on the rearmament question but also on a range of important issues related to Japan's diplomacy and particularly its relationship with the United States.

All too often, Washington found itself having to interact with a sharply divided government in Tokyo, whose senior members seemed overly eager to place their personal ambitions ahead of either Japan's national interests or anything resembling a coherent government policy. This problem was particularly pronounced during the 1950s and arguably has been a critical factor in efforts to build an effective and proactive working partnership between the two governments throughout the post-war period. In August 1955, for example, Shigemitsu Mamoru, Foreign Minister in the Hatoyama cabinet, had travelled to Washington in an effort to persuade Dulles and the Eisenhower administration to consider replacing the existing security treaty with a new, more explicitly reciprocal arrangement. The initiative was unsuccessful, with Dulles arguing that domestic divisions in Japan militated against tackling the issue at this stage. Here, it might be thought was evidence of a Secretary of State unduly dismissive of the views of a valuable alliance partner. Yet, Dulles's position is readily understandable in light of the remarkable degree to which the Japanese side was fragmented and confused about its own objectives. Senior LDP politicians, such as Kōno Ichirō and Kishi Nobusuke, together with prominent officials in the Foreign Ministry, happily briefed the Americans against accepting Shigemitsu's proposals, and even Prime Minister Hatoyama made it clear with "embarrassing frankness," via intermediaries, that he had little confidence in his Foreign Minister.²⁶

²⁶ Memorandum of conversation, "Frank" (Takezō) Matsumoto, J. Graham Parsons, August 11, 1955, RG59, Office of Northeast Asian Affairs (ONEAA), Japan Subject File, 1947–1956, lot 58D118, box 2, NA; "Foreign Minister Shigemitsu's Visit. August 25–September 1, 1955. Summary of Position," August 22, 1955, U.S. Council on Foreign Economic Policy, Office of the Chairman, Dodge Series, Subject Subseries, EL.

A similar pattern of damaging internal division and bureaucratic isolation surfaced in the extended peace treaty and territorial negotiations between Japan and the Soviet Union between 1955 and 1956. Much of the discussion between Moscow and Tokyo focused on the vexed issue of the “northern territories,” the four island groups of Habomai, Shikotan, Etorofu, and Kunashiri to the north of Hokkaido, claimed by Japan as its sovereign territory, but held by the Soviets since their occupation at the end of the Second World War. In an apparent effort to resolve this issue, the Soviets proposed a variety of solutions, including a compromise option in which, in return for the restoration of diplomatic relations between the USSR and Japan, Moscow would return the two southernmost of these islands, Shikotan and Habomai, while retaining the remaining islands.

Traditional interpretations of these negotiations have pointed to American intervention as the key reason for the ultimate failure of the normalization talks, arguing that Dulles deliberately pressured Shigemitsu to reject the Russian offer by threatening to maintain effectively in perpetuity the U.S. military presence in the article three territories of Okinawa and the Ryūkyūs. These territories had been administered by the Americans since 1945, but with the understanding that “residual sovereignty” rested with Japan. By privately implying to Shigemitsu that the United States was prepared to abandon the residual sovereignty claim, Dulles, it has been suggested, was effectively blackmailing the Japanese Foreign Minister, intentionally pressuring him to back away from offering any concessions to the Soviets.²⁷

Yet this sequence of events can be viewed in a different light, not least because of considerable documentary evidence in both the British and American archives that Dulles, as he claimed privately at the time, had raised the question of linkage between Okinawa and the two-island proposal in an effort to provide Shigemitsu with negotiating ammunition vis-à-vis the Soviets. Dulles, in fact, far from looking to destabilize relations with Tokyo by issuing threats was merely suggesting that Shigemitsu might present the “risk” of American retaliation to the Soviets as a plausible but uncontentious basis for holding firm to a four-island solution.²⁸ The contro-

²⁷ See, for example, Fiona Hill, “A Disagreement between Allies: The United Kingdom, the United States, and the Soviet-Japanese Territorial Dispute, 1945-56,” *Journal of Northeast Asian Studies* (Fall, 1995).

²⁸ “Japanese Domestic Political Situation,” September 27, 1956, RG59, ONEAA, Japan Subject File, 1947-56, lot 58D637, box 7, NA; Crowe to Denning, August 29, 1956, FO371/121040,

versy surrounding Dulles's proposal can equally well be explained in terms of internal divisions within the Japanese government, in particular, rivalry between senior career diplomats in the Gaimushō (Japan's Foreign Ministry) and the Foreign Minister himself, not to mention wider splits within the Hatoyama cabinet and the LDP as a whole. Details of Dulles's suggestion of a linkage between the two island solution and the status of Okinawa had, in fact, been leaked to the press by Matsumoto Shunichi, a leading Japanese Foreign Ministry official involved in the talks with Moscow, "with the intention of embarrassing not so much the Americans as Shigemitsu himself." Matsumoto felt that ceding sovereignty over the Southern Kuriles to the Soviets was too high a price to pay for the return of Shikotan and the Habomais, and it was clear to the State Department that, through the disclosure, he was intentionally "knifing" his Foreign Minister, while "sending private reports to Kōno [Ichiro] in Tokyo that Shigemitsu was botching the negotiations."²⁹ Public disclosure of Dulles's proposal had the desired effect of suggesting that Shigemitsu had failed in his ambition to reach an agreement with the Soviets, but also indirectly fostered the misleading public perception that the Americans were intervening to close off Japan's negotiating options. Certainly, the Soviets, via their own media outlets, were quick to trumpet this interpretation. Understandably, against this background, the State Department were frustrated to discover that they were working with a deeply divided government. In the words of one U.S. official, "it is hard to do business with these fellows when they are all knifing each other to beat the band."³⁰

The problem of internal bureaucratic and political divisions on the Japanese side continued, throughout the 1950s, to pose a major problem in building an effective alliance partnership with Japan. For example, during the Lucky Dragon crisis of 1954, poor co-ordination and rivalry between the Foreign Ministry and the Ministry of Education, Health and Welfare had contributed to erroneous press reports suggesting—despite clear offers of help from Washington—that the United States had failed to extend adequate medical treatment to the hapless Japanese fishermen

FJ10338/47, PRO.

²⁹ De la Mare to Crowe, September 7, 1956, FO371/121041, FJ10338/51; De la Mare to Crowe, September 15, 1956, FO371/121041, FJ10338/56, PRO.

³⁰ De la Mare to Crowe, September 7, 1956, PRO.

caught in the fallout from U.S. hydrogen bomb testing in the South Pacific.³¹ In turn, this contributed to a climate of public and media-driven distrust of the U.S. government, verging on paranoia, which threatened to seriously destabilize alliance relations.

Undoubtedly, there were shortcomings on the American side, both in terms of the speed with which Washington responded to the crisis and the willingness of some officials, such as Lewis Strauss, the head of the U.S. Atomic Energy Council, to be less than candid in detailing the background to the crisis. Strauss's position, however, was an isolated one and needs to be balanced against the efforts of the Operations Co-ordinating Board in Washington, and John Allison, the U.S. Ambassador in Tokyo, to adequately respond to Japanese concerns. Moreover, there were wider issues that complicated crisis management on the American side in the immediate aftermath of the crisis, not least of which was the need to prevent the Soviet Union from learning details of the type of technology that had been used in the original test explosion. The pressure for secrecy ensured that Washington was unable to disclose to Tokyo precise information on the composition of the radioactive ash resulting from the explosion. This constraint, was naturally hardly helpful in winning public confidence in Japan but it reflected the uncomfortable but accurate reality of a Japanese government system that was notoriously prone to leaks, unable to guarantee the confidentiality of official information, and in certain dramatic instances exposed to high-level penetration by Soviet agents. The extent to which Japanese nationals had been caught up in Moscow's elaborate espionage network was first uncovered in August 1954, following the defection to the United States of Yuri Rastvorov, a KGB official and also second secretary in the Soviet mission in Tokyo.³²

The critical stance of Japanese public opinion, particularly on nuclear related issues, created particular problems for Japan's conservative politicians, especially those who recognized the importance of the military dimension of the relationship with the United States in guaranteeing Japan's security. It contributed to a general climate in which the country's most senior

³¹ “Bikini hisaisha wo meguri—gakusha, jishusei wo shuchō” [Bikini Victims—Scholars Stress Independence], *Asahi Shinbun*, March 23, 1954, p. 7.

³² “Abei ikka kankei hikitsugu jikkō” [Matters Relating to the First Section of the European-American Affairs Bureau], March 29, 1954, Sect. 11, A'0134/2/0335-342, Foreign Ministry Archives, Tokyo, Japan; Ishii Osamu, *Reisen to nichibei kankei—pâtonâshipppu no keisei* [The Cold War and US-Japan Relations—Forming a Partnership] (Tokyo: *Japan Times*, 1989), p. 212.

leaders were publicly obliged to distance themselves from, or in certain instances actively criticize, the government in Washington, while privately endorsing and accepting American security-related policy proposals. This was true, for example, in the case of Okinawa, where privately and periodically LDP officials recognized, albeit with some regret, the need to accept a continuing U.S. presence on the territory and an administrative structure that was entirely independent of Japanese control.³³ More strikingly, it was also reflected in the government's tolerance of the "don't ask, don't tell" policy of the U.S. government regarding the stationing of U.S. nuclear-capable forces on Japanese territory. Recently released U.S. archival material documents clearly shows that senior Japanese government officials were willing covertly to accept the presence of such "special weapons" while routinely and misleadingly informing the Diet, the country's parliament, of the government's uncompromising opposition to the introduction of nuclear weapons.³⁴

It would be an exaggeration, of course, to assume that responsibility for the failure to develop a fully-fledged and active alliance partnership with Japan over this period rested entirely with Japanese authorities, or was the product solely of domestic divisions within Japan. Just as there were obstructive forces in Japan, so too in the United States, important bureaucratic actors, most notably the military—both the Pentagon and the Joint Chiefs of Staff—could be unduly inflexible and unimaginative in responding to the Japanese position. This was particularly true in matters relating to Okinawa. Moreover, there were issues, particularly the issue of trade and political relations with China, where a more accommodating response by all the major players on the U.S. side might well have paid dividends in terms of strengthening ties with Japan. Nonetheless, it is important to stress the extent to which senior government officials, especially in the State Department, made the case for taking Japan seriously. John Allison and Douglas MacArthur, II, as ambassadors in Tokyo, routinely argued for flexibility and responsiveness to Japanese concerns, and their recommendations were sympathetically received both by Dulles and in certain important instances by the President also. Eisenhower, for example, as a former com-

³³ Kōno Yasuko, *Okinawa henkan wo meguru seiji to gaikō* [The Diplomacy and Politics of Okinawa's Reversion] (Tokyo: Tōkyō daigaku shuppankai, 1990), p. 120.

³⁴ Office of Intelligence Research, "The Relationship of Japan to Nuclear Weapons and Warfare." Department of State, Intelligence Report No. 7466, National Archives, College Park, Washington, DC, p. 8.

mander, was acutely aware of the need to minimize the long-term U.S. military presence in Japan and, together with Dulles, explored the possibility of a base consolidation program designed to limit the size of the U.S. military footprint in Okinawa.³⁵ Building down the American troop presence in Japan during the late 1950s was a key goal of the Eisenhower Administration. The United States had backed away from a strategy of urging rearmament on Japan by as early as 1955, premised not on any desire to restrain or contain Japan, but rather on the belief that only a politically and economically stable Japan would be likely to align itself with American interests.³⁶ As Eisenhower remarked at one point to Senator Styles Bridges, “I’m not concerned about ‘buying friends’ or purchasing satellite countries or any other thing—that is all false. As a free country, the only ally we can have is a free ally, one who wants to be with us—that is what we are trying to develop.”³⁷

1960–1978: Economics Eclipses Security—the Advent of “Low-profile” Diplomacy

By the beginning of the 1960s, it quickly became apparent that the early, ambitious aspirations of Dulles and his State Department colleagues were unlikely to be realized, despite the positive breakthrough achieved in successfully negotiating a new U.S.-Japan Mutual Security Treaty, part of a three year process that was finally concluded in 1960. The intense and sometimes violent popular demonstrations in Tokyo, organized by students and progressive forces concentrated in the capital against both the new security treaty and, more importantly, the style of leadership of Kishi, the Prime Minister at the time (widely criticized as authoritarian and reactionary), dramatically and abruptly closed off the prospect of substantial rearmament and the emergence of a conventional, proactive Japanese security stance that the Americans had hoped for. Although the Mutual Security Treaty was successfully enacted, Kishi was forced to resign to take responsibility for both the civic unrest that had plagued the capital and the cancellation of

³⁵ Eisenhower to Dulles, April 9, 1958, Dulles Papers, Telephone Conversation Series, box 13, EL.

³⁶ John E. MacDonald to Elmer B. Staats, “Summary of NSC 5516/1,” April 14, 1955, White House Office, National Security Council Staff, Operations Co-ordinating Board Central Files, EL.

³⁷ Dwight D. Eisenhower, *Waging Peace. A Personal Account, 1956-1961* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1965), p. 135.

President Eisenhower's visit to Japan, and also in the face of internal opposition from rival faction leaders within the governing Liberal Democratic Party (LDP).

Against this background of domestic disorder, Ikeda Hayato, Kishi's successor, pursued the line of least resistance and intentionally adopted a "low profile" foreign policy, focusing on economic development and income doubling as a means of forging a new non-ideological domestic consensus. Ikeda's tactical maneuver succeeded dramatically in restoring the LDP's political fortunes, and the new Prime Minister, in embracing a national "income doubling" agenda, helped put in place a set of policy norms and conventions that, in large part because of his successes, were quickly copied by his successors. Ikeda's strategy also benefitted from the willingness of the new Kennedy Administration that took office in 1961 to similarly concentrate on the economic aspects of the bilateral relationship.³⁸ Ikeda served as Prime Minister from 1960 to 1964, and was followed by Satō Eisaku who enjoyed a relatively long tenure as Prime Minister, remaining in office until 1972, when he was replaced by Tanaka Kakuei. Both Ikeda and Satō were political proteges of Yoshida, and their concentration on economic priorities during a period when the country was enjoying dramatically high rates of industrial growth and prosperity added weight to the notion of a conscious policy continuity or "Yoshida line" tying together the immediate with the later post-war years. However, this image of a new coherent Japanese national policy agenda, although compelling and attractive, particularly when allied with a distinctive and, to some observers, uniquely Asian model of political economy was at best only a partial description of a more complex reality. It masked the continuing tendency of Japanese leaders to articulate the progressive norms of the new post-war pacifist and anti-militarist Japan, while privately underlining their commitment to the pragmatic and realist goals of the traditional nation-state and of their principal security partner, the United States.

This public-private distinction remained during the 1960s and early 70s, reflected most strikingly in Prime Minister Satō's willingness in 1969 secretly to grant to the Americans the freedom to reintroduce nuclear weapons into Japan in the event of a Far Eastern security crisis.³⁹ Satō's covert deal with the Nixon administration was part of a bilateral quid pro quo intended to

³⁸ Schaller, *Altered States*, 1997, p. 163.

³⁹ Wakaizumi Kei, *Tasaku nakarishi wo shinzemu to hossu* (Tokyo: Bungeishunju, 1994), pp. 416-17.

secure U.S. agreement to return Okinawa to Japan. This decision was in stark contrast with the Prime Minister's earlier public expression, in 1968, of the country's three non-nuclear principles (rejecting the possession and manufacturing by Japan of nuclear weapons and prohibiting their introduction into Japanese territory). The Japanese Prime Minister, it seems, was quite happy in private to entertain policy initiatives that would have been anathema to the bulk of the Japanese electorate. Indeed, recently released files from the Johnson Presidential library reveal that as early as 1965, Satō, in private conversations with the then Ambassador to Japan, Edwin Reischauer, had indicated his "common sense" belief that Japan should "have nuclear weapons."⁴⁰

Yet, despite such forthright attitudes, there were very real obstacles to any substantial deepening of co-operative alliance ties between Washington and Tokyo. Much of Satō's accommodating stance on the nuclear issue can be explained in terms of the Prime Minister's own personal ambitions and his powerful commitment to regaining the article three territories. When it came to active support for America's strategic position, both globally and within East Asia, the Japanese leadership was characteristically cautious. The unpopularity of the Vietnam conflict among the Japanese public militated against any strong support for the U.S. position beyond rhetorical backing and occasional financial assistance, although Tokyo was quite happy to benefit from the economic dividends associated with American weapons procurement and the continuing U.S. base presence in Japan. Even the suggestion, encouraged by the 1969 Nixon-Satō communiqué, that Japan had aligned itself with the United States by acknowledging that the security of the Korean peninsula was "essential to Japan's own security," was quickly downplayed by the Japanese authorities who sought subsequently to strenuously avoid being tied into anything resembling a regional security commitment.⁴¹

Japanese caution in this context was understandable—not only because of the post-war reluctance of Japan to become embroiled in armed conflict of any sort, but also because the government appeared to have few friends or committed supporters at the senior-most levels in Washington. Certainly, under Nixon's leadership, interest in Asia became concentrated on

⁴⁰ "Visit of Prime Minister Satō, Background Paper, January 7, 1965." I am indebted to Jeff Moag and Eric Gundersen, both of the National Security News Service in Washington, DC, for providing me with this and other documentation relating to Satō's 1965 visit to Washington.

⁴¹ Michael J. Green, *Japan's Reluctant Realism: Foreign Policy in an Era of Uncertain Power* (New York: Palgrave, 2001), p. 114.

China—a reflection of strategic opportunities and also the personal preferences and expertise of both the President and his national security adviser, Henry Kissinger. Where Japan did feature as a major U.S. policy concern was often in relation to trade and economic issues—for example, in the long-running dispute over Japanese textile imports—and here interaction between the two administrations was more likely to be confrontational than co-operative.

1978–1991: a Deepening but Limited Defense Dialogue

It was only by the late 1970s and early 1980s, following the intensification of Cold War tensions with the Soviet Union, especially the growing Soviet naval threat in the Pacific, that official Japanese security policy began gradually to shift in a more activist direction. Under the assertive leadership of Prime Minister Nakasone Yasuhiro, the security relationship with the United States and the West as a whole was now much more explicitly endorsed. Japanese defense planners began, for the first time, to attempt to define a national security doctrine, and via public statements, important technology-sharing arrangements with Washington. Most important of all, through the U.S.-Japan 1978 Joint Defense Guidelines, Japanese and American leaders sought to institutionalize what had been, in many respects, a fledgling and rather one-sided military alliance. Closer security relations with Washington included:

- C The issuing in 1976 of the country's National Defense Program Outline (NDPO), the first serious attempt by the Japan Defense Agency to provide a clearly articulated definition of the country's defense doctrine.
- C Agreement by Washington and Tokyo in 1978 on a new set of U.S.-Japan Joint Defense Guidelines outlining how the two countries would co-operate in the event of armed attack on Japan. Japan's military would be responsible for repelling, limited, small-scale aggression while awaiting support and reinforcement from U.S. forces.
- C Prime Minister Suzuki's 1981 announcement that Japan would guarantee the security of its sea-lanes for a distance of 1,000 nautical miles beyond its shoreline.
- C A 1983 technology sharing agreement between Washington and Tokyo intended to promote the flow-back of important new defense technology from Japan to the United States.
- C Public statements in 1983 and 1985 by Prime Minister Yasuhiro Nakasone characterizing Japan as "unsinkable aircraft carrier" in the Pacific and explicitly identifying Japan with the security interests of the anti-Soviet Western alliance.

Such initiatives—important though they undoubtedly were—took place in a rarefied atmosphere. They reflected elite level co-operation rather than widespread popular support on either side of the Pacific, and all too often rhetorical commitments were only partially matched

by practical achievements. Moreover, the initiative for security co-operation and for setting strategic priorities often rested with Washington. Tokyo's security perspective was more often than not filtered through American lenses, and there was little scope for a distinctively Japanese response to regional security challenges—either in a bilateral or a multilateral context. Although it is possible to identify a long-standing Japanese official preoccupation with the need to promote regional stability, this operated mainly in the economic sphere (for example via the use of ODA or in support for ASEAN) and involved Japan in a supporting rather than an initiating role, often in a manner that underlined the lack of a coherent set of Japanese security and foreign policy priorities. The clearest expression of this was Prime Minister Aihara's "Comprehensive Security Doctrine" of 1980, a relatively unsuccessful attempt to use ODA to bolster, largely at U.S. direction, the position of strategically vulnerable front-line states such as Turkey, Pakistan and South Korea.⁴²

While there was much talk in the 1980s of "internationalization" or *kokusaika*, policy often appeared to be inward rather than outward-looking—a tendency perhaps best epitomized by the interest of Japan's politicians as well as the Japanese business and defense communities in promoting self-sufficiency and the indigenous production (*kokusanka*) of leading-edge defense technologies.⁴³ This is a tendency that surfaced most explicitly and dramatically in the bilateral dispute in the mid-1980s between Washington and Tokyo over plans to jointly develop and produce a new fighter aircraft, the FSX, as a replacement for the aging F-1. The dispute was important not only in highlighting the deep distrust that existed on both sides of Pacific—a far cry from the cooperative agenda that Dulles had hoped for in 1951—but also because of important bureaucratic developments in Washington signaling an increasing tendency for security priorities in the alliance to compete for attention, and in certain instances take second place, to U.S. commercial and economic interests.

In the face of these tensions, Japan had powerful incentives to retreat from high-profile involvement overseas or an active partnership with the Americans. The political focus remained

⁴² Robert Orr, *The Emergence of Japan's Foreign Aid Power* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1992), pp. 112-13.

⁴³ Michael Green, *Arming Japan. Defense Production, Alliance Politics and the Postwar Search for Autonomy* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1995), pp. 10-11.

stubbornly local rather than international, and Japanese leaders quickly discovered (in an interesting inversion of the tendency in U.S. politics for national leaders to use foreign policy to boost their standing domestically) that valuable political victories could best be secured on the home rather than the foreign front. Prime Minister Nakasone's key political successes were, for example, concentrated in the domestic arena, in the fields of education, administrative reform, and the deregulation of the tobacco and telecommunications sectors. It was in this context that he was able to build important bureaucratic coalitions of support and win the backing of a domestic public that was rarely impressed by the Prime Minister's attempts to walk tall on the world's policy-making stage.

Post-cold War Adjustments

Despite the gains of the 1980s, post-Cold War bilateral relations between Washington and Tokyo have been anything but stable and in some respects have imposed contradictory pressures on Japan, alternately encouraging and discouraging Tokyo from strengthening its security co-operation with Washington. At the same time, friction has generated its own, dialectic-like pressure for positive change, with concerned officials on both sides of the Pacific scrambling to offset any deterioration in bilateral ties.

Trade Tensions

Intensifying trade friction between Washington and Tokyo during the early 1990s placed the bilateral partnership under major pressure, with economic issues threatening to overwhelm or, at the very least, destabilize the long-standing security partnership between the two countries. Candidate Clinton, in positioning himself against George H.W. Bush during the 1992 presidential primaries, exploited the contentious issue of alleged Japanese protectionism in order to appeal to traditional Democrat constituencies, while also promoting the virtues of "strategic trade" theory and a cooperative partnership between the public and private sectors as a means of copying Japan's supposedly distinctive model of economic development.⁴⁴

The Democrats' electoral gambit not only paid dividends in the presidential campaign but also continued to influence trade relations with Japan, particularly in shaping a "managed trade"

⁴⁴ Paul Krugman, *Pop Internationalism* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1996), pp. 106-16.

agenda during the two Clinton administrations. (By contrast, the pressure in favor of strategic trade policies quickly dissipated, as it became clear during the mid to late 1990s that Japan's economic success had unraveled and that past achievements could not be unambiguously attributed to central government targeting, however market-sensitive it may or may not have been.) The consequence of this adversarial approach to economic relations with Japan was the growth in Japan of widespread official and popular irritation, if not active dislike (*kenbei*) of the United States, exacerbated by the rape by U.S. marines of an Okinawan school-girl in 1995. Added to this was the U.S. administration's apparent tilt in the direction of the PRC, symbolized most dramatically by Clinton decision to visit Beijing in June 1998 without incorporating Tokyo into his Asian itinerary—a development that encouraged some in Japan to argue that “Japan passing” (a policy of consciously overlooking Japan) had been added to the existing pattern of “Japan bashing.” Towards the end of the 1990s, bilateral economic relations became further strained in the wake of the Asian financial crisis of 1997, as U.S. Treasury officials were increasingly critical of the Japanese government's apparent failure to respond sufficiently decisively to the local turmoil, given its preoccupation with reducing Japan's fiscal debt rather than reflating the Japanese economy as a means of boosting demand and export opportunities within the region.

Closer Security Ties

Despite the intensification of these political and economic tensions, they were partially offset during the 1990s by progress on the security side of the relationship—an area where Japan has, it should be stressed, made some of the running on its own initiative. Some of the impetus for the reinforcement of bilateral security ties originated in the United States as State and Defense Department officials, increasingly concerned by intensifying bilateral trade friction, sought in the mid 1990s to re-emphasize the benefits of joint security co-operation and to re-extend the alliance to address the evolving post-Cold War security situation in Asia. U.S. official reiteration of its commitment to maintaining a high profile security presence in the region was highlighted with the issuing of the Pentagon's 1995 East Asian Strategy Report. In Japan, a similar point of view was expressed with the publication in August 1994 of the Higuchi Report, a study commissioned by the Hosokawa Administration to examine national security following growing fears over the proliferation risks associated with North Korean in the early 1990s. While the Higuchi Report recommended that Japan broaden its military ties with other states in the

region as a means of increasing Japanese flexibility, its central conclusion stressed the importance of maintaining a strong security relationship with Washington.⁴⁵

With both Washington and Tokyo equally committed to reinforcing the bilateral security relationship, the two countries were during the 1990s able to substantially strengthen and enhance their defense cooperation through a variety of agreements including, inter alia:

- C The establishment in 1997 of the Special Action Committee on Okinawa (SACO) which, in response to the 1995 Okinawa rape controversy, recommended the consolidation of U.S. bases on Okinawa (principally via the relocation of a U.S. marine heliport at Futenma) as a means of defusing base-related tension and in order to respond to local grievances.
- C Agreement between Washington and Tokyo in 1997 on a new Acquisition and Cross-Servicing Agreement (ACSA) intended to ensure partial Japanese support for the training of U.S. forces in Japan, as well as joint exercises and operations during emergencies.
- C Final approval by the Japanese Diet in May 1999 of the new U.S.-Japan Defense Guidelines, initially endorsed by the new governments in 1997. The guidelines provide an important, new, clearly defined institutionalized structure for bilateral co-operation via the creation of a Bilateral Planning Committee, Bilateral Co-ordination Forum, and Bilateral Co-ordination Center.⁴⁶
- C Approval in August 1999 by both governments of a memorandum of understanding setting out the terms for a two to five year program to study the feasibility of jointly developing a Naval Theater-Wide Anti-ballistic Defense system (TMD). The memorandum represents the culmination of bilateral talks that began in 1993 and was a direct response to the emerging regional missile threats posed by both Beijing and Pyongyang.
- C Agreement in March 2000 by U.S. State Department and Japanese Foreign Ministry officials to establish a joint commission, focusing on arms control and non-proliferation initiatives⁴⁷

Persistent Irritations

While these initiatives represented important steps in the consolidation and strengthening of the security relationship, there have been a number of important recent developments that reflect either continuing bilateral irritation or a difference of outlook by the two governments on

⁴⁵ Thomas Drohan, *The U.S.-Japan Defense Guidelines: Towards an Equivalent Alliance*. Policy Paper 238E (Tokyo: Institute for International Policy Studies [IIPS]), p. 8.

⁴⁶ Drohan, *U.S.-Japan Defense Guidelines*, 1999, p. 13.

⁴⁷ Michael J. Green, "The Security Treaty at 40—Strong but with Complaints about Back Pain," *Comparative Connections*, April, 2000, p. 21. Available on line at http://www.csis.org/pacfor/cc/001Qus_japan.html. Accessed October 1, 2001

defense-related issues. In reaction to North Korea's 1998 launch over Japan of a medium-range Taepodong ballistic missile, the Obuchi government decided in March 1999 to develop and launch four intelligence satellites by fiscal 2002-3. The decision in part was prompted by the perception in some official quarters in Tokyo that Japan had become too dependent on the United States for intelligence and advance-warning information of possible missile attacks and, therefore, was ill-prepared to respond swiftly to North Korea's missile launch.⁴⁸ The decision also reflected pressure from a variety of interest groups within Japan (including conservative politicians, defense specialists and industrialists) in favor of an accelerated indigenous satellite program as a means of bolstering Japan's defense and foreign policy autonomy. U.S. government officials responded critically, questioning the merits, in terms of cost-effectiveness and alliance co-ordination, of pursuing entirely independent development rather than purchasing existing U.S. satellite technology. However, by September 1999, an issue that had threatened to develop into a replay of the, at times, acrimonious FSX controversy of the late 1980s, appeared to have been diffused, as both governments exchanged official notes setting out the terms for a joint-development project and allowing for the sale of certain U.S. commercial components to Japan.⁴⁹

Despite progress on the satellite issue, Washington and Tokyo continued during 1999 and 2000 to wrestle over a number of bilateral irritants. U.S. government officials were frustrated by the slow reaction of their Japanese counterparts to complaints regarding harmful dioxin emissions from a rubbish incinerator located next to the U.S. Atsugi naval base; disagreement over Japan's level of host-nation support (HNS) for U.S. bases in Japan imposed strains on ties with Washington, as Japan's Ministry of Finance pointed to the down-turn in Japan's economy as justification for a scaling back on Tokyo's commitment.⁵⁰ More significantly, perhaps, Okinawa

⁴⁸ U.S. officials at the time argued, by contrast, that they had informed Tokyo of the launch information immediately it became available, and that the lack of a rapid reaction by the Japanese government was the result of poor internal communication within the Japanese government rather than any shortcomings on Washington's part.

⁴⁹ "Japan: Defence Direction," *Oxford Analytica Daily Brief*, August 25, 1999, pp. 4-5; Michael J. Green, "Still in the Eye of the Hurricane?" *Comparative Connections*, September, 1999, pp. 1-2. Available on line at http://www.csis.org/pacfor/cc/993Qus_japan.html. Accessed October 1, 2001.

⁵⁰ This issue was only resolved in April 2000 with a modest reduction in Japan's "sympathy budget." Michael J. Green, "The Security Treaty at 40," p. 18; William T. Breer and Tokuko

remained a contentious issue between the two countries largely because the current governor, Keiichi Inamine (despite having seemed initially supportive of the base-relocation strategy associated with the SACO committee), appeared to have aligned himself more closely with local opposition groups in Okinawa, calling for a 15 year time-limit for the new basing arrangements intended to replace the previous Futenma facility. U.S. defense planners have been, and remain opposed to formal time-limits, fearing the impact this would have on other American facilities elsewhere in the region, and failure to resolve this issue remains a significant problem for both sides, exacerbated since July 2001 by yet another rape incident involving a U.S. serviceman.

Revitalizing the Alliance

Against the backdrop of these tensions and in anticipation at the end of 2000 of a presidential transition, it is hardly surprising that there should have been pressure in the United States to re-examine the fundamentals of the security relationship with Japan. The impetus for a reassessment of the alliance was bipartisan, with both Republicans critics and members of the Clinton administration warning that relations with Tokyo had stalled.⁵¹ The product of this concern surfaced in a thoughtful report released in October 2000 by the National Defense University. Headed up by two longstanding Japan-hands—Richard Armitage for the Republicans and Joseph Nye for the Democrats—the report argued vigorously for a more “mature partnership” between the two countries, stressing that the 1997 defense guidelines should be seen as a floor rather than a ceiling for future defense cooperation. Past U.S.-Japan policy was criticized for being too episodic and betraying a lack of leadership. In its place, the report lobbied for an unambiguous U.S. commitment to the defense of Japan, including the Senkaku islands; enhanced cooperation between the armed forces of the two countries; and a more mobile and flexible U.S.-Japan defense structure in which the Marines currently based in Okinawa should have a larger regional role. The report also argued for the removal of Japan’s prohibition on the right of collective defense; wider sharing of defense technology; radically expanded intelligence co-operation; and clear

Shironitta, “Host Nation Support Debate: Chance to Strengthen the Alliance,” *Japan Watch*, April 2000. Available on line at: <http://www.csis.org/japan/japanwatch/jw0400.html>. Accessed October 1, 2001.

⁵¹ Kurt M. Campbell, “Energizing the U.S.-Japan Security Partnership,” *Washington Quarterly* 23 [4]: 125.

U.S. recognition that a more consciously independent and distinctly Japanese foreign policy need not conflict with America's diplomatic priorities.⁵²

Significantly, a number of the authors of the report have now assumed leading positions in the Bush White House. Armitage is Deputy Secretary of State, while Torkel Patterson and Michael Green are both serving as Asia specialists on the National Security Council. Moreover, with Paul Wolfowitz as Deputy Defense Secretary and James Kelly recently appointed as Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian affairs—two individuals with considerable exposure to Japan-related issues—knowledgeable and experienced “Japan-hands” are well represented in the administration. In light of this, it seems fair to assume that bilateral relations with Tokyo will be approached creatively and with sensitivity for Japanese concerns. This does not necessarily minimize the importance of other powers—notably China and the two Koreas—in Washington's thinking, but it arguably opens the door for increased co-operation between Washington and Tokyo. Already there have been a number of encouraging indicators including:

- C The relative speed with which the Bush Administration reacted to the *Ehime Maru* crisis following the accidental sinking in February 2001 of a Japanese fishing boat by a U.S. submarine. Notable in this process has been the repeated, public apologies issued by a number of senior U.S. officials.
- C The positive atmospherics surrounding the July 2001 summit meeting between President Bush and Prime Minister Koizumi and announcement of an ambitious joint economic initiative—the *U.S.-Japan Economic Partnership for Growth*—intended to address the challenge of structural economic reform in Japan. The selection of Robert Zoellick (another official with long experience of dealing with Japan) as United States Trade Representative (USTR), and the administration's high profile commitment to free trade, suggests that economic relations are likely to be less of a problem area than they were under Clinton, notwithstanding differences over the Kyoto Protocol and Tokyo's dismal record on whaling issues.
- C Continued American backing for multiparty regional security programs involving the United States, Japan and South Korea—both the Korean Peninsula Energy Development Organization (KEDO) and the Trilateral Cooperation and Oversight Group (TCOG)—two initiatives intended to ameliorate tensions with North Korea. Despite early fears that Washington might be adopting an uncompromisingly hard-line towards Pyongyang, especially after the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks, recent evidence suggests that there is more continuity than change in America's approach towards Kim Jong-II's regime.

⁵² Bipartisan Study Group, *The United States and Japan*, 2001.

Uncertainty Regarding Japan's Response

Despite these positive indicators, it remains uncertain whether by themselves they will prove sufficient to lift the bilateral relationship to a significantly higher, more involved and mutually supportive level of co-operation. Much will depend on how Japan chooses or is able to respond. To an observer surveying Japanese post-1991 foreign policy in the round, Tokyo's reaction to new regional challenges has often appeared measured and thoughtful. However, while there is much evidence of creative diplomacy at work, in both a bilateral and a multilateral context (especially on the part of Japan's Foreign Ministry), there is little to suggest that the initiatives of past and present administrations have been part of an overarching strategic plan or "vision" for the region. Moreover, recently, particularly following the advent of the Koizumi cabinet in April 2001, there have been troubling signs of serious bureaucratic confusion among senior officials. Revelation of an embezzlement scandal within the Gaimushō provoked unprecedented personnel changes, including the enforced retirement of four highly-placed civil servants, including Administrative Vice-Minister Yutaka Kawashima, the senior-most career Foreign Ministry official and, in the judgement of some observers, one of the most gifted and able officials in his generation.⁵³ At the same time, Koizumi's choice of Foreign Minister—Makiko Tanaka—while popular with the electorate, risked destabilizing Japan's foreign policy. Tanaka was criticized widely, both in the Japanese media and by members of her own party, for being overly accommodating towards Beijing and for attempting to pursue a diplomatic agenda at odds with that of her own government and senior foreign ministry officials. To her detractors, the new foreign minister appeared heavy-handed, remarkably undiplomatic in relations with Japan's allies (most notably the United States) and overly inclined publicly to challenge the authority of the Prime Minister. Finally, in February 2002 Koizumi fired Tanaka. As a consequence of this upheaval, the government is likely to face difficulties in prioritizing different policy agendas and in marshaling support both domestically and internationally in a manner that will best advance the country's national interest.

⁵³ Hisahiko Okazaki, "Nation Better Off if Kawashima Remains," *Japan Times*, July 18.

Mixed Messages Regarding U.S.-Japan Relations

In terms of the security relationship with Washington, there are tentative signs that the defense communities on both sides of the Pacific may be moving closer together. Japanese defense bureaucrats, while traditionally relatively weak policy actors, appear to recognize the importance of enhancing operational clarity as part of the new U.S.-Japan defense guidelines,⁵⁴ and there have been a number of recent legislative changes, affecting for example the air refueling capabilities of Japan's Air Self-Defense Forces, that suggest a continuing pattern of evolving defense realism within the political leadership. More broadly, in the field of co-operative and collective security, Japan has continued to display a constructive and sometime initiating role in a variety of contexts that could be calculated to dovetail closely with American interests, including sponsoring anti-piracy proposals in Southeast Asia; supporting the monitored dismantling of the former Soviet Union's nuclear weapon-stocks; helping to destroy Japanese wartime chemical weapons left over in mainland China;⁵⁵ continued participation in KEDO and TCOG; and engaging—at least until very recently—in separate bilateral dialogue and personnel exchanges with the Chinese and Russian navies.

Yet these positive developments need to be set alongside more problematic issues. While the Japanese government broadly welcomed the election of Bush as a positive development in terms of bilateral relations, some senior Japanese officials have been privately concerned by what they see as continuing confusion in America's policy toward the PRC.⁵⁶ Similarly, Ryōzō Katō, a leading Gaimushō policy maker, has warned of the dangers that technical developments and military modernization might pose for the long-term durability and strength of the bilateral relationship.⁵⁷ This is particularly true where ballistic missile defense—both the theater and

⁵⁴ Interview with London-based Japan Defense Agency official, December 2000.

⁵⁵ "Japanese Chemical Weapons in China," *Strategic Comments*, December 2000. Available online at <http://www.iiss.org/stratcom/sc.asp?610ch>. Accessed September 8, 2001.

⁵⁶ Telephone interview with senior Japanese Foreign Ministry official, New York, NY, December 2000.

⁵⁷ Ryōzō Katō, "Nichibei dōmei no kudōka wo osoreru," [Fears of a Hollowing-out of the U.S.-Japan Alliance], *Chōkan Gion* December 2000.

national variants—are concerned—topics that have been surprisingly under-emphasized in public discussions and Diet debates.⁵⁸

The problem not only relates to fears that National Missile Defense (NMD) might encourage the United States to downplay its traditional alliance relationships, or concerns that Japan might be drawn unwittingly into a regional conflict with China over Taiwan. It also involves serious, unresolved questions relating to the domestic management and coordination of the country's national security interests. Theater Missile Defense (TMD) co-operation, for example, is likely to provoke inter-service rivalry between the different branches of the Japanese military, since the Air and Ground Self-Defense Forces are likely to see the new initiative (a sea-based proposal) as competing with their own existing weapons systems development projects. In addition, there are important command and control requirements that need to be resolved in designing an effective TMD, issues that will have an important bearing on the manner in which a Japanese Prime Minister—traditionally a relatively bureaucratically constrained decision-maker—will be expected to manage a crisis situation. Equally important are the legal questions associated with this new technology. Japanese security doctrine rests on the somewhat curious assumption that the country (and by extension the government) enjoys the right to collective defense but is not entitled to exercise it. A future regional TMD system may well involve a number of participating countries (Japan, the United States, and South Korea, for example) and, therefore, the legality of such an arrangement is likely to be subject to much scrutiny. (Even though the Koizumi cabinet is committed to re-examining the prohibition on collective security, it is unclear whether the government will succeed in removing this constraint.) Similarly, devising an effective TMD involves important questions relating to where (in terms of its launch and flight trajectory) a hostile missile ought to be intercepted. Such issues inevitably will force Japan's defense planners to look hard at the assumptions underlying the country's non-offensive defense doctrine in determining whether or not it is legally acceptable as well as practicable to

⁵⁸ Yoichi Funabashi, "Tokyo's Temperance," *Washington Quarterly* 23 [3]: 136-7; Michael Swaine, Rachel Swanger and Takashi Kawakami, *Japan and Ballistic Missile Defense* (Rand, July 2001), p. xi. Available on line at <http://www.rand.org/publications/MR/MR1374>. Accessed September 6, 2001.

target a hostile missile either over Japanese territory, or in international airspace, or in the sovereign territory of the belligerent power that launches the missile in question.⁵⁹

Multilateralism, Milieu Goals, and Evolving Norms

It should be stressed that the Japanese government's ability to broaden and modify its relations with the United States and with some of its regional partners and former adversaries has not been exclusively a response to changing international factors. It has also been substantially influenced by shifts in opinion domestically. Both public opinion and the views of party politicians have shifted markedly in response to the new regional security challenges, generating, as a consequence, a policy environment more receptive to an increasingly realist foreign and defense policy.⁶⁰ North Korea's unpredictable and often destabilizing behavior, for example, has prompted a discernible shift in public concern in Japan. According to a *Yomiuri Shinbun* newspaper poll carried out in the late summer of 1999, 72 percent of respondents expressed a strong interest in defense issues and 46 percent favored improvements in Japan's emergency legislation to allow the national government to respond swiftly and effectively to a threat to the country's security.⁶¹

Other indications of a developing realist inclination have been the generally high levels of Diet support (a more than 70 percent approval rate) for the new U.S.-Japan Security Guidelines; passage in the Diet in August 1999 of LDP legislation officially recognizing the "rising sun" flag and the *kimigayo* anthem as national symbols; and cross party-support, in both the LDP and Japan's main opposition party, the Democratic Party of Japan (DPJ), for a more active Japanese defense policy, involving measures for more effective territorial defense and possible Japanese participation in UN peacekeeping operations involving the direct use of military force. Similarly, occasional public statements by senior Japanese government officials—such as former Chief Cabinet Secretary Hiromu Nonaka's suggestion that it would be constitutionally permis-

⁵⁹ Satoshi Morimoto, Ken Jimbo, Ken Suzuki and Yoichiro Koizumi, "Theatre Missile Defense (TMD) and Japan's Security," *Plutonium* 20 (Winter 1998). For a discussion on the regional response to TMD, see the paper by Adam Segal in this volume, "East Asian Responses to Theatre Missile Defense."

⁶⁰ Ikuo Kabashima, "Zen Kokkai giin ideogonii chōsa" [An Ideological Survey of all Diet Members], *Chōka Ron*, 1999.

⁶¹ "Japan: Defence Direction," *Oxford Analytica Daily Brief*, August 25, 1999, p. 4.

sible for Japan to launch a pre-emptive strike against North Korea if it felt a missile attack was imminent—have implied that the government may be less constrained by traditional post-war Japanese pacifist cultural norms.

Attitudinal changes, however, take time before they begin to have a substantive impact on actual policy. Certainly, it is highly unlikely that Japan would become (as some have argued) an independent, expansive security player in the region. For one thing, the Japanese military lacks the critical go-it-alone defense capability needed if it wishes to strike out independently from the United States. Although Japanese military spending has historically been the highest of all of the states in the region, Japan's armed forces remain crucially deficient in a number of key areas, including ship-based air support, long-range air support, and access to aircraft carriers. The army lacks strategic or even major tactical mobility,⁶² and politicians continue to block operational reforms intended to enhance the flexibility of the Japanese military.

Even where attitudinal changes offer the prospect of medium to long-term policy shifts—such as current, cross-party backing for the establishment of two Diet committees to examine and deliberate on the question of constitutional reform (the first such initiative since the last examination of the Constitution between 1957 and 1962)—significant security-related taboos linger (in addition to the practical challenges associated with constitutional revision) and continue to limit the scope for a major, immediate, and complete break from Japan's post-war defense traditions.⁶³ In the face of such constraints, it makes sense for the Japanese government to concentrate on expanding its network of security relations in both a multilateral and a bilateral context as a means of maximizing its policy-making flexibility and discretion. A cursory glance at recent decisions by the government reveals that this has indeed been a trend in recent years,

⁶² Tim Huxley and Susan Willet, "Arming East Asia," *Adelphi Paper* 329 (London: International Institute for Strategic Studies, 1999), p. 68.

⁶³ Morton Halperin, for example, the head of the Clinton White House's Policy Planning Staff (PPS), has suggested that Japan in the 21st century might become an independent nuclear capable power—a claim that sits uneasily alongside existing technical information and the evidence from a recent opinion poll indicating that only four percent of individuals surveyed believe that Japan ought to possess its own nuclear weapons. See Morton H. Halperin, *The Nuclear Dimension of the U.S.-Japan Alliance*. Available on line at: <http://www.nautilus.org/nukepolicy/Halperin/index.html>. Accessed October 1, 2001; Ryukichi Imai, *Japan's Nuclear Diplomacy. Focus on nuclear energy not weapons. Policy Paper 231E* (Tokyo: Institute for International Policy Studies, 1999).

although not in manner that suggests a well-defined set of official priorities where particular relations are concerned. At most one can argue that Tokyo has been motivated by “milieu goals” —the desire to become involved in a variety of multilateral fora, often in a non-traditional security setting, as a means of encouraging stability in an increasingly unstable and fluctuating regional environment.⁶⁴ The attractiveness of such an approach from a policy-making perspective is that it leaves room for a flexible adjustment of the two aspects of Japan’s post-war dual security identity—both the recent increasing realist inclination and the long-standing, idealist post-war legacy with its stress on co-operation and mutual accommodation, associated most powerfully with article nine of Japan’s peace constitution, the country’s nuclear allergy, and the official preference for a non-offensive defense policy.⁶⁵

At the same time the immediate practical gains from this scatter-gun like approach to security policy-making remain very unclear, even if individual initiatives offer the prospect of success. Japan’s preference for a financial rather than a personnel-based contribution to the 1999 East Timor crisis reveals the continuing difficulty of turning to the United Nations in order to boost its regional or global security credentials. Similarly, the emphasis in 1998 by former Prime Minister Keizo Obuchi on “human security” has attracted considerable academic interest,⁶⁶ but the focus, for now at least, seems more rhetorical than results-oriented. Even Japan’s participation since 1996 in the Asia-Europe Meeting (ASEM) process, and its close association with the Asean Regional Forum (ARF), where Tokyo had a key initiating role in 1994, have realized only modest benefits for Japan, despite providing the somewhat reassuring backdrop of regular meetings and integrating China and, more recently, North Korea into regional discussions.⁶⁷ The same

⁶⁴ Yoshihide Soeya, “Japan. Normative Constraints versus Structural Imperatives,” in *Asian Security Practice. Material and Ideational Influences*, ed. Muthiah Alagappa (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998), p. 220.

⁶⁵ For a fuller discussion of the normative dimensions of Japanese security policy, see Peter Katzenstein, *Cultural Norms and National Security* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1996).

⁶⁶ Akihiko Tanaka, “Obuchi Diplomacy: How to Follow a Successful Start,” *Japan Echo*, April 1999, p. 9.

⁶⁷ Tsuyoshi Kawasaki, “Between Realism and Idealism in Japanese Security Policy: The Case of the ASEAN Regional Forum,” *Pacific Review* 10 [4]; Julie Gilson, “Japan’s Role in the Asia-

is true of Japan's association with the APEC process where a key initiating role has yet to translate into a decisive leadership position.⁶⁸ Ultimately, Japan's regional and security priorities remain unclear and the country continues to labor under a "multi-track diplomacy" that potentially stands in the way of an integrated foreign policy.⁶⁹

Where ties with Washington are concerned, claims that Japan will remain rigidly and exclusively wedded to its traditional security dependence on the United States seem unfounded. There is considerable pressure and recognition in both Tokyo and Washington that the relationship needs to mature to accommodate a broader and more explicitly independent role for Japan in regional and even global security concerns. What is unclear is how best to attain this objective. For American policy-makers the dilemma the challenges faced by the United States in the 1950s: how to encourage greater Japanese independence and activism but in a manner that supplements and reinforces, rather than conflicts with American strategic interests. Enhanced dialogue, together with efforts to promote greater operational coherence is a useful starting point, but there will also need to be a greater willingness on the part of Japan to articulate a clear and long-term vision of its security priorities. Securing such change will require substantial administrative reform, the continuing amelioration of the traditional, but increasingly out-dated domestic constraints standing in the way of Japanese strategic flexibility, and above all decisive leadership at the very top of the Japanese political spectrum. The direct election of the Prime Minister—a much mooted proposal in recent months—may offer one route to this type of leadership, although it remains fraught with political and legal difficulties.

Unsurprisingly, given the plethora of bureaucratic and psychological obstacles standing in the way of sweeping and immediate reform, it has taken an unprecedented and unpredictable event to accelerate the process of change in Japan. The horrifying September 11, 2001 terrorist assault on New York's World Trade Center produced a swift response from Japan's government,

Europe Meeting," *Asian Survey* 39 [3]; Takashi Inoguchi, "Globalization and Japan's Foreign Policy," *Japan Review of International Affairs* 13 [3]. See also the related paper in this volume by Lisa J. Sansoucy, "Japan's Regional Security Policy in Post Cold-War Asia."

⁶⁸ Yoichi Funabashi, *Asia Pacific Fusion* (Washington, DC: Institute for International Economics, 1995), p. 252.

⁶⁹ C.S. Ahn, "Interministry Co-ordination in Japan's Foreign Policy Making," *Pacific Affairs* 71 [1]: 41.

particular from Prime Minister Koizumi. This was not limited to easily proffered rhetorical support. It also included financial assistance to New York City, to the front-line states of India and Pakistan, and most importantly, an unambiguous offer of Japanese SDF-based logistical and medical support for U.S. forces involved in any future anti-terrorism campaign. The significance of this last development should not be underestimated, since it may presage a removal of Japan's long-standing ban on participation in collective security initiatives. Japanese officials are well aware that failure to contribute tangibly (in the form of men and materiel rather than simple financial support), to any allied initiative against Osama Bin Laden's terrorist network, would be politically and diplomatically disastrous for Japan. Already, the Japanese parliament is deliberating on how best to respond to the crisis and there appears to be an emerging cross-party consensus in favor a more vigorous Japanese role that goes well beyond the relatively slow, primarily financial contribution provided by Japan during the Gulf War of 1991. Yet, for now at least, we are perhaps too close to events to anticipate the precise form of Japanese participation and the extent to which Japanese public opinion will be supportive of any American-led response, not to mention the degree to which Japan's neighbors will be alarmed by a more proactive Japanese security policy. At the very least, it should be stressed that these changes are part of a larger, long-term pattern of evolving security realism by Japan. In the short-term, both popular and official opinion are likely to continue to evolve in a more activist direction, in the process deepening and strengthening existing ties with the United States, yet in a context where enhancing Japanese foreign and security policy flexibility remains a priority for Japan's leaders. In this sense the terrorist attack of September 11 may prove to be one event which (Macmillan's pessimism notwithstanding), serves to highlight the underlying strengths rather than the shortcomings of relations between Washington and Tokyo.

EAST ASIAN RESPONSES TO THEATER MISSILE DEFENSE

Adam Segal

The highest form of generalship is to attack the enemy's strategy, the next best is to attack the enemy's alliances, the next in order is to attack the army in the field, and the worst of all is to besiege walled cities.

Sun-Zi, *The Art of War*

The rise of ballistic missile capabilities in East Asia—especially in China and North Korea—has raised fears in the United States, Japan, South Korea, and Taiwan of increased regional instability. This increased sense of vulnerability is in part due to the perceived military efficacy of these weapons. Military planners throughout the region noted the death of twenty-eight American soldiers in Saudi Arabia in a Scud attack during the Gulf War, and few can ignore the risk of ballistic missiles armed with nuclear, chemical, or biological warheads. Yet a large portion of this increased sense of exposure derives from the perception that ballistic missiles seem designed to strike at the center of U.S. strategy in the region, and that the status of this strategy itself is increasingly uncertain. The 1994 *Report on Theater Missile Defense Options for Asia Pacific*, for example, argues, “The U.S. kept the stability in the region, deterred aggression through bilateral alliances, through forward deployment of armed forces, through active diplomatic engagement, and through military response when necessary.” “Ballistic missiles with WMD [weapons of mass destruction] warheads,” the report continues, “provide a military capability that has the greatest potential to put U.S. forward-based forces at risk and to threaten U.S. allies and friends.”¹

While the United States reaffirmed its commitment to an Asian strategy based on strong bilateral alliances and fostering multilateralism in 1998, other regional actors are concerned about the future of this “hub and spoke” strategy; they worry about both U.S. withdrawal and

¹ *Report to Congress on Theater Missile Defense Architecture Options for the Asia-Pacific Region*. Online at <http://www.defenselink.mil/pubs/tmd050499.pdf>. Accessed February 2001.

U.S. unilateralism.² Increasingly, the assumption that the U.S. military presence provides for regional stability has been questioned.³ In the past, Chinese rhetorical criticism of “hegemonism” was balanced by an acceptance of the role the United States played as regional stabilizer. More recently China appears less willing to accept this role for American troops in Asia, and in the Defense White Paper it offered an alternative vision of security—“a new concept of security”—that explicitly criticized the U.S. alliance structure as a vestige of “Cold War” thinking.⁴ Uncertainty in the region means that all actors will be hedging, pursuing initiatives internally and overseas that are designed to safeguard their own interests.

In this context, the development and deployment of theater missile defenses (TMD) appears to some as the best available means to combating the threat to U.S. forces and to U.S. strategy in East Asia. At the most basic level, effective missile defense will protect forward-deployed troops and limit the military efficacy of ballistic missiles. But at a more political level, technological solutions also structure U.S. relations in the region. How theater missile defense technologies are researched, developed, and deployed are expected to facilitate alliance responsibilities and ensure the cooperation of U.S. allies in the region. Theater missile defense technologies may reinforce the “hub and spoke” pattern of relations the United States depends on in East Asia; they may also put new pressures on U.S. security relations.

Deployment of TMD may generate significant security costs to the United States and its allies in the region, reducing regional stability in the short and long term. Possible Chinese and North Korean reactions include: the deployment of a larger number of short range missiles; Chinese development of multiple reentry vehicles or multiple independently targetable reentry vehicles; the strengthening of North Korea’s desire to test and develop longer range missiles; the development of countermeasures; and the purchase of theater missile defense and other off-the-

² *The United States Security Strategy for the East-Asia Pacific Region 1998*. Online at <http://www.defenselink.mil/pubs/easr98/>. Accessed February 2001.

³ For an argument that the U.S. military presence now prevents greater regional integration see, Charles A. Kupchan, “After Pax Americana: Benign Power, Regional Integration, and the Sources of a Stable Multipolarity,” *International Security* 23, no. 2 (Fall 1998): 40-79.

⁴ *China’s National Defense in 2000*. <http://english.peopledaily.com.cn/features/NDpaper/nd.html>. Accessed March 2001.

shelf systems from Russia. TMD may also increase suspicion and raise tensions between all the major actors in the region.

In this essay I introduce the current theater missile defense systems under development and their expected effectiveness. I also discuss the factors affecting deployment decisions in Korea, Japan, and Taiwan, as well China's response to these systems. In the last section of the paper, I explore some alternatives to theater missile defense. If one of the main concerns about missile defenses is the threat to U.S. strategy in the area, then there may be responses that address these more political concerns without raising military costs. There may be other responses to the threat of ballistic missiles, both military and political, that do not have the same risks.

Theater Missile Defenses

Theater missile defenses fall into three categories: lower tier (or low altitude), upper tier (high altitude), and boost phase. Issues surrounding TMD vary by what type of system we are talking about, whom the defense is intended for, and whom it is supposed to defend against. The most vocal political conflict has emerged over upper-tier systems like Navy Theater-Wide (NTW). These upper-tier systems have larger footprints—they defend larger areas—and may alter the strategic balance by acting more like national missile defenses (NMD) for smaller regions like Korea, Taiwan, and Japan, depending on where and how they are deployed. In addition, the higher technical requirements of these systems may tighten existing or create new alliance structures since they require close cooperation between defense partners.

Lower Tier Defenses

Designed to intercept missiles low in the atmosphere, lower tier defenses have relatively slow-flying interceptors. These slower speeds mean that interceptors cannot travel very far and so lower tier theater missile defenses cover only relatively small areas. Intercept takes place at altitudes less than 20 kilometers; interceptors maneuver to the target using their fins to steer through the air. Lower tier defenses are designed to intercept short-range ballistic missiles with ranges roughly 600 to 1500 kilometers. These defenses may also work against aircraft and cruise missiles (see table 1).

Table 1. Theater Missile Defense Systems

<i>Lower Tier</i>	Deployment Mode	Approximate radius of defended area	Defend against:
PAC-2	Truck-mounted	10-15 kilometers	Short range missiles, ranges up to 600 km; aircraft
PAC-3	Truck-mounted	40-50 kilometers	Short range missiles, ranges up to 1500 km; aircraft
Navy Area Defense	Ship-based	50-100 kilometers	Short range missiles, ranges up to 600 km; aircraft

<i>Upper Tier</i>	Deployment Mode	Approximate radius of defended area	Defend against:
THAAD	Ground-based; transportable by aircraft	Few hundred kilometers	Short and medium range missiles, ranges up to 3500 km. May have capacity against ICBMs
Navy Theater Wide	Ship-based	More than a few hundred kilometers	Short and medium range missiles, ranges up to 3500 km. May have capacity against ICBMs

<i>Boost Phase</i>	Deployment Mode	Approximate radius of defended area	Defend against:
Airborne Laser	Airplane	Possibly Huge	Short and medium range missiles, ranges up to 3500 km. May have capacity against submarine-launched ICBMs

Source: Union of Concerned Scientists, Fact Sheet: U.S. National and Theater Ballistic Missile Defense Programs.

The United States currently has one lower theater defense in operation, others in development. The Patriot PAC-2 (Patriot Advanced Capabilities) defends a small area against aircraft and ballistic missiles with a range of up to about 600 kilometers. The interceptor uses a “blast fragmentation” warhead meant to explode within several meters of its target. Korea, Taiwan, and Japan have all deployed the PAC-2. In contrast, PAC-3, which is supposed to defend against missiles with a longer 1500-kilometer range, will be “hit-to kill”; it will destroy targets by hitting them directly. Navy area defense will also use an explosive warhead to defend against missiles with ranges between 600 and 1000 kilometers, but it will be ship based.

Upper Tier

The United States is currently developing two upper tier systems: Theater High-Altitude Area Defense (THAAD) and Navy Theater Wide (NTW). These systems are designed to intercept missiles high in or above the atmosphere, which permits large ground areas to be defended. Both systems use hit-to-kill vehicles that maneuver to their targets by using thrusters to change their trajectory. THAAD is a land-based system designed to defend against missiles of ranges up to 3500 kilometers and to be transportable by airplane. Interception of the kill vehicle and the incoming warhead must take place high in the atmosphere at altitudes above forty kilometers. It is intended to help protect areas when employed in conjunction with PAC-3 or Navy Area lower-tier point defense systems.

After nine failures, THAAD intercepts were successful twice in 1999. These two successes did little to re-establish confidence that THAAD would be deployed as scheduled in 2007. Phillip Coyle, the director of operational test and evaluation for the Pentagon, called the tests “highly scripted,” and not as challenging as the conditions that THAAD would need to handle to actually knock an incoming missile out of the sky.⁵

Intended as a theater defense against intermediate range missiles, Navy Theater Wide will be deployed at sea on Aegis-class cruisers. The system will use an exo-atmospheric kill vehicle that can only attempt to intercept an incoming missile at an altitude above 80-100 kilometers. The kill vehicle, guided by radar on the Aegis cruiser and by its own on-board

⁵ Paul Richter, “Missile Defense Tests ‘Scripted,’ Official Says,” *Los Angeles Times*, August 24, 1999, p. 1.

infrared sensors, is expected to destroy the warhead by colliding with it. Basing the navy theater wide system on ships will increase the system's mobility; in some cases, NTW could be deployed near the launch site, allowing the system to operate in different theaters and possibly to defend relatively large areas. The fact the system can only intercept at altitudes above 80-100 kilometers means that it would be unable to defend against short-range missiles.⁶

The development schedule of Navy Theater Wide has been delayed several times and continues to slip. The initial NTW system (called Block I), expected to be able to intercept missiles with a range of about 1000 kilometers (like the North Korean Nodong), was originally planned for deployment in 2007. The Pentagon restructured the plan in late 1999, saying deployment was to take place in three stages: Block IA, Block IB, and Block IC. Block IA, to be deployed by 2006, will be a single ship carrying up to six test missiles. Scheduled for two years later, Block IB will include two ships with fifty missiles. And in 2010 Block IC would come on line; this system envisions eighty missiles on four ships and could be used for missile defense, air defense, or both at the same time.⁷ Senior defense officials announced in February 2001 that Block I has been scrapped so the navy can concentrate on Block II.⁸

Block II is expected to use a faster booster, an improved kill vehicle, and upgraded radar to intercept missiles with a range up to 3500 kilometers.⁹ The system is scheduled for deployment at an unspecified date after 2010. Japan has agreed to cooperate in the development of this system, providing technology for the missile nose cones, warhead shapes, infrared target seekers and rocket motors.

Because, as mentioned before, both THAAD and NTW kill vehicles must intercept their targets high in or outside the atmosphere, these defensive systems may be susceptible to counter-

⁶ On a standard trajectory, a 300-km range missile like the Scud would have an apogee of about 80 kilometers.

⁷ "Missile Defense: Schedule for Navy Theater Wide Program Should be Revised to Reduce Risk," GAO Report, 5/00. Online at http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/aces/aces160.shtml. Accessed February 2001.

⁸ Robert Suro, "Missile Defense is still just a Pie in the Sky," *Washington Post*, February 12, 2001, p. 3.

⁹ "Navy Kicks Off R&D Effort for Theater Wide Missile Defense Radar," *Inside Missile Defense*, August 5, 1998.

measures. If seeking to deliver a chemical or biological weapons, the attacker could divide the agent among hundred of submunitions in order to overwhelm the defense. If using a nuclear or conventional warhead, the attacker could disguise the weapon to make it look like a decoy. Placing the warhead in a lightweight balloon made of aluminized mylar and releasing it along with a large number of similar, but empty, balloons would make it indistinguishable from the decoys to the defense sensors. The attacker could also cover the warhead with a shroud cooled by liquid nitrogen. This would make it nearly impossible for the kill vehicle's infrared sensors to detect the warhead at a great enough distance to have time to maneuver to hit it.¹⁰

Boost Phase

The United States is also designing boost phase systems to intercept missiles during the early part of the missiles' flight. During ascent, missiles are slow moving and have very bright exhaust gases that are easy to track. The advantage of boost-phase defenses is that they destroy the missile before the warhead and any decoys are released; counter measures could not defeat the system.

There is currently one boost phase system under development. Based on a modified Boeing 747, the airborne laser (ABL) would target a laser on the body of short or medium range missile until the metal heated to structural failure. For theater missiles, the airplanes must be within several hundred kilometers of the launch, so the plane would either have to fly outside of the borders of the country, or the United States would have to establish air superiority to protect the ABL from attack.

Ballistic Missile Threats in The Region

The primary short- and medium-range ballistic missile threats to U.S. forces, friends, and allies in the Asia-Pacific Region come from North Korea and China. Although little is known about the North Korean program, the country has dedicated significant resources to ballistic missiles over the last thirty years. Today, Pyongyang fields a force comprising some thirty-six

¹⁰ For more detail on these and other possible countermeasures see Andrew Sessler et al., *Countermeasures: A Technical Evaluation of the Operational Effectiveness of the Planned US National Missile Defense System* (Cambridge: Union of Concerned Scientists and MIT Security Studies Program, April 2000).

launchers and 700 missiles.¹¹ Using indigenous technology as well as technologies transferred from the Former Soviet Union, China, and Egypt, the North Koreans have built several types of short and medium range missiles. The Hwasong-5 has a 340 km range and 1000 kg payload, and the Hwasong-6 has a 500 km range and 700 kg payload. In 1996, the Department of Defense estimated that North Korea's arsenal includes several hundred of these missiles.¹² A 1995 Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA) report estimates that North Korea can produce about 50-100 Scud missiles a year (see table 2).¹³

According to U.S. military analysts, these weapons support North Korea's goal of reunifying the peninsula by force. In a statement to Senate Armed Services Committee, General Thomas Schwartz, Commander-in-Chief of the United Nations Command, Combined Forces Command, and U.S. Forces in Korea, characterized the North Korean military strategy as mandating "the achievement of surprise, prosecution of a short and violent war, prevention of major U.S. reinforcement of the peninsula, and negation of the ROK's mobilization." The General continued that "realizing they cannot match Combined Forces Command's technologically advanced war-fighting capabilities, the North's leadership focuses on developing asymmetrical capabilities such as ballistic missiles . . . designed to preclude alliance force options and offset U.S. conventional military superiority."¹⁴ With the ability to threaten South Korea and Japan, North Korea can potentially deter the United States from striking North Korean nuclear facilities, retaliating for attack on the South, or intervening should there be instability north of the de-militarized zone.

¹¹ Joseph S. Bermudez, Jr., *A History of Ballistic Missile Development in the DPRK* (Monterey, CA: Monterey Institute of International Studies, Center for Nonproliferation Studies, November 1999), p. 1.

¹² *Proliferation: Threat and Response* (Washington, DC: Office of the Secretary of Defense, April 1996).

¹³ Defense Intelligence Agency, *North Korea: The Foundations for Military Strength Update 1995*, December 1995.

¹⁴ Statement of General Thomas Schwartz, U.S. Senate Armed Services Committee, *Hearing on the Defense Authorization Request for Fiscal Year 2001 and the Future Years Defense Program*. 106th Cong., 2nd sess., March 7, 2000, p. 6.

Table 2. North Korean Missiles

	Estimated Number (by 2005)	Range (km)	Deployment Date
Scud B	100?	300	1981
Hwasong-5	150?	330	1984
Hwasong-6	250?	500	1989
Nodong-1	12-36/100*	1300	1999
Taepodong-1	0	1500-2000	2000

Source: Federation of American Scientists, <http://www.fas.org/nuke/guide/dprk/missile/index.html>.

*U.S. military analysts put the number of Nodong much higher at “about 100.” See Statement of General Thomas Schwartz, U.S. Senate Armed Services Committee, *Hearing on the Defense Authorization Request for Fiscal Year 2001 and the Future Years Defense Program*. 106th Cong., 2nd sess., March 7, 2000, p. 6.

The number, type, and range of Chinese missile are far greater than North Korea’s (see table 3). China deployed its first medium range missile in 1966 (most likely targeted on Japan) and deployed its second generation, the DF-3, in 1971.¹⁵ Between 1981 and 1991 it developed and fielded five new systems including the mobile medium range DF-21 in 1985 and a mobile short-range ballistic missile, the DF-15, in 1990. During the same time, China also researched missile defense countermeasures like saturation, maneuvering reentry vehicles, shaping, stealth, decoys, and depressed trajectories.

Table 3. Chinese Missiles

	Estimated Number (by 2005)	Range/CEP (km/meters)	Deployment Date
DF-11/M-11	200-300	300/150	Early-00s
DF-15/M-9	450-500	600/<600	1994
DF-21	50-80	1800/700	Early 1990s
DF-3	50-80	3000/1000	1970s

Source: Federation of American Scientists, <http://www.fas.org/nuke/guide/china/theater/index.html>

Beijing’s stated goal is to achieve Taiwan’s reunification with the mainland, preferably by peaceful means. The immediate task, however, has been to keep Taiwan from moving further along the path toward independence and to compel Taipei to accept Beijing’s view of the “one-China” principle. The acquisition of M-9 and M-11 short range ballistic missiles over the past

¹⁵ Stanley Norris, Andrew Burrows, and Richard Fieldhouse, *Nuclear Weapons Databook*, vol. V: *British, French, and Chinese Nuclear Weapons* (Boulder: Westview Press, 1994).

decade by the People's Liberation Army, coupled with repeated statements that "China will not commit itself not to resort to force," have reinforced Beijing's willingness to try to intimidate Taiwan. China has had long- and medium-range missiles deployed since the early 1980s. What has changed since 1995 and 1996 is how the United States and U.S. friends and allies in Asia view Beijing's missile capabilities and intentions toward Taiwan.

China's missile buildup also serves to offset the technological weaknesses of its conventional forces, especially in comparison to Japan and the United States. Chinese analysts have noted that one of the major mistakes the Iraqis made in the Gulf War was to allow the allied forces to build and reinforce bases in Saudi Arabia for months before attacking. As Thomas Christensen describes, China sees ballistic missiles as effective weapons against a technologically superior enemy. Christensen cites an internally circulated PLA text—*Zhanyi Xue* [Military Studies]—that envisions under almost every type of war-fighting scenario a concentrated attack on the enemy's assets by Chinese missile forces. Moreover, the conventional missile force is described as having sufficient range and accuracy for attacks on naval bases, airstrips, and command-and-control centers.¹⁶

South Korea

U.S. missile defense requirements are not the same as South Korean defense priorities. On the one hand, additional lower-tier TMD deployments, both land- and sea-based, by U.S. forces could possibly help defend ports, airfields, and key U.S. military facilities that would be essential in fulfilling alliance responsibilities to come to the aid of the Republic of Korea (ROK). On the other, South Korea has to balance its own security concerns with its desire for peace and eventual unification with the North as well as its expanding relationship with China.

The immediate causes for the U.S. deployment of TMD on the Korean peninsula were the breakdown of the inter-Korean talks on mutual inspection and rising military tensions on both sides of the de-militarized zone. In 1992, North and South Korea agreed in principle to mutual inspections of nuclear facilities. After the North's refusal to accept a South Korean proposal for short-notice inspections of all suspected nuclear sites, the inter-Korean talks on mutual inspec-

¹⁶ Thomas J. Christensen, "Posing Problems without Catching Up: China's Rise and Challenges for U.S. Security Policy," *International Security* 25, 4 (Spring 2000): 5-40.

tions broke down in November 1992. North Korea subsequently threatened to withdraw from the Non-Proliferation Treaty in 1993. After the DPRK tested the Nodong and as tensions grew between the United States and the North over nuclear inspections, the United States decided to deploy Patriot missile batteries to South Korea in mid-1993. South Korea initially objected, fearing the disruption of the ongoing nuclear talks, but acquiesced when it appeared that North Korea was reinforcing its troops along the de-militarized zone. The United States finally deployed five PAC 2 batteries with sixty-four missiles each in March 1994.

All during the 1990s, South Korea pursued a range of missile defense options. The ROK negotiated with Russia, Israel, and the United States on purchasing different defenses. As early as December 1992, Russia began discussing the building of a S300 system for TMD. In October of 1993, the ROK Ministry of Defense began holding discussion about participating in the U.S. TMD program. Fearing incompatibility with the defense systems of the U.S. forces stationed in Korea—and the entry of Russian defense contractors into South Korea—Washington pushed for the purchase of a U.S. system.

South Korea's interest in purchasing a TMD system was significantly weakened by the 1997 Asian financial crisis. And in March of 1999, the South Korean Ministry of Defense announced that it did not plan to participate in the U.S. TMD program. While emphasizing South Korea's vulnerability to a North Korean attack, spokesman Young-Gu Cha indicated that South Korea lacked sufficient funds to create an effective TMD system and that the geography of the Korean peninsula precluded a missile defense system from being militarily effective. Seoul is too close to the border for a TMD system to be able to stop incoming North Korea Scud-type missiles.¹⁷ In addition, given missile impact dispersion, loss of agent viability, and unclear meteorological conditions, North Korea is more likely to use means of delivery other than ballistic missiles for chemical or biological weapons.¹⁸

Apparently no longer interested in upper tier TMD, South Korea has increasingly expressed interest in extending the range of its short-range missiles. Currently, under an agree-

¹⁷ "Korea Shows Reluctance in TMD Plan; Taiwan Remains Positive," *Sisa Journal* (4/8/99): 64-65.

¹⁸ Thomas Morgan, "TMD Architecture in East Asia: Military and Political Alternatives for Reducing Threats," in Natalie W. Crawford and Chung-in Moon, eds., *Emerging Threats, Force Structures, and the Role of Air Power in Korea* (Santa Monica, CA: Rand, 2000), p. 256.

ment with the United States, South Korean missiles are limited to 180 kilometers. Under a new agreement, South Korea would join the Missile Technology Control Regime and be allowed to develop missiles with a range of 300 km. This would put Pyongyang and most of the rest of the North in the range of conventional missiles.

Decisions about the deployment of any TMD system or extending missile ranges are complicated by South Korea's growing relationship with China. While China has supported the North over the last fifty years, Seoul's expanding economic, military and political ties with Beijing are a factor in TMD acquisition. Bilateral trade grew from \$4.4 billion in 1994 to \$23.7 billion in 1998; today, the countries have become each other's third largest trading partners. In addition, the two militaries have routine high- and functional-level exchanges.¹⁹

Taiwan

A March 1999 Pentagon report on the cross-straits military balance argued that Taiwan's most significant vulnerability is its limited ability to defend against the growing number of Chinese short-range ballistic missiles.²⁰ China is said to target these weapons on Taiwanese airfields, command and control nodes, and naval facilities. These weapons may not be particularly accurate, but missile attacks may have the ability to demoralize Taiwan's leaders and its general population as well as disrupt trade and the stock market. As the accuracy of these missiles increases, they will be both a military and political risk.

Taiwan's current air defense system consists of three sets of Patriot systems along with six sets of the indigenous Tien-Kung I and Tien-Kung II (Sky Bow). In June 1994 Raytheon agreed to provide PAC-2 to Taiwan, but delivery was slow. After the March 1996 crisis, the United States agreed to speed delivery of PAC-2, which began in January 1997. In 1999, during the annual arms sales talks, Taiwan requested four Aegis-equipped destroyers and the PAC-3.

¹⁹ Kenneth Allen and Eric MacVadon, *China's Foreign Military Relations* (Washington, DC: Henry L. Stimson Center, October 1999), p. 66.

²⁰ Department of Defense, Report to Congress Pursuant to the FY99 Appropriations Bill, March 1999. More widely known as 1999 Cross Straits Report.

The Clinton administration deferred any decision on the sales; and in April 2001 the Bush administration approved an arms package that did not include either system.²¹

The Tien Kung series TMD was originally developed to intercept China's 3000 km-range DF-3 missile, but will more likely be used to counter DF-15 and DF-21 (600 and 1800 km range, respectively) missiles. In 1997 the Tien Kung successfully intercepted a target missile.²² Taiwan has considered purchasing Russian S-300 systems, but decided against it because of incompatibility with the U.S. TMD it already operates.²³ Taiwanese leaders have noted the need for an increased reliance on an indigenous system should the United States decide not to sell future missile defense systems to Taiwan.

There are both military and political reasons for Taiwan to participate in a U.S. TMD system. Most obviously, the Chinese missile threat is real and continues to grow. China began deploying short-range DF-15 and DF-11 missiles opposite Taiwan in 1990, and the total number of missiles deployed is expected to grow from 200 to possibly over 600 in the next several years.²⁴ These missiles require only six to eight minutes to cross the Taiwan Straits. An overlapping system of PAC 3 and Aegis-equipped ships may give Taiwan limited protection against Chinese ballistic missiles and diminish the effectiveness of a preemptive attack. An effective defense would not only deter the Chinese, but also provide psychological reassurance to the people of Taiwan. In addition, workable missile defenses may remove the incentives for Taiwan to develop more offensive measures like longer distance missiles.

Yet the military effectiveness of any system will probably be highly limited. Any upper tier system will be unable to intercept short-range missiles, and China may be able to overwhelm the PAC 3 and Tien Kung defenses with a saturation attack. A missile attack could come from

²¹ Peter Felstead, "A Major Arms Packet, But No Aegis for Taiwan," *Janes.com*, 26 April 2001.

²² "Tien Kung II Missile Intercepts Air-To-Air Missile," *Foreign Broadcast Information Services-China* (hereafter FBIS-CHI), 17 February 1997, pp. 97-34.

²³ Wyn Bowen and Stanley Shepard, "Living Under the Red Missile Threat," *Jane's Intelligence Review* (December 1996): 560-64.

²⁴ Tony Walker and Stephen Fidler, "China Builds Up Missile Threat," *Financial Times*, February 10, 1999, p. 1; Bill Gertz, "China Adding Missiles Aimed Toward Taiwan," *Washington Times*, February 5, 2001, p. 1.

multiple directions. If the Chinese used medium range missiles in an attack, these missiles have re-entry speeds likely to preclude a high probability of intercept by lower-tier systems. Upper tier systems like NTW would also be susceptible to countermeasures; according to U.S. intelligence reports, flight tests of the DF-21 in November 1995 and January 1996 included decoys.²⁵ Moreover, U.S. defense analysts have questioned whether Taiwan will be able to operate the more complicated ship-based Aegis systems effectively.

The debate in Taiwan over TMD acquisition has reflected an awareness of these limitations. Some Taiwanese military analysts worry that missile defense is “a big money pit,” diverting resources from other more critical needs. They also fear that the system might be provocative and encourage an even greater build-up of Chinese missiles. By late 1998, Taiwan had reservations about acquiring TMD beyond PAC-2. But based on an analysis of the ballistic missile threat, the Ministry of Defense made three related decisions in January 1999 on Taiwan’s defense requirements. First, Taiwan would invest \$1 billion over the following three years to purchase six PAC-3 missile fire units to provide coverage for Taichung and Kaohsiung, as well as Taipei.²⁶ Second, Taiwan would only be interested in lower-tier TMD systems, whether land- or sea-based. Finally, Taiwan would withhold judgment on requesting any future upper-tier systems.²⁷

Political factors may, in fact, play a larger role than military issues in the Taiwanese decision-making process, especially in the case of Navy Theater Wide. The political benefits for Taiwan are at least threefold. First, interest in TMD strengthens U.S.-Taiwan relations, especially in the military sphere. Many defense analysts were alarmed after the missile tests that the United States and Taiwan had no way to coordinate a response to future Chinese military measures. In this context, the process of cooperation required to operate an upper tier missile defense—especially the sharing of intelligence and satellite information and increasing force inter-

²⁵ Bill Gertz, “Chinese ICBMs will Threaten US, Pacific by 2000,” *Washington Times*, May 23, 1999, p. 1. The September 1999 National Intelligence Estimate on the ballistic missile threat to the United States also concluded that China has developed numerous countermeasures.

²⁶ Lu Tehyun, “Military Studying Possibility of Joining TMD,” Lien-Ho Pao, Foreign Broadcast Information Services-China-99-002.

²⁷ Erik Eckholm with Steven Lee Meyers, “Taiwan asks US to let it Obtain Top-Flight Arms,” *New York Times*, March 1, 2000.

operability—would be more valuable than the possible security benefits of the actual delivery of any system. Taiwanese Defense Minister Tang Fei himself stated that: “The introduction of a TMD system would bear a political significance bigger than its military significance.” For Taipei, the acquisition of missile defenses may have less to do with countering the Chinese missile threat than demonstrating evidence of U.S. support for Taiwan’s defense.

Second, TMD activates and promotes a sustained interest in Taiwan’s security in the Congress. This has been particularly important to Taiwan after the “three no’s” and the apparent shift toward China during the June 1998 Clinton-Jiang Summit.²⁸ Taiwanese request for arms sales, especially of ballistic missile defense systems, allowed Congressional Republicans to charge the Clinton administration was “soft” on China; in April 2001 the Bush administration approved a major arms package for Taiwan, but no missile defense systems.²⁹ The 1999 Taiwan Security Enhancement Act, offered by Senators Jesse Helms and Tom Delay, called for the “the continued provision of additional defense articles and defense services in accordance with the Taiwan Relations Act, including missile defense equipment; satellite early warning data; air defense equipment; and diesel-powered submarines, Aegis combat systems, and other naval defense systems.”³⁰ If passed, the Act would have required enhanced military exchanges between the United States and Taiwan and calls for the establishment of a direct communications link between the U.S. Pacific Command and Taiwan’s military headquarters.

Finally, for domestic political reasons, both the Democratic Progressive Party (DPP) and Kuomintang (KMT) must respond to the Chinese missile threat. The DPP has called for the re-organization of defense away from fixed Patriot sites and a move to Aegis-based systems. It has also argued that Taiwan should engage in joint research or at least ensure the transfer of technol-

²⁸ No U.S. support for Taiwan independence, for Taiwanese membership in any international organization that requires statehood, or for “Two Chinas” or “One China, One Taiwan.”

²⁹ Charles Snyder, “No Aegis, But Hefty Package Offered,” *Taipei Times*, April 25, 2001, p. 1.

³⁰ Taiwan Security Enhancement Act, H.R. 1838, House International Relations Committee, October 26, 1999. The Senate did not act on this measure, so the bill died at the end of the 106th Congress.

ogy for TMD systems.³¹ The KMT Central Standing Committee has also declared that Taiwan should join a TMD system

Japan

Japan was one of the first U.S. allies to acquire the Patriot system in the mid-1980s and it upgraded to PAC-2 after the Gulf War. Enhancements to the system were made in 1994 and subsequently called PAC-2 Plus. Discussions about Japan's participation in research of a U.S. upper tier system began in 1993 when the two sides formed a TMD working group. It took five years and the test launch of the Taepo Dong in 1998 to get Japan to participate officially in the R&D of NTW.³² A second potential threat from Chinese intermediate range missiles is rarely stated publicly for the rationale behind TMD, although some Japanese argue that it is the real threat driving the system.

Following its usual practice, the Japanese Defense Agency has separated the research, development, and procurement phases of Navy Theater Wide.³³ Not only is this separation unusual from a U.S. perspective—in the United States research and development are generally linked—but the point of separation falls well within the weapon development stage as defined by the Pentagon. This has allowed the U.S. side to include Japan in its research and development phase while Japan officially commits only to joint research.³⁴ There are therefore two further policy decisions to be made in Tokyo: whether or not to proceed with the development phase, and whether to procure and deploy the system. Japan initially intended to finish a study about wheth-

³¹ "DPP Report Endorses TMD, Missile Development," *China Times*, December 6, 1999.

³² Japan has officially been engaged in a ballistic missile defense dialogue with the United States since 1987 when it signed the Agreement Concerning Japanese Participation in Research for the Strategic Defense Initiative.

³³ Michael J. Green, *Arming Japan: Defense Production, Alliance Politics, and the Post War Search for Autonomy* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1995).

³⁴ Michael Green, "Theater Missile Defense and Strategic Relations with the People's Republic of China," in *Restructuring the U.S.-Japan Alliance: Toward a More Equal Partnership*, ed. Ralph A. Cossa (Washington, DC: Center for Strategic and International Studies, 1997).

er or not to go past the development stage in 2003, but was that date has been pushed back to at least 2006.³⁵

NTW could be deployed against threats from North Korea or China. An effective defense would not only protect Japan from attack, it would also reduce North Korean perceptions that it could split the U.S.-Japan alliance in a time of crisis. TMD would hedge against a stronger China in the future, and some argue that it might be used as a bargaining chip to negotiate a reduction in Chinese missiles. Under most conditions, a missile shield would help Japan carry out its role of protecting U.S. troops in the region. One or two NTW ships stationed near Japan would be sufficient to intercept a Nodong, with a range between 1000 and 1300 kilometers, launched at any part of Japan. NTW Block II could in principle defend against DF 21 and DF 3 missiles (1800 and 3000 kilometers respectively). Using a ship-based system like NTW would mean that the system would in fact not have to be based on Japan, unlike the army's THAAD.³⁶

The other potential security (and political) benefit from Navy Theater Wide would be strengthening the U.S.-Japan alliance. Cooperation on the NTW program is seen as an important component of a healthy alliance relationship. The Japanese may eventually provide technical support and monetary assistance, and their involvement in the program will also lend important political support to the United States in the region. Even among Japanese who are skeptical of the project, there is a feeling that Japan cannot say no to proceeding with the NTW program. As stated by Hisahiko Okazaki, a longtime diplomat and now head of a research organization in Tokyo: "We don't need a missile defense for Japan. But America wants the cooperation, and we should always show we are reliable allies. If it costs money, we pay money. For Japan, the target should be the maintenance of the U.S.-Japan alliance."³⁷

Despite these potential benefits, there are, of course, also costs to Japan. Even if a system is built, its effectiveness is unknown. Both Korean and Chinese missiles may employ counter-measures. In addition, a missile fired by North Korea may be more likely to carry chemical or

³⁵ "Theater Missile Defense Study Extended until 2006," *Japan Times*, February 17, 2001.

³⁶ David Wright and Eryn MacDonald, "Japan and the Navy Theater Wide Missile Defense System," unpublished manuscript, 2001.

³⁷ Doug Struck, "Japan Divided on US Call for Missile Defense," *Washington Post*, February 8, 2001, p. 18.

biological weapons, rather than a nuclear warhead.³⁸ Official estimates are that the DPRK has enough plutonium for “at least one, possibly two, nuclear weapons.”³⁹ During any crisis, North Korea may consider these weapons too valuable to use on a relatively untested missile of unknown reliability; the DPRK could instead use a much more reliable method of delivery. North Korea is believed to have the capacity to produce large quantities of chemical or biological agents, and would place these agents in sub-munitions or bomblets on the warhead. This method of delivery would facilitate dispersal of the agent and overwhelm the NTW interceptors.

In addition to the technical concerns, there are domestic political and regional factors that will influence Japan’s development of TMD. The cost of missile defense may be difficult to justify after a decade of economic recession; there are other items in the military budget including the F-2 fighter aircraft and intelligence satellites that will be fighting for funding. Any TMD work that appears to be increasing Japan’s military power may attract domestic opposition to a “military buildup,” and possibly raise constitutional issues. Smaller systems, like point defense, would probably not be a problem for Japan, but the more expansive plan of merging NMD and TMD under the Bush administration may be unconstitutional. Such a plan would require Japan to share hardware, intelligence, and command centers with U.S. forces. The Japanese military might be asked to try to shoot down a missile that might be aimed somewhere other than Japan. In the past, such “collective” military defense with another nation has been interpreted as unconstitutional.⁴⁰

NTW will also make managing relations with China more difficult. While the Chinese have been vocal in their opposition to Japan’s participation (and their objections will be discussed below), Japanese officials appear largely unmoved by China’s objections. The Japanese argue that Navy Theater Wide is purely defensive, and unless China plans to attack Japan, it should not care about defenses. Yet most Chinese analysts are likely to interpret Japan’s partici-

³⁸ Some analysts question whether North Korea can make a nuclear weapon small and light enough to be delivered by the Nodong. This is discussed in greater detail in Wright and MacDonald, “Japan and the Navy Theater Wide Missile Defense System.”

³⁹ See for example, the Central Intelligence Agency’s unclassified summary of “Report to Congress on the Acquisition of Weapons of Mass Destruction and Advanced Conventional Munitions 1 July Through 31 December 1999.”

⁴⁰ Struck, “Divided Japan.”

pation in NTW as breaking Japanese norms of self-restraint and leading to an eventual military buildup. The end result of a TMD system may be that Japan faces more Chinese missiles than currently deployed.

Finally, in the last decade, Japan has taken an extremely proactive role in international arms control agreements. It was a key supporter of the extension of the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons Treaty (NPT) and of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). If theater missile defense, or more likely national missile defense, help unravel the WMD and missile control regimes, Japan will increasingly find its defense policies at odds with its arms control goals.⁴¹

China

Theater missile defenses present an extremely complicated challenge to China and its goals in the region. In the face of overwhelming U.S. superiority in conventional weapons, Chinese military planners believe they must rely on asymmetric capabilities, especially ballistic missiles.⁴² Chinese leaders are also extremely worried that TMD will reduce China's ability to coerce and threaten Taiwan, thus encouraging Taiwanese independence.

The challenges of TMD, like the responses, vary based on the system and who is building it. Broadly speaking, China has not vocally opposed lower tier TMD (as long as it does not include Taiwan). Foreign Ministry official Sha Zukang has argued that "we do not envisage a dispute concerning development of what we call genuine TMD. Here I am referring to those anti-theater missile systems used solely in a limited area."⁴³ What China does oppose is the development, deployment, and proliferation of antimissile systems that it believes have potential strategic defense capabilities in the name of TMD and go "beyond the legitimate self-defense of relevant countries."

⁴¹ Michael J. Green and Toby Dalton, *Asian Reaction to U.S. Missile Defense* (Seattle: National Bureau of Research, 2000).

⁴² This superiority has been continually demonstrated to the Chinese, starting with the Gulf War, and continuing with the Straits Crisis of 1996. NATO operations in Kosovo reinforced these views.

⁴³ Chen Yali, "TMD issue detrimental to Sino-US Relations," *China Daily* (online), 27 January 1999.

Upper-tier systems like NTW make higher technical and political demands on the countries they are deployed in and so create different problems for China. In looking at Japanese participation in TMD, the Chinese fear an increased role for Japan in regional security. Justifications for building the system in Japan which rest on North Korea have not convinced Chinese analysts. Some Chinese analysts worry that the technologies involved in NTW will help Japan develop ballistic missiles.⁴⁴ Those in China with lingering suspicions of Japan's military past have expressed concern about Japan's growing plutonium stock, and see the acquisition of a missile defense as a shield to go along with a potential sword.

China also worries about how NTW technologies will be developed and who will share them. Chinese analysts are not happy about the strengthening of the U.S.-Japan alliance, and note increasing military interoperability, intelligence sharing, and integration of the Japan Defense Agency into U.S. command.⁴⁵ The Chinese are even more concerned that Navy Theater Wide technology in Japan will be transferred to Taiwan, or that it could be used during a crisis in the Taiwan Straits. Even if it is not transferred to Taiwan, Chinese analysts worry that coverage of an NTW system designed for Japan, but deployed in the south, would extend to the island. Japanese officials insist that Japan's only role in a crisis will be protecting U.S. forces, not direct involvement in defending Taiwan. However, Chinese officials have argued that the 1997 revised defense guidelines between the United States and Japan are ambiguous; they fear that the guideline's reference to "situations in areas surrounding Japan" does not exclude Taiwan and so directly links NTW, Japan, and the Taiwan issue.

Finally, the Chinese also fear that NTW in Japan will in fact be part of a larger national missile defense for the United States that undermines China's strategic deterrent. Recent proposals for national missile defense includes interceptors based in the continental United States as well as a sea-based system with high-speed interceptors. Depending on their location and their fly-out time, these anti-missile missiles may be able to intercept China's intercontinental ballistic missiles, weakening China's already small deterrent force.

⁴⁴ Wei Ming, "TMD Yushang Mafanle," *Jiefangjun Bao*, April 3, 2000.

⁴⁵ Duan Hong, "TMD, US-Japan Relations, and East Asian Security," Paper presented at East Asian Regional Security Futures: Theater Missile Defense Implications, The United Nations University, Tokyo, Japan, June 24-15, 2000. Online at <http://www.nautilus.org/nukepolicy/tmd-conference/papers.html>

China has voiced multiple opposition to the transfer of any type of theater missile defense to Taiwan. As a senior Chinese official stated in January 2000, “If the United States wants to develop a theater missile defense system for its own defense needs, that is its own business. What China does not want to see is TMD covering Taiwan. If that happened, then it would damage U.S.-China relations.”⁴⁶ Most simply, TMD transfers would complicate China’s military options and reduce the military effectiveness of China’s missile forces. Shielded from these missiles, TMD transfers would encourage those within Taiwan who seek independence. Moreover, TMD, according to the Chinese, would be a harmful intrusion on internal Chinese affairs and a violation of the three Joint Communiqués governing U.S.-Chinese relations.

The Chinese also worry that the intelligence and information sharing needed to operate TMD systems (especially upper tier) are the first steps toward the re-establishment of a U.S. military alliance with Taiwan. At the very least, a Taiwan-deployed theater missile defense would require U.S. military specialists to train Taiwanese units. Satellite data would have to be transferred, probably by a direct link between Cheyenne Mountain and Taiwanese military command. According to Chinese analysts, transfers to Taiwan could eventually be part of a joint Northeast Asia missile defense network that would include the United States, Japan, and South Korea. In addition, some Chinese analysts have argued that the transfer of TMD technology to Taiwan would help Taipei develop offensive ballistic missile programs of its own; China believes that Taiwan is developing the 600 km Sky Steed ballistic missile from the Sky Bow surface-to-air missile.⁴⁷

Alternatives to TMD

The above discussion suggests there are significant potential costs as well as benefits to the United States developing a regional TMD system. Theater missile defenses may bring limited protection against ballistic missile threats, and they may also provoke a regional arms race. The United States must differentiate between situations in which the burden-sharing of development costs and deployments is sensible, and those in which there are reduced risks if the United

⁴⁶ Steven Mufson, “Chinese Military Leaders Object to U.S. Missile Sales to Taiwan,” *Washington Post*, 27 January 2000.

⁴⁷ “Beijing Source on Taiwan Missile Development,” *Sing Tao Jih Pao*, July 29, 1999.

States goes it alone.⁴⁸ Especially because most of the systems under discussion rely on untested technologies and will not be ready for deployment for five or ten years, the United States should think hard about including Taiwan and Japan into TMD programs.⁴⁹

There may be political and military solutions that address the issues discussed above that do not include the immediate risks of TMD. For all of its partners in the region, the United States should make clearer its ability and willingness to respond to ballistic missile attacks; such a move would strengthen extended deterrence, convincing allies that U.S. interests are at stake. As Thomas Christensen has suggested, the United States should announce that it will not use military force to defend a Taiwan that has unilaterally declared independence, but that it will defend Taiwan vigorously if China uses force to try and coerce unification in the absence of a declaration of independence.⁵⁰

More specifically, while Chinese missiles may be a potent weapon of terror, they may be less of a military threat.⁵¹ If the PLA wanted to target Taiwanese airforce bases and airstrips, given the low accuracy (circle of equal probability, or CEP) and relatively low yields from 500 kg conventional warheads, China would have to fire a large number of warheads at each airfield. Studies of an Indian attack on a Pakistani airfield suggest that India would have to fire anywhere from 96 to 672 Prithvi missiles to close one airfield (assuming a CEP of about 500 meters, a yield of 1000kg, and two airstrips per airfield).⁵² Assuming the DF-15 has a CEP of 300 meters,

⁴⁸ *Theater Missile Defense in the Asia-Pacific Region*, Henry L. Stimson Center Working Group Report (Washington, DC), June 29, 2000.

⁴⁹ Thomas Christensen, "Theater Missile Defense and Taiwan's Security," *Orbis* 44 (Winter 2000): 79-90.

⁵⁰ Thomas Christensen, "Clarity on Taiwan: Correcting Misperceptions on Both Sides of the Strait," *Washington Post*, March 20, 2000.

⁵¹ The greater military threat to Taiwan may be a "leaky" naval blockade. In this case, the Taiwanese would be better off asking for the tools of anti-submarine warfare like the P-3 Orion aircraft, which drops buoys with sonar devices and fires torpedoes at any submarines the buoy detects. See Michael O'Hanlon, "Taiwan's Real Bind," *New York Times*, April 20, 2000.

⁵² Z. Miam, A. H. Nayyar, and M. V. Ramana, "Bringing Prithvi Down to Earth: The Capabilities and Potential Effectiveness of India's Prithvi," *Science and Global Security* 7 (1988): 330-60.

and assuming two airstrips for Taiwanese airfields, the PLA will have to use about 650 missiles—about the total number the Pentagon projects for 2005—for one airfield.⁵³ Also, because the PLA has fewer launchers than missiles, it would need to fire in multiple salvos, giving the Taiwanese air force time for repairs or redeployment. Instead of participating in TMD, Taiwan may be better off improving early warning systems and command and control facilities, as well as hardening airfields and strengthening passive defenses.⁵⁴

All of this could be paralleled by increases in informal contact between the United States and Taiwanese military.⁵⁵ If the United States decides to go ahead with an antimissile system, TMD on U.S. ships is probably a better choice than TMD on Taiwanese ships. These ships could be deployed to protect U.S. troops in Japan, and if necessary, outside the Taiwan Straits to protect Taiwan. How far outside the Straits these ships will be depends on intercept flight speed, how high in the altitude the United States tries to intercept, and the trajectories of Chinese missiles; it is possible that U.S. ships will have to be deployed directly in the entrance of the Straits, making them an inviting target for the PLA and raising the possibility of direct conflict between the United States and China.⁵⁶ Still, at least in the next five to 10 years, deployment on U.S. ships may bring security benefits without political costs.

In the case of Japan, there are real risks to encouraging Japan to assume a greater role in TMD development.⁵⁷ Japanese participation may exacerbate the Sino-Japanese security dilemma.

⁵³ Calculations are by Iain Johnston. CEP estimates from FAS. Use of GPS guidance, which the Chinese are working on, would greatly increase accuracy. See Mark Stokes, *China's Strategic Modernization: Implications for the United States*. Online at <http://www.fas.org/nuke/guide/china/doctrine/chinamod.htm>. Accessed February 2001.

⁵⁴ Michael Swaine, *Taiwan's National Security, Defense Policy, and Weapons Procurement Process* (Santa Monica, CA: RAND, 1999).

⁵⁵ *Theater Missile Defense in the Asia-Pacific Region*, Henry L. Stimson Center Working Group Report (Washington, DC), June 29, 2000.

⁵⁶ If NTW were trying to hit a DF-15 at its apogee, or just after it passes above 100 km (which would be preferable to get a few shots) it might have to be deployed at or less than 500 km from the Strait for a minimum energy trajectory and 300 km for a depressed trajectory. Calculations based on estimates by David Wright of the Union of Concerned Scientists.

⁵⁷ Thomas J. Christensen, "China, the U.S.-Japan Alliance, and the Security Dilemma in East Asia," *International Security* 23, no. 4 (Spring 1999): 49-80.

If the primary benefit of missile defenses to Japan is maintaining a healthy alliance, the United States could find other research projects on which the Japanese can work. It could bracket missile defense issues within the overall alliance structure, reassuring the Japanese that pulling out of joint research would not mean forfeiting the chance to purchase any future system. The United States will deploy its most effective TMD system to protect its own troops, and Japan would accrue the security benefits without the political costs.

In addition, the United States could also consider rededicating itself to multilateral solutions to ballistic missiles, exploring more cooperative or regional security agreements. Strengthening the missile technology control regime (MTCR) would require China's participation, but China might be more willing to cooperate if it were assured that any TMD would not include Taiwan. In a regional forum, all of the participants might be able to negotiate a limit to offensive and defensive systems.

Finally, the United States could pursue bilateral negotiations with North Korea and China which may help reduce the threat of attack. The recent announcements from North Korea that it is considering ending its moratorium on the testing of long-range missiles in response to the "hard line stance" of the Bush administration may be more than a penchant for blackmail; it may also reflect a desire to get negotiations started again.⁵⁸ The United States and DPRK could move to revive the cooperative nuclear agreement of 1992, which included a provision for the establishment of a joint inspection regime of nuclear facilities. Expansion of this regime to missile facilities could be an effective confidence building measure reducing the need for theater missile defenses.⁵⁹

⁵⁸ "North Korea Warns U.S. on Missile Testing," *New York Times*, February 22, 2001. For an argument that North Korea has not engaged in blackmail, but "tit for tat," cooperating when Washington cooperates, retaliating when Washington reneges, see Leon Sigal, "Six Myths about Dealing with Pyongyang," Northeast Asia Peace and Security Network Special Report, February 20, 2001. Online at http://www.nautilus.org/fora/security/0102C_Sigal.html. Accessed February 2001.

⁵⁹ James Clay Moltz, "Missile Proliferation in East Asia: Arms Control vs. TMD Responses," *Nonproliferation Review* 4, no. 3 (Spring/Summer 1997).

In the case of China, some of have suggested that the two sides may be able to negotiate an informal “rules of the game” for missiles and defenses.⁶⁰ In return for China revealing more about the expected end point of its current build-up of short-range missiles, the United States could limit the number, range, and speed of intercepts. While the success of these negotiations is certainly not guaranteed, the process may be as important as the outcome. The negotiation process would have the symbolic importance of, if not accepting Chinese security concerns, then at least recognizing them. Unilateral pursuit of theater missile defense suggests to the Chinese that, despite public justification to the contrary, these systems are designed to contain China.

None of the above steps are exhaustive and there are certainly barriers and difficulties to implementing them. The purpose of listing them is not so much as to test their political viability, but to suggest alternative approaches to security in the region to TMD alone. These measures are cheaper than theater missile defense and may reduce the unintended consequences of unconstrained military competition between the United States, Japan, China, Taiwan, and North Korea.

⁶⁰ This has been recently suggested for discussions about NMD. See Erik Eckholm, “Experts Try to Make Missile Shield Palatable to China,” *New York Times*, January 28, 2001.

Appendix: List of Acronyms

ABL	Anti-ballistic Laser
CEP	Circle of Equal Probability
CTBT	Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty
DF	Dong-Feng (East Wind)
DIA	Defense Intelligence Agency
DPP	Democratic Progressive Party (Taiwan)
DPRK	Democratic People's Republic of Korea
KMT	Kuomintang (Taiwan)
MTCR	Missile Technology Control Regime
NMD	National Missile Defense
NTW	Navy Theater Wide
PAC	Patriot Advanced Capabilities
PLA	People's Liberation Army
ROK	Republic of Korea
THAAD	Theater High-Altitude Area Defense
TMD	Theater Missile Defense
WMD	Weapons of Mass Destruction

PART II

Asian Security in a Regional Perspective

CHINA'S PERIPHERY POLICY AND CHANGING SECURITY ENVIRONMENT IN THE ASIA-PACIFIC REGION

Suisheng Zhao

Although China has been seen as a rising power with global significance in the post-Cold War world, its security relies heavily upon maintaining good relations with neighboring countries in the Asia-Pacific region. A Chinese strategist, Wu Xinbo, admits that although China has a great power self-image it does not have adequate strength to play the role commensurate to this self-image. Therefore, "China is still a country whose real interest lies mainly within its boundaries, and to a lesser extent, in the Asia-Pacific region where developments may have a direct impact on China's national interests. . . . In terms of interests and resources, it is fair to say that China is a regional power with some limited global interests."¹ With limited capacity in traditional economic and military terms, China has to focus its resources on the Asian-Pacific region. Over one decade ago, Steven Levine stated that "outside Asia, China's role is determined more by what China may become than by what it already is."² This statement is still true today. Thus Beijing has to formulate its foreign policy in particular to response to issues close to home.

For a long time in the early years of the People's Republic of China (PRC), however, China was "a regional power without a regional policy."³ The tensions with many of its neighboring countries became an important source of threat to China's national security. Beijing was in constant alert against possible invasions of hostile powers via its neighboring countries and fought several wars with neighbors or with hostile powers in neighboring countries to defuse the threat. China's relations with Asian Pacific countries began to improve gradually in recent

¹ Wu Xinbo, "Four Contradictions Constraining China's Foreign Policy Behavior," *Journal of Contemporary China* 10, no. 27 (May 2001): 294.

² Steven I. Levine, "China in Asia: The PRC as a Regional Power," in Harry Harding, ed., *China's Foreign Relations in the 1980s* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1982).

³ Levine, "China in Asia," p. 107. Denny Roy, in a book of 1998, still believed that "China has no apparent 'Asian policy'." Denny Roy, *China's Foreign Relations* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 1998), p. 8.

decades after it made a comprehensive periphery policy. This improvement has had significant impact on its security environment.

This paper analyzes the recent changes in Beijing's policy and relations with its Asian neighbor and its impacts on China's security environment. It starts with an examination of Beijing's making of its periphery policy, then goes on to explore the subsequent changes in Beijing's security environment. The last section will analyze the challenges to Beijing's periphery policy in the Asia-Pacific region.

Beijing's "Good Neighboring Policy"

China often calls its Asian neighbors "periphery countries" (*zhoubian guojia*). Although it was always aware of the importance in maintaining stable relations with these periphery countries for its national security, Beijing was never able to make an integrated policy toward neighboring countries. There were many factors responsible for the absence of China's regional policy. One was frequent domestic turmoil and policy change, which severely limited China's ability to make any coherent foreign policy, including regional policy. The second was China's traditional cultural complacency and the legacy of sinocentrism, which took China as the center of Asia for granted. The third was what Levine called China's ambiguous position in the region: "more than merely a regional actor, but still less than a global power," which left China in an uncertain relationship with its Asian neighbors.⁴ The fourth was China's unique position in the bipolar Cold War setting, which forced Beijing to see its security in global rather than regional terms.

Most of these factors began to change after China launched market-oriented economic reform and opening up to the outside world in the early 1980s. Externally, while China confronted no serious security threat throughout the 1980s, its strategic position in the triangular relationship between the United States, the USSR, and the PRC declined along with the *détente* between the two superpowers and the end of the Cold War. Internally, Deng Xiaoping and his reform-minded colleagues were determined not only to halt the domestic political turmoil that characterized the early years of the PRC but also to create a favorable international environment for economic modernization. In response to the new situation, the reform-minded leaders in

⁴ Levine, *China in Asia*.

Beijing made a deliberated effort to devise an integrated regional policy, known as “*zhoubian zhengce*” (periphery policy) or “*mulin zhengce*” (good neighboring policy), to cope with the changes that challenged China’s understanding of its relations with neighboring countries.

A study by You Ji and Jia Qingguo points to three new trends in Asia that led reform-minded leaders to pay a special attention to its periphery.⁵ The first was the prospect of a “pacific century,” which Beijing embraced with the hope that fast economic growth in the Asia-Pacific region could offer new energy to China’s economic prosperity. Taking the opportunities created by the restructuring of the world economy, China was determined to integrate its economy with the rest of the region. The second was the emergence of “new Asianism,” which claimed that the success of Asian modernization was based on its unique values. This concept resonated in the hearts of many Chinese leaders, reformers and conservatives alike, because it challenged the Western ideological and economic centrality. Chinese leaders wanted to help drive this evolving trend of Asianism by working closely with its Asian neighbors. The third was the development of regional or sub-regional blocs following the collapse of the bipolar system. Beijing decided to take advantage of the collectivism that might provide new mechanisms useful for China to face the West. “[m]ultilateralism, albeit highly limited, developed as China started cooperation with neighboring states on transnational security problems (e.g., environmental pollution, illegal immigration, drug-trafficking, organized cross-border crime, etc.).”⁶

In light of these new developments, Beijing’s leaders began to make a periphery policy that would help China to achieve the goal of creating a regional environment conducive to its economic modernization and national security. According to Liu Huaqiu, Director of the Foreign Affairs Office of the State Council, the objectives of the good neighboring policy was to “actively develop friendly relations with the surrounding countries, preserve regional peace and stability, and promote regional economic cooperation.” To carry out this policy, Chinese leaders showed a benign face in negotiations with neighboring countries over a series of disputes. As Liu stated,

⁵ You Ji and Jia Qingguo, “China’s Re-emergence and Its Foreign Policy Strategy,” in Joseph Y.S. Cheng, ed., *China Review, 1998* (Hong Kong: Chinese University Press, 1998), p. 128.

⁶ Wu Baiyi, “The Chinese Security Concept and its Historical Evolution,” *Journal of Contemporary China* 10, no. 27 (May 2001): 278.

China advocates dialogues and negotiations with other countries as equals in dealing with the historical disputes over boundaries, territorial lands, and territorial seas and seeks fair and reasonable solutions. Disputes that cannot be settled immediately may be set aside temporarily as the parties seek common ground while reserving differences without letting those differences affect the normal relations between two countries.⁷

Specifically, Beijing's periphery policy was aimed at exploring the common ground with Asian countries in both economic and security arenas by conveying the image of a responsible power willing to contribute to stability and cooperation in the region. It is important to note that Beijing's good neighboring policy, just like any other parts of its foreign policy, was closely related with its reform-minded leaders' objective of economic modernization. In order to achieve a high rate of economic growth, these leaders looked for the common ground in cooperation with neighboring countries in order to take a share of the rapid economic growth in the region. This economic motivation was very influential in guiding China's periphery policy, evident in their attempt to make diplomacy "serving domestic economic construction" (*waijiao fuwu yu guonei jingji jiangshe*) after the inception of market-oriented economic reforms.⁸

Their efforts have been very successful. The overall foreign policy goal since the late 1970s has been set to maintain a peaceful international environment for economic modernization. Reform-minded Chinese leaders argued that economic power was both a means and an end of foreign policy. They defined economic modernization in the terms of economic security of the nation. A Chinese scholar described that economic security

underscores the safety and survivability of those economic parts or sectors vital to the country's growth, the livelihood, and its whole economic interests. Indispensable for achieving such a security are elements ranging from favorable internal and external business environments, to strong international competitiveness, to status and capabilities in world politics. The final goals for economic security are to enhance national economic power, to secure domestic markets while expanding

⁷ Liu Huaqiu, "Zhongguo jiang yiongyuan zhixing dudi zhizhu de waijiao zhengce" [China Will Always Pursue Peaceful Foreign Policy of Independence and Self-determination], *Quishi*, no. 23 (December 1997): 3.

⁸ Liu Tsai-ming, "Zhuanfang xing waijiaobuzhang" [A Special Interview of New Foreign Minister], *Wenhui Bao*, June 27, 1998, p. A3.

external ones, and to guarantee national interest and advantage in competition and cooperation abroad.⁹

In order to obtain economic power and security, Beijing was interested in the economic development models of Japan and other successful East Asian Newly Industrial Countries (NICs) and hoped for economic gains from increased trade and investment between China and these Asian countries. As a result of this policy effort, China traded more and more with Asian countries than with other regions after the 1980s. The total trade amount with Asian countries was only \$16.6 billion in 1980, but it reached \$48.5 billion in 1990 and \$175.69 billion in 1995, right before the Asian financial crisis, counted for over 60 percent of China's total foreign trade.¹⁰

In the traditional security arena, political leaders in China have made every effort to prevent their neighboring countries from becoming military security threats. A number of periphery countries were perceived as posing such threats due to the following two reasons: border disputes and their relations with outside powers hostile to China. Accordingly, Beijing's periphery policy has two security goals in mind: to settle border disputes "through consultations and negotiations"¹¹ to prevent alliances of its neighbors with outside powers hostile to China. The first policy goal has involved China in a search for secure boundaries and a look for peaceful settlements in land and maritime territorial disputes. The second policy goal has involved China in developing strategic relationships and finding common grounds with Asian countries in resisting pressures on market penetration and human rights issues from Western powers. Under these circumstances, China's periphery policy has been shaped principally by the dynamics of two major sets of relations. One is the dynamics between China and the global power of the United States. The second is the interactions between China and regional rivals such as Japan and India.

⁹ Wu Baiyi, "The Chinese Security Concept and its Historical Evolution," pp. 279-80.

¹⁰ Yan Xuetong, *Zhongguo de Jueqi, Guoji Huanjing pinggu* [The Rise of China: An Evaluation of the International Environment] (Tianjin, China: Tianjin Renmin Chubanshe, 1998), p. 283.

¹¹ Jiang Zemin's report to the 15th National Congress of the CCP, Beijing *Xinhua*, October 16, 1997.

Beijing's special attention to its periphery does not mean that China is willing to turn its back on the world and simply cultivate its own garden. As You and Jia said, Beijing's periphery policy

is not just about putting the backyard in order. PRC's diplomatic history has clearly showed that troubled relations with the surrounding nations in the past had seriously narrowed China's foreign policy options, especially toward major powers. . . . Closer integration with Asia has become a must in China's regional foreign policy initiatives.¹²

In other words, establishing good relationships with neighbors is aimed at providing China with a more secure environment in its periphery as a leverage to increase its influence in world affairs.

Improvements of China's Security Environment in The Asia-Pacific

Indeed, China's security environment in its periphery improved greatly after it began to formulate and implement the good-neighboring policy. In his study of China's peripheral security environment (*zhoubian anquan huanjing*), a Chinese security expert, Yan Xuetong, asserted that as China found more and more common security interest (*gongtong anquan liyi*) with peripheral countries, China began to enjoy a more peaceful environment together with its neighboring countries in recent years. The result was an increased mutual trust between China and its neighbors and an enhanced national security for China.¹³

Yan's assertion was based on his observation that China and its neighbors shared two fundamentally common security interests. One was to prevent a world war and a new cold war from taking place and the second was to avoid regional military conflict. According to Yan, although some countries might be concerned that China's rise would upset the balance of power, most countries agreed with China's terms of strategic balance in the region. Yan divided China's periphery countries into three categories according to the degrees of their agreement with China's terms of strategic balance. The first category of countries shared China's interest in developing a regional multipolarization in which China would be one of important strategic power and play a balancing role. These countries included Pakistan, North Korea, Burma, Nepal, Cambo-

¹² You Ji and Jia Qingguo, "China's Re-emergence."

¹³ Yan, *Zhongguo de Jueqi* [The Rise of China], pp. 234-36.

dia, Malaysia, Singapore, Russia, and central Asian states. They hoped to see China becoming powerful to reduce the pressure of the United States intervening in their internal affairs. The second category of countries included Australia, Canada, Indonesia, Thailand, the Philippines, Vietnam, New Zealand, and India. They hoped to maintain the existing strategic balance in which the United States had the strategically advantaged position. These countries didn't want to see China become a balancing power to the United States. But they did not have major conflicts of interest with China. The third category of countries, mainly the United States and Japan, were concerned over the rise of China and wanted to establish a multilateral mechanism in China's periphery to prevent China from becoming a security threat to their interests. Yan believed that because China shared common strategic interests with most of the periphery countries, China had enjoyed and could continue to enjoy a favorable security environment in the periphery for the near future.¹⁴

It was indeed a prudent policy that China followed in its efforts to find shared strategic interests with neighboring countries. By implementing this policy, China has improved its relations with most of periphery countries in the recent decades. This improvement came roughly in two chronological stages: the late Cold War period of the 1980s and the post-Cold War period of the 1990s.

The first stage started with China's economic reform and opening up to the outside world in the early 1980s. Two policy shifts were significant in this period. The first was to abandon ideology as the guidance and develop friendly relations with neighbors regardless of their ideological tendencies and political systems (*buyi yishi xingtai he shehui zhidu lun qingsu*). This policy shift was stated in a Chinese foreign policy history book as one of the five major policy shifts in the 1980s.¹⁵ The second significant policy shift was to change the practice of defining China's relations with its neighbors in terms of their relations with either of the Soviet Union and the United States (*yimei huaxian, yisu huaxian*). China would develop normal relations with neighboring countries regardless of their relations with the Soviet Union and the United States.

¹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵ Tian Peizeng, ed., *Gaige Kaifang yilai de Zhongguo Waijiao* [Chinese Diplomacy Since the Reform and Opening Up] (Beijing: Shijie Zhishi Chubanshe, 1993), pp. 6-7.

These policy changes resulted in an improvement of China's relations with some periphery countries previously in tension during the period.

One good example was the normalization of relationship with Mongolia, which had long been perceived as a Soviet satellite on China's northern frontier. A border agreement between the two countries was signed in November 1988. Another example was China's effort to improve its relationship with India. This effort resulted in the ice-breaking visit of Indian Prime Minister, Rajiv Gandhi, to Beijing in December 1988, the first such visit after the Sino-India border war in 1962. China declared that this visit marked the beginning of a normal relationship between these two countries.¹⁶ Maintaining a good relationship with North Korea and at the same time improving their relationship with South Korea was a third example. The so-called "traditional friendship" between China and North Korea had always been delicate, as North Korea had swung between Moscow and Beijing for many years. This relationship became particularly difficult in the 1980s when differences in ideology, economic and political systems, and foreign policy were growing between these two communist neighbors. However, Beijing managed fairly good relationship with the North while successfully established close relations with the South at the end of the 1980s.

The improvement of the relationship with Taiwan was still another example. To create a peaceful international environment for its modernization drive, Deng Xiaoping decided to shift Beijing's policy from "liberating Taiwan" by force to a peaceful reunification offense by suggesting talks between the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) and the Nationalist Party (KMT) in the early 1980s. Yie Jianying, the Chairman of the National People's Congress Standing Committee, specifically proposed *santong* (three links, i.e., commercial, postal, and travel) and *siliu* (four exchanges, i.e., academic, cultural, economic, and sports) between the two sides.¹⁷ Although the Taiwan government suspected Beijing's policy as "united front" tactics at first, it responded to Beijing's peaceful inducement under domestic pressures and began to ease restric-

¹⁶ Xie Yixing, *Zhongguo Dangdai Waijiao Shi* [History of Contemporary Chinese Diplomacy] (Beijing: Zhongguo Qingnian Chubanshe, 1996), p. 430.

¹⁷ *Beijing Review* 24, no. 40 (October 5, 1981): 11.

tions on trade, investment and travel to the mainland after 1986.¹⁸ By the end of the 1980s, economic and cultural exchanges across the Taiwan Strait developed rapidly.

The Tiananmen Massacre in 1989 and the subsequent end of the Cold War marked the beginning of the second stage of improvement of China's relations with periphery countries. The massacre led to economic sanctions by and deterioration of relations with Western countries. However, it had little negative impact on China's relations with its Asian neighbors, as the human rights records in most of these countries were not better than that in China. To a certain extent, these Asian governments were sympathetic to China's authoritarian rule and struggle against pressures from the Western countries. To improve China's international environment after Tiananmen, Beijing's leaders made a series of policy adjustments. A former Chinese diplomat characterized these adjustments in twelve Chinese characters: *wendingzhoubian* (stabilizing periphery), *kaiduowaijiao* (expanding diplomacy), *liuzhuanjumian* (altering the situation). Specifically, reformed-minded Beijing's leaders decided to further reduce the role of ideological factors in China's foreign relations and stop drawing lines according to a country's social-political system or attitudes toward China. The emphasis was on the improvement of relations on China's periphery in order to establish a secure and stable periphery environment.¹⁹ As a result of this effort, it was really ironical that while China's relations with the Western countries soured, its relations with Asian-Pacific neighbors improved after the Tiananmen Incident.

Taking the example of the improvement of the relations between China and the Southeast Asian countries, China normalized diplomatic relations with several influential Southeast Asian countries in the early 1990s: Indonesia (August 8, 1990), Singapore (October 3, 1990), Brunei (September 30, 1991), and Vietnam (November 1991). In spite of the rising concern over the China threat among many Southeast Asian countries, they not only sided with China against the U.S. pressures on the human rights issue, but also accepted Beijing's position that the reunification with Taiwan was China's domestic affair. China was invited to attend the ASEAN post-Ministerial Conference in 1991 and became a member of the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF) in

¹⁸ Suisheng Zhao, "Management of Rival Relations Across the Taiwan Strait: 1979-1991," *Issues and Studies* 29, no. 4 (April 1993): 77-78.

¹⁹ Chen Youwei, *Tiananmen Shijianhou Zhonggong yu Meiguo Waijiao Niemu* [The Inside Stories of Diplomacy between China and the US after the Tiananmen Incident] (Hong Kong: Zhongzheng Shuju, 1999), pp. 200-11.

1994 and ASEAN's comprehensive dialogue partner in 1996. Since then, China has actively participated in what they called "*shanhui jizhi*" (three meeting mechanism) of ASEAN Foreign Ministerial Meeting, Enlarged ASEAN Foreign Ministerial Meeting, and ARF.²⁰

The Asian financial crisis that started in summer 1997 provided a good opportunity for China to further improve its relations with Southeast Asian countries. Although China was not immune from its effect, it withstood the crisis better than many of its neighbors. As the World Bank indicated in the aftermath of the crisis, "China's growth is one source of stability for the region."²¹ Beijing's leaders took a policy of "stand-by-Asia" and even sent several billion dollars in aid to afflicted Southeast Asian economies. In response to the speculation that China would have to devalue its currency, Renminbi, under the economic pressures, China's premier, Zhu Rongji, repeatedly promised to maintain its stability. A Chinese devaluation would have set off competitive devaluation across the region. This "beggar thy neighbor" competition could undo Southeast Asian countries' recovery efforts and would have devastating economic and political consequences for the whole region. China's positive response to the crisis in comparison to Japan's paralysis helped China gain influence very significantly. Because Southeast Asia now depended, to a hitherto unprecedented degree, on China's ability to stabilize its currency, China hereby significantly improved its relations with Southeast Asian countries, particularly in economic terms. During the Asian financial crisis, China obtained the power to shape Asia-Pacific development in ways that it never had previously. As a result, at the first ASEAN-plus-1 summit meeting between the leaders of nine ASEAN members and Chinese president Jiang Zemin in Kuala Lumpur in December 1997, a joint declaration was published to establish a good-neighboring and mutual-trust partnership between China and ASEAN oriented towards the 21st century.²²

In the 1990s China also significantly improved relations with its neighbors in the north and northwest. Formal diplomatic relations with South Korea were established on August 24,

²⁰ Yan, *Zhongguo de Jueqi* [The Rise of China], p. 287.

²¹ The World Bank, *Global Economic Prospects and Developing Countries, 1998/99: Beyond Financial Crisis* (Washington DC: World Bank, 1999), p. 34.

²² Wang Yong, "China, ASEAN Stress Peace: Summit Agrees on Approach," *China Daily*, December 17, 1997, p. 1.

1992, which marked the success of China's policy to secure balanced relationship with both South and North Korea. To continue maintaining the balance relationship, Beijing was very careful not to anger North Korea; to this end it refrained from developing any military contact and security relations with South Korea. Instead, it focused on bilateral trade and investment relations with the South while it made every effort to keep strategic relations with the North. In this position, China hoped to better defend its interests in the future reunification process of two Koreas. As You Ji indicated, "this strategy envisages the likely orientation of China's strategic interest in a Korea that is reunified, peacefully. China hopes to see that there will not be a U.S. military presence after Korea's reunification. It hopes to see that the reunified Korea will take a position that is pro-China rather than pro-Japan."²³

Following the disintegration of the Soviet Union, China also secured a good start with the newly independent central Asian states of Kazakhstan, Tajikistan, Kyrgyzstan, Uzbekistan, and Turkmenistan in 1992. Three of the five central Asian states share borders of more than 3,000 kilometers with China. Securing its relations with these countries is crucially important to ensure China's border area stability and energy supplies, or as a *Wall Street Journal* report indicated, to "buttress the twin pillars of its future economic growth: political stability and plentiful energy."²⁴ According to this report, China shared with these countries the concern that radical Islam, inspired by the example of Taliban-controlled Afghanistan, would stir ethnic and popular revolt. China's westernmost region is inhabited by Turkic-speaking Muslim Uighurs, and it fears fundamentalist fervor. Russia has been bogged down in guerrilla war with Muslim nationalists in Chechnya. Tajikistan, Kyrgyzstan and Uzbekistan have cast militant Islam as their main enemy. This common concern led these countries to work with China to contain ethnic fundamentalism. Eager to prevent Islamic militancy from fueling separatism in Xinjiang, China has dispatched waves of senior politicians and military delegations to Central Asia. It gave parachutes, medicine and other supplies to airborne forces and border guards in Tajikistan, which has been convulsed by civil war. It also pledged military aid to Uzbekistan, which has been raided annually by an

²³ You Ji, "China and North Korea: A Fragile Relationship of Strategic Convenience," *Journal of Contemporary China* 10, no. 28 (2001): 396.

²⁴ Andrew Higgins and Charles Hutzler, "China Sees Key Role For Central Asia In Ensuring Energy Supplies, Stability," *Wall Street Journal*, June 14, 2001.

Afghanistan-based opposition group called the Islamic Movement of Uzbekistan. Another important issue on the agenda for China's relations with these central Asian states is energy supplies, as these countries could be an excellent source for China's future energy supplies. According to this report, China's own conservative estimates show oil imports filling half the six million barrels a day it will need by 2010, up from just under a third today and zero less than a decade ago. Its need for natural gas, too, is projected to soar fivefold, to 3.9 trillion cubic feet. To meet demand, China has been exploring frantically in Xinjiang, a search Exxon and other energy giants have joined at various times, and also invested in two oil fields in Kazakstan.²⁵

To maintain good relations with bordering central Asian states, Chinese president Jiang Zemin took a lead in the "Treaty of Enhancing Military Mutual Trust in the Border Areas" signed by China, Russia, Kazakhstan, Tajikistan, and Kyrgyzstan in Shanghai in April 1996. This group has since then been known as the "Shanghai Five." At first, the Shanghai Five was designed as a talking shop on minor issues of borders and territory among China and its Central Asian neighbors. Yet in a few short years, the group has begun to address political and military questions, and shared problems like organized crime. The five countries signed a "Treaty of Mutual Reduction of Military Forces in the Border Areas" in April 1997. At its June 2001 meeting in Beijing, the Shanghai Five accepted a new member, Uzbekistan, and agreed to meet under a new name, the Shanghai Cooperation Organization. These six countries agreed on political, military and intelligence cooperation for the purpose of "cracking down on terrorism, separatism, extremism" and to maintain "regional security." Reportedly, Iran, Mongolia, India, and Pakistan are interested in joining the organization, which Chinese president Jiang called the "Shanghai Pact." A Western observer believed that the use of Shanghai Pact is perhaps intended "to evoke the former Warsaw Pact." According to this observer, "Together, the Shanghai Pact countries have a population of 1.5 billion; they control thousands of strategic and tactical nuclear weapons, and this combined conventional military forces number 3.6 million."²⁶ It was from this perspective that an Australian newspaper report stated that "The newly formed Shanghai Co-operation Organization, bracketing China, Russia and four Central Asian republics, is poised to emerge as

²⁵ Ibid.

²⁶ Constantine C. Menges, "Russia, China and What's Really on the Table," *Washington Post*, July 29, 2001, p. B2.

a potent force against United States influence and a rising tide of Islamic militancy in the region.”²⁷ A reporter of *The Christian Science Monitor* also believed that

The Shanghai meeting of Russia, China, and four Central Asian nations is an effort to develop an organization that could one day offer a modest geopolitical counterweight to Western alliances. Its timing and substance are considered significant, with Russia and China already drawing closer after signing a number of bilateral agreements.²⁸

Indeed, Beijing’s relationship with Russia improved spectacularly in recent decades. The most important factors that brought these former communist giants close were twofold. First, the Soviet/Russian search for security and economic reform matched China’s yearning for stability in the aftermath of Tiananmen. Second, both countries were resentful over the high-handed behavior of the United States. While growing American pressure increasingly irritated China, the Western reluctance to provide large-scale assistance disappointed Russia. Thus, “there was an increasing convergence of views between Moscow and Beijing over the need to create alternative poles in world affairs to the one dominated by the US.”²⁹ This convergence of views paved the way for the improvement in Sino-Russian relations.

Following Boris Yeltsin’s first official visit to China in December 1992, Beijing and Moscow institutionalized a twice-a-year summit meeting system at president and premier levels. A Western observer found that this sustained summit diplomacy was similar to “the Gorbachev-Reagan (the Yeltsin-Bush) summits” in 1985-92, which helped put an end to the Cold War.³⁰ Jiang and Yeltsin met five times in six years by the end of 1997. In spite of Yeltsin’s critical health situation, the sixth summit was held in a Moscow hospital in November 1998 and Yeltsin visited Beijing for the seventh summit in December 1999. The 1999 Sino-Russian Summit cul-

²⁷ John Schauble, “Russia-China Alliance Emerges as a Foil to US,” *Sydney Morning Herald*, June 16, 2001.

²⁸ Robert Marquand, “Central Asians Group to Counterweigh US: Russia, China, and Four Republics Meet to Expand Solidarity and Oppose Separatism,” *Christian Science Monitor*, June 15, 2001.

²⁹ Peter Ferdinand, “China and Russia: A Strategic Partnership?” *China Review* (Autumn/Winter 1997): 19.

³⁰ Henri Eyraud, “From Confrontation to Partnership,” *China Strategic Review* 3, no. 1 (Spring 1998): 158.

minated in a landmark Joint Communiqué criticizing American hegemony and denouncing “human rights interventions” by foreign countries. China officially declared Chechnya a matter for Russia, stating, “The Chinese side supports the government of the Russian Republic’s action in fighting terrorism and splitism forces.” For its part, the Russians officially supported China’s sovereignty over Taiwan. The communiqué criticized the United States both for its attempt to undermine the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty, as well as for its refusal to ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. The communiqué states, “The Russian side supports the Chinese side in opposing the position of any country under any form of bringing the Chinese province of Taiwan into a (anti-missile defense) plan.”³¹

The Sino-Russian relationship was first defined as a “constructive partnership” in 1994 and “strategic” was added in the Sino-Russian Joint Communiqué published on April 25, 1996, four days after the publication of U.S.-Japanese Joint Security Statement on April 17, 1996. This relationship was finalized as a “strategic cooperative partnership oriented towards the 21st Century” in 1997. After the retirement of Yeltsin, Chinese leaders continued the partnership with Yeltsin’s successor, Vladimir Putin. At the July 2001 summit in Moscow, the presidents of the two former communist powers signed the Good Neighborly Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation to defend mutual interests and boost trade. Although the treaty may be a marriage of convenience in that both China and Russia faced pressure of the only superpower, the United States, after the end of the Cold War, it was significant in terms of the improvement of the bilateral relationship between these two former communist giants. As one observer indicated, “since their first meeting in 2000, Putin and Jiang have met eight times to coordinate what the new treaty describes as their ‘work together to preserve the global strategic balance’.”³² Reuters’ report also indicated that this friendship pact “provided a legal framework for friendship now re-established after decades of mistrust over border and ideological disputes.”³³

³¹ *Renmin Ribao*, December 13, 1999, p. 1.

³² Menges, “Russia, China,” p. B2.

³³ Reuters, “Russia and China Sign Friendship Agreement,” *New York Times*, July 16, 2001.

The Sino-Russian partnership resulted in the declaration of the demarcation of the eastern section of Sino-Russian border at the Jiang-Yeltsin Beijing summit in November 1997. A *China Daily* commentary celebrated that

After six years of close cooperation on the basis of consultation, mutual understanding and mutual concessions, the 4,300-odd-kilometer frontier will become a landmark of peace and friendship between the two countries and peoples, laying a solid foundation for stronger good-neighborly relations and regional stability and prosperity.³⁴

As a result of successfully implementing the periphery policy, China's security along its borders has been substantially improved. China becomes more confident in its security environment when there is less immediate military threat to China's security. A Chinese official publication proudly declared that "Today, looking around our neighboring areas from east to west and from north to south, we have basically established a relatively stable periphery environment around our neighboring areas. Our country has established good neighboring relations with all our neighbors. This is the best period since the founding of the PRC."³⁵

Challenges to China's Security Environment in the Asia-Pacific

China's periphery policy has served its interest in establishing a stable regional environment and promoting economic modernization along pragmatic lines. There is no reason to doubt the sincerity of Beijing's leaders in furthering good relations with neighbors when Jiang Zemin, at his report to the 15th CCP National Congress in October 1997, stated that "China's modernization requires a stable international environment" in Asia as elsewhere.³⁶ China's ability to develop good neighboring relations was certainly enhanced by the successful power transfer from Deng Xiaoping to Jiang Zemin at the 15th CCP's National Congress in September 1997. This new leadership has made it clear that China's best interest is to make cooperation rather than conflict in Asia.

³⁴ Commentary, "A Productive Summit," *China Daily*, November 12, 1997, p. 4.

³⁵ Tian Peizeng, ed., [Chinese Diplomacy], p. 20.

³⁶ Jiang Zemin's report to the 15th National Congress of the CCP, October 16, 1997.

However, China still faces many serious challenges if it wants to further improve its security environment in the periphery. Although Beijing's leaders have declared the victory of the good neighboring policy, the success has largely been along its land borders in the North and West. The security environment along China's East and South frontiers, particularly the coastal frontiers where China's major economic and political centers are located, have not been improved as much. Some new problems have also occurred in these areas. In particular, there are at least four sets of challenges that Beijing's leaders have found difficult. One is divisive territorial disputes with several neighbors; the second is rivalry with other regional powers; the third is the fear of its weak neighbors of the threat of China; and the fourth is the management of the most important relationship with the United States.

China's Border Disputes with Neighbors

The first challenge is to settle border disputes in the following three categories.³⁷ The first category is land boundaries. Before the arrival of Western imperialist powers, territorial boundaries along China's frontiers had little significance under the tributary system. After the decline of the Chinese Empire in the 19th century, Western powers not only took over many of China's tributaries, but also pushed the frontiers forward into areas that China would have preferred to control itself. These new frontiers were often institutionalized in what China called "unequal treaties." As a result, after the founding of the PRC, communist leaders in Beijing found themselves in a series of territorial disputes with its neighbors. The second category is the so-called "lost" territories: Hong Kong, Macao, and Taiwan. The third category is maritime boundaries involving both bilateral and multilateral relations. Bilaterally, China is in dispute with Vietnam over the demarcation of the Tonkin Gulf and with Japan over the Senkaku Islands (Diaoyutai in Chinese), a group of rocky islets lying on the edge of the continental shelf about 100 miles north-east of Taiwan. Japan considers these islets as part of the Ryukyus, whereas China claims them as part of the Taiwan province and therefore part of China. The major multilateral dispute is over the Spratly/Nansha islands in the South China Sea, which is believed to be a potentially

³⁷ Harold C. Hinton characterized them into four categories and I regroup them into three. Harold C. Hinton, "China as an Asian Power," in Thomas W. Robinson and David Shambaugh, eds., *Chinese Foreign Policy: Theory and Practice* (Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press, 1995), pp. 352-57.

resource-rich region possessing oil deposits. Beijing draws a maritime boundary running from Taiwan southwestward virtually along the coasts of the Philippines and East Malaysia and Brunei, and then northward more or less along the coast of Vietnam. The Philippines, Malaysia, Brunei, and Vietnam have disputed this claim.

Border issues are related to sovereignty, which is Beijing's most important concern in its foreign relations. Beijing has been firm in negotiations over all three categories of territorial disputes. Some progress towards the settlement of these disputes has been made, albeit very limited. The most important progress is over land dispute with Russia, which shares a total of 4300-odd-kilometer borders with China: about 4245 kilometers on the Manchurian sections and 55 kilometers between Kazakstan and Mongolia. China made progress in this settlement primarily because most of the areas in question do not in general contain Chinese populations. China signed the first border agreement in May 1991 with the USSR on the Manchurian sections of the common border. In September 1994, the second agreement was reached on the delimitation of the Sino-Russian border in the Altai region, between Mongolia and Kazakhstan. Ratified in 1996, it led to the concrete demarcation in 1997. The Sino-Russian Joint Statement in November 1997 promises that the two sides "will complete demarcation of the Western section of the Sino-Russian border within the agreed period of time."³⁸ The Chinese-Russian Border Demarcation Commission was disbanded upon finishing its work in April 1999, when more than 2,084 border signs and markers along their borders were set up and 2,444 islands on the border rivers were divided. About 1,163 of these islands go to Russia and the others go to China. The only unsettled territories are three large islands: two on the Ussuri River and one on the Argun River, all of which are currently controlled by Russia.

The Chinese government has been extremely firm on the second category of territory disputes because it believes that people in these territories are ethnically and historically Chinese. Taking back these territories involves not only the vital security interest of China but also the legitimacy of the regime. Beijing recovered Hong Kong in 1997 and Macao in 1999. Taiwan is now the focus of dispute in this category. Beijing has tried to use the same method to recover Taiwan as it did with Hong Kong and Macao, offering economic inducement and proposing a "one country, two systems" formula since the early 1980s. But this peaceful offense has not

³⁸ "Sino-Russian Joint Statement on Relations," *China Daily*, November 12, 1997, p. 4.

achieved its objectives. While total trade across the Strait rose from \$5 billion in 1990 to \$25 billion in 1997 and to \$32.386 billion in 2000, making Taiwan the second (after Japan) largest supplier to the mainland and China the third largest market of Taiwanese goods, the political relationship between the two governments remains officially nonexistent and hostile. In frustration and to show its determination, Beijing launched a series of military exercises in the Taiwan Strait in 1995-96.³⁹ However, military coercion has not stopped Taiwan's political centrifugal tendency either. President Lee Teng-hui proposed a "special state-to-state relationship" in July 1999 in spite of Beijing's military threat. Chen Shui-ban, the candidate of the pro-independent party, DPP, was elected as Taiwan's 10th president in the fiercely contested 2000 election. Although Beijing has made it clear that it is willing to fight a war if necessary to recover Taiwan, it still has to be concerned about the reactions of the United States and other Asian-Pacific countries, as well as the resultant rupture of China's economic development. Beijing's leaders have been left very little room to maneuver in this effort of national reunification.⁴⁰

The progress in the third category of disputes is extremely limited. In the cases of dispute over Tonkin Gulf and Senkaku/Diaoyutai islands, no agreement or compromise has been reached with Vietnam and Japan. In the South China Sea, while Beijing has shown a certain degree of flexibility by suggesting "shelving the disputes and working for joint development" (*gezhi zhengyi, gongtong kaifa*), China's maritime neighbors have been very assertive in contesting Beijing's sovereignty claims. As one study indicated, "although China has offered joint development to other claimants, its concept of joint development seems to involve joint development of the producing oil and gas fields on other claimants' continental shelves—and then only after China's sovereignty has been recognized."⁴¹ In addition, as the same study pointed out, Beijing has continued to "insist on bilateral solutions and its interest and sincerity in participating in a multilateral cooperative solution remains in doubt." China's position has been criticized and

³⁹ For a study of this crisis, see Suisheng Zhao, ed., *Across the Taiwan Strait: Mainland China, Taiwan, and the 1995-1996 Crisis* (New York: Routledge, 1999).

⁴⁰ Suisheng Zhao, "Deadlock: Beijing's National Reunification Strategy After Lee Teng-hui," *Problems of Post-Communism* 48, no. 2 (March-April, 2001): 42-51.

⁴¹ Mark J. Valencia, Hon M. Van Dyke, and Noel A. Ludwig, *Sharing the Resources of the South China Sea* (Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii Press, 1997), pp. 77 and 99.

even ridiculed by other claimants in the South China Sea. Although Beijing and Hanoi reached an agreement in defining their disputed 1,300-kilometer land border after Chinese Premier Zhu Rongji wrapped up his visit to Vietnam in December 1999, no resolution was found over the two large islands groups, the Paracels and the Spratlys, over which China claims sovereignty. China has occupied the Paracels since 1974, and in 1988 it had a military clash with Vietnam over them. Vietnam also still occupies most of the Spratlys, but the Philippines has stepped up its claims over them in recent years. Protesting Chinese construction activity on Filipino-claimed Mischief Reef in 1998, the Philippine military set up patrols in the disputed archipelago and announced that the Philippine navy would fire warning shots if Chinese vessels got closer than five miles to its patrols.⁴² Beijing has not given up its claims of sovereignty over these islands because they are extremely important for China's security and energy supply. Sovereignty claims over these islands keep all of China's options open regarding resources, should any be discovered. However, Beijing's sovereignty claim may eventually bring China into conflict with all the countries in Southeast Asia. Were that to happen, "China's ability to use force is constrained by the possible reactions of the United States, Japan, and ASEAN, which would probably view such action as an attempt by Beijing to dominate the South China Sea."⁴³ Although the sovereignty claim is crucially important for Beijing's leaders, it is certainly an extremely difficult decision for them to squander China's military resources and their political capital to seize these barren flyspecks.

Rivalry with Other Regional Powers

The second major challenge to China's peripheral security is how to work with other regional powers, namely, Japan and India, to secure peace and stability together in the Asian-Pacific region.

For obvious historical and geopolitical reasons, China's relationship with Japan has always been difficult. Japan was China's most cruel and destructive enemy for a half century between 1895 to 1945. Japan also allied with the United States to contain China, before these two countries established diplomatic relations in 1972. Although a Sino-Japan peace treaty was

⁴² UPI news, November 12, 1998.

⁴³ Valencia, et al., *Sharing the Resources*, p. 88.

signed in 1978, this formally friendly relationship has been largely superficial. While China has regarded Japan as a successful model of economic modernization and tried to lure Japanese trade and investments, Japan has been unwilling to build up a potential rival unnecessarily. Japanese loans and investment have come to China only on a modest scale for years. According to one study, in the period between 1980 and 1996, the total amount of Japanese investment in China was \$14.6 billion in comparison to \$34.6 billion from the four small East Asian Tigers of Hong Kong, South Korea, Singapore, and Taiwan.⁴⁴

Disappointed, Beijing's leaders have blamed Japan for its arrogant and unfair trading practices. In particular, they have been extremely alert to any signs of Japan's remilitarization. Beijing has played the "guilt card" as a weapon. During Jiang Zemin's visit to Japan in November 1998, the first visit by a PRC president, Jiang reminded Japanese leaders at almost every public occasion that the past is far from forgiven or forgotten. Beijing has done everything to discourage Japan from aspiring to leadership of the region or taking on a greater global or regional political role. At a seminar on Northeast Asian Security held in Shanghai, Chinese strategists asserted that "Northeast Asia is the only region where China has a strategic advantage. One of China's strategic goals should be to delay Japan's advancement toward becoming a major military power."⁴⁵

However, China's strategy has not been very effective. When President Jiang visited Japan expecting to dominate the scene, the Japanese refused to give a formal written apology for war atrocities even though South Korea had received this apology earlier, and refused to exclude the Taiwan Strait from its security agreement with the United States. Japan also refused to utter the "three no's" (no support to Taiwan independence; no support to one China, one Taiwan; and no support to Taiwan's bid to join the United Nations) on the Taiwan issue, although President Clinton had made the pledge in his visit to Beijing earlier. In the meantime, no matter what China thinks, Japan has taken a more and more critical position on China's military modernization efforts. As June Teufel Dryer indicated, "China's economic growth was accompanied by

⁴⁴ Xiaomin Rong, "Explaining the Patterns of Japanese Foreign Direct Investment in China," *Journal of Contemporary China* 8, no. 20 (March 1999): 132.

⁴⁵ Ren Xiao, "Tongbeiyia anquan xingshi de xianzhuang yu weilai" [The Current and Future Security Situation in Northeast Asia], *Guoji Zhanwang* [International Outlook], no. 7 (1996): 11.

increase in the defense budget that averaged 12-13% each year. Given the absence of any external invasion threat and the presence of many domestic problems, this worried the PRC neighbors. Japan began to complain about the lack of transparency in Beijing's defense decision-making."⁴⁶ In response, Japan has made China the major target of its national defense strategy. It is hard, in this case, to be optimistic about the future relationship between these two important countries in the Asia-Pacific region. Their rivalry is certainly a major challenge to the success of China's periphery policy.

India is another budding rival of China in Asia. Although these two countries made friends by working together in the promotion of the national independent movement in the third world during the 1950s, they became enemies and fought a border war in 1962. Sino-Indian relationship began to improve in the late 1980s. China and India signed two agreements on maintaining peace and tranquility and confidence building measures in the border area in 1993 and 1996 respectively. President Jiang Zemin visited India in November 1996. Even as Beijing was cultivating a more friendly relationship with New Delhi, it was shocked by India's going nuclear in May 1998 and Indian Defense Minister George Fernandes' characterization of China as "a major threat to Indian security."⁴⁷ Beijing was furious and accused India "running against the international trend of peace."⁴⁸

However, this event was not a bolt from the blue. Sino-Indian geopolitical rivalry has never stopped in the following three issue-areas. The first is the Pakistan issue. While China has sought to improve relations with India, it has maintained a long-term strategic partnership with Pakistan, against which India has waged three wars against in the five decades since its independence. New Delhi believes that China has used the Sino-Pakistan alliance to check the growing influence of India in Asia. Tibet is the second issue. Although India has publicly affirmed Beijing's position that Tibet is part of China, it did not welcome China's incorporation of Tibet, which otherwise might serve as a buffer between these two countries. China has been irritated that India has allowed the Dalai Lama and his exile government to reside in Dharmasala and to

⁴⁶ June Teufel Dryer, "Sino-Japanese Relations," *Journal of Contemporary China* 10, no. 28 (2001): 375.

⁴⁷ China News Digest-Global (electronic news), December 12, 1998.

⁴⁸ *China Daily*, May 19, 1998, p. 4.

campaign for Tibetan independence. The third issue is the two segments of the 2,500 mile Sino-India border that are still disputed: the southeastern Himalayan Mountains, now administered by India, and the Aksai Chin Plateau, through which a major Chinese highway links Tibet and Xinjiang. Solutions to these troubled issues have to be found in order for China to establish a truly good neighboring relationship with India.

The China Threat to its Weaker Neighbors

With its rapid economic growth, China has been regarded as the coming superpower in the 21st century. This realization has given rise to the speculation about a “China threat,” particularly among China’s weak neighbors. They worry that, after China modernizes, Beijing would like to have East Asia as its exclusive sphere of influence, a modern equivalent of the traditional tributary system. Beijing has denied this speculation and offered repeated assurance that “China will never seek hegemony.”⁴⁹ However, this assurance has not eased the fear of China’s weaker neighbors.

To be objective, military expansion cannot be considered a serious Chinese objective at least in the foreseeable future. China lacks the military power and faces immense internal and external challenges to an expansionist policy in Asia. The presence and influence of the United States and the strength of dynamic regional powers, such as Japan and India, have defined and will continue to define the boundaries within which China’s power may be asserted. Unless unforeseeable vacuums of power develop in Asia, it is difficult to conceive of China acquiring the hegemonic role that the United States long had in the Western Hemisphere or that the USSR played in Eastern Europe.

However, there is a perception gap between China and its weaker neighbors: “China, viewing itself in global terms, does not always realize how strong it is when placed in regional context. The rest of Asia, viewing China in a regional perspective, does not always realize how weak it is on a global scale.”⁵⁰ In this case, although China remains relatively weak in many of the measurable indicators of power, China’s weaker neighbors see China in terms of its considerable potentials and the long historic record of cultural and political domination of the region.

⁴⁹ Jiang Zemin’s report to the 15th National Congress of the CCP, October 16, 1997.

⁵⁰ Levine, *China in Asia*.

China is slow to understand and properly respond to the suspicion and fear of its weaker neighbors. Talking about China's relations with Southeast Asian countries, for example, a Chinese scholar believed that "as soon as the mutual trust is established, good neighboring relations and partnerships would be able to be complete." He asserted that "the foundation for the mutual trust has been laid. The only problems are to overcome some barriers to the mutual trusts."⁵¹ However, the nature of the relationship is much more ambivalent than this understanding. As one Western scholar indicated, "while most of ASEAN's policies towards China are guided by the economic perspectives of a huge Chinese market, explaining ASEAN's constructive engagement strategy towards China, Beijing's ambiguous foreign and security policies are simultaneously a major concern in the region."⁵² According to this scholar, "The rapid modernization programs of China's armed forces (including its nuclear arsenal), Beijing's territorial claims in the entire South China Sea and its gunboat policies towards Taiwan have raised widespread concern over irredentist tendencies in China's foreign security agenda."⁵³ The fear of the perceived China threat is partially responsible for stimulating a rush to arms in many Asian-Pacific countries after the end of the Cold War.⁵⁴ Many of China's weak neighbors have determined to enhance their defense self-reliance capacities and military preparedness to better deal with regional contingencies.

This ambivalent relationship has been further complicated by China's traditional attitudes toward its weaker neighbors. While pursuing a good neighboring policy, it continues to see periphery countries with a degree of condescension. Taking the example of China's attitudes

⁵¹ Zhang Xizheng, "Zhongguo tong dongmeng de muling huxin huoban guanxi" [The Good Neighboring, Mutual Trust, and Partnership between China and ASEAN], in Zheng Yushou, ed., *Huolengzhan shiqi de zhongguo waijiao* [Chinese Diplomacy in the Post-Cold War Era] (Hong Kong: Tiandi Tushu, 1999), p. 224.

⁵² Frank Umbach, "ASEAN and Major Powers: Japan and China—A Changing Balance of Power?" in Jorn Dosch and Manfred Mols, eds., *International Relations in the Asia-Pacific: New Patterns of Power, Interest, and Cooperation* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2000), p. 174.

⁵³ Ibid.

⁵⁴ For one illumination of the arms race post-Cold War Asia-Pacific, see Desmond Ball, "Arms and Affluence: Military Acquisitions in the Asia-Pacific Region," *International Security* 18, no. 3 (Winter 1993/94): 78-112.

toward Vietnam, a weaker neighbor that China ruled for centuries in history, the Chinese still view their influence in Vietnam as generous and civilizing. Deng Xiaoping justified China's invasion in 1979 in terms of teaching a lesson to the disrespectful Vietnamese who enjoyed substantial Chinese support during the war against the Americans but sided with the Soviet Union and challenged Chinese sovereignty over the islands in the South China Sea after the war. Vietnam joined ASEAN, a high-profile international organization, to reduce its isolation and vulnerability to the Chinese threat in 1995. Apparently, Chinese leaders have been displeased to see Vietnam's membership in ASEAN. However, they have no option but to live with the fact that their weaker neighbors could make alliance in coping with China. How to handle this situation is certainly a serious challenge to China's periphery policy.

Relations with the United States

Managing the relationship with the United States, the only superpower in the post-Cold War World, is the most significant challenge for China to establish a positive security environment in its periphery. The United States is a forwardly deployed power in Asia-Pacific, maintains formal security treaties with Japan and South Korea, and is the primary weapon supplier to Taiwan. Whether or not Beijing can successfully handle the above-mentioned other challenges, to a large extent, depends on the nature and level of American involvement in Asia and on the U.S. policy toward China. The United States has the ability to influence China's periphery policy by affecting the policies of some of China's neighbors and the overall security environment in the Asian-Pacific region. However, China's ability to influence U.S. policy is very limited because it does not have much leverage over U.S. policy, which is largely a hostage to its domestic politics.

The Sino-U.S. relationship has been on a roller coaster since Tiananmen. It deteriorated after 1989 and warmed up briefly during the period between President Jiang's visit to Washington in October-November 1997 and President Clinton's visit to Beijing in June-July 1998. However, Sino-U.S. relations have been under strain again since late 1998. The U.S. Congress was angry over charges of China's nuclear spying and political payoffs, the Clinton administration's careless handling of U.S. technology transfer to China, reports of China's new suppression of political dissidents, import obstacles as the Chinese economy slowed, and the PLA missile build-up along the Taiwan Strait. As the domestic criticism over the Clinton administration's engage-

ment policy increased, the Sino-U.S. relationship was pushed onto a difficult path. Chinese Premier Zhu Rongji's visit to Washington in April 1999 failed to halt this down-turn. The NATO bombing of the Chinese embassy on May 7, 1999 further pushed these two countries toward the edge of confrontation. Although the downward spiral was temporarily arrested, the relationship, as a Chinese scholar indicated, was "stabilized only at a low level" in the last months of the Clinton administration.⁵⁵

When George W. Bush took the White House in January 2001, Chinese leaders became especially concerned about the outlook for U.S.-China relations as Bush had termed China a "strategic competitor" rather than the partner that President Clinton had termed it earlier. This concern proved real as a series of incidents in the first four months after Bush took office seriously strained Sino-American ties. The most important one was the accidental mid-air collision between a U.S. Navy EP-13 spy plane and a Chinese fighter jet on the South China Sea on April 1, 2001. Although this incident was finally resolved without lasting impact, the Sino-U.S. relationship was further strained. As a *Washington Post* article reported in the aftermath of the crisis, "China's leaders are increasingly concerned that Washington and Beijing are headed for a confrontation as China emerges as an economic and military power in Asia."⁵⁶ A series of actions taken by the Bush administration in its first 100 days of tenure seemed to confirm Beijing's concerns. Bush backed a national missile defense system, which China feared would negate its nuclear deterrent. Over Chinese objections, the U.S. government permitted Taiwanese President Chen Shui-bian unprecedented access to the United States, allowing him to stop twice in America and meet lawmakers in his transit visit to New York City and Houston in June 2001. Bush also shelved the peace process for the Korean Peninsula and hosted the Tibetan spiritual leader, the Dalai Lama, at the White House. He approved a multibillion-dollar weapons package for Taiwan in May 2001, including, for the first time, offensive weapons such as submarines. A pro-China Hong Kong magazine listed all these actions and believed that

Although it is still hard to say that the United States is ready to invade China, all this showed that the United States was indeed openly creating a tense military

⁵⁵ Jia Qingguo, "Frustrations and Hopes: Chinese Perceptions of the Engagement Policy Debate in the United States," *Journal of Contemporary China* 10, no. 27 (May 2001): 325.

⁵⁶ John Pomfret, "China Growing Uneasy about US Relations," *Washington Post*, June 23, 2001, p. A1.

confrontation atmosphere and raising the political pressure against China for the purpose of driving China into a war panic.⁵⁷

The deterioration of Sino-U.S. relations is certainly not conducive to China's effort to secure its periphery. China's foreign policy establishment has been worried that the foundations are being set now for long-term aggressive competition with the United States. This is not something that these Chinese leaders want to see. However, handling relations with the United States has always been difficult for the Chinese leaders since the end of the Cold War. Many Chinese leaders, particularly those in the PLA, have been deeply suspicious about U.S. containment policy dressed as engagement. They have pointed out that while preaching strict Chinese compliance with international arms control agreements in the name of regional stability, the United States has increased its arms sales to Taiwan and strengthened its defense links with Japan and South Korea. China has been particularly alarmed over the U.S. announcement to build the Theater Missile Defense (TMD) system covering the Asia-Pacific following a surprise North Korean rocket test in 1998. TMD may not only be used to protect Taiwan from Chinese missiles but also to give Japan a more active role in regional security matters. The U.S. military intervention in Yugoslavia has seriously fed China's paranoia about Taiwan and Tibet. To add to this concern, China has seen the decision by the Philippine Senate on May 28, 1999 to reopen its territory for joint exercises with U.S. forces as another link in an American chain of containment against China. China has been particularly apprehensive about the shift of the U.S. military and strategic focus from the Atlantic to the Pacific, which would have serious consequence on China's periphery policy. An article in Beijing's *Liaowang Zhoukan* (Outlook Weekly) speculated that in the Asian-Pacific Region, "following the 'new US-Japanese defense guidelines,' the United States will step up its deployment of Theater Missile Defense and strengthen its military alliance, and the possibility of the establishment of an 'eastern NATO' cannot be ruled out." It further indicated that

In line with the shift of the focus of US military strategy from Europe to Asia, the US military will redeploy its forces in the west Pacific, step up activities by mili-

⁵⁷ "US Policy of Containing China: Result of Biased, Lopsided Information," *Guangjiaojing* [Wide-Angle Mirror], no. 344 (May 16, 2001): 33.

tary planes and ships, expand the scope and frequency of its aggressive reconnaissance against China, and step up activities for advance military probing.⁵⁸

China cannot change the U.S. forward deployment and the web of alliance in Asia, at least in the foreseeable future. Therefore, working with the United States is not a choice but a necessity. Beijing has to find ways to stabilize relations with the United States in order to create a favorable regional environment for its periphery policy. Confrontation with the United States will not only complicate China's periphery policy but also render a high cost for its modernization efforts. As one Western reporter pointed out, "the direction of Beijing's relations with the United States could exert a strong influence on China's development plans, forcing funds to be funneled into defense spending instead of economic growth."⁵⁹

Conclusion

To establish and maintain a peaceful security environment in its periphery, China has tried to appear as a benign power that focused on economic development and has tried to improve relations with its Asian neighbors. However, it has been assertive and even belligerent when dealing with issues relating to what it considers as vital national interests, such as territorial disputes. These two-pronged efforts have often transmitted conflicting signals to its neighbors and make it difficult for China to meet the challenges discussed above. The disparity between China's belligerent behavior and "benign" face may bring uncertainties ahead in the Asia-Pacific, particularly considering the rapid growth of China's economic and military power toward the 21st century. China could become more assertive in taking back Taiwan and resolving maritime disputes in its own terms. China's regional rivals and weaker neighbors would have to be more concerned about China's might and threats. China's growing power could also rub against longstanding U.S. interests in Asia.

However, this situation has not seemed to bother Beijing's leaders very much. They have become more confident in dealing with their neighbors because of the increase in China's economic and military capacity. In his summary of the security environment for China's rise in the

⁵⁸ Shan Min, "What is the United States Intending to Do with its China Security Strategy," *Liaowang Zhoukan* [Outlook Weekly], no. 18 (April 30, 2001): 31.

⁵⁹ Pomfret, "China Growing Uneasy," p. A1.

Asia-Pacific, a Chinese scholar, Yan Xuetong, stated that China and its neighbors have shared the goal of their security strategy, as all of them have wanted to maintain regional peace and stability. It is not a surprise to any country that China as big power wants to be placed in an advantageous position in the strategic balance. This is a normal interest and demand in international politics and will not pose a threat to the security of other states. “China has shared certain common security interests with all peripheral countries and has no conflict in the overall interest with any countries although there are some contradictions in national border and reunification issues.”⁶⁰ But it remains to be seen if this optimistic view can prevail.

⁶⁰ Yan Xuetong, *Zhongguo de Jueqi* [The Rise of China], p. 238.

JAPAN'S REGIONAL SECURITY POLICY IN POST-COLD WAR ASIA

Lisa J. Sansoucy

Introduction: From Bilateralism to Multilateralism¹

Japan's approach to regional relations in Asia has often been characterized as economic multilateralism combined with security bilateralism.² However, in 1991 this dichotomy began to blur when, after years of opposition, Japanese leaders began to support multilateral approaches to the region's security problems as well. One example of this change in position is the diplomatic initiative known as the Nakayama Initiative. Under the leadership of Foreign Minister Nakayama Taro, Japan proposed the creation of a new regional multilateral security dialogue that would build on the existing Post-Ministerial Conference (PMC) of the Association of South-east Asian Nations (ASEAN).³ Prior to the Nakayama Initiative, like their American counterparts, Japanese leaders had been firmly opposed to the development of multilateral security institutions in Asia, fearing that these would undermine Japan's alliance with the United States.

Why did Japan change its position vis a vis Asian security multilateralism in the early 1990s? One reason is that in the wake of the Gulf War, Japan incurred heavy criticism for what many countries termed its "checkbook diplomacy," or its failure to contribute personnel to the multinational coalition assembled in the Gulf. In response to the criticism that Japan had been "self-indulgent" during the crisis and engaged in "contemptible tokenism," Japanese policy makers were keen to show the United States that they could take the initiative diplomatically in

¹ For their helpful comments and suggestions on this paper, I would like to thank the participants of the workshop "The United States and Asian Security," held at Cornell University in March 2001, especially Matthew Evangelista and Judith Reppy, as well as the members of the German Institute for Japanese Studies (D.I.J.) Social Science Study Group in Tokyo.

² See, for example, the collection of essays in Peter J. Katzenstein and Takashi Shiraishi, eds., *Network Power: Japan and Asia* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1997).

³ Paul Midford, "Japan's Leadership Role in East Asian Security: The Nakayama Proposal and the Logic of Reassurance," *Pacific Review* 13, no. 3 (2000): 382.

contributing to the maintenance of global security.⁴ In addition, they feared that with the end of the cold war and the disappearance of the Soviet threat, the United States would withdraw militarily from the region in the early 1990s. These fears were not unfounded. In 1990, the United States announced that it would make a ten percent reduction of its forces in the region.⁵ American forces also withdrew from the Subic Bay naval base in the Philippines in 1992. America's intentions regarding its long-term military commitment to the Asian region were not publicly clarified until 1995 when the so-called Nye Report, "U.S. Security Strategy for the East Asia-Pacific Region," was published.⁶ From the perspective of Tokyo, then, multilateralism was a useful tool to keep the United States engaged in the region and to respond to American demands for increased burden sharing.

Although Foreign Minister Nakayama's efforts to create a regional security dialogue met with only lukewarm support from ASEAN, as Peter Katzenstein notes, his diplomatic overtures did have three important effects on the security policies of the major powers in the region.⁷ First, the Nakayama Initiative propelled ASEAN into developing plans to set up its own multilateral security dialogue as part of the ASEAN-PMC. These plans eventually materialized into the ASEAN Regional Forum in 1994.⁸ Second, Japan's support for multilateralism in the early 1990s nudged the United States into changing its own position toward multilateral security

⁴ For an overview of the effects of the Gulf War on Japanese foreign policy, see Courtney Purington, "Tokyo's Policy Responses During the Gulf War and the Impact of the 'Iraqi Shock' on Japan," *Pacific Affairs* 65 (Summer 1992): 161-81. For an analysis of the effect of the Gulf War on U.S.-Japan relations, see Walter LaFeber, *The Clash: U.S.-Japan Relations Throughout History* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1997), pp. 385-89; For a sampling of the criticism of Japanese foreign policy after the Gulf War, see Robert J. Samuelson, "The Japan Problem," *Washington Post*, April 10, 1991; and Richard Cohen, "No Time for Hubris," *Washington Post*, February 28, 1991. The "tokenism" quote is from Senator John McCain in 1990, quoted in LaFeber, *The Clash*, p. 388; Interview No. 6, October, 2000, Tokyo.

⁵ Jurek Martin, "Adding Up the Security Equation," *Financial Times*, June 5, 1990, p. 23.

⁶ United States Department of Defense, Office of International Security Affairs, *U.S. Security Strategy for the East Asia-Pacific Region* (Washington, DC: February 1995).

⁷ Peter J. Katzenstein and Nobuo Okawara, "Japan and Asian-Pacific Security: Regionalization, Entrenched Bilateralism and Incipient Multilateralism," *Pacific Review* 14, pt. 2 (2001): 165-94.

⁸ Midford, "Japan's Leadership Role," p. 387.

arrangements in the Asia-Pacific region.⁹ Finally, the Nakayama Initiative gave Prime Minister Miyazawa Kōichi some political capital and maneuvering room in pushing for multilateral security initiatives in the early 1990s. These included the passage of the United Nations Peacekeeping Cooperation Bill in 1992 and Japan's contribution of unarmed Self-Defense Force (SDF) personnel and civilian police to the United Nations Transitional Authority in Cambodia (UNTAC).¹⁰ Nakayama's proposal failed to materialize, as Paul Midford has noted, but it did set the stage for the later establishment of the ASEAN Regional Forum.¹¹

To date, the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF) is the only multilateral security institution in the Asian region. It was founded in July 1994 by the six ASEAN member states at the time: Brunei, Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore, and Thailand and ASEAN's seven dialogue partners: the United States, Japan, Australia, New Zealand, Canada, South Korea, and the European Community. The ARF was designed as a means for consultations among member states on regional political and security issues. It was based on an extension of the already institutionalized Post-Ministerial Conference (PMC) within ASEAN. The ARF was originally composed of the six ASEAN states, the seven dialogue partners, plus the states that ASEAN wanted to engage: Russia, China, Vietnam, and Laos. Its goals are to increase confidence-building measures, preventive diplomacy, non-proliferation, and arms control in the Asian region.¹² The ARF also operates both inter-sessional support groups (ISG) and inter-sessional meetings (ISM), governmental working groups that focus on defense white papers, military observers, military exercises, the South China Sea, the creation of a nuclear weapons free zone, and peacekeeping operations.¹³

⁹ See James A. Baker, III, "America in Asia: Emerging Architecture for a Pacific Community," *Foreign Affairs* 70 (Winter 1991/1992): 1-18; Interview No. 7, Tokyo, January 24, 2001.

¹⁰ Katzenstein and Okawara, "Japan and Asian-Pacific Security," pp. 165-94; and Courtney Purrington, "Tokyo's Policy Responses," pp. 173-76.

¹¹ Midford, "Japan's Leadership Role," p. 388.

¹² See Amitav Acharya, "Regional Institutions and Security Order in Asia," paper prepared for the Workshop, "Security Order in the Asia-Pacific," Bali, Indonesia, May 29-June 2, 2000.

¹³ Alastair Iain Johnston, "The Myth of the ASEAN Way? Explaining the Evolution of the ASEAN Regional Forum," in *Imperfect Unions: Security Institutions over Time and Space*,

In addition to pressures from the United States for increased burden-sharing, Japanese security policy makers faced two major obstacles in formulating policy toward the ARF. The first is the “Japan Problem,” or the ways in which the history of Japan’s wartime aggression in the region continues to constrain its current security policy options. The second is the “China Problem,” or the lack of consensus among Japanese security policy makers over the nature of Chinese power and intentions. Both of these policy problems are explained in greater depth below.

The Japan Problem: “A Difficult Neighbor”

In constructing security policy toward the Asian region, Japanese policy makers are constrained by the legacies of the past. Japan’s history of aggression and colonialism in the region makes neighboring states extremely wary of any increases in Japan’s military activities in the region. These constraints operate across both Northeast and Southeast Asia. For example, when the Japanese government recently approved a new revisionist history textbook that glosses over Japan’s wartime atrocities in the region, the South Korean, North Korean, and Chinese governments registered strong protests. The textbook, created by Japan’s nationalist Society for History Textbook Reform, was approved by the Japanese government in April 2001. Among other omissions, it fails to mention that Japan invaded China in 1932, that the Japanese Army carried out large-scale civilian massacres in Nanjing in 1937, and that tens of thousands of Asian women were forced into sexual slavery by imperial Japanese forces in the 1930s and 1940s.¹⁴ South Korea’s reaction to the Japanese government’s refusal to order revisions in the textbook makes clear the linkage between historical memory and security policy in the region. Seoul promptly recalled its ambassador to Tokyo, cancelled a planned joint military exercise with Japan, and the South Korean National Assembly unanimously passed a resolution demanding that the govern-

Helga Haftendorn, Robert O. Keohane, and Celeste Wallander, eds. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), pp. 287-324.

¹⁴ The textbook euphemistically argues that “the Japanese Imperial Army advanced southwards to liberate countries from European colonialism.” See, “Most Japanese School Districts Reject Disputed History Textbook,” *New York Times*, August 16, 2001, p. A5.

ment block Japan's campaign for a seat on the United Nations Security Council.¹⁵ In Southeast Asia as well, Japan's initiatives in the region continue to be hamstrung by the specters of the past. For example, when Japan stepped up its exports to Southeast Asia in the 1960s and 1970s during the era of high economic growth, many Southeast Asian leaders viewed this as a continuation of Japan's colonial designs on the region in another guise.¹⁶ When Prime Minister Tanaka Kakuei visited the region in 1974 he was greeted with anti-Japanese demonstrations and boycotts of Japanese goods throughout the region. In Bangkok and Jakarta, these turned violent.¹⁷

As the vehemence of the Korean, Chinese, and Southeast Asian reactions show, Japanese policies toward the Asian region reverberate within an echo chamber in which the cries of the victims of Imperial Japan can still be heard. This is particularly well illustrated by the ongoing struggles of the Asian "comfort women" to gain recognition and compensation from the Japanese government. Between 1931 and 1945, approximately 200,000 Korean, Chinese, Taiwanese, Okinawan, Indonesian, East Timorese, Malaysian, Filipino, and Dutch women and girls were kidnapped and forced to become sex workers in a system of "comfort stations" that the Japanese government arranged for its imperial army troops invading Asia. For almost 50 years the Japanese government steadfastly denied the existence of this state-organized system of slavery and brothels in its former colonies, and the Japanese Ministry of Education required that all textbooks delete references to it. This historical amnesia continued until 1993 when a professor at Tokyo's Chuo University dug up and made public some government documents from the archives of the Japanese Defense Agency that clearly incriminated the Japanese government and

¹⁵ See Howard W. French, "Japan's Refusal to Revise Textbooks Angers its Neighbors," *New York Times*, July 9, 2001, p. A3; and Bob Egelko, "World War II Reparations: Asian Sex Slaves Hope New Law Will Aid in Fight for Redress," *San Francisco Chronicle*, July 1, 2001, p. A8.

¹⁶ For example, during Japan's brief colonization of Vietnam during World War II, Japanese troops burned Vietnam's surplus rice in order to fuel factories and power plants. In the famine that ensued during 1944-1945, between one and two million Vietnamese died. See George McT. Kahin, *Intervention* (New York: Anchor Books, 1987), p. 12; See also Walter Hatch and Kozo Yamamura, *Asia in Japan's Embrace: Building a Regional Production Alliance* (Hong Kong: Cambridge University Press, 1996).

¹⁷ Sueo Sudo, *Southeast Asia in Japanese Security Policy* (Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, 1991), p. 20.

the imperial army at the highest levels.¹⁸ Outraged by the Japanese government's refusal to offer an apology and compensation, in December 2000 a network of surviving "comfort women" from eight countries and their supporters organized the "Women's International War Crimes Tribunal" in Tokyo.¹⁹ The Tokyo Tribunal concluded that Emperor Hirohito was guilty of a crime against humanity for allowing the sexual enslavement of Asian women during World War II. Japan's Ministry of Foreign Affairs, however, still refuses to acknowledge the grievances of the "comfort women" for fear of a wave of compensation claims against the Japanese government from other World War II-era forced laborers. For Japan then, as Russians were fond of saying during the Stalinist era, "the trouble with the past is that you never know what you'll find in it."²⁰

From a policy perspective, the role that historical memory plays in constraining contemporary Japanese security policy may be termed "the Japan Problem." Asian neighbors react to the prevalence of *kotonakareshugi* in Japanese society, which literally translates as "let there be no incidents-ism," or the tendency to avoid problems and frictions at all costs.²¹ This failure within Japanese domestic society to openly discuss and reconcile the issues of war guilt and responsibility for World War II makes other Asian nations suspicious of Japan. As Han Sung Joo, South Korea's former foreign minister noted, "the German question has been more or less settled. In Asia, however, Japan remains a difficult neighbor."²²

Within Japan's Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MOFA), however, there is a faction of security policy makers who are sensitive to the "Japan Problem." These are often senior diplomats of the World War II generation who feel a moral liability toward their Asian neighbors for Japan's past aggression. Perhaps the best example is Satoh Yukio, who is now Japan's representative to

¹⁸ Gordon Brewer, "Japan Fails to Face its Shame—Tokyo's Dilemma over Forced Prostitution," *Financial Times*, April 25, 1992, p. xvii.

¹⁹ The Tribunal was presided over by Judge Gabrielle Kirk McDonald, former presiding judge of International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia in The Hague.

²⁰ Brewer, "Japan Fails to Face its Shame," p. xvii.

²¹ I am grateful to Dr. Kyoko Selden for her insights into the etiology of this term.

²² Han Sung Joo was South Korea's foreign minister from 1993-1994. See Howard W. French, "Shrine Visit and a Textbook Weigh on Koizumi's Future," *New York Times*, August 10, 2001, p. A3.

the United Nations. At the time ARF policy was being constructed, he was MOFA's Director-General of the Information Analysis, Research, and Planning Division. Satoh and others within the MOFA recognized that Japan suffered from a negative reputation in the region and that this would hamper any Japanese attempts at regional institution building. They also knew that neighboring states, especially China, would be unnecessarily provoked if Japan were to take the lead in establishing a multilateral regional security institution. So they welcomed ASEAN's move to expand the ASEAN Post-Ministerial Conference (PMC) into a wider regional security dialogue in 1993.²³ They also emphasized that existing security arrangements in the region would be maintained, most importantly the Mutual Security Treaty with the United States. They argued that, in addition to its basic deterrence function, the bilateral alliance would continue to serve as the foundation of Japan's security policy and an important regional mechanism to reduce suspicions of Japan.²⁴

Satoh and his colleagues also believed that multilateralism could complement the existing bilateral arrangements in the region and serve to ease suspicions of Japan. Satoh was convinced that it was important for Japan "to place [it]self in multilateral venues, wherein the countries which are worried about the future direction of Japanese defence policy can express their concern."²⁵ Multilateral security dialogues that conveyed Japan's peaceful intentions in the region were necessary, and the ARF could function as an effective venue for that purpose.²⁶ In such fora, the countries of the region could discuss ways to enhance the transparency of defense programs, to control conventional arms transfers, and to promote the non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.²⁷ Regional security dialogues were an important policy tool, Satoh

²³ Tsuyoshi Kawasaki, "Between Realism and Idealism in Japanese Security Policy: The Case of the ASEAN Regional Forum," *Pacific Review* 10, no. 4 (1997): 494.

²⁴ Satoh Yukio, "Emerging Trends in Asia-Pacific Security: The Role of Japan," *Pacific Review* 8, no. 2 (1995): 270-71.

²⁵ Satoh Yukio, "Emerging Trends," pp. 273-74.

²⁶ Kawasaki, "Between Realism and Idealism," p. 493; Satoh "Emerging Trends," p. 273.

²⁷ Satoh, "Emerging Trends," p. 273.

argued, because they could also reduce the anxiety of other Asian countries that Japan would become a military power.²⁸

That the effects of the “Japan Problem” can be mitigated through multilateralism is a conclusion shared by other members of Japan’s security policy community. For example, Soeya Yoshihide, Professor of Political Science at Tokyo’s Keio University, argues that if Japan wants to play an increasingly activist role on the international stage in the post-cold war era, it can only do so within the framework of multilateral institutions. “In order for Japan to play a larger and constructive role in regional security it needs to cope with this deep distrust and fear of a reassertive Japan. One diplomatic alternative for Japan is to institutionalise its presence in a regional network of interdependence and mutual restraint, and to strengthen such a system in the security realm.”²⁹ Soeya also argues that it is important for Japan to incorporate assurances into its security policy that history will not repeat itself and to emphasize the strength of its security alliance with the United States.³⁰

More specifically, in developing Japan’s policy toward the Forum, MOFA officials identified three major powers in the region as the primary target states to be engaged through the ARF: China, the United States, and Japan.³¹ Satoh articulated this engagement strategy in the form of three questions: 1) “How far will the United States reduce its military presence?”; 2) “How far will Japan expand its influence?”; and 3) “How far will China extend its military

²⁸ Satoh Yukio, “Beyond Stability: New Directions for Sino-Japanese Relations,” *Harvard International Review* (Spring 1996): 33.

²⁹ Yoshihide Soeya “Japan’s Place in Multilateral Security,” *Trends*, Institute for Southeast Asian Studies (ISEAS), Singapore, February 26, 1994, p. 3.

³⁰ Yoshihide Soeya, “Reisengo no Ajia Taiheiyō to Nihon Gaikō” [Japanese Foreign Policy and the Post-Cold War Asia-Pacific], *Gaikō Jihō* [Diplomatic Review] No. 1294 (January 1993): 25-27; Kondo Shigekatsu, “Reisengo no Ajia Taiheiyō Chōshi no Anzen Hoshō o Ika ni Kakuho Suru ka” [How Can We Guarantee the Security of the Asia-Pacific Region After the Cold War?], *Shin Bōei Ronshū* [Journal of National Defense] 20, no. 1 (June 1992): 68; Satoh Yukio, “1995 Nen no Fushime ni Mukatte: Ajia Taiheiyō Chōshi no Anzen Hoshō” [Regional Security in the Asia-Pacific: 1995 as a Turning Point], *Gaikō Forum*, no. 64 (January 1994): 23; *21-Seiki no Ajia Taiheiyō to Nihon o Kangaeru Kondankai* [The Roundtable on Japan and the Asia Pacific Region in the 21st Century], Report Submitted to the Prime Minister of Japan on December 25, 1992, p. 7.

³¹ Interestingly, none of the target states are members of ASEAN. See Kawasaki, “Between Realism and Idealism,” p. 492.

capability?”³² He saw in the ARF an opportunity to reduce the level of uncertainty and distrust between these three states and to enhance political transparency in the region.³³ MOFA officials hoped that through the ARF, Japan, China, and the United States would be able to reassure each other of their non-aggressive intentions and to increase the transparency of their intentions, thereby maintaining the stability of the status quo.³⁴

Thus, the main tenets of Satoh’s comprehensive approach to post-cold war Asian security may be summarized as follows. Japan should: 1) promote the stability of the U.S.-Japan alliance; 2) promote the stability among China, Japan, and the United States; 3) recognize that no major antagonistic relationship exists in the region, except on the Korean peninsula; 4) eliminate suspicion, uneasiness, and distrust in the region; 5) encourage the inclusion of non-traditional security issues, such as the environment and migration, in security dialogues; and 6) encourage non-governmental Track II cooperation and dialogues.³⁵

Security policy makers such as Satoh who are sensitive to the “Japan Problem” sought to address it by building into their policies what I would call “self-binding” mechanisms. Despite the fact that the alliance between Japan and the United States continues to play an important role in the region of reassuring Japan’s neighbors, Japanese policy makers explicitly sought to construct in the ARF a multilateral security institution that was targeted, at least in part, against itself.³⁶ Satoh and his colleagues at the MOFA recognized the tactical importance of the ARF, for example, as a tool to engage China and Russia, but they also included a normative element in their policy, acknowledging Japan’s moral responsibility toward the countries it had once victimized in the region. For example, Satoh notes that “It is undeniable . . . that a strong sense of guilt

³² Satoh Yukio, “Emerging Trends in Asia-Pacific Security: The Role of Japan,” *Pacific Review* 8, no. 2 (1995): 268.

³³ Kawasaki, “Between Realism and Idealism,” p. 494.

³⁴ Kawasaki, “Between Realism and Idealism,” p. 491.

³⁵ Satoh, “1995 Nen no Fushime ni Mukatte,” pp. 18-21; Satoh, “Emerging Trends,” p. 273; Kawasaki, “Between Realism and Idealism,” p. 492.

³⁶ On the continuing importance of the U.S. military to the region’s security, see Thomas J. Christenson, “China, the U.S.-Japan Alliance, and the Security Dilemma in East Asia,” *International Security* 23, no. 4 (Spring, 1999): 50.

about the Japanese aggression has been working behind Japan's policy toward China for a long time, even after the normalization of relations."³⁷ Satoh also argues that the Japanese public should have a correct understanding of what Japan did in the 1930s and 1940s and cites the importance of accurately teaching the next generation about Japan's recent past as a way to enhance the level of reassurance among the countries of the region.

The China Problem: Partner or Adversary?³⁸

Multilateral institution building also brought with it another familiar problem for Japanese security policy makers: how to engage the traditional center of power in Asia, namely, China. Uncertainty about China's many sovereignty disputes—for example, in the East and South China Sea—as well as its ongoing military modernization, missile technology proliferation activities abroad, and the missile build-up along the Taiwan Strait, are all of great concern to Japanese policy makers.³⁹ In fact, one of the first questions raised in formulating the Nakayama Initiative was whether China should be included as a member in a regional multilateral security institution. At first, Japan opposed the inclusion of Russia, and the three socialist states in the region, China, North Korea, and Vietnam. It envisioned the institution as an American-led coalition aimed at containing the socialist states in the region. As early as the mid-1980s, Mikhail Gorbachev had made diplomatic overtures to Japan promoting a regional multilateral security dialogue based on the 1975 European Security Conference held in Helsinki. In parallel with Soviet troop reductions in Europe, Gorbachev sought to push disarmament eastward into the Pacific.⁴⁰ In an important policy speech made in July 1986 from Vladivostok, Gorbachev proposed the creation of a Conference on Security Cooperation in Asia (CSCA) modeled on the European Conference for Security Cooperation in Europe (CSCE). However, his proposal failed to gain Japanese support. Until 1991, the MOFA was firmly opposed to including the Soviet Union in any

³⁷ Satoh, "Beyond Stability," p. 34.

³⁸ See Kawasaki, "Between Realism and Idealism," p. 488.

³⁹ Suisheng Zhao, "China's Periphery Policy and Changing Security Environment in the Asia-Pacific Region," this volume.

⁴⁰ Daniel Sneider, "Soviets Wage Glasnost at Sea," *Christian Science Monitor*, August 4, 1989, p. 1.

kind of regional multilateral security institution for fear that this would undermine the U.S. presence in the region and ratify the existing territorial status quo with respect to the Northern Territories. These four islands of the Kurile island chain north of Hokkaido were occupied by the Soviet Union at the close of World War II and continue to be jointly claimed by the Soviet Union and Japan.⁴¹ The dissolution of the Soviet Union in 1991, however, and the democratic transformation in Russia that followed, allowed Japan to de-link its China policy from its Russian policy after 1991. The end of the cold war also strengthened the hand of those Asianists in the MOFA who supported Chinese membership in the ARF.⁴² Thus, there was a fundamental shift in MOFA's thinking about security multilateralism in 1993. Prior to 1993, Japanese support for multilateralism, exemplified by the Nakayama Initiative, was aimed at keeping the United States engaged in the region and checking its isolationist tendencies. After 1993 MOFA's strategy shifted to using security multilateralism as a tool to engage China.⁴³

Japan's security policy community, however, was still deeply split over how to treat China. Reminiscent of the debate among U.S. Soviet specialists in the 1960s and 1970s regarding the nature of Soviet power (totalitarian vs. authoritarian), the debate among Japan's China specialists since the end of the cold war has hinged on the nature of Chinese power and intentions. Analysts within the Japanese Defense Agency (JDA) regarded China as an expansionist power that should be treated as a potential adversary. Hence, they argued that the ARF should be directed against it.⁴⁴ They were primarily concerned with the balance of power in the Asia-

⁴¹ Joanna Pitman, "Cool Kaifu Response to Gorbachev Plan for New Pacific Order," *The Times*, April 18, 1991; Cristina Chuen, "The Changing Security Picture in the Russian Far East: Does Russia Matter in Northeast Asia?" this volume; Midford, "Japan's Leadership Role," p. 378; Stephen Blank, "We Can Live Without Each Other; Dialogue and Rivalry in Russo-Japanese Relations," paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the *International Studies Association* (ISA), Atlanta, Georgia, April 1992.

⁴² Midford, "Japan's Leadership Role," pp. 383-84.

⁴³ Michael Leifer, *The ASEAN Regional Forum: Extending ASEAN's Model of Regional Security*, Adelphi Paper No. 302 (Oxford: Oxford University Press; London: International Institute for Strategic Studies, 1996), pp. 24, 27.

⁴⁴ See, for example, Nishihara Masashi, "Ajia no Anzen HoshÇni Nihon wa DÇKakawaru ka?" [How Should Japan Get Involved in Asian Security Affairs?], *Asuteion* 30 (Autumn 1993): 60-64; Nishihara Masashi, "Ajia TaiheiyÇChŞki to Takokukan Anzen HoshÇKyÇryoku no Waku-

Pacific region between China and Russia, on the one hand, and Japan and the United States, on the other. They saw the ASEAN Regional Forum as purely symbolic, useful only as a tactical tool in bargaining with China and Russia.⁴⁵ They also saw the ARF as a vehicle by which Japan could deepen its relationship with ASEAN and other maritime states such as Australia and strengthen its strategic position vis a vis China.⁴⁶ JDA analysts group states into two categories. The first is potential (or latent) adversaries (*senzaiteki tekisei koku*); and the second is actual adversaries (*kenzaiteki tekisei koku*). In the case of China, which they classified as a *potential*, but not yet *actual* adversary, they concluded that Japan could use the regular contact provided by the ARF to discourage China from becoming an actual adversary.⁴⁷

Analysts within Japan's Ministry of Foreign Affairs, on the other hand, argued that China was a status quo power that should be treated as a partner. With respect to the ARF, they argued that the multilateral forum should include China.⁴⁸ Given that the MOFA is the most powerful

gumi: ASEAN Chōki Fōramu o Chāshin ni" [An Outline for Multilateral Security Cooperation in the Asia-Pacific Region: Focus on the ASEAN Regional Forum], *Kokusai Mondai* [International Affairs], No. 415 (October 1994): 60-64; Morimoto Satoshi, "Ajia Taiheiyō no Anzen Hoshō to Sono Wakugumi" [Asian Pacific Security and its Framework], *Gaikō Jihō* [Diplomatic Review], No. 1302 (October 1993): 4 - 20; Naya Masatsugu, "Ajia no Anzen Hoshō Taisei no Wakugumi" [A Framework for the Asian Security System], *Gaikō Jihō* [Diplomatic Review], No. 1295 (February 1993): 4-19; and Nihon Senryaku Kenkyō Sentō, [Japanese Center for Strategic Studies], *Sekai ni Ikiru Anzen Hoshō* [Global Security Policy] (Tokyo: Hara Shōbō, 1994).

⁴⁵ Kawasaki, "Between Realism and Idealism," pp. 482, 484.

⁴⁶ Kawasaki, "Between Realism and Idealism," p. 490; On Japan's affinity with the maritime powers in the region, see Shiraishi Takashi, *Umi no Teikoku* [Maritime Empires] (Tokyo: Chōka Kōron Shinsho, 2000); and Hamashita Takeshi, "The Intra-Regional System in East Asia in Modern Times," in *Network Power: Japan and Asia*, Katzenstein and Shiraishi, eds., pp. 113-35.

⁴⁷ Nishihara Masashi, "Takokukan Kyōchōshugi no Zeijakusei: Ikōki no Anzen Hoshō Taisei o Kangaeru" [The Weakness of Multilateralism: Security Structures in Transitory Periods], *Bōei Daigaku Kiyō* [Annals of the National Defense University], Vol. 68 (March 1994): 25; Takeda Isami, "Anzen Hoshō no Diarogu no Teishō: Nihon ni totte no ASEAN to Oceania" [In Support of a Dialogue on Security: Japan's Perspective on ASEAN and Oceania], *Gaikō Fōramu*, No. 49 (October 1992): 25. Naya, "Ajia no Anzen Hoshō Taisei no Wakugumi," p. 15; Nihon Senryaku Kenkyō Sentō, p. 209; Kawasaki, "Between Realism and Idealism," p. 488; Interviews No. 4 and 5, Tokyo, January 2001.

⁴⁸ Satoh, "Beyond Stability," p. 33.

actor in security policy formulation in Japan, its vision of engaging China as a partner in regional security prevailed.⁴⁹ This can be seen, for example, in the Ministry's steadfast avoidance of the term "confidence building measures" (CBMs) in its regional diplomacy, since CBMs imply a relationship between adversaries (e.g. Israel and the Palestinian Authority). Instead, Japanese officials were careful to use the terms *anshin zairyō* "sources of assurance," and *anshin no kyōjō* "increased feelings of assurance," in constructing their ARF policy.⁵⁰ Satoh, for example, was careful not to isolate China as *the* problem in the region's security, and explicitly denied that China was a military threat.⁵¹ Indeed, in keeping with Japan's comprehensive approach to national security, the MOFA defined the nature of the Chinese threat in broader terms, including problems stemming from economic dislocations, environmental pollution, and energy shortages.⁵² In the end, Japan's ARF Policy did not explicitly identify China as an adversary, while at the same time it built in measures for transparency, or "self-binding mechanisms," that would reassure China of Japan's non-aggressive intentions. In order to reduce tensions between the United States, China, and Japan, the MOFA wanted to collaborate with other states, particularly with China, in disclosing military information. They also wanted the ARF to implement transparency measures by which every member state would share quality information regarding their own military programs.⁵³

Thus, Japan's ARF policy was constructed with two audiences in mind. On the one hand, Japanese foreign policy makers were mindful of pressures from the United States to take on a greater role in the maintenance of regional security and, on the other hand, they wanted to engage China. In the case of the ARF, the way that these two sets of imperatives were reconciled

⁴⁹ Peter J. Katzenstein and Nobuo Okawara, *Japan's National Security: Structures, Norms, and Policy Responses in a Changing World* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University East Asia Program, 1993), p. 23; Rinn-Sup Shinn, "Japan's Foreign Affairs Establishment," Congressional Research Service (CRS) Report, May 16, 1996, p. 15.

⁵⁰ Midford, "Japan's Leadership Role," p. 383; Satoh, "1995 Nen ni Mukatte," p. 20.

⁵¹ Kawasaki, "Between Realism and Idealism," p. 492.

⁵² Kawasaki, "Between Realism and Idealism," p. 500, n. 24.

⁵³ Acharya, "Regional Institutions and Security Order in Asia;" Kawasaki, "Between Realism and Idealism," p. 491.

was to introduce “self-binding” mechanisms, including assurances that Japan would not become a military power, into Japan’s regional policy in order to reassure the Chinese and wider Asian audience.

Conclusion: the Future of Asian Security

Since Japan’s defeat in World War II, Japanese leaders have placed highest priority in their foreign relations on the maintenance of good relations with the United States.⁵⁴ While highly contested at times, the Security Treaty with the United States signed in 1951 and renewed in 1960 remains the most important institution for the maintenance of East Asian regional security and the foundation of Japan’s external security strategy. It is likely that in the near term, rather than be displaced by a multilateral security institution such as the ASEAN Regional Forum, cooperation between the United States and Japan will increase on regional security on issues such as the Korean Peninsula, East Timor, and the dismantling of the former Soviet Union’s nuclear weapons’ arsenals, within the framework of the bilateral alliance.⁵⁵ Evidence of this trend toward regional security cooperation between the United States and Japan can be seen, for example, in the September 1997 revision of the original 1978 Guidelines for U.S.-Japan Defense Cooperation which provides for the expansion of Japan’s defense perimeter beyond the 1,000 nautical mile limit agreed to in 1981. The perimeter is now defined very flexibly to include, “situations in areas surrounding Japan that will have an important influence on Japan’s peace and security.”⁵⁶ Another important development in the Asian security environment is the increased regional activities of Japan’s police force. Japanese civilian police took part in the 1993 United Nations Peacekeeping Operation in Cambodia, for example, and Japan’s National Police Agency (NPA) has been active in organizing regional police cooperation in the areas of drug control, transna-

⁵⁴ John Swenson-Wright, “U.S.-Japan Diplomatic and Security Relations Post-1945: A Historical Perspective,” this volume. See also Katzenstein and Okawara, *Japan’s National Security*, 1993, p. 29.

⁵⁵ Swenson-Wright, “U.S.-Japan Diplomatic and Security Relations Post-1945,” p. 39; Peter J. Katzenstein and Nobuo Okawara, “Japan and Asian-Pacific Security”; Kawasaki, “Between Realism and Idealism,” p. 490.

⁵⁶ U.S.-Japan Security Consultative Committee, “Completion of the Review of the Guidelines for U.S.-Japan Defense Cooperation,” New York, NY, September 23, 1997, p. 2.

tional crime, and terrorism.⁵⁷ Policing is an area in which Japan excels and can contribute to regional security without amending Article Nine, the war renunciation clause, of its constitution. It is thus a politically expedient way for Japan to enhance its security in the region while at the same time responding to increased calls for burden-sharing from the United States.

Albeit for different reasons, all the major powers in the region, Japan, China, Russia, ASEAN, and the United States, agree on the importance of maintaining the U.S. military presence in the region.⁵⁸ One of the interesting discontinuities in Japanese security policy since the end of the cold war, however, is an explicit willingness on the part of Japanese leaders to acknowledge the “Japan Problem” discussed above, i.e., how historical memory thwarts Japan’s ability to take on a leadership role in the region. As one observer noted, “During the cold war . . . Japan didn’t have to face the issues of the past. We could always get by just ignoring it. Japan was under the umbrella of the United States and America settled Japan’s Asian issues.”⁵⁹ Now that Japan is taking a more assertive role in the region, it is clear that its leaders also have to come up with a new formula for addressing Japan’s problems in Asia. Japan’s attempts to resolve these issues through multilateralism in Southeast Asia may prove to be a model for tackling some of the more difficult security problems in Northeast Asia in the future, such as the Northern Territories dispute.

In promoting the creation of a security institution that is in part targeted against itself, we can also see movement in Japan’s security policy toward the kind of strategy used by Germany for addressing questions of war guilt. As Thomas Berger argues in his analysis of German and Japanese strategic culture, “German state elites have sought to lock in a reconstructed German identity—pacified, democratic, and internationalist—by linking this identity to regional and multilateral institutions.”⁶⁰ In Japan’s post-cold war security policy we can see a similar phenome-

⁵⁷ Peter J. Katzenstein and Nobuo Okawara, “Japan and Asian-Pacific Security,” pp. 165-94.

⁵⁸ Thomas J. Christenson, “Chinese Realpolitik,” *Foreign Affairs* 75, no. 5 (September/October 1996): 44.

⁵⁹ Tanaka Hiroshi of Ryukoku University. Quoted in Howard W. French, “Japanese Veteran Testifies in War Atrocity Lawsuit,” *New York Times*, December 21, 2000, p. A3.

⁶⁰ Peter J. Katzenstein, ed., *The Culture of National Security: Norms and Identity in World Politics* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1996), p. 61.

non at work. There is an attempt on the part of Japanese state elites to do something analogous to the German example, to lock in a reconstructed, pacified Japanese state identity by tying it to regional institutions.⁶¹ In fact, Satoh makes explicit that he is modeling Japan's post-cold war security policy on that of Germany. He states, "it is important for Japan to place [it]self in multi-lateral venues, wherein the countries which are worried about the future direction of Japanese defense policy can express their concern. *Here, Japan can learn from what the former Federal Republic of Germany had been doing since the end of the Second World War.*"⁶²

In designing Japan's regional security strategy in the early 1990s, I would argue that MOFA officials were engaged in the politics of post-Cold War national identity reconstruction. By building self-binding mechanisms into their policy, MOFA officials were implicitly acknowledging Japan's war guilt at a time when this issue is still very sensitive in Japan's domestic politics. In the German case, we see that the process of national identity reconstruction has been going on steadily throughout the post-war period.⁶³ German state identity has become increasingly trans-nationalized and Europeanized through regional institutions during the post-war period.⁶⁴ However, this process is just now getting under way in Japan and Asia, with important implications for the future of Asian security.

⁶¹ Katzenstein, ed., *Culture of National Security*, p. 61.

⁶² Satoh, "Emerging Trends," p. 274. Italics added.

⁶³ See, for example, Alan Watson, *The Germans: Who Are They Now?* (London: Methuen, 1992).

⁶⁴ Peter J. Katzenstein, ed., *Tamed Power: Germany in Europe* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1997); Thomas U. Berger, "Norms, Identity, and National Security in Germany and Japan," *The Culture of National Security: Norms and Identity in World Politics*, Peter J. Katzenstein, ed. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1996), pp. 317-56.

THE CHANGING SECURITY PICTURE IN THE RUSSIAN FAR EAST

Cristina Chuen

Although Russia's participation in northeast Asian security issues has been minimal during the past decade, its role is likely to increase in the near future. What this function will entail is still unclear and open to outside influence: without increased positive engagement (including international assistance to Russia's Far Eastern regions and support for improved Russian ties with Japan and Korea), the likelihood that Russia will become a destabilizing force increases dramatically. With some support, Russia might instead serve as a stabilizer in the Pacific.

This paper examines the Russian state at two levels, investigating how the military security of northeast Asian nations affected by their relationship both with Moscow and with the Russian regions. A brief look at the state of the economy and crime in Russia's border regions suggests that without a large influx of investment capital—whether Russian or foreign—basic infrastructure such as roads and electricity provision will collapse, and Russia's economy will no longer be able to continue “muddling through,” as it has done for nearly a decade. A collapse would have grave security implications. Adding to the peril is the sorry state of military bases and the military industry in the Russian Far East, along with the risk that military equipment will be smuggled or sold to other Asian nations. An economic rebound, on the other hand, could encourage legal sales of military equipment to Asia. Whatever the outcome—economic growth or collapse—interactions with East Asia on the national and subnational level will inevitably increase. What those interactions entail depends upon the range of possible relationships open to Russia in East Asia, whether in the political, economic, or security spheres.

Other states can have a great deal of influence over the options and choices of both national and subnational actors in Russia. Therefore it is important that the international community understand not only Russia's national strategic goals but also its economic and security needs, along with those of substate actors in the Russian Far East. Economic changes will have an especially strong effect on the military units and military industries located in the Russian Far East. These domestic actors can in turn affect the national security policies Moscow develops. Russia and its regions need the opportunity to play a positive role in East Asia, and need to inter-

act with East Asian nations other than China. And these nations must in turn pay attention to Russian substate actors. Otherwise Russia may be boxed into a corner and act in ways detrimental to the security of the region.

Russia's Policies in Asia

Recent statements by Russian President Vladimir Putin have emphasized the importance Russia places on its relationships in Asia. The motive is both geopolitical and domestic: Moscow and Beijing are increasingly cooperating to bolster the positions of both nations in international organizations, while the future in terms of economy and security for the 75 percent of Russia that lies in Asia is strongly influenced by the mutual relationships of these two vast regions.¹ To date, Russia has only been able fully to engage China in security and economic issues, and in this effort the center exercises only partial control. Russia has also made attempts to engage Japan, South Korea, or North Korea, but these have foundered at both the national and subnational levels. While the region may not need Russia to serve as a stabilizer, it would certainly be harmed by Russian instability. In order to decrease the likelihood that Russia might play a negative role, it is in the interest of the international community to respond to Russian overtures, involving Russia in more bilateral relationships and multilateral efforts in the region.

Russia's security doctrine, by promoting the country as a major power mediating international disputes, implies that it acts as a stabilizer in Asia. Yet that same doctrine requires the maintenance of fairly high levels of power projection capability in the region. Should the military be unable to maintain these levels, instability could well result. Russian military enterprises are often ordered to fulfill central defense orders even when Moscow does not finance them, further endangering the factories' positions, and forcing them to find other ways to make money.²

¹ Suisheng Zhao discusses China's interest in developing a "regional multipolarization," in which China would play an important balancing role. Russia may not regard China as a balancer, but has recognized its strength and the ability of the two nations to balance the United States in some multilateral forums when they adopt common policies. See Suisheng Zhao, "China's Periphery Policy and Changing Security Environment in the Asia-Pacific Region," in this volume.

² Should Bush and Putin make deeper cuts in nuclear weapons, an issue discussed in Randall Forsberg's paper in this volume, Russia's military industry can only benefit, making it less likely

Regional Influence Over Foreign Policy

While the regional role in Russian foreign policy is small, it does exist, and may indeed increase if the economy should change, either positively or negatively. Regional authorities' economic and political interactions with domestic and foreign actors can and do affect central policies. For example, regional leaders often take trips to foreign countries, most often to promote trade. The center encourages such travel in the hopes that increased foreign trade will help shore up the local economy.³ Should these trips promote arms sales not previously approved by Moscow, however, the regional efforts can affect national policy, since the central government often shies away from irritating a friendly nation by denying it the right to conclude contracts already approved at the local level. In some instances, regional governors have even gone so far as to speak on issues clearly within the purview of the federal government: the former governor of Primorye fought for several years over the demarcation of the Russo-Chinese border in his region, and had a souring effect on bilateral talks between the two nations at that time.

Central Attempts to Control the Regions

The center has been well aware of the problem of independent regional action, and has periodically reasserted its authority during the past decade. One of the first such attempts was the establishment of presidential representatives in 1991, after a few regions were given the right to elect governors. However, regional interests captured many of the presidential representatives (causing the representatives to work, in effect, as regional representatives to Moscow, not vice versa), while regional actors stymied the actions of others or the center sacrificed them in order

to resort to illegal sales or to push legal sales of more sophisticated equipment.

³ In July 2000, for instance, Primorye Governor Yevgeniy Nazdratenko was invited to accompany Putin on a visit to North Korea, reportedly reflecting the heavy stress that Moscow's Asian security policy places on direct regional affiliations. "Komandirovka v sostave delegatsii prezidenta Rossii" [A Business Trip as a Member of the Russian President's Delegation], *Rybak Primorya*, 21 July 2000, <http://ribak.vladivostok.com>, accessed 30 July 2001. In April 2001, Khabarovsk Governor Viktor Ishayev went to Japan as head of the Russian delegation to the Pacific Basin Economic Council, and held talks with Japanese businessmen. "Khabarovsk Governor to Head Russian Delegation to Pacific Economic Council," *Interfax*, 6 April 2001.

to appease the governors.⁴ By 1996, then Foreign Minister Yevgeniy Primakov told a Duma committee grappling with the problem of regional government actions that run counter to national policy that a “strict definition and distribution of powers between bodies of state authority of the Russian Federation and its subjects is, probably, the most important problem of the construction of the Russian state at present.”⁵

Three further changes under former president Boris Yeltsin gave the governors a great deal of clout in dealing with Moscow and greater room for independent action. First, he maintained harmony with the regions through a variety of bilateral treaties and agreements. Second, he changed the way the upper house of parliament was formed: in 1995 the selection method of the 198 members of the upper house changed to provide for the automatic membership of the 89 governors and 89 regional parliament heads. Third, beginning in 1996, all regional governors were chosen by direct election. Their importance was enhanced further via the important role they played in helping Yeltsin win the 1996 presidential election.⁶

Vladimir Putin came to power riding on a war against separatism in Chechnya, and avowed that he would reassert a national hierarchy. Instead of continuing Yeltsin’s efforts to increase the ability of the public to control local government from below, he tried to increase

⁴ For instance, the first presidential representative to Primorye, Valeriy Butov, fought against Governor Nazdratenko’s administration and was relieved of his duties by President Yeltsin on 4 January 1994. The next presidential representative to Primorye, Vladimir Ignatenko, acted as Primorye’s advocate, not a representative of central concerns. On 23 May 1997, the Kremlin changed course and appointed an enemy of Nazdratenko’s, local FSB head Viktor Kondratov, as presidential representative to Primorye. Despite significant central support, Kondratov was unable to effect any changes in Primorye, and was removed from office on 23 February 1999. On 22 October 1999, Valentin Kuzov, formerly one of Nazdratenko’s deputy governors, was appointed as presidential representative to Primorye. Territorial administration press service, *Zolotoi Rog* 12 January 1994, p. 3; Marina Loboda, “O vlastnykh kreslakh ya nikogda ne mechtal” [I Never Dreamed of Powerful Positions], *Vladivostok*, 29 May 1997, <http://vl.vladnews.ru>, accessed 30 July 2001; “Prezent Kondratovu ot prezidenta” [A Present for Kondratov From the President], *Vladivostok*, 25 February 1999, <http://vl.vladnews.ru>, accessed 30 July 2001; Yevgeniy Itarov, “Svershilos, kogda uzh i ne zhdali” [It Happened When We Least Expected It], *Zolotoy rog*, 22 October 1999, <http://www.zrpress.ru>, accessed 30 July 2001.

⁵ ITAR-TASS, 29 September 1996, as cited in Greg Austin and Alexey Muraviev, *The Armed Forces of Russia in Asia* (London: Tauris, 2000), p. 23.

⁶ Austin and Muraviev, *The Armed Forces of Russia in Asia*, p. 26.

accountability to the center. By an edict prepared in secret, he divided Russia into seven large federal districts, and appointed a presidential representative, sometimes called a governor-general or viceroy, with the “functions” of “coordination, control and harmonization,” to each federal district. This step followed a plan originally considered by Yeltsin in 1997, designed to increase presidential representatives’ independence.⁷ Unfortunately, their duties and powers were not well defined in the edict. Their clearest mandate was to eliminate or reform regional laws that conflicted with the Russian constitution.⁸ Presumably the presidential representatives were also supposed to make regional governors conform to national foreign policy, although how they were to do so is unclear. Further, Putin changed the way members of the upper house of parliament were selected: governors themselves would no longer sit on the Federation Council, but would instead each appoint a delegate; another delegate would be appointed by regional legislatures. While this modification reduced the governors’ presence in Moscow somewhat, it also gave them a permanent lobbyist in the capital. To date it is unclear that it has in any way furthered Putin’s centralization effort.

Naturally, regional authorities have fought to retain their powers. Republics, which have more rights than other types of regions in the Russian Federation, reacted to the new attempt to force them to heed Moscow by increasing their support for nationalist movements on their territories.⁹ Further worsening the relationship between republics and the center were statements by northwestern federal district presidential representative Viktor Cherkesov that the status of

⁷ Steven Solnick, “The New Federal Structure: More Centralized, or More of the Same?” Program on New Approaches to Russian Security Policy Memo Series, No. 161, October 2000, <http://www.fas.harvard.edu/~ponars/POLICY%20MEMOS/Solnick161.html>, accessed 30 July 2001.

⁸ Vadim Sukhoverkhov, “Polpredy ‘sozhrali’ Kreml” [Presidential Representatives ‘Devoured’ the Kremlin], *Moskovskiy komsomolets*, 17 February 2001, pp. 1-2.

⁹ Emil Pain, “The Evolution of Center-Periphery Relations in Russia: From Yeltsin to Putin,” Center for Nonproliferation Studies Seminar, Monterey Institute of International Relations, 2 March 2001.

republics would soon be eliminated (although the presidential representatives to the Volga and North Caucasian federal districts quickly disavowed his claims).¹⁰

At first, the regions of the Russian Far East federal district, only one of which is a republic (Sakha-Yakutiya), cautiously welcomed their new presidential representative, Lieutenant General Konstantin Pulikovskiy, who had become famous after his 1996 ultimatum to the population of Groznyy, Chechnya, ordering them to abandon the capital within 48 hours.¹¹ Regional politicians had hoped that a representative with sufficient power might bring more central attention to local problems. While Pulikovskiy initially supported some regional views, he soon came into conflict with the Far Eastern regions, in particular Primorye and Kamchatka.

Like presidential representatives in other districts, Pulikovskiy began to fight for expanded powers for himself, in particular control over financial flows between the center and the regions. The representatives sought control over bank transfers and investments, and tried to coordinate foreign trade in their districts.¹² Since the ties between local factories and local authorities are of long standing, however, they have proven difficult to break. Military industries perhaps balked most, for local politicians serve as factory advocates in Moscow and factory salesmen abroad.

Instead of wooing industry, Pulikovskiy fought local politicians. This action appears not to have been simply of his own doing, but part of a general Kremlin plan to oust independent regional leaders, in particular through the late 2000/early 2001 elections. The presidential representatives only met with limited success throughout Russia, however, and no success at all in the Russian Far East. In the Kamchatka gubernatorial election, for example, a Kremlin-supported candidate challenged the sitting governor's candidate, and a third man—Communist Party head Mikhail Mashkovtsev—won. In another case, Moscow set its sights on Primorye. In early 2001, President Putin had a telephone conversation with Primorye governor Yevgeniy Nazdratenko, who then resigned, leading to pre-term gubernatorial elections in the kray. Nazdratenko was,

¹⁰ Mikhail Afanasev, "Litsa vlasti" [The Faces of Power], *Izvestiya*, 22 February 2001, <http://www.izvestia.ru>, accessed 30 July 2001.

¹¹ Yevgeniy Krutikov, "Skhema slomana, vagonchik tronulsya" [System Smashed, Train Gets Moving], *Izvestiya*, 20 May 2000, p. 1.

¹² Sukhoverkhov, "Polpredy 'sozhrali' Kreml."

however, given the post of head of the Russian Fisheries Committee, thus maintaining his importance to the region. With Nazdratenko out of the way, presidential representative Pulikovskiy quickly became involved in the details of managing the Primorye government. Right after the ex-governor's departure from Vladivostok, Pulikovskiy suggested that his vice governors resign as well, and he appointed First Deputy Presidential Representative Gennadiy Apanasenko to be in charge of the kray. Pulikovskiy has also had a strong influence over the Kamchatka government since the communists came to power in January 2001: according to local complaints, he has made it difficult for the new governor there to consolidate power, and has benefitted from the power vacuum by increasing his own role in that area too.

Nevertheless, the Russian Far East is a very large region and Pulikovskiy has been stretched thin trying to monitor all developments there. While he has made several foreign trips, going to Vietnam in spring 2001 and to China in June, ostensibly to monitor Far Eastern governors also traveling, he is of course unable to be present at every meeting or even have his deputies attend all of them.¹³

Yet Pulikovskiy has still managed to find time to try influencing gubernatorial elections in Amur and Primorye. The extremely dirty elections for governor of Amur region were won by 35-year-old State Duma deputy Leonid Korotkov in a run-off on 8 April 2001. Korotkov beat an incumbent who appeared to have the reluctant support of Moscow. Although Pulikovskiy characterized both candidates as "tarnished" (*obgazhennyye*),¹⁴ the presidential representative was widely seen to have "lost" the Amur elections.¹⁵

As for the Primorskiy election, Pulikovskiy's role was even clearer: he had his first deputy, Apanasenko, pushed forward as a leading candidate. Although Pulikovskiy reportedly pres-

¹³ In the spring, Pulikovskiy accompanied Putin in Vietnam. Viktoriya Sokolova, "Da, aziaty my" [Yes, We are Asians], *Izvestiya*, 2 March 2001, <http://www.izvestia.ru/>, accessed 30 July 2001; in June, he traveled to China. "Putin's envoy downbeat on plans to sell energy to China," ITAR-TASS, 9 June 2001.

¹⁴ Igor Verba, "Vertikal vlasti, ili shest dlya golykh ambitsiy" [The Vertical of Power, or a Springboard for Empty Ambitions], *Nezavisimaya gazeta*, 23 March 2001, in Integrum Techno, <http://www.integrum.ru>, accessed 30 July 2001.

¹⁵ Oleg Zhunusov, "Plenipotentiary or Political Representative?" *Izvestiya*, 12 May 2001, in FBIS Document CEP20010515000067.

sured kray authorities to support Apanasenko's candidacy, acting governor Valentin Dubinin instead ran for governor himself. In response, the presidential representative's office stopped supporting Dubinin, and was apparently involved in the reinstatement through the courts of former first vice governor Konstantin Tolstosheyn. This turn of events was ironic, because it was the presidential representative's staff that had reportedly forced Tolstosheyn out of office after Nazdratenko's departure in the first place: they had received information from Lieutenant General Viktor Kondratov linking Tolstosheyn to local organized crime figures.¹⁶ (Kondratov was the former Primorskiy presidential representative and head of the Kray Federal Security Service [FSB].) But Tolstosheyn became an Apanasenko supporter and was often seen together with Pulikovskiy after his reinstatement. Thus Tolstosheyn now became acting governor while Dubinin began campaigning for governor.¹⁷

Despite Pulikovskiy's support, Apanasenko placed third in the 27 May election. He qualified for the run-off election on 17 June after the second-place finisher, Viktor Cherepkov—no favorite at the Kremlin—was disqualified for speeches in the mass media financed through unofficial funds. Indeed, the entire election appears to have been rife with fraud. Citizens brought court cases against both Apanasenko and front-runner Sergey Darkin: Apanasenko was charged with using the administrative resources of his office and other irregularities, and Darkin with offering voters T-shirts in exchange for votes. But in the end neither of these candidates was disqualified.¹⁸ In the run-off, Darkin, who was supported by former governor Nazdratenko, won

¹⁶ Igor Vydrin, "Kholodnaya zima ili goryachiye vybory?" [A Cold Winter or Hot Elections?], *Nezavisimaya gazeta*, 16 May 2001, <http://www.ng.ru>, accessed 30 July 2001.

¹⁷ Tolstosheyn suggested that Pulikovskiy was involved in his reinstatement. Yevgeniy Lents, "Full Circle; Everything Back the Way It Was in Maritime Kray," *Segodnya*, 10 May 2001, as translated in "Maritime Kray Deputy Governor Pre-Election Reinstatement Viewed," FBIS Document CEP20010511000289; Irina Nagornyykh and Aleksey Chernyshev, "Primorskiy uzhasnik" [A Primorskiy Horror Flick], *Kommersant-Vlast*, 26 June 2001, <http://vlast.kommersant.ru>, accessed 30 July 2001.

¹⁸ Mayak Radio, 28 May 2001, in "Court to Determine Candidates for Regional Election Run-offs," FBIS Document CEP20010528000018.

with 40.18 percent of the votes, while 24.31 percent voted for Gennadiy Apanasenko and 33.68 percent voted against both.¹⁹

After Darkin's victory, Pulikovskiy called upon those who lost at the elections to stop backing lawsuits against each other and support the new governor, but he otherwise showed little support for him. In a statement at the Justice Ministry on 27 June 2001, he complained that some of the governors were elected "by chance," had no legal education, and knew nothing about governing the territories they had been elected to administer.²⁰ Further, he proposed that the country's entire administrative system be revamped: individual krais and oblasts should be eliminated, he urged; governors should be appointed, and a special law should be passed on the demarcation of the powers between the components of the Federation and the personnel of the federal districts.²¹ He has also suggested that a district parliament be created, including the heads of all Far Eastern District regional legislatures, and that its decisions be mandatory for all regions in the district.²² As Pulikovskiy himself admitted, however, these were simply his personal ideas and opinions. There has not been any official response to the suggestions, nor does it seem likely that there will be one.

Pulikovskiy's involvement in regional elections has weakened, not strengthened, Moscow's authority in the Russian Far East. Rumors regarding his impending retirement continue to circulate in the Far East, fueled not only by his lack of success at local elections, but even more so by other, more serious deficiencies of his regime. These include lack of progress in regional preparations for the winter; inability to cooperate with regional leaders; failure to give moral support to suffering Sakha-Yakutiya during a time of severe flooding by choosing to remain in

¹⁹ Igor Verba, "Primorye s novym gubernatorom?" [A New Governor for Maritime Kray?] *Nezavisimaya Gazeta*, 19 June 2001, <http://www.ng.ru>, accessed 30 July 2001.

²⁰ "Ni odin iz nikh, ya by tak skazal, on ne podgotovlen sovershenno k tomy, chtoby on pravilno, yuridicheski gramotno upravlyal toy territoriyey, na kotoroy ego izbrali grazhdane. A nekotoryye izbralis dazhe sluchayno." Konstantin Pulikovskiy, as cited in Anna Fedotova, REN-TV news, 28 June 2001, as cited in "Konstantin Pulikovskiy vystupil na kollegii Minyusta" [Konstantin Pulikovskiy Addressed the Ministry of Justice Collegium], in Monitoring Teleradioefira, in Integrum Techno, <http://www.integrum.ru>, accessed 30 July 2001.

²¹ Anna Fedotova, REN-TV news, 28 June 2001.

²² Regions.ru, Moscow, 25 May 2001, <http://www.regions.ru>, accessed 30 July 2001.

Primorye for election campaigns instead of transferring his base of operations; and—perhaps most critical of all—his deep energy cuts in Khabarovsk kray, which have seriously affected the military industry in Khabarovsk. Regarding this last, the governor of Khabarovsk kray, Viktor Ishayev, has come forward with a stark assessment: if the Amurskiy Zavod shipyard has its power cut off, and a lack of heat causes the water in the reactor to freeze, a “not very small Chernobyl” may result.²³ Despite Pulikovskiy’s poor showing on the regional front, there is little indication as yet that his position in Moscow has deteriorated. He maintains his position as presidential representative, even though he has done little to increase Moscow’s control over Russia’s far eastern regions.

Regional Influence Over Local Military Bases and Military Industry

Military bases and military industry are strongly influenced by regional economies, regional crime, and the actions of regional officials. The explanation lies in the inability of Moscow to fully finance the country’s military operations, despite an increase in the amount of tax moneys collected by the center. Russian bases and defense industries therefore continue to depend on assistance from the local regions, giving regional leaders a strong position from which to influence their activities. At present it seems very unlikely that the Kremlin will be able to remove most of the governors’ real powers, other than controls over financial flows from the center.

It is difficult to quantify regional leaders’ influence, which varies by locality. However, there are many examples of local officials affecting the military in ways that are certainly not mandated by the federal government. For instance, in Khabarovsk local military leaders reportedly consult with Governor Ishayev regarding the timing of military training exercises.²⁴ Regions in the Russian Far East have resorted to the dangerous practice of cutting off electricity to local

²³ “Esli energetiki za dolgi otklyuchat elektroenergiyu, esli ne budet tepla i zamerznet voda v reaktore [strana i region poluchat novyy i] ne ochen malenkiy Chernobyl.” As cited in Vasiliy Buslayev, “Kogda i za chto osvobodyat Pulikovskogo?” [When and Who will Fire Pulikovskiy?] *Yezhednevnyye Novosti*, 20 June 2001, <http://novosti.vl.ru>, accessed 30 July 2001.

²⁴ CNS interview with Khabarovsk customs official, Fall 2000.

military bases, despite federal prohibitions.²⁵ The bases themselves have devised questionable ways of supplementing their meager funds: in Khabarovsk, for example, they have reportedly permitted Chinese citizens to purchase housing on their grounds.²⁶ Submarine crews have asked for staggering levels of assistance from regional leaders.²⁷

Dependence on local leaders is unlikely to reach the level of actual control over regional military facilities. It nonetheless leaves both the bases and regional governments open to mutual blackmail, influences the actions of local military leaders, and can affect levels of military preparedness. The readiness of Far Eastern bases is crucial to Moscow's ability to project power in the region. At present, however, most bases are in crisis. In addition to power outages, they suffer from high crime levels, a lack of equipment, and poor training.²⁸ For instance, in an interview

²⁵ In July 2000, fleet commanders had electricity only a few hours per day, data transmission equipment was down nine hours per day, and submarine crews were reduced to preparing meals over wood fires. *Agence France Presse*, 26 July 2000, in "Power Cuts Put Control of Russian Pacific Fleet at Risk," FBIS Document EUP20000726000139.

²⁶ CNS interview with Khabarovsk customs official, Fall 2000.

²⁷ For instance, last November the crew of the *Krasnoyarsk* SSGN requested that the Krasnoyarsk governor help them obtain funding for submarine renovations. "Ekipazh atomnoy podlodki 'Krasnoyarsk' poprosil Aleksandra Lebedya pomoch v finansirovanii remonta submariny" [The Crew of the *Krasnoyarsk* Nuclear Submarine Asked Aleksandr Lebed for Help in the Financing of Submarine Renovations], ITAR-TASS, 17 November 2000, in Integrum Techno, <http://www.integrum.ru>, accessed 30 July 2001. Regions have regularly funded food and housing for submarine crews, and at times actual submarine upkeep. In October, Petropavlovsk-Kamchatskiy mayor Aleksandr Dudnikov discovered on a visit to the *Petropavlovsk-Kamchatskiy* SSGN that there were no fire extinguishers or medical kits on board. His city quickly donated 100,000 rubles for their purchase. Elizaveta Mayetnaya, "Brat'yam 'Kurska' speshat na pomoshch'" [They are Rushing to Assist the Brothers of the *Kursk*], *Moskovskiy komsomolets*, 14 October 2000, in Integrum Techno, <http://www.integrum.ru>, accessed 30 July 2001. Regions sponsoring Kamchatka-based submarines recently signed documents obligating themselves to 55 years of such sponsorship. "Predstaviteli devyati rossiyskikh gorodov sozdali sovet shefov soyedineniya atomnykh podvodnykh lodok Tikhookeanskogo flota" [Representatives of Nine Russian Cities Created a Council of Pacific Fleet Submarine Unit Sponsors], ITAR-TASS, 18 October 2000, in Integrum Techno, <http://www.integrum.ru>, accessed 30 July 2001.

²⁸ Crime is a problem even in elite units, such as the Kamchatka Nuclear Submarine Flotilla. Local criminal organizations have distributed cards to new recruits detailing the location of valuable submarine parts and the price they fetch. Thefts are a constant problem, and are often discovered when a submarine prepares to put out to sea. Author's interview with naval lawyer, Petropavlovsk-Kamchatskiy, July 2000. Less elite units are in even more desperate straits. One

on Moscow's Central television, Far East District Troops Commander Yuriy Yakubovich stated outright that the Far East Air Force and Air Defense District is only at about 50 percent readiness; the aircraft are aging and there is no maintenance; and pilots rarely fly not because of fuel shortages, but because aircraft are nearing the end of their life cycle. According to Yakubovich, the District has not received a single piece of new equipment in seven years. The vehicles are at least twelve years old, while some artillery pieces, anti-air and antitank systems have been fielded for as much as 40 and more years.²⁹

Should regional leaders' influence vis-à-vis the center eventually wane, one would expect two different effects—both adverse—on the local defense industry: military factories may find it harder to locate foreign customers and persuade Moscow to accept their sales contracts; they are also likely to have less central funding and will probably become increasingly desperate. Desperation could well prompt them to undertake illegal sales, and is likely to increase the level of theft in the plants. Thus weaker regional leaders are unlikely to make it easier for Moscow to control the military industrial factories located in the regions.

Defense industries may be affected by crime or weak leadership, but they can also benefit greatly from vigorous regional support. Powerful independent leaders, like Khabarovsk Governor Ishayev, are effective advocates in Moscow and good salesmen abroad. Thus the Amurskiy Zavod shipbuilding plant in Komsomolsk-na-Amure has frequently praised Ishayev for his assistance. That plant is currently in talks with India regarding the possible lease or sale of a nuclear submarine under construction there. The plant and regional government are reported to be strongly behind the sale, but they face opposition from Moscow. The Russian Foreign Ministry is rightfully more wary, fearing that such a transaction would open the window to future sales of nuclear fuel to India. A lease, for which there is precedent in Soviet times, is hardly better, for it could also involve a fuel transfer (although the vessel could return to Russia for refueling). In

corrupt head of a Kamchatka base sent an excess of funds to some units and nearly none to other units, which have become increasingly hopeless. Maksim Dyachenko, "Raskhishcheniye i nakazaniye (po Nedostoyevskomu)" [Crime and Punishment (not à la Dostoyevsky)], *Gorodskaya gazeta*, 26 October 2000, p. 2.

²⁹ Andrey Karaulov, Center TV, as cited in *Monitoring SMI*, 27 May 2001, as translated in "Russia: TV Center Holds Round Table Discussion: Defense Industry Privatization, Arms Exports," FBIS Document CEP20010531000357.

any event, the lease or sale of a sophisticated SSN (nuclear powered submarine) sets a bad precedent, and should draw the protests from Russia's and India's neighbors.³⁰ In the past, Russian plants agreed to sell equipment to China that the federal government approved only so as not to harm the bilateral relationship. In sum, notwithstanding the detriment both to local security and federal interest, regional actors are clearly able to increase the types of technology for sale abroad.

Illegal sales and thefts not only diminish Russian military readiness, but may even increase the military capabilities of other nations. As yet there are no reports of successful thefts resulting in the transfer of critical technologies to other nations. But it may only be a matter of time. North Korea has attempted more than once to obtain the blueprints for Russian nuclear submarines, as well as their training schedules, but apparently all their efforts were foiled; Russians themselves tried to steal and sell a top-secret radar complex for the Su-27 aircraft to China but were also foiled.³¹ The sheer number of thefts, however, suggests that some may well have involved technology transfer.³²

Military Reforms in the Russian Far East

In addition to problems of underfunding, the military has been undergoing structural reforms. One of the first places in Russia to begin the reform of regional force structures was Kamchatka, in May 1998. Previously, troops and forces deployed in Kamchatka and Chukotka were subordinated to five commands in four services (Navy, Air Force, Air Defense Force, and

³⁰ "Indiya poluchit malenkiy 'Kursk', Rossiya–dollary i golovnyuyu bol" [India to Receive a Little *Kursk*, Russia-Dollars and a Headache], *Vneshneekonomicheskoye obozreniye*, 3 November 2000, in Integrum Techno, <http://www.integrum.ru>, accessed 30 July 2001.

³¹ Vladimir Larin and Sergey Prokhorov, "Where Did Makarov Sell the Projectile?: Special Services' Illicit Weapons Trade," *Profil*, 28 June 2000, in "Theft, Sale of Weapons Leads to Concern About Nuclear Warhead Security," FBIS Document CEP20001129000306.

³² To date, however, most thefts involve metals and spare parts. One of the more interesting cases involved the smuggling of Su-27 aircraft parts from Khabarovsk to China. Two Russian military men and one former officer assisted two Chinese citizens in stealing the equipment from the Komsomolsk-na-Amure Aviation Production Association and active military units. One of the air regiments had to disband due to a lack of equipment after the thefts. Boris Savelyev, ITAR-TASS, 5 February 1999, in "Russians, Chinese Charged with Smuggling Su-27 Parts," FBIS Document FTS19990205001573; Larin and Prokhorov.

Army). With the formation of the Northeastern Group of Troops and Forces, all forces except the two Kamchatka Strategic Rocket Forces bases are now subordinated to the Commander of the Pacific Fleet (HQ in Vladivostok), with an operational commander stationed in Kamchatka. The first operational commander was the Commander of the Kamchatskaya Flotilla, Vice-Admiral Valeriy Dorogin. The creation of a unified group should reduce complexity and increase operational support of the forces, and it has already resulted in the shrinking of the command superstructure and elimination of duplicate logistic and other structures. But the process of reform is difficult, as officers and bases try to benefit from the changes and fight to maintain their positions when facing elimination. The situation in Kamchatka was not helped when Dorogin ran for State Duma deputy, was then elected, and served as both operational commander of the Northeastern Group and deputy for about six months, before a replacement commander was sent.

The biggest reforms in Primorye and Khabarovsk relate to base closings, and the transfer of the nuclear-powered submarine force to Kamchatka. There are already several bases without active nuclear vessels, including Zavety Ilyicha in Khabarovsk and Razboynik Bay in Primorye, which still have decommissioned vessels, and Rakushka Naval Base in Vladimir Bay, Primorye, which has been completely shut down. The facilities with decommissioned submarines continue to require a strong guard force, as well as personnel to maintain the safety of on-board reactors. (As of July 2001, Zavety Ilyicha had three decommissioned submarines that had yet to be defueled, while Primorye had 15 decommissioned attack submarines with fuel, of which three were contaminated.)³³ There are also great quantities of spent nuclear submarine fuel remaining in Primorye. This fuel remains a proliferation risk due to its highly enriched uranium. Although some of the fuel has been in storage for many years, and its radioactivity is thus decreasing, a nation like North Korea could still use it to construct nuclear devices, should they succeed in obtaining it. Russia's other Asian neighbors thus have every reason to make the desperate circumstances of the guards around such facilities a top concern.³⁴

³³ NIS Nuclear Profiles Database, Center for Nonproliferation Studies, Monterey Institute of International Studies, <http://cns.miis.edu>, accessed 30 July 2001.

³⁴ According to Yuriy Sazonov, military prosecutor of the Petropavlovsk-Kamchatskiy garrison, by April 2001 there had already been five cases in Kamchatka involving attempts by military staff to sell military property this year. Aleksandr Arkhipov, "Protiv dvukh ofitserov, zaderzhan-nykh na Kamchatke po podozreniyu v trgovle radioaktivnymi priborami, vzbuzhdeno ugolov-

To sum up, Russia's regions have an impact on local defense facilities and military plants through the general level of criminality and poverty in the region, as well as through the direct actions of regional leaders. These actions can be positive, such as the provision of assistance or free electricity to military bases (although regional assistance is of course not a good way to fund the military in the long run). They can also be negative, as when regions cut off electricity or protest against activities in local bases.³⁵ Military readiness in the region has also been affected by the reforms of Russia's armed services, which may strengthen forces in the long term but are costly in the short term. The level of preparedness conditions the policies Moscow can realistically hope to implement. At present Moscow's military maneuvering in Asia is like a Potemkin village: all show with nothing behind it. Nevertheless, military facilities still house great numbers of arms as well as nuclear materials and chemicals. Should their security be breached, as the necessary guard personnel is compromised, these materials could fall into foreign hands. This threat could prove as great to Russia's neighbors as its military might.

noye delo" [A Criminal Case Has Been Brought Against Two Officers Arrested in Kamchatka on Suspicion of Trading Radioactive Instruments], ITAR-TASS, 28 April 2001, in Integrum Techno, <http://www.integrum.ru>, accessed 15 May 2001. Recent incidents involving thefts from nuclear-powered submarines in the Russian Far East include a March 2000 attempt by five guards were to steal metal from a partially dismantled Yankee-class submarine. The men, who had been earning about \$25 a month, were asphyxiated in the submarine. "Gibel'naya Chazhma" [Fatal Chazhma], *Vladivostok*, 22 March 2000, <http://vl.vladnews.ru>, accessed 30 July 2001. In an incident with potentially drastic consequences, in January 2000 two sailors bribed a guard and broke into a decommissioned nuclear submarine with two functioning nuclear reactors. They removed a number of elements from the reactor control unit and also seized radioactive calibrating material with the aim of selling the material on the black market. They were unable to raise the reactor fuel rods because a mechanic, acting on his own initiative, had bolted down the rods the previous day. Mikhail Druzhinin, "Matrosy razdolbali yadernyy reaktor" [Sailors Break a Nuclear Reactor], *Kommersant-daily*, 29 January 2000, <http://www.online.ru>, accessed 30 July 2001.

³⁵ Not all protests are negative. While environmental protests against commendable dismantlement efforts in Primorye are unfortunate, protests against the mishandling of spent rocket fuel in Primorye and Kamchatka may have a positive affect on military safety. *Vladivostok*, 20 May 1997, p. 3; "Melanzh s chasovym mekhanizmom" [Rocket Fuel on a Timer], *Novosti*, 2 November 2000, <http://novosti.vl.ru>, accessed 30 July 2001; "Genshtab poklyalsya nas ne travit" [The General Staff Promised Not to Poison Us], *Novosti*, 24 January 2001, <http://novosti.vl.ru>, accessed 30 July 2001; "Dorogina otmyvayut. . ." [They are Washing Dorogin Clean], *Kamchat-skoye vremya*, 16 November 2000, pp. 8-9.

Russia's Relations with China

Chinese-Russian relations are now at a high point. They began to thaw already in 1986, in the latter days of the USSR, leading to Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to Beijing in 1989. The decrease of Russian military power in 1991 increased China's incentives to deal with Russia, and in December 1992 the two countries signed an agreement on the mutual reduction of armaments and the development of more open military relations in border areas.³⁶ In 1994 the relationship was defined as a "constructive partnership," with the word "strategic" added in the Sino-Russian Joint Communiqué of 25 April 1996, four days after the U.S.-Japanese Joint Security Statement was issued.³⁷ At the August 1999 "Shanghai Five" summit meeting in Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan, presidents Yeltsin and Jiang furthered harmony between the two nations, with both speaking out against U.S. plans for theater missile defenses and U.S. "hegemony" and calling for a multipolar world.³⁸

During Putin's July 2000 visit to China, he and Jiang Zemin signed five documents, including a denunciation of American national missile defense (NMD) plans, a pledge to work together against "hegemonism, power politics and group politics" (references to U.S. and NATO actions), and a joint statement noting that "the incorporation of Taiwan into any foreign missile defense system is unacceptable and will seriously undermine regional stability." The latter was the first official Russian endorsement of Chinese opposition to an Asian theater defense (TMD) system. Moscow subsequently declared that Russia would "not support any form of Taiwan independence" and would refuse to sell armaments to Taiwan.³⁹ On 16 July 2001, President Putin and Chinese leader Jiang Zemin signed a Treaty on Good-Neighborly Relations, Friendship, and Cooperation, and a separate declaration stressing their commitment to the principles of

³⁶ Austin and Muraviev, *The Armed Forces of Russia in Asia*, p. 103.

³⁷ For more details on Sino-Russian diplomatic relations, see Suisheng Zhao's paper in this volume.

³⁸ The Shanghai Five are Russia, China, Kyrgyzstan, Kazakhstan, and Tajikistan. They signed a military agreement at their first meeting, on 26 April 1996, on strengthening trust in the border areas. Interfax, 25 August 1999; Reuters, AP, UPI, Russian agencies, 25 August 1999, as cited in "Anti-Western Edge to Russian-Chinese Summit," *Jamestown Monitor*, 26 August 1999.

³⁹ Reuters, Xinhua, 18 July 2000, as cited in "Russian-Chinese Partnership Hailed," *Jamestown Monitor*, 19 July 2000.

the 1972 U.S.-Soviet⁴⁰ Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty.⁴¹ Just two days later, however, meeting with U.S. President George Bush, Putin pledged not to join forces with China should Washington abandon the ABM Treaty to develop a missile shield.⁴² Instead, he said Russia and China would emphasize economic cooperation, including military sales.⁴³

China's "strategic partnership" with Russia is unlikely to turn into a true security pact unless the rest of the world forces the two nations together. Too many conflicts of interest work against their becoming true allies, and in China's eyes what Russia may have to offer is no substitute for Western technology and trade, although at least in the near term China continues to show interest in Russian armaments. The two states are chiefly drawn together by geopolitical factors. Both wish to play a role in world politics; it is in their interest to cooperate in "balancing" the United States, a country they see as trying to play an undeserved hegemonic role. To lessen the likelihood that Russia and China might establish a true security pact, other nations, the United States in particular, should encourage their participation in world affairs and work on providing positive incentives to reduce cooperation in the security sphere.

As for economic ties, the more dependent the financial well-being of the Russian Far East (both military and non-military) is on China, the less room for maneuver Moscow has. At present, China is an important economic partner in the non-military realm, but has far from a monopoly position in the region. In fact, China's own continuing efforts to reform its state-owned industries do not permit sufficient investment in Russia to help buoy its economy. Although it is not in Chinese interest to see the Russian economy collapse, China alone cannot maintain her neighbor's financial health. Despite a rumor in Moscow that Beijing may offer to repay Russia's

⁴⁰ In September 1997 Russia, Belarus, Kazakhstan, and Ukraine became parties to the ABM treaty as successor states to the USSR. "Memorandum of Understanding on Successor States to the ABM Treaty," New York, 26 September 1997.

⁴¹ Vsevolod Ovchinnikov, "U nas s Kitayem snova est Dogovor" [We Once Again Have a Treaty With China], *Rossiyskaya gazeta*, 17 July 2001, <http://www.rg.ru>, accessed 30 July 2001.

⁴² Alice Lagnado, "Putin Won't Side With Beijing Against Shield," *Washington Times*, 19 July 2001, <http://washingtontimes.com>, accessed 24 July 2001.

⁴³ Ovchinnikov, "U nas s Kitayem snova est Dogovor," 17 July 2001.

international debts, there is as yet little indication that China has any intention of assisting in Russian economic development.⁴⁴

In the military-industrial sphere, however, China's role looms large. While today's China benefits from acquiring Russian arms technology, Russia may soon run out of weapons it is able, and willing, to sell. Moscow has in fact attempted to prevent the sale of critical weapons technology, lest it be turned against Russia. At times, however, subnational Russian actors have subverted central controls, as noted above. Should the Russian economy collapse, the already shaky condition of military plants in the Far East could well plummet further. Should the economy improve, the factories that do not benefit thereby may try finding illegal ways to supplement their incomes. To counter such dangers and affect these plants positively other nations can seek to engage them, by helping them convert, purchasing their products, and/or encouraging them to merge (larger, national companies are more easily controlled). Russia's relationship with China is not necessarily a danger to the United States and other states in the north Pacific. It is more likely to become a threat, however, if Russia has no other economic or security partners in the region.

Russia's Relations with Japan

Russia's relationship with Japan faces various hurdles, the most important of which is a territorial dispute going back to World War II and the consequent lack of a peace treaty between the two nations. The development of economic ties, which would be difficult under the best of circumstances, has been stymied by these political problems.⁴⁵ It would be in the best interest of both nations to conclude an agreement. However, politicians in both capitals need arguments that will play in the domestic political arena in order to make coming to a compromise feasible. In Russia, Putin could use his reputation as a strong nationalist and point to the 1956 Soviet-Japa-

⁴⁴ As cited in <http://www.grani.ru>, accessed 27 July 2001.

⁴⁵ In 2000 Russian-Japanese trade increased 20 percent, but still was only \$5.2 billion, while Japanese investment in Russia remained a static \$350 million. Currently Japanese capital invested in the Russian Far East is 7.2 percent of its total Russian investment. Moscow recently announced a new federal targeted program for developing the Far East and stimulating private investment, but it is unclear if this will stimulate Japanese investment. Zoya Kaika, *Vedomosti*, 30 May 2001, as cited in "Russian Economic Performance Roundup-30 May," FBIS Document CEP20010530000358.

nese Declaration to justify giving two of the disputed islands to Japan. Japan's present government, however, is unlikely to compromise unless other states provide some political cover.

Territorial Dispute Negotiations

The four disputed islands, called the southern Kurils by the Russians and Northern Territories by the Japanese, were seized by Soviet troops at the end of World War II. Tokyo has proposed the redrawing of the Russian-Japanese border so that the islands will ultimately return to Japan. Moscow has instead suggested focusing on a peace treaty that would formally end World War II, or signing an interim treaty, and postponing the territorial issue. But Japan has refused to separate the two issues, and has also tied a solution of the territorial issue to the full normalization of political and economic relations between the two nations and increased Japanese financial aid to Russia.

There have been hints that the Japanese stance might be softening: on 27 July 2000 Hiromu Nonaka, secretary general of the Liberal Democratic Party, suggested that Tokyo de-link the territorial and treaty questions, and on 31 July Japanese Deputy Foreign Minister Yutaka Kawashima said that Japan should consider allowing talks to continue beyond a year-end deadline.⁴⁶ Other Japanese officials, including then-Prime Minister Yoshiro Mori, however, made it clear that the official Japanese position remained unchanged.⁴⁷

With the accession of Vladimir Putin and the passing of 1 January 2000—the deadline set in 1997 to adopt a treaty—Japan proposed a new time limit: the end of 2000.⁴⁸ Putin and Mori met four times in 2000, but came no closer to agreement. In fall 2000 Putin reportedly suggested a way out of the deadlock: reviving the moribund 1956 Soviet-Japanese Declaration, whereby two of the four islands—Shikotan and the Habomai group of islets—would be handed over to

⁴⁶ Reuters, 1-2 August 2000, *Asahi Shimbun*, 1 August 2000, and *Izvestiya*, 2 August 2000, as cited in “Is Japan Softening Its Position on Territorial Dispute with Russia?” *Jamestown Monitor*, 8 August 2000.

⁴⁷ “Is Japan Softening Its Position on Territorial Dispute with Russia?” *Jamestown Monitor*, 8 August 2000.

⁴⁸ In 1997 at a meeting in Krasnoyarsk President Boris Yeltsin and Prime Minister Ryutaro Hashimoto signed an agreement committing Moscow and Tokyo to resolving the islands question and signing a peace treaty by the year 2000.

Japan after a peace treaty is signed. In 1960 the Soviet Union had rescinded the agreement, after Japan and the United States revised their security treaty.

Not long afterwards, however, in November 2000, Russian Deputy Foreign Minister Aleksandr Losyukov, the Russian diplomat who oversees Russia's relations with Japan, averred that the two countries were interpreting the 1956 agreement differently: the Japanese considered the return of two islands only a prelude to negotiations on the return of the other two, while the Russians believed the 1956 agreement allowed Moscow to retain permanent control of the other two islands. On 1 December 2000, disputing Losyukov's claim, the Japanese denied that the two countries differed in their interpretation of the 1956 accord. In turn, the Russian Foreign Ministry countered three days later that it was not considering the handover of even two islands. The Japanese side subsequently hardened its position as well.⁴⁹

Talks between Foreign Ministers Yohei Kono and Igor Ivanov in January 2001 did not move the negotiations forward. And by this time Losyukov was declaring outright that Russia had no intention of ceding any of the four islands, although he did grant that Russian and Japanese experts were "very actively" discussing the 1956 declaration.⁵⁰ The meetings ended acrimoniously when Kono, against Moscow's wishes, publicly announced that heads of state Putin and Mori would meet on 25–26 February. After the Kono announcement, the Russians denied Kono an expected meeting with Putin and informed him that the February summit date was off.⁵¹ Nevertheless, a new summit date, 25 March, was set during a Putin-Mori telephone call on 13 January.

Just one day later, however, on 14 January 2001 Russian bombers twice breached Japanese airspace. Several times in the past decade Russian military forces have undertaken actions that irritated Japan just when diplomatic relations were taking a positive turn.⁵² It is possible

⁴⁹ "Japanese-Russian Territorial Dispute Rears Its Head Again," *Jamestown Monitor*, 19 December 2000.

⁵⁰ Unidentified Japanese source, as cited in Reuters, 16 January 2001, as cited in "Moscow and Tokyo Continue to Wrangle Over Islands Issue," *Jamestown Monitor*, 17 January 2001.

⁵¹ "Russian and Japanese Leaders to Meet, Tokyo Protests Russian Air Intrusion," *Jamestown Monitor*, 15 February 2001.

⁵² "Russian and Japanese Leaders to Meet, Tokyo Protests Russian Air Intrusion."

these actions were initiated by the military, either in the center or the region, to harm the territorial talks. The violation of Japanese airspace came in stark contrast to the flight of Russian bombers near Norway that same day: none of the aircraft from Russia's northwest entered Norwegian airspace. In addition, Russia had advised Norway of its intended maneuvers near the Norwegian border, but reportedly sent Japan no such advisories.⁵³

An additional problem the two countries may face is the possible Russian default on an initial payment of US\$6 million due on Soviet-era debts to Japan.⁵⁴ As of March 2001, nevertheless, Russia was making some effort to begin repaying its obligations.⁵⁵

At the March 2001 summit meeting in Irkutsk Putin and Mori issued the "Irkutsk Declaration," wherein the two leaders agreed that the 1956 declaration is a "fundamental legal document" which serves as the "starting point" of the peace treaty process; this was the first written confirmation of the validity of the 1956 pact. But the future of the peace-treaty process remained unclear, as Mori and Putin differed in their interpretation of what the Irkutsk Declaration really meant and set no new deadline for concluding a pact formally ending World War II hostilities.⁵⁶ Furthermore, after the summit Russia and Japan disputed whether their leaders had agreed on a "double-framework approach" to the territorial question. According to the Russian Foreign Ministry, "no 'separate consultations' were agreed upon at the March summit." Mori, on the other hand, asserted that Japan and Russia had come to terms on two frameworks governing the return of the islands. One of the two would detail the conditions for returning the Habomai group of

⁵³ "Russian and Japanese Leaders to Meet, Tokyo Protests Russian Air Intrusion."

⁵⁴ Unidentified Japanese source, as cited in Reuters, 16 January, as cited in "Moscow and Tokyo Continue to Wrangle Over Islands Issue."

⁵⁵ "Russia Paying Debt to Japan," ITAR-TASS, 1 March 2001, in "Russia Paying Debt to Japan, No Figures Given," FBIS Document CEP20010301000162.

⁵⁶ "Northern Territories to be Discussed at Moscow Symposium," Kyodo, 23 May 2001, in FBIS Document JPP20010523000140; Naoko Aoki, "Mori, Putin Confirm 1956 Pact Over Isles Dispute," Kyodo, 25 March 2001, in FBIS Document JPP20010325000041.

islets and Shikotan Island, while the fate of the other two islands, Kunashiri and Etorofu, would be addressed under a separate framework.⁵⁷

The new Japanese Prime Minister, Junichiro Koizumi, appears to be taking a harder line toward Russia than did his predecessor. He sent a letter to Putin seeking clarification of the ownership of all four islands, rather than espousing the two-track approach favored by Mori. The letter met with a very negative Russian response. Should Koizumi maintain his current position, negotiations are unlikely to move forward.⁵⁸ He and Putin met in person for the first time on 21 July, during the G-8 summit in Genoa, Italy. Both indicated their desire to continue bilateral talks. Putin invited Koizumi to visit Russia early in 2002, and both sides agreed to meet during the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation forum in Shanghai in autumn 2001.⁵⁹

Given Putin's well-cultivated image as defender of Russia's national interest, he would probably be able to use the 1956 declaration as justification for returning two of the four islands. The strong showing of Koizumi's Liberal Democratic Party in the 2001 Japanese parliamentary elections⁶⁰ indicates that the current prime minister may be the strongest Japan has had in quite some time. But unless other nations provide some political cover, inducing concessions on the islands issue, it is unlikely that he will be able to meet Russia halfway.

Possible Future Solutions

Radical measures seem called for in order to resolve the decades-long stalemate between Japan and Russia. It would, for instance, certainly be in the interest of other Western and Pacific nations to induce Japan to some kind of accommodation. Other countries, including the United States, could promise more actively to support a seat for Japan on the United Nations Security

⁵⁷ "Russia Denies Agreeing to 2-track Approach During Summit," Kyodo, 14 May 2001, in FBIS Document JPP20010514000107.

⁵⁸ "No Prospect for Return to Japan of Russian-held Isles," Kyodo, 24 May 2001, in FBIS Document JPP20010524000124.

⁵⁹ "Koizumi Seeks Early Solution Of Isle Row With Russia," *Jiji Press*, 21 July 2001; "Russian President and Japanese Premier in Genoa Confirm Their Earlier Agreements," Interfax, 23 July 2001.

⁶⁰ Howard W. French, "Ruling Party Earns Decisive Victory in Japan," *New York Times*, 30 July 2001, <http://www.nytimes.com>, accessed 30 July 2001.

Council in return for signing such an agreement; and Russia would certainly do well to promote it. In addition, the United States, Japan, and Russia could establish a trilateral security pact linking a solution to the territorial issue with Russia's entry into NATO, and giving Japan observer status at NATO, as well as support for a United Nations Security Council seat. Involving Russia in international security pacts would fit in well with current attempts to ease Moscow's fears of U.S. missile defense plans.

A peace treaty between Japan and Russia would improve the strategic balance in the region, increasing Japanese political influence in the region and lessening China's. If attaining a peace treaty proves impossible, Japan should be encouraged to sign an interim agreement, separating the territorial issue from other matters. At the very least, other nations ought to engage both Japan and Russia in multilateral solutions to Asian security concerns, such as the problem of missile and nuclear development in North Korea.

Increased Japanese economic activity in the Russian Far East could help to stabilize that region, and lessen the likelihood of desperate undertakings by local Russian firms. Japan should be encouraged, for example, to assist in the conversion of Russian military facilities to peacetime use, but on its own Japan is unlikely to succeed in this realm. To date Tokyo's efforts have been plagued by problems. In particular, a project to build a radioactive waste filtration facility in Primorye, the Russian territory closest to Japan, has faced huge cost overruns and resulted in the loss of face and jobs by the top Japanese involved.⁶¹ It has also failed to build an institutional base for further cooperation. On the other hand, despite some shortcomings, U.S. nonproliferation programs have created a constituency in both nations for continued cooperation. The United States would be well advised to share its experience with the Japanese, and help them spend profitably the money they have allocated for Russian assistance projects. Other nations too would do well to cooperate with Japan in the Russian Far East.⁶²

⁶¹ For a detailed review of the project, see Cristina Chuen and Tamara Troyakova, "The Complex Politics of Foreign Assistance: Building the *Landysh* in the Russian Far East," *Nonproliferation Review* 8, no. 2 (summer 2001): 134-49.

⁶² To date, the only ongoing joint project is a feasibility study into the dismantlement of a Victor-class nuclear-powered submarine. The project, which is being undertaken by a joint French-Japanese consortium, does not involve French government assistance. The Japanese companies Mitsui and JGC (Japan Gasoline Company) are working with the French company SGN (Société Générale pour les Techniques Nouvelles, formerly Saint Gobain Nucléaire) on the study.

Russia's Relations with the Koreas

After a decade of neglect, Russia's relations with North Korea (DPRK) have slowly begun improving. Its relations with the South, which showed a marked improvement in the early 1990s, may once again be on the upswing. Three state visits are helping to smooth these paths: in February 2001 Putin visited South Korea; in April Kim Il-chol, DPRK Minister of the People's Armed Forces, came to Moscow (the first visit by a high-level military official in a decade), and on 4 August North Korean leader Kim Jong-il himself arrived in the Russian capital. Nevertheless, Russia's ties with both nations remain at a fairly rudimentary level, although she has indicated her eagerness to improve them. One positive sign was the 15 May 2001 call by South Korean (ROK) National Assembly Speaker Lee Man-sup for parliamentary talks involving Russia and both Koreas to promote economic cooperation among the three nations.⁶³

South Korea

South Korea has made some gestures towards Russia, for example, by joining Russia in a statement, issued on 27 February 2001, declaring support for the 1972 anti-ballistic missile treaty. Since then South Korea has felt it necessary to qualify the statement by indicating that it was not meant as a declaration against U.S. NMD plans.⁶⁴ The Russian-South Korean relationship faces several difficulties. Russia owes South Korea some \$1.8 billion. The two nations are also having trouble overcoming obstacles to building new railway lines that would link both Koreas with Russia.⁶⁵ Finally, North Korea largely absorbs the South's attention and resources.

Some Russian analysts have suggested that South Korea might have a role to play in balancing Chinese, Japanese, and American influence in the Russian Far East. It would be advisable

"French and Japanese Consortium to Deal with Far-East Subs," 14 April 2000, Bellona Foundation Web Site, <http://www.bellona.no>, accessed 27 July 2001.

⁶³ "ROK Nat'l Assembly Speaker Proposes Parliamentary Talks With 2 Koreas, Russia," *Korea Herald*, 17 May 2001, in FBIS Document KPP20010516000092.

⁶⁴ "Washington Downplays Significance of Joint South Korea-Russia Statement," *Agence France Presse*, 1 March 2001.

⁶⁵ Patrick Tyler, "South Korea Takes Russia's Side in Dispute Over U.S. Missile Defense Plan," *New York Times*, 28 February 2001, <http://www.nytimes.com>, accessed 28 February 2001.

for the United States and Japan to encourage an increase in South Korea's activity in Russia where possible. The Russian Far East is home to many ethnic Koreans, and South Korea has shown an interest in assisting the region, no doubt in part because an economic collapse in Russia would not help the North Korean situation. It would probably make sense to involve South Korea there even more, by having it join programs sponsored by the United States and other countries, and by establishing a multilateral insurance program to encourage South Korean, as well as other foreign companies to invest in the Russian Far East. The joint declaration resulting from the February 2001 summit meeting, whereby South Korea agreed to boost Korean investment in a major Siberian natural gas field, is a step in the right direction.⁶⁶

North Korea

The Russian-North Korean relationship has been slowly improving. In February 2000 Russian Foreign Minister Igor Ivanov visited Pyongyang and concluded a "Treaty of Good Will, Neighborly Friendship and Cooperation between North Korea and Russia." The treaty stipulates that both countries will develop friendly relations based on mutual respect, nonintervention in domestic affairs, equality, reciprocity, territorial rights, and international legal principles.⁶⁷ During Putin's visit to North Korea from 19 to 20 July 2000, a "DPRK-Russia Joint Declaration" was adopted, which included calls for improved bilateral relations and increased cooperation as well as joint pronouncements on several key international issues, including a North Korean statement of support for Russian efforts to maintain and strengthen the ABM treaty. The declaration also included the statement that "the DPRK and Russia oppose interference in other states' internal affairs perpetrated under the pretext of humanitarian intervention and support each other's efforts to defend . . . independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity," as well as the pledge that "the two countries will contact each other without delay when the danger of invasion is im-

⁶⁶ Tan Wen Li, "Concern as Putin Reaches Out for Closer Ties with Asia," *The Straits Times*, 6 March 2001, in "Singapore Columnist Notes Concern over Putin's Efforts to Boost Ties With Asia," FBIS Document SEP20010305000117.

⁶⁷ Kim Tu-hwan, "DPRK-Russia Cementing a Cooperative Relationship," *Yonhap*, 20 July 2001, as translated in "ROK Daily on DPRK-Russia Consolidation of Friendship and Cooperation," FBIS Document KPP20010720000102.

minent, or when peace and security of the two are threatened”—a promise that could be interpreted to mean that Russia would come to the North’s aid in a conflict with the South.⁶⁸

The character of these new ties is not yet set and it is thus important at this time to strengthen the positive aspects. Since North Korea has little reason to fear Russia, Moscow could play a positive part in multilateral talks involving Pyongyang. While some issues concerning North Korea and its relations with South Korea, China, the United States, and Japan must be solved on a bilateral basis, other questions, particular those that have reached a stalemate, might benefit from opening up more wide-ranging talks including the participation of Russia. Assistance in bringing North Korea to the negotiating table will give Russia more weight in Seoul, increasing the likelihood of a further improvement in economic ties between Russia and South Korea. Further, acting as mediator in North Korea could calm Russian fears of losing its role in international affairs. U.S. Secretary of State Colin Powell’s request in July 2001 that Putin tell Kim Jong-il that it is in his interest to resume talks with Seoul and Washington is a good beginning.⁶⁹

If Russia is not involved in a positive way in North Korea, Russian-DPRK ties will be relegated to the military sphere. Indeed, when DPRK Minister of People’s Armed Forces Kim Il-chol visited Moscow in April 2001, he signed an intergovernmental agreement on defense industry cooperation. The pact did not appear to comprise any large Korean purchases of Russian military equipment. However, in the run-up to the coming Putin-Kim meeting, Moscow has reportedly promised to sell North Korea a number of high-tech weapons. According to an official Russian source cited by the *Korea Herald*, the North Koreans have requested S-300 ground-to-air missiles, an anti-aircraft radar navigation system, 3,000-ton-class warships, advanced T-90 tanks, technology and technical support for the production of MiG-29 fighters, and missile and rocket components, as well as reconnaissance photos filmed from aircraft and military satellites on a regular basis. Apparently Pyongyang asked Moscow to provide the weapons in return for

⁶⁸ Reuters, 20 July 2000 and The Digital Chosun, 20 July 2000, as cited in “Putin Visit to North Korea: A Breakthrough?” *Monitor—A Daily Briefing on the Post-Soviet States* 6, no. 142 (21 July 2000).

⁶⁹ George Gedda, “Powell Urges Russia to Press North Korea on Reconciliation Efforts with South,” Associated Press, in Lexis-Nexis Academic Universe, <http://www.lexis-nexis.com>, accessed 30 July 2001.

the North's approval of the Traversing Korea Railways project, linking South Korea to Russia by rail. This development contrasts with Russian Prime Minister Igor Ivanov's statements indicating that Russia will mainly sell spare parts, and that its arms sales will not compromise stability on the Korean Peninsula.⁷⁰ The revival of Russian arms sales to North Korea is a step in the wrong direction. Russia should be encouraged to minimize such military deals and instead maximize transactions in non-military areas that will contribute to the stabilization and internationalization of the North Korean economy. Should the arms sales go through, the good will they will no doubt engender in Pyongyang should be used to further international efforts to engage North Korea.

To promote the valuable aspects of Russia's connections with North Korea (and minimize the less favorable ones) a number of options can fruitfully be explored. First and foremost, the Russian wish to play a role in the Korean Peninsula Energy Development Organization (KEDO)⁷¹ should be granted. While Russia cannot afford to provide the level of funding that would normally be required to acquire the status of executive member on the project, the other executive members (the United States, South Korea, Japan, and the European Union) should help Moscow find another way to contribute. For instance, Russia could be entrusted with upgrading the North Korean power grid—a safety necessity once the light-water reactors go online—and could also integrate the North Korean grid with Russia's. Improving the power grid could help the DPRK even before the light-water reactors go online, since Russia has excess power capacity in the summer, when North Korea has power shortages, and a power deficit in the winter, when North Korean hydroelectric power production is at its height. In addition, Russia's participation could increase its understanding of the project, and become as well a new avenue for the United States to use in addressing a difficult issue: making Russia understand why, on the one hand,

⁷⁰ Hwang Jang-jin, "Russia, N.K. Make Progress On High-Tech Weapons Trade," *Korea Herald*, 30 July 2001, http://www.koreaherald.co.kr/SITE/data/html_dir/2001/07/30/200107300046.asp, accessed 30 July 2001.

⁷¹ KEDO is an international organization established to supply the DPRK with two proliferation-resistant light-water reactor units and heavy fuel oil for heating and electricity in exchange for the DPRK freezing and eventually dismantling its nuclear program. KEDO came about as part of the Agreed Framework negotiated in 1994 by the United States and the DPRK. KEDO Web Site, <http://www.kedo.org>, accessed 6 August 2001.

selling power reactors to Iran is a security problem but exporting them to North Korea instead solves security problems.

Finally, there is the small chance that the Russians might prove useful in calming the North Koreans as 2003 approaches and the light-water reactors are not yet complete, or in persuading the North Koreans not to react too strongly to the current anti-Pyongyang rhetoric emanating from Washington. The Russians believe they are better able to understand North Korean motives, given their long history of interactions with the nation and their understanding of the North Korean political system. After a tense decade the recent improvement in their mutual relations gives hope that Moscow may have some new ideas on how to cooperate with the Pyongyang regime—ideas beneficial to the international community.

While Moscow does not share all of Washington's concerns regarding North Korea, increased Russian participation in North Korean negotiations is likely to do American mediators more good than harm. Most Asian nations will be more confident if new multilateral solutions can be found to long-standing security problems, instead of continuing the present pattern of ad hoc, bilateral solutions. On 26 July Russian Foreign Minister Igor Ivanov suggested that existing talks—between the two Koreas, between North Korea, the United States, and Japan, and between North Korea, South Korea, the United States, and Japan—be supplemented by discussions involving six countries: South Korea, North Korea, Russia, the United States, China, and Japan.⁷²

As for regional ties, North Korea and Russian regional actors began to cooperate about a decade ago, but that local economic cooperation has remained at a low level. North Korea has had the most contact with Primorye, the region with which it shares a border, particularly in the fishing and sea transport industries. At present the question of using fuel oil at North Korea's Radzhin oil terminal to increase electricity production in Primorye is under consideration. The Primorsk power company Dalenergo has held talks with its North Korean counterparts several times since 1994 regarding the possible mutual sale of electricity, but has been unable to move the issue forward without central support. The Traversing Korea Railways project—to build a railroad from the Russian border to South Korea, which would reduce freight times to Europe from the present 40-45 days via the Suez Canal, to about 14 days—may not be a boon to the

⁷² "Interfax Diplomatic Panorama," 27 July 2001, in FBIS Document CEP20010727000285.

Russian Far East. According to Khabarovsk Governor Ishayev, the railroad would provide a link from South Korea's huge port at Pusan, through China and Russia, to Europe, drawing away traffic from ports in the Russian Far East. Ishayev predicts the "death" of Primorye's and Khabarovsk's ports, were this to happen.⁷³ Moscow is still pushing the project, since it would improve Russian relations with both Koreas. The Russian Far East also hosts North Korean guest workers, who typically work in construction or forestry. However, the overall level of economic ties between the two nations is small. In the first quarter of 2000, Primorye's trade turnover with North Korea was \$280,650; as of that time North Korea had invested in eight enterprises in Primorye.⁷⁴ The amount of money guest workers send home appears to be significant for the welfare of their families in North Korea. This regional economic cooperation should be supported and expanded, both for the economic benefits and for the opportunity it provides to interact with the North Korean population.

Russia's Relations with the United States

The United States has been disappointed in the results of policies designed to aid Russian economic and political development. Whether failures were due to insufficient funding, Russian corruption, or other reasons, a decision by the United States to withdraw from economic and political aid projects could push Russia into actions counterproductive to U.S. interests. Encouraging our friends in Asia to engage Russia positively and become involved in its economy would help stabilize the region while lessening the need for a strong U.S. presence there. The United States should use its influence to promote the engagement of Japan and South Korea in particular, and support an increase in Russian ties to other states in the region as well.

If the United States and its friends disengage, Russia will be forced to find allies elsewhere. Already, Putin has had meetings with Saddam Hussein, Muammar Qadhafi, and Fidel

⁷³ "Pyongyang and Moscow Concludes on Railway Connection," *Joongang Ilbo*, 28 March 2001, in "DPRK-Russia Railway Talks," NAPSNet Daily Report, 28 March 2001, <http://www.nautilus.org/napsnet/dr/0103/MAR28.html>, accessed 30 July 2001; "Viktor Ishayev: 'Dalniy Vostok ne vyigrayet ot vossoyedeniya Transkoreyskoy magistrali s Transsibom'" [The Far East Will Not Win From the Joining of the Trans-Korean Railroad with the Trans-Siberian Railroad], *Strana.ru*, 28 July 2001, <http://www.strana.ru>, accessed 28 July 2001.

⁷⁴ "Komandirovka v sostave delegatsii prezidenta Rossii."

Castro. Even if one believes that Russia's embrace of rogue regimes is merely a temporary tactic to engender more attention from the West, one should be wary of pushing too hard and boxing Russia in: there is a real danger that a Russia in desperate financial straits might begin to make questionable military sales to such countries.

Although the United States is trying to decrease its direct engagement in Russia in general, regarding the Russian Far East in particular the level of interaction is already quite low, and certainly shows no sign of increasing. Yet even without large amounts of government funding there are many things that the United States can do to help stabilize the Russian Far East: promoting Russian security at a strategic level, conversion assistance, encouraging U.S. investment in Russia, and sponsoring nonproliferation assistance programs.

There have been several very successful assistance programs in the nuclear field, but plans for future projects have run into some problems. Particularly regarding possible help with submarine dismantlement in Kamchatka, American actions have created an aura of mistrust among the local population. During negotiations on this issue the United States has not made sufficient efforts to inform the public or Kamchatka government. While U.S. government officials cannot divulge any details of ongoing negotiations, they could issue a press bulletin on progress of the talks, indicating that no agreement has yet been made, that they will issue further statements when one is concluded, and that U.S. funding will only be forthcoming for projects that meet all Russian environmental requirements. A bulletin may not quell all rumors but should improve the prospect for future public acceptance of any deal that might be forthcoming. The problems with U.S. nonproliferation assistance programs have rarely concerned the level of funding so much as a failure to understand Russian incentives and local politics.

As for economic assistance, Western plans to date have been disappointing. Loan programs, such as those by the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD), have had some success, but mostly on a small scale. These have had no noticeable impact on military industry. Arrangements to send short-term advisors to Russian companies have had even poorer results. Instead, the West should consider instituting a program to provide additional insurance to foreigners investing in particular Russian industries, in order to reduce the risk of investment and induce Western capital to fund the conversion of Russian military industries.

There is at present no plan to assist with military conversion, although U.S. projects to eliminate SSBNs have de facto created some opportunities for conversion in the local military-

industrial complex. These actions have not been enough, however, to eliminate the risks of theft or sales of strategic equipment or materials abroad. If a government-funded conversion program is unpalatable, then at the very least the United States and other foreign governments should look for ways to promote private investment that results in conversion.

Direct U.S. contacts with the Russian military have been at a very superficial level, and while helpful, have gone only a short way in increasing mutual confidence. Much much more needs to be done. Foreign states cannot and should not assist the Russian military in improving its readiness. On the contrary, through adroit diplomacy they may even influence further closing of Russian bases. By helping Russia to find a role to play in Asia and by paying attention to its security concerns in the region, other nations can influence Russian decisions over the level of military preparedness deemed necessary in the region. It will be very difficult to increase Russia's sense of security, however, if the United States develops a missile shield without Russian acquiescence. Washington should make every possible attempt to consider and deal with Russian and Chinese security concerns when going forward with missile defense plans, in particular making a full effort to review Russian missile defense suggestions even if those suggestions seem less than concrete.⁷⁵

Concluding Remarks

Russia's impact on East Asia is likely to increase. By fostering improved Russian ties with Japan and the Koreas, as well as the West, the United States and its allies could help Russia to play a positive role. The West also has an opportunity to steer the Sino-Russian relationship in a non-military direction. If left alone, without political and economic engagement, the Russian state could well collapse, resulting in the destabilization of the region.

Although Russia has played little part in Asia during the past decade, current economic trends suggest that its footprint in Asia is likely to change. Increasing reliance on raw materials means the domestic economy is shifting to the east. Rising transport costs increasingly cut off the Russian Far East from the rest of the national economy, so that it will not survive without in-

⁷⁵ For arguments in favor of the United States pursuing the Russian missile defense proposals, see Ivo Daalder and James Lindsay, "Russia Can Be Our Ally on Missile Defense," *New York Times*, 27 February 2001, p. 23, <http://www.nytimes.com>, accessed 27 February 2001.

creasing trade with Asia. The infrastructure in the Russian Far East, in particular, is nearing collapse. East Asia is unlikely to be able to stabilize Russia if the nations in the area are left to develop their relationships on a bilateral basis. Few Japanese businesses will go into Russia without government support, and the government will not offer that support until the long delayed peace treaty between Russia and Japan is concluded. The United States can play a role in assisting in treaty negotiations. South Korean investment in Russia could increase if Moscow participates more fully in multilateral negotiations regarding North Korea. Involving Russia in some North Korean issues, particularly KEDO, has other potential benefits: helping Russia solve its energy problem in the Primorye region, assuaging geopolitical concerns, and perhaps even providing new ideas on how to deal with North Korea.

There is little disadvantage to increasing multilateral activities in the region. On the other hand there is a great danger in leaving Russia out in the cold. It remains a large nation with many weapons, including nuclear weapons and materials. While past policies may not all have proven successful, current Western governments should look for new policies of engagement, not isolation. There are many unexploited opportunities for involving other East Asian nations in solving the Russia problem. Avoiding chaos in the largest nation in Asia should be a top priority of the next decade.

CONTRIBUTORS

Cristina-Astrid Hansell Chuen
Center for Nonproliferation Studies
Monterey Institute of International Studies

Matthew Evangelista
Peace Studies Program and Government Department
Cornell University

Randall Forsberg
Institute for Defense and Disarmament Studies

Judith Reppy
Peace Studies Program and Department of Science & Technology Studies
Cornell University

Lisa J. Sansoucy
Government Department
Cornell University

Adam Segal
Council on Foreign Relations

J-J Suh
Government Department
Cornell University

Dr. John Swenson-Wright
Japan Research Centre
Faculty of Oriental Studies, University of Cambridge

Suisheng Zhao
Center for China-US Cooperation
Graduate School of International Studies
University of Denver