PART I

Security, Identity, and Stability

Chapter 1

CHINA, THE U.S.-JAPAN ALLIANCE, AND THE SECURITY DILEMMA IN EAST ASIA

Thomas J. Christensen

Many scholars and analysts argue that in the twenty-first century international instability is more likely in East Asia than in Western Europe. Whether one looks at variables favored by realists or liberals, East Asia appears more dangerous. The region is characterized by major shifts in the balance of power, skewed distributions of economic and political power within and between countries, political and cultural heterogeneity, growing but still relatively low levels of intraregional economic interdependence, anemic security institutionalization, and widespread territorial disputes that combine natural resource issues with postcolonial nationalism.[1]

If security dilemma theory is applied to East Asia, the chance for spirals of tension in the area seems great, particularly in the absence of a U.S. military presence in the region. The theory states that, in an uncertain and anarchic international system, mistrust between two or more potential adversaries can lead each side to take precautionary and defensively motivated measures that are perceived as offensive threats. This can lead to countermeasures in kind, thus ratcheting up regional tensions, reducing security, and creating self-fulfilling prophecies about the danger of one's security environment.[2] If we look at the variables that might fuel security dilemma dynamics, East Asia appears quite dangerous. From a standard realist perspective, not only could dramatic and unpredictable changes in the distribution of capabilities in East Asia increase un-

certainty and mistrust, but the importance of sea-lanes and secure energy supplies to almost all regional actors could also encourage a destabilizing competition to develop power-projection capabilities on the seas and in the skies. Because they are perceived as offensive threats, power-projection forces are more likely to spark spirals of tension than weapons that can defend only a nation's homeland.[3] Perhaps even more important in East Asia than these more commonly considered variables are psychological factors (such as the historically based mistrust and animosity among regional actors) and political geography issues relating to the Taiwan question, which make even defensive weapons in the region appear threatening to Chinese security.[4]

One way to ameliorate security dilemmas and prevent spirals of tension is to have an outside arbiter play a policing role, lessening the perceived need for regional actors to begin destabilizing security competitions. For this reason, most scholars, regardless of theoretical persuasion, seem to agree with U.S. officials and local leaders that a major factor in containing potential tensions in East Asia is the continuing presence of the U.S. military, particularly in Japan.[5] The historically based mistrust among the actors in Northeast Asia is so intense that not only is the maintenance of a U.S. presence in Japan critical, but the form the U.S.-Japan alliance takes also has potentially important implications for regional stability. In particular, the sensitivity in China to almost all changes in the cold war version of the U.S.-Japan alliance poses major challenges for leaders in Washington who want to shore up the alliance for the long haul by encouraging greater Japanese burden sharing, but still want the U.S. presence in Japan to be a force for reassurance in the region. To meet these somewhat contradictory goals, for the most part the United States wisely has encouraged Japan to adopt nonoffensive roles that should be relatively unthreatening to Japan's neighbors.

Certain aspects of U.S. policies, however, including joint research of theater missile defenses (TMD) with Japan, are still potentially problematic. According to security dilemma theory, defensive systems and missions, such as TMD, should not provoke arms races and spirals of tension. In contemporary East Asia, however, this logic is less applicable. Many in the region, particularly in Beijing, fear that new defensive roles for Japan could break important norms of self-restraint, leading to more comprehensive Japanese military buildups later. Moreover, Beijing's focus on preventing Taiwan's permanent separation from China means that even defensive weapons in the hands of Taiwan or its potential supporters are provocative to China. Given the bitter history of Japanese imperialism in China and Taiwan's status as a Japanese colony from 1895 to 1945, this certainly holds true for Japan.

In the first section of this article I describe why historical legacies and ethnic hatred exacerbate the security dilemma in Sino-Japanese relations. In the second section I examine Chinese assessments of Japan's actual and potential mili-

tary power. In the third section I address how changes in the U.S.-Japan relationship in the post-cold war era affect Chinese security analysts' views of the likely timing and intensity of future Japanese military buildups. I argue that, for a combination of domestic and international reasons, the United States faces tough challenges in maintaining the U.S.-Japan alliance in a form that reassures both Japan and its neighbors. In the fourth section I discuss why certain aspects of recent efforts to bolster the alliance through Japanese commitments to new, nonoffensive burden-sharing roles are potentially more provocative than they may appear on the surface. In the fifth section I detail how China's attitudes about Japan affect the prospects for creating confidence-building measures and security regimes that might ameliorate the security dilemma over the longer term. In the sixth section I discuss the relevance of my analysis for U.S. foreign policy in the region and why, despite the problems outlined above, there are reasons for optimism if trilateral relations among the United States, China, and Japan are handled carefully in the next two decades.

WHY CHINA WOULD FEAR A STRONGER JAPAN

Chinese security analysts, particularly military officers, fear that within 25 years Japan could again become a great military power. Such a Japan, they believe, would likely be more independent of U.S. control and generally more assertive in international affairs. If one considers threats posed only by military power and not who is wielding that power, one might expect Beijing to welcome the reduction or even elimination of U.S. influence in Japan, even if this meant China would have a more powerful neighbor. After all, the United States is still by far the most powerful military actor in the Western Pacific.[6] However, given China's historically rooted and visceral distrust of Japan, Beijing would fear either a breakdown of the U.S.-Japan alliance or a significant upgrading of Japan's role within that alliance.[7] This sentiment is shared outside China as well, particularly in Korea. Although at present Chinese analysts fear U.S. power much more than Japanese power, in terms of national intentions, Chinese analysts view Japan with much less trust and, in many cases, with a loathing rarely found in their attitudes about the United States.

THE HISTORICAL LEGACY

Japan's refusal to respond satisfactorily to Chinese requests that Tokyo recognize and apologize for its imperial past—for example, by revising history textbooks in the public schools—has helped to preserve China's natural aversion to Japan.[8] Chinese sensibilities are also rankled by specific incidents, such as Prime Minister Ryutaro Hashimoto's 1996 visit to the Yasukuni Shrine, which commemorates Japan's war dead, including war criminals like Tojo.[9] Although some fear that

Japan's apparent amnesia or lack of contrition about the past means that Japan could return to the militarism (*junguozhuyi*) of the 1930s, such simple historical analogies are relatively rare, at least in Chinese elite foreign policy circles.[10]

Chinese analysts' concerns regarding Japanese historical legacies, although not entirely devoid of emotion, are usually more subtle. Many argue that, by downplaying atrocities like the Nanjing massacre and underscoring events like the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, Japanese elites portray Japan falsely as the victim, rather than the victimizer, in World War II. Because of this, some Chinese analysts fear that younger generations of Japanese citizens may not understand Japan's history and will therefore be insensitive to the intense fears of other regional actors regarding Japanese military power. This lack of understanding will make them less resistant to relatively hawkish elites' plans to increase Japanese military power than their older compatriots, who, because they remember World War II, resisted military buildups during the cold war.[11]

Chinese analysts often compare Japan's failure to accept responsibility for World War II to the more liberal postwar record of Germany, which has franker discussions of the war in its textbooks, has apologized for its wartime aggression, and has even offered financial payments to Israel.[12] Now a new unflattering comparison is sure to arise. During their November 1998 summit in Tokyo, Prime Minister Keizo Obuchi refused to offer an apology to China's President Jiang Zemin that used the same contrite wording as the rather forthright apology Japan offered to South Korea earlier in the year. This divergence in apologies will probably only complicate the history issue between Tokyo and Beijing.[13]

It may seem odd to the outside observer, but the intensity of anti-Japanese sentiment in China has not decreased markedly as World War II becomes a more distant memory. There are several reasons in addition to those cited above. Nationalism has always been a strong element of the legitimacy of the Chinese Communist Party (CCP), and opposing Japanese imperialism is at the core of this nationalist story. As a result, Chinese citizens have been fed a steady diet of patriotic, anti-Japanese media programming designed to glorify the CCP's role in World War II. Although far removed from that era, most Chinese young people hold an intense and unapologetically negative view of both Japan and, in many cases, its people.[14] As economic competition has replaced military concerns in the minds of many Chinese, China's basic distrust of Japan has been transferred to the economic realm. Japanese businesspeople are often described as unreliable, selfish, and slimy (*youhua*). As a result, despite five decades of peace and a great deal of economic interaction, chances are small that new Japanese military development will be viewed with anything but the utmost suspicion in China.

Elite analysts are certainly not immune to these intense anti-Japanese feelings in Chinese society. These emotions, however, have not yet affected the practical, day-to-day management of Sino-Japanese relations. On the contrary,

since the 1980s the Chinese government has acted to contain anti-Japanese sentiment in the society at large to avoid damaging bilateral relations and to prevent protestors from using anti-Japanese sentiment as a pretext for criticizing the Chinese government, as occurred several times in Chinese history.[15] But Chinese analysts' statements about the dangers that increased Japanese military power would pose in the future suggest that anti-Japanese sentiment does color their long-term threat assessments, even if it does not always alter their immediate policy prescriptions. Because they can influence procurement and strategy, such longer-term assessments may be more important in fueling the security dilemma than particular diplomatic policies in the present.

CHINESE ASSESSMENTS OF JAPANESE MILITARY POWER AND POTENTIAL

In assessing Japan's current military strength, Chinese analysts emphasize the advanced equipment that Japan has acquired, particularly since the late 1970s, when it began developing a navy and air force designed to help the United States contain the Soviet Union's growing Pacific Fleet. Chinese military writings highlight Japanese antisubmarine capabilities (such as the P-3C aircraft), advanced fighters (such as the F-15), the E-2 advanced warning aircraft, Patriot air defense batteries, and Aegis technology on surface ships.[16] Chinese analysts correctly point out that, excluding U.S. deployments in the region, these weapons systems constitute the most technologically advanced arsenal of any East Asian power. They also cite the Japanese defense budget, which, although small as a percentage of gross national product (GNP), is second only to U.S. military spending in absolute size.[17]

Despite their highlighting of Japan's current defense budget and high levels of military sophistication, Chinese analysts understand that Japan can easily do much more militarily than it does. While they generally do not believe that Japan has the requisite combination of material capabilities, political will, and ideological mission to become a Soviet-style superpower, they do believe that Japan could easily become a great military power (such as France or Great Britain) in the next twenty-five years. For example, although these analysts often argue that it is in Japan's economic interest to continue to rely on U.S. military protection in the near future, they do not think that significantly increased military spending would strongly damage the Japanese economy.[18] They have also been quite suspicious about the massive stockpiles of high-grade nuclear fuel that was reprocessed in France and shipped back to Japan in the early 1990s. Many in China view Japan's acquisition of this plutonium as part of a strategy for the eventual development of nuclear weapons, something, they point out, Japanese scientists would have little difficulty producing.[19] Chinese security analysts also have stated that Japan can become a great military power even if it

forgoes the domestically sensitive nuclear option. Chinese military and civilian experts emphasize that nuclear weapons may not be as useful in the future as high-tech conventional weapons, and that Japan is already a leader in dual-use high technology.[20]

In particular, Chinese experts recognize that Japan has practiced a great deal of self-restraint in eschewing weapons designed to project power far from the home islands. For example, in 1996 one military officer stated that despite the long list of current Japanese capabilities mentioned above, Japan certainly is not yet a normal great power because it lacks the required trappings of such a power (e.g., aircraft carriers, nuclear submarines, nuclear weapons, and long-range missile systems).[21] For this officer and many of his compatriots, the question is simply if and when Japan will decide to adopt these systems. For this reason, Chinese analysts often view Japan's adoption of even new defensive military roles as dangerous because it may begin to erode the constitutional (Article 9) and nonconstitutional norms of self-restraint (e.g., 1,000-nautical-mile limit on power-projection capability, prohibitions on the military use of space, and tight arms export controls) that have prevented Japan from realizing its military potential.

Interestingly, many Chinese analysts do not consider economic hard times in Japan to be particularly reassuring. On the contrary, in terms of intentions, some fear that economic recession and financial crises could improve the fortunes of relatively hawkish Japanese elites by creating a general sense of uncertainty and threat in Japanese society, by fueling Japanese nationalism more generally, and by harming relations with the United States (Japan's main provider of security). In terms of capabilities, some Chinese analysts argue that Japan's technological infrastructure, which would be critical to a modern military buildup, does not seem affected by Japan's recent economic woes.[22]

FACTORS THAT WOULD ENCOURAGE OR PREVENT JAPANESE MILITARY BUILDUPS

Although almost all Chinese analysts would fear the result, they have differed in their assessment of the likelihood that Japan will attempt to realize its military potential in the next few decades. The more pessimistic analysts have argued that this outcome is extremely likely or even inevitable. Their views are consistent with the predictions of balance-of-power theories, but they do not agree with the analysis of some Western experts on Japan who believe that cultural pacifism after World War II, domestic political constraints, and economic interests will steer Japan away from pursuing such a strategy.[23] Even the more pessimistic Chinese analysts are aware of these arguments about Japanese restraint and do not dismiss them out of hand, but some view such obstacles to Japanese military buildups merely as delaying factors in a long-term and inevitable pro-

cess. Other more conditionally pessimistic and cautiously optimistic analysts place greater faith in the hypothetical possibility of preventing significant Japanese buildups over the longer run, but have expressed concern over the hardiness of the delaying factors that could theoretically prevent such buildups. The most optimistic analysts have argued that these factors should remain sturdy and will prevent Japan from injuring its regional relations by pursuing a more assertive military role.[24]

The vast majority of these optimists and pessimists believe that, along with the domestic political and economic stability of Japan, the most important factor that might delay or prevent Japanese military buildups is the status of the U.S.-Japan relationship, particularly the security alliance.[25] The common belief in Beijing security circles is that, by reassuring Japan and providing for Japanese security on the cheap, the United States fosters a political climate in which the Japanese public remains opposed to military buildups and the more hawkish elements of the Japanese elite are kept at bay. If, however, the U.S.-Japan security alliance either becomes strained or undergoes a transformation that gives Japan a much more prominent military role, Chinese experts believe that those ever-present hawks might find a more fertile field in which to plant the seeds of militarization.[26]

THE CHINA-JAPAN SECURITY DILEMMA AND U.S. POLICY CHALLENGES

For the reasons offered above, most Chinese analysts fear almost any change in the U.S.-Japan alliance. A breakdown of U.S.-Japan ties would worry pessimists and optimists alike. On the other hand, Chinese analysts of all stripes also worry to varying degrees when Japan adopts greater defense burden-sharing roles as part of a bilateral effort to revitalize the alliance. These dual and almost contradictory fears pose major problems for U.S. elites who, while concerned that the alliance is dangerously vague and out of date and therefore unsustainable, still want the United States to maintain the reassurance role outlined in documents such as the 1998 East Asia-Pacific Strategy Report.[27] Especially before the recent guidelines review, the U.S.-Japan alliance had often been viewed in the United States as lopsided and unfair because the United States guarantees Japanese security without clear guarantees of even rudimentary assistance from Japan if U.S. forces were to become embroiled in a regional armed conflict.[28]

Before 1995 some U.S. elites argued that the alliance was overrated and that it had prevented the United States from pursuing its economic interests in the U.S.-Japan relationship. Some even argued that the United States should use the security relationship as leverage against Japan in an attempt to open Japanese trade and financial markets to American firms.[29] In this view Japan had

been able to ride free for too long on the U.S. economy because of Washington's concern over preserving an apparently unfair alliance relationship.

Since the publication of the critically important February 1995 East Asia Strategy Report (also known as the Nye report), U.S. leaders have been expressing very different concerns about the U.S.-Japan relationship. The Nye report, and the broader Nye initiative of which it is a part, placed new emphasis on maintaining and strengthening the security alliance and on keeping economic disputes from poisoning it. The report reaffirms the centrality of U.S. security alliances in Asia, places a floor on U.S. troop strength in East Asia at 100,000, and calls for increased security cooperation between Japan and the United States, including greater Japanese logistics support for U.S. forces operating in the region and consideration of joint research on TMD.[30]

Despite the Clinton administration's decision to insulate the U.S.-Japan security relationship from economic disputes, there has been a widely held concern that, purely on security grounds, the alliance could be dangerously weakened if Japanese roles are not clarified and expanded and if the two militaries are not better integrated in preparation for joint operations.[31] Japan's checkbook diplomacy in the Gulf War was considered insufficient support for U.S.-led efforts to protect a region that supplies Japan, not the United States, with the bulk of its oil. It also became clear during the 1994 crisis with Pyongyang over North Korea's nuclear weapons development that, under the existing defense guidelines, in a Korean conflict scenario Japan was not even obliged to allow the U.S. military use of its civilian airstrips or ports. In fact, if the crisis had escalated, Japan might not have provided overt, tangible support of any kind. Even U.S. access to its bases in Japan for combat operations not directly tied to the defense of the Japanese home islands was questionable.[32] Aside from the obvious military dangers inherent in such Japanese passivity, Japanese obstructionism and foot-dragging could undermine elite and popular support in the United States for the most important security relationship in East Asia. It appeared to many American elites that the cold war version of the U.S.-Japan alliance could be one regional crisis away from its demise. Such concernsdrove the Nye initiative, which was designed to clarify and strengthen Japan's commitment to support U.S.-led military operations. Fearing instability in Japanese elite and popular attitudes on defense issues, Washington also wanted to increase the number of functional links between the two militaries to tie Japan more firmly into the U.S. defense network for the long run.[33]

Chinese security analysts followed these trends in U.S.-Japan relations with great interest and concern. Before 1995 most pessimistic Chinese analysts predicted and feared Japanese military buildups largely because they sensed the potential for trouble, not strengthening, in the post–cold war U.S.-Japan alliance. Those analysts posited that, given the lack of a common enemy and the natural clash of economic interests between Japan and the United States, political con-

flict between the two allies was very likely. This conflict could eventually infect and destroy the U.S.-Japan security relationship, which in turn could lead to the withdrawal of U.S. forces and eventually Japanese military buildups. In this period some Chinese analysts also discussed how domestic factors such as U.S. neo-isolationism, rising Japanese nationalism, the inexperience and lack of security focus in the newly elected Clinton administration, and domestic instability in Japan could combine with worsening U.S.-Japan trade conflicts to speed the alliance's demise.[34]

By mid-1995 it seemed to an increasingly large group of Chinese analysts that U.S.-Japan trade conflict was being contained and that the Clinton administration was paying more attention to international security affairs and to Asia in particular.[35] Key contributors to this growing confidence in U.S. staying power were the Nye report and the failure of the automobile parts dispute between Tokyo and Washington to escalate.

The news for China was not all good, however. By spring 1996 the Nye initiative had led to harsh reactions in China, exposing the subtle challenges facing the United States in managing the U.S.-China-Japan triangle. China's cautious optimism about trends in the U.S.-Japan alliance turned to pessimism, as concerns about future Japanese military assertiveness grew rapidly. But the new reasons for pessimism were quite different than in the period before 1995. The fear was no longer potential discord in the U.S.-Japan relationship, but concern that the United States would encourage Japan to adopt new military roles and develop new military capabilities as part of a revitalized alliance in which Japan carried a greater share of the burden and risk.[36]

On April 17, 1996, President Clinton and Prime Minister Hashimoto issued a joint communiqué that called for revitalization of the alliance to better guarantee the "Asia-Pacific region." In the communiqué and in the guarantees reached in the days preceding it, Japan guaranteed base access for U.S. forces and committed itself to increased logistics and rear-area support roles. The two sides also agreed to cooperate in the "ongoing study" of ballistic missile defense.

The joint communiqué was issued one month after the most intense phase of the 1995–96 Taiwan Strait crisis, during which the United States deployed two aircraft carrier battle groups, including one based in Japan, off of Taiwan. The crisis and the joint communiqué triggered fears among Chinese experts about U.S. use of Japanese bases in future Taiwan scenarios. It also suggested that Japan might soon begin scrapping various norms of self-restraint and begin expanding its military operations into the Taiwan area and the South China Sea. In addition to focusing on new logistics roles for Japan and the potential for future joint development of missile defenses, Chinese observers believed that the joint communiqué expanded the geographic scope of the alliance from the area immediately around Japan to a vaguely defined, but clearly much larger, "Asia Pacific."[37] As one leading Chinese expert on Japan recently argued, the

U.S. presence in Japan can be seen either as a "bottle cap," keeping the Japanese military genie in the bottle, or as an "egg shell," fostering the growth of Japanese military power under U.S. protection until it one day hatches onto the regional scene. Since 1996, this analyst argues, fears about the "egg shell" function of the U.S.-Japan alliance have increased markedly, while faith in the "bottle cap" function has declined.[38]

In September 1997 Chinese analysts' concerns turned to the announcement of revised defense guidelines for the U.S.-Japan alliance. These guidelines put in writing many of the changes suggested in the joint communiqué. New and clarified Japanese roles in the alliance included those logistics and rear-area support roles mentioned in the joint communiqué and added "operational cooperation" missions for Japan's Self-Defense Forces in time of regional conflict, including intelligence gathering, surveillance, and minesweeping missions. Although Washington and Tokyo quickly abandoned the provocative term "Asia Pacific" following the issuance of the joint communiqué, the 1997 guidelines are not entirely reassuring on this score either. They state that the scope of the alliance covers "situations in the areas surrounding Japan," but that the definition of those areas would be determined by "situational" rather than "geographic" imperatives. This only confirmed conspiracy theories among Beijing elites regarding the potential inclusion of Taiwan and the South China Sea in the alliance's scope.[39] Following the issuance of the revised guidelines, Jiang Zemin announced that China was now on "high alert" about changes in the alliance.[40]

Chinese analysts view aspects of both the joint communiqué and the revised guidelines as troubling in the near term, mainly because they can facilitate U.S. intervention in a Taiwan contingency. They believe that the United States is currently largely in control of the U.S.-Japan alliance's military policy. But they view Japan as having both stronger emotional and practical reasons than the United States for opposing Taiwan's reintegration with the mainland and a greater stake than the United States in issues such as sea-lane protection far from the Japanese home islands.[41] More pessimistic Chinese analysts often state that Japan's material interests have not changed much from the 1930s to the present. They believe that, because Japan is still heavily dependent on foreign trade and investment, it could again choose to develop power-projection capabilities designed to protect its economic interests in the distant abroad. Vigilant about this possibility, Chinese analysts have reacted negatively to even mild new Japanese initiatives away from the home islands (such as sending peacekeepers to Cambodia or minesweepers to the Persian Gulf after the Gulf War).[42]

In 1998 Chinese concerns focused on Japan's September agreement to research theater missile defense jointly with the United States. The initial proposal for joint development of TMD was made by Washington in 1993, long before the Nye initiative had been launched. It was later folded into the initiative, but Japan still seemed reluctant to commit itself to the project.[43] After five years

of U.S. coaxing and Japanese foot-dragging, Tokyo finally agreed to joint TMD research after the launch of a North Korean rocket across Japanese territory on August 31, 1998. Although Chinese analysts do recognize the threat to Japan from North Korea, they still believe that development of U.S.-Japan TMD is also designed to counter China's missile capabilities, which the People's Liberation Army (PLA) and civilian analysts recognize as China's most effective military asset, especially in relations with Taiwan.[44]

TAIWAN, THE U.S.-JAPAN ALLIANCE, AND THE OFFENSE-DEFENSE FACTOR

The importance of the Taiwan issue in Chinese calculations about TMD and the revised guidelines cannot be overstated and, along with the brutal legacy of World War II, is perhaps the most critical exacerbating factor in the China-Japan security dilemma. The nature of the cross-strait conflict is such that the usual argument about the offense-defense balance and the security dilemma applies poorly. That argument, simply stated, is that the buildup of defensive weapons and the adoption of defensive doctrines should not fuel the security dilemma and spirals of tension because such capabilities and methods are not useful for aggression.[45] Defensive weapons are stabilizing because they shore up the territorial status quo by deterring or physically preventing aggressors from achieving revisionist goals, whereas offensive weapons are destabilizing because they threaten that status quo.[46]

What makes offense-defense theories less applicable in the China case is that Beijing's main security goal is to prevent Taiwan from declaring permanent independence from the Chinese nation, a de facto territorial condition that Taiwan already enjoys. In other words, the main threat to China is a political change in cross-strait relations that would legalize and freeze the territorial status quo. China's main method of countering that threat is a combination of military and economic coercion. In cross-strait relations Beijing considers traditionally defensive weapons in the hands of Taiwan and any of its potential allies to be dangerous, because they may give Taiwan officials additional confidence in their efforts to legitimate the territorial status quo. In fact, given that China seems willing to risk extreme costs to deter Taiwanese independence, and, if necessary, to compel a reversal of any such decision by the Taipei authorities, and that Taiwan has fully abandoned Chiang Kai-shek's irredentist designs on the mainland, Taiwan's ability to attack the mainland, strangely, may be no more worrisome to China than Taiwan's ability to fend off the mainland's attacks on Taiwan.[47]

Given the Chinese concerns over Taiwan, future U.S. and Japanese TMD, if effective, and if transferred in peacetime or put at the service of Taiwan in a crisis, could reduce China's ability to threaten the island with ballistic missile at-

tack, the PLA's main means of coercing Taiwan. Particularly relevant here are the ship-based systems that Japan and the United States agreed to research jointly in September 1998. China worries for the same reason that most Americans support the choice of a ship-based TMD system.[48] As one U.S. commentator applauds, ship-based systems "can be moved quickly to other regions to support out-of-area conflicts."[49] The "upper-tier" navy theater-wide system, which the United States has proposed for the future, would not only be highly mobile, but because it was originally conceived to provide wide area defense for geographically large U.S. military deployments, would, if effective, also have a "footprint" that could cover the island of Taiwan. Chinese arms control and missile experts note this possibility with some concern.[50] Like their U.S. and Japanese counterparts, Chinese analysts have serious doubts about the likely effectiveness of such a system, particularly given the proximity of Taiwan to the mainland and the ability of China to launch a large number and variety of missiles. Nevertheless, they still worry about the psychological and political impact the system could have on Taipei's attitudes about seeking more diplomatic space and on U.S. and Japanese attitudes about cross-strait relations.[51]

When complaining about how specific aspects of recent changes in the U.S.-Japan alliance might influence cross-strait relations, Chinese analysts tend to focus on the potential problems of a future U.S.-Japan TMD system rather than on the less dramatic operational support roles specified for existing Japanese Self-Defense Forces in the revised guidelines (i.e., intelligence gathering, surveillance, and minesweeping). Chinese analysts' concerns about the joint communiqué and the revised guidelines tend to be more abstract, focusing on the fuzzy "situational" scope of the alliance or the possible erosion of Japanese norms of self-restraint in military affairs. However, although it appears unlikely that they would be deployed near Taiwan in a crisis, the systems of the Japanese Self-Defense Forces mentioned in the revised guidelines also could prove helpful to Taiwan. In particular, if Japan ever decided to deploy minesweepers there, this would have the potential to reduce the PLA's ability to coerce Taiwan in a cross-strait crisis or conflict by playing the purely defensive role of helping to break a real or threatened PLA blockade on shipping. For these reasons, the apparently mild operational support roles Japan agreed to in the revised guidelines may also contribute to Beijing's hostile reaction to recent trends in the U.S.-Japan alliance.[52]

U.S.-JAPAN ALLIANCE TRENDS AND POTENTIAL CRISIS-MANAGEMENT PROBLEMS

If the United States and Japan eventually decide to move from joint research and development to deployment of ship-based U.S. and Japanese TMD systems (at least several years from now), Japan would have the capability to involve itself in a cross-strait crisis in a meaningful way, even if it had no intention to do

so when acquiring the system. Under such circumstances, in a future Taiwan Strait crisis involving the United States (short of a shooting war), U.S. leaders would be tempted to ask for Japanese assistance in missile defense near Taiwan in preparation for potential PLA attacks. The United States then might place Japan in the difficult position of choosing whether to help the United States in a Taiwan crisis. Such a decision by U.S. leaders would be most likely to occur if they believed that defensive Japanese roles would not be overly provocative to China.

There may be no positive outcome from such a request. If Japan chose not to help the United States in such a purely defensive role, especially if that refusal placed U.S. forces at added risk, this would have severely negative implications for the U.S.-Japan alliance. But, if Japan chose to help, the results could be worse still. Given the anti-Japanese sentiments in Chinese elite circles and popular culture, Japan's direct involvement in any form in a cross-strait crisis short of a shooting war could have a particularly detrimental impact on crisis management. Although U.S. intervention in such a crisis would be quite provocative to China in and of itself, it is safe to assume that Japanese intervention would be even more likely to lead to escalation.[53] Even if the crisis did not escalate, any hope of building a stable, long-term China-Japan security relationship could be lost. The ability of the United States and China to recover from such a standoff would likely be greater than the ability of China and Japan to do so.[54]

Although missiles are the PLA's likely weapons of choice in a cross-strait conflict or coercion campaign, it is at least imaginable that Beijing could choose less aggressive tactics than missile attacks (such as real or threatened mining of ports or shipping lanes in and around Taiwan) to deter or reverse Taiwan's diplomatic adventurism.[55] A lower-level coercive strategy may be more attractive in certain instances, particularly if Taiwan's alleged violation of Beijing's prohibitions were much less clear-cut than an outright declaration of independence.[56]

The new plans for operational cooperation in the revised guidelines were almost certainly created with Korean scenarios, not Taiwan, in mind. And for several reasons, they seem much less likely to play into a Taiwan Strait crisis scenario than would a future Japanese ship-based TMD capability. But, for theoretical purposes, it is worth considering how such Japanese missions could affect a future Taiwan crisis to demonstrate how misapplied logic about offensive and defensive weapons could lead to avoidable escalation in the Taiwan Strait context.

From Taiwan's perspective, the mere threat of mine-laying would require extensive sweeping to reassure both shipping interests and military commanders.[57] In such circumstances, if for military or political reasons the United States decided that Taiwan's own minesweeping equipment should be supplemented with ships from the U.S.-Japan alliance, future U.S. decisionmakers might be tempted for either military or political reasons to ask Japan to send minesweep-

ers to assist in such an operation. On the military side, current U.S. minesweeping capabilities, particularly those in the theater, are weak, which might make Japanese assistance look attractive (the Seventh Fleet usually has only two minesweepers at the ready in the Pacific).[58] On the political side, if the potentially provocative nature of defensive missions, especially Japanese ones, is not fully appreciated, then U.S. leaders might request Japanese support as a high-profile demonstration of burden sharing. As in the TMD scenario, Japan would then be put into the difficult position of either sending Japanese ships to the front lines of a Taiwan crisis, thus greatly increasing the risk of escalation (less likely), or risking severe damage to the U.S.-Japan alliance by refusing to play an even purely defensive role (more likely).[59]

CHINESE ATTITUDES AND THE PROSPECTS FOR REGIONAL CONFIDENCE BUILDING

An important prerequisite for resolving a security dilemma is for the actors involved to recognize that one exists. A core factor that underpins the security dilemma is the general lack of empathy among the actors participating in a security competition. Beijing elites may be no better or worse than their counterparts in most other nations on this score. Although they may not use the technical term "security dilemma," Chinese analysts recognize the potential for arms racing and spirals of tension in the region. They even recognize that Japan might build its military out of fear, rather than aggression. China actually supported Japanese buildups in the 1970s and early 1980s in response to the development of the Soviet navy.[60] In 1994 several analysts argued that China did not want North Korea to have nuclear weapons because this might cause Japan to develop them.[61]

Beijing also has demonstrated an ability to understand that others might see China as a threat.[62] But, while many Chinese analysts can imagine some states as legitimately worried about China and can picture Japan legitimately worried about other states, it is harder to find those who believe that Japan's military security policy could be driven by fears about specific security policies in China.[63] Chinese analysts, especially in the past two years, seem to agree that China's overall rise (*jueqi*) is a general source of concern for Japan. They tend not to recognize, however, that particular Chinese actions or weapons developments might be reason for Japan to reconsider aspects of its defense policy. For example, when asked about concerns expressed by Japanese officials about Chinese weapons developments (such as the increased numbers and improved accuracy of Chinese missiles) or provocative Chinese international behavior (such as missile firings near Taiwan or bullying of the Philippines over the Mischief Reef), Chinese analysts generally dismiss these expressions as "excuses" (*jiekou*) designed to facilitate Japanese hawks' predetermined plans for military

buildups. As the work of Western experts on Japanese security policy demonstrates, these Chinese analysts are very wrong to hold this belief.[64] If such views continue to prevail in Beijing, China is unlikely to take actions to reassure Japan in either bilateral or multilateral agreements.

A different and even more troubling Chinese perspective on China's potential influence on Japanese defense policy has also gained frequency in the past two years. Perhaps because of the relatively high economic growth rates in China compared to Japan in the 1990s, some Chinese experts have expressed more confidence that China would be able to defend its security interests against Japan, even in the absence of a U.S. presence in the region. Although they hardly dismiss the potential threat of a Japan made more assertive by a U.S. withdrawal, they seem relatively confident that China's strength and deterrent capabilities could influence Japan's strategy by dissuading Tokyo from significant Japanese buildups or, at least, later military adventurism.[65] From the security dilemma perspective this attitude may be even more dangerous than the view that China can pose little threat to Japan. If increasing Chinese coercive capacity is seen as the best way to prevent or manage anticipated Japanese buildups, then the danger of China taking the critical first step in an action-reaction cycle seems very high.

There are some more hopeful signs, however. Some Chinese analysts, usually younger experts (appearing to be in their forties or younger), with extensive experience abroad, do recognize that Chinese military strengthening and provocative actions could be seen as legitimate reasons for Japan to launch a military buildup of its own. Given the age of these analysts and the increasing number of Chinese elites with considerable experience abroad, the trends seem to be heading in a positive direction on this score. On a sober note, more than one of these empathetic experts has pointed out that Chinese experts who take Japanese concerns about China seriously are often viewed with suspicion in government circles and sometimes have difficulty when presenting their views to their older and more influential colleagues, particularly in the military.[66]

CHINA'S VIEWS ON MULTILATERAL SECURITY REGIMES

One possible way to ameliorate the security dilemma is through multilateral regimes and forums designed to increase transparency and build confidence. For various reasons, Beijing has viewed multilateral confidence building with some suspicion. Many Chinese analysts emphasize that the increased transparency called for by such institutions can make China's enemies more confident and thereby reduce China's deterrent capabilities, particularly its ability to deter Taiwan independence or foreign intervention in cross-strait relations.[67] Especially in the early 1990s they worried that multilateral forums and organiza-

tions might be fronts for great powers, and that confidence-building measures might be aspects of a containment strategy designed to keep China from achieving great power status in the military sector.[68]

That said, China has not shunned multilateral forums. China has participated in the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF) since its first meeting in 1994, and in 1997 Beijing hosted an ARF intersessional conference on confidence-building measures. Although Beijing has prevented any dramatic accomplishments at ARF meetings on important questions such as the territorial disputes in the South China Sea, the precedent of such Chinese participation seems potentially important.[69] As Iain Johnston and Paul Evans argue, although still in their nascent phases, these developments should not be dismissed as mere rhetoric or showmanship. China is capable of participating in meaningful multilateral accords, as is demonstrated by its recent agreements on border demarcation and confidence-building measures struck with Russia and the former Soviet republics in Turkish Central Asia. Moreover, there is in Beijing a small but growing community of true believers in the benefits of arms control, confidence-building measures, and multilateralism more generally.[70]

The reduced fear of U.S. domination of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) and of ASEAN collusion against China, combined with the increased fear of developments in U.S. bilateral diplomacy in the Asia Pacific since 1996, have convinced many formerly skeptical analysts that some form of multilateralism may be the best alternative for China given the risks posed by U.S. bilateral business as usual.[71] Given that China both fears and has little influence over various aspects of current U.S. bilateral diplomacy (such as strengthening the U.S.-Japan alliance or the U.S.-Australia alliance), accepting a bigger role for multilateral dialogue, if not the creation of formal multilateral security institutions, may be the least unpleasant method of reducing the threat that U.S. bilateralism poses.[72] So, in this one sense, the revitalization of the U.S.-Japan alliance may have had some unintended positive results by encouraging China to consider more seriously the benefits of multilateral forums that might reduce mutual mistrust in the region.[73] This phenomenon runs counter to psychological and social constructivist theories on the security dilemma that emphasize how accommodation, not pressure, is the best way to make states adopt more cooperative postures.[74]

The acceptance of formal multilateral dialogue has not spread from Southeast Asia to Northeast Asia because of mistrust between China and Japan, and between the two Koreas. But there are some fledgling signs of hope. In January 1998 Beijing agreed to trilateral track-II security talks with the United States and Japan. However, Chinese analysts have argued that the time is not yet right for a formal trilateral security forum given the tensions over the revised U.S.-Japan defense guidelines and the TMD issue, the lack of basic trust between China and Japan, and the fear that China would be isolated in a two-against-one for-

mat in which it engaged the U.S.-Japan alliance as a corporate entity.[75] One should not rule out the possibility of official trilateral talks over the longer term, however. If Beijing is sufficiently concerned about U.S. transfer or codevelopment of TMD with regional actors, it might agree to official trilateral dialogue with the United States and Japan to try to head off such an outcome.

U.S. POLICY OPTIONS IN THE U.S.-CHINA-JAPAN SECURITY TRIANGLE

Given the central role that the status of the U.S.-Japan alliance plays in both pessimistic and optimistic Chinese scenarios for Japan's future, there is little doubt that maintaining the U.S. presence in Japan is critical to countering the security dilemma in East Asia. If a Japanese commitment to a more active role in the alliance is essential to the survival of the alliance over the long haul, then some adjustments are necessary, regardless of Chinese reaction. In fact, given how pessimistic Chinese analysts would likely be if the alliance were to dissolve fully, they should understand that the Nye initiative is much better for China than U.S. policies before 1995 that encouraged drift in the alliance and lack of confidence in the U.S. security commitment in East Asia.

Certain new Japanese responsibilities in the alliance seem to have high payoffs in terms of U.S.-Japan alliance stability with few costs in terms of sharpening the China-Japan security dilemma. Increased Japanese logistics roles and guaranteed base access in time of conflict, both relatively nonprovocative measures for Japan's neighbors, should remedy some of the disasters U.S. officials predicted when they evaluated the alliance during the 1994 North Korean nuclear crisis. Japan's general commitment to participate in certain military support functions, such as minesweeping and surveillance, also seems like a good idea, as long as the United States does not become overly reliant on Japanese assistance in this area. For political reasons, it would seem wise for the United States to establish and maintain sufficient capabilities of its own so that it could pick and choose when to request Japanese assistance. In a cross-strait crisis, the United States would likely want to minimize Japanese participation and forgo it entirely at the front. In addition to the reasons offered above, if China's actions inadvertently brought about Japanese intervention, given Japan's reputation throughout the region, Tokyo's involvement could be exploited domestically and internationally by Beijing elites in ways that Saddam Hussein might have capitalized on an Israeli intervention during the 1990–91 Gulf crisis and Gulf War. Washington was able to forgo Israeli assistance because the United States and its allies could secure military dominance without Israeli help.

One unwise way for Japan and the United States to try to reassure China would be to exclude Taiwan explicitly from the scope of the U.S.-Japan alliance. China has pressed Japan and the United States to do this. Both have refused be-

cause neither wants to encourage irredentism by the People's Republic against Taiwan by excluding in advance the possibility that they would come to Taiwan's defense if the mainland attacked Taiwan without provocation. This is almost certainly a major reason why the scope of the alliance in the revised defense guidelines refers to "situational" rather than "geographic" conditions. Despite considerable Chinese pressure, Japan has not even agreed to parrot President Clinton's "three no's" policy, declaring only that Tokyo does not support Taiwan's legal independence. But, even if Tokyo did state the other two "no's," this would not be the same as excluding Taiwan from the scope of the U.S.-Japan alliance, which would be a radical, and I believe, potentially destabilizing policy position.[76]

A better way to reassure China without totally abandoning Taiwan or the notion of missile defenses in Japan would be for the United States to consider developing TMD without Japanese assistance. In 1998 Chinese analysts consistently pointed out that U.S.-Japan coproduction of TMD carries a fundamentally different and more provocative political meaning for China than if the United States produced such systems without Japanese help as part of its global strategy to protect U.S. troops deployed abroad. Despite the North Korean threat to Japan, U.S.-Japan codevelopment of TMD in Asia still seems primarily designed to counter China. Codevelopment with Japan also triggers many fears in Beijing about the fostering of future Japanese power that U.S. development of TMD without Japanese assistance would not.[77] For example, following the North Korean missile launch across Japan, which solidified Tokyo's decision to pursue TMD research, Tokyo announced plans to develop an independent spy satellite capability to observe foreign missile activity. If implemented this plan will weaken the effectiveness of, and may even contravene, Diet resolutions prohibiting the use of space for military purposes, an important restraint on future Japanese military power. Like TMD development, the satellite decision suggests the possibility of a more independent and unfettered Japanese military establishment for the future.[78] Chinese analysts also point out that mobile Japanese TMD could provide a "shield" for the "sword" of more offensive Japanese forces and, if extremely effective, it may also be able to protect the Japanese home islands from Chinese missile retaliation, thus reducing Chinese defensive and deterrent capabilities and blurring the political distinction between offensive and defensive weapons.[79] Finally, agreeing with the literature on the technical indistinguishability of offensive and defensive systems, some Chinese analysts argue that Japan can adapt some of the technology involved in TMD for offensive purposes.[80]

American TMD development is part of a global strategy designed to protect U.S. forces and U.S. bases, which are threatened by the increasing quantity and accuracy of missiles in the hands of potential adversaries around the world.[81] As such, American TMD should not be bargained away in negotiations with any

particular state or group of states. Decisions on American TMD should be based solely on difficult questions related to the potential effectiveness of the system against enemy missiles, the relative cost to potential adversaries of developing methods that can defeat the system, and the opportunity costs of developing TMD systems in the defense budget.

But decisions about whether the United States should develop and eventually deploy the system alone or with other countries (and with whom) should be left open for consideration and perhaps for negotiation. This should hold true especially in areas like Northeast Asia, where geography and technology might allow potential adversaries to develop cheap and potentially provocative countermeasures against such systems. If the United States and Japan were willing to reconsider joint development of TMD, they might be able to exploit Chinese concerns to encourage Beijing to participate in a formal trilateral security dialogue and to begin to consider a bit more transparency in its murky military sector. Moreover, Japan and the United States may be able to gain more active participation from Beijing in discouraging further North Korean development of missiles and weapons of mass destruction. Given that Tokyo seemed at best only vaguely committed to joint development of TMD until the August 1998 North Korean rocket launch, such a security payoff, if deliverable by Beijing, might be sufficient to convince Japan to rely on U.S. advancements in TMD technology and to wait for eventual deployment of the systems to U.S. bases in Japan.[82] Such an outcome, arguably, would also have a positive effect on U.S.-Japan alliance longevity, because Japan would have added incentive to allow the U.S. navy to remain in Japanese ports for the long run.

In addition to lowering China's more general concerns about Japan, the United States could benefit in other ways from developing TMD without Japanese collaboration and from developing more organic capabilities for the Seventh Fleet. The United States would be better able to avoid scenarios in which it might be tempted to request Japanese support in these areas in time of crisis or war. Japanese agreement to supply such support in many instances cannot be assumed. Moreover, by maintaining a minimum dependence on Japanese capabilities, the United States would be better able to pick and choose when Japan's participation in a conflict would do more political harm than military good.

Of course, my prescriptions about TMD and other U.S. naval capabilities carry costs. If the United States develops TMD without Japan, for example, it will have to forgo Japanese technology and Japanese money. I am not in a position to analyze the importance of the former, but on the latter score, speculation about Japan's expected contribution places it somewhere between several hundred million and several billion dollars over the next several years. This hardly seems irreplaceable.[83] Mine-clearing equipment is not among the navy's most expensive items. For hundreds of millions of dollars, the United States

could greatly enhance its organic capabilities in the Seventh Fleet. The main problem is the leadership challenge involved in selling policies based on abstract threats, such as future regional spirals of tension in East Asia, to the American public and Congress.[84]

Even if sustainable only for the next ten to fifteen years, the U.S. strategy of carefully calibrating increased Japanese activities in the alliance should have high payoffs. If the United States can avoid an escalation of Sino-Japanese security tensions in this time frame, several objectives could be achieved. First, the very nascent efforts to create regional confidence-building measures and regimes that encourage transparency will have time to bear fruit, as will Tokyo's and Beijing's recent efforts to improve bilateral ties and high-level contacts.[85] Second, more cosmopolitan government officials and advisers should rise through the ranks in China as a generation of Chinese experts with extensive experience abroad comes of age. Third, China more generally will have time to undergo the next political transition as the "fourth generation" leadership replaces Jiang Zemin's generation, perhaps carrying with it significant political reform. Given the strong popular sentiments in China about Japan and Taiwan and the dangers of hypernationalism in the democratization process, it would be best for the region and the world if China transited political reform without the distractions and jingoism that would likely flow from a Sino-Japanese security competition.[86] Fourth, the process of Korean unification would be significantly simplified if it were not accompanied by a Sino-Japanese military rivalry. Fifth, the region, including both Japan and China, will have time to recover from the current economic crisis without simultaneously worrying about intensifying security competition. As the interwar period showed, a combination of domestic instability and international tensions can lead to extremely unfortunate political changes within countries and in the relations among them. Moreover, if security relations are less tense, the financial crisis might provide an excellent opportunity to increase overall regional cooperation. Sixth, Tokyo will have more time to reconsider and rectify its treatment of the legacies of World War II.[87] Seventh, it would be best for long-term regional stability if Japan's own strands of hypernationalism were kept in check during Japan's post–cold war political transition following the demise of the Liberal Democratic Party's monopoly on power.

We can be fairly certain that new Japanese military roles will exacerbate the atmosphere of distrust between Japan and China. It is more difficult, however, to speculate about what exactly China might do differently if Japan adopts certain new roles. For example, if Japan appears headed toward eventual deployment of ship-based theater missile defenses, China might try to develop ballistic, cruise, and antiship missiles, and perhaps antisatellite weapons faster and more extensively than it otherwise would to acquire the ability to destroy, saturate, or elude the capability of these defensive weapons.[88] More-

over, one could speculate that, if China felt it necessary to diversify and improve its nuclear deterrent in the face of proposed U.S.-Japan TMD, Beijing might abandon its commitment to the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty in order to test warheads for new delivery systems. China might also be less cooperative with the United States on weapons technology transfers, with implications for security in South Asia and the Middle East. On the most pessimistic end of the spectrum, China might try to speed reunification with Taiwan or press its case in the Diaoyu/Senkaku Islands dispute with Japan in potentially destabilizing ways, fearing that U.S.-Japan TMD or direct Taiwanese participation in a regional TMD system might make it more difficult to tackle those issues after the systems become deployed.

These possible scenarios are based on counterfactual arguments that would be difficult to prove even if one or more of the policies above were actually adopted by China. For example, given the Taiwan problem and the vast superiority of the United States in military power, China is likely to develop its missile capability to a significant degree regardless of the details of U.S.-Japan TMD cooperation. It will be difficult to discern the relative impact of specific policies on the trajectory of that development. But U.S. security policy in East Asia and much of the post–cold war security studies literature on the region have been built on counterfactual arguments that, although impossible to prove, are almost certainly correct. If one is willing to entertain the notion that a continued U.S. presence in East Asia, especially in Japan, is the single biggest factor preventing the occurrence of destabilizing spirals of tension in the region, one should also be willing to entertain the notion that the form this presence takes will also have important implications for Japan and its neighbors.

CONCLUSION

Given China's intense historically based mistrust of Japan, Beijing's concern about eroding norms of Japanese self-restraint, and the political geography of the Taiwan issue, even certain new defensive roles for Japan can be provocative to China. The United States should therefore continue to be cautious about what new roles Japan is asked to play in the alliance. This is particularly true in cases where the United States may be able to play the same roles without triggering the same degree of concern in Beijing.

By maintaining and, where necessary, increasing somewhat U.S. capabilities in Japan and East Asia more generally, not only will the United States better be able to manage and cap future regional crises, but also it ideally may be able to prevent them from ever occurring. By reassuring both Japan and its potential rivals, the United States reduces the likelihood of divisive security dilemma scenarios and spiral model dynamics in the region. In so doing, the United States can contribute mightily to long-term peace and stability in a region that prom-

ises to be the most important arena for U.S. foreign policy in the twenty-first century.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This chapter originally appeared as an article of the same title in *International Security* 23, no. 4 (Spring 1999): 49–80. For helpful comments I am grateful to Robert Art, David Asher, Paul Giarra, Bonnie Glaser, Paul Godwin, Avery Goldstein, John Ikenberry, Iain Johnston, Peter Katzenstein, Jonathan Kirshner, George Lewis, Li Hong, Michael Mastanduno, Thomas McNaugher, Robert Pape, Barry Posen, Theodore Postol, Edward Rios, Richard Samuels, Harvey Sapolsky, Stephen Van Evera, Cindy Williams, Xu Xin, four anonymous reviewers, and the members of the Brandeis University International Relations Seminar, the China Study Group at the Foreign Policy Research Institute in Philadelphia, the National Security Group Seminar at Harvard University's John M. Olin Institute, the Security Studies Program and MISTI China seminars at MIT, and the Penn-Dartmouth conferences on "The Emerging International Relations of the Asia Pacific Region." I would like to thank the Olin Institute's East Asia Security Project for its generous research funding. I am also grateful to Kristen Cashin for administrative assistance.

ENDNOTES

1. Aaron L. Friedberg, "Ripe for Rivalry: Prospects for Peace in a Multipolar Asia," *International Security* 18, no. 3 (Winter 1993/94): 5–33; Richard K. Betts, "Wealth, Power, and Instability," *International Security* 18, no. 3 (Winter 1993/94): 34–77; Stephen Van Evera, "Primed for Peace: Europe after the Cold War," *International Security* 15, no. 3 (Winter 1990/91): 7–57; and James Goldgeier and Michael McFaul, "A Tale of Two Worlds," *International Organization* 46, no. 2 (Spring 1992): 467–492.

2. For the original security dilemma and spiral models, see Robert Jervis, "Cooperation under the Security Dilemma," *World Politics* 30, no. 2 (January 1978): 167–174; and Jervis, *Perception and Misperception in International Politics* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1976), chap. 3.

3. For writings on the destabilizing influence of offensive weapons and doctrines, see Stephen Van Evera, "The Cult of the Offensive and the Origins of the First World War," *International Security* 9, no. 1 (Summer 1984): 58–107; Van Evera, "Offense, Defense, and the Causes of War," *International Security* 22, no. 4 (Spring 1998): 5–43; and Sean M. Lynn-Jones, "Offense- Defense Theory and Its Critics," *Security Studies* 4, no. 4 (Summer 1995): 660–691.

4. My understanding of the Chinese perspectives reflects more than seventy interviews, often with multiple interlocutors, that I conducted during four month-long trips to Beijing in 1993, 1994, 1995, and 1996, and two shorter trips to Beijing and Shanghai in 1998. My interlocutors were a mix of military and civilian analysts in government think tanks as well as academics at leading Chinese institutions. The government think-tank analysts are not decisionmakers, but they advise their superiors in the fol-

lowing key governmental organizations: the People's Liberation Army (PLA), the Foreign Ministry, the State Council, and the Chinese intelligence agencies. For obvious reasons, the individual identities of particular interviewees cannot be revealed.

5. In fact, even optimistic projections for the region are predicated on a long-term U.S. military presence. See, for example, Robert S. Ross, "The Geography of the Peace: East Asia in the Twenty-first Century," *International Security* 23, no. 4 (Spring 1999): 81–118.

6. One might argue that the geographical proximity of Japan alone would make a new regional power a greater threat to China than the more distant United States. In any case, the decision over what poses a larger threat—a distant superpower or a local great power—cannot be reached by analyzing the international balance of power alone. As in the Chinese case, the assessment of which country poses the greater threat will be based on historical legacies and national perceptions. I am grateful to Stephen Walt for helpful comments on this point.

7. For the classic study, see Allen S. Whiting, *China Eyes Japan* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989).

8. It is possible that the concerns expressed by Chinese analysts discussed below about Japan and the United States are purely cynical tactics designed to prevent the rise of a new regional power by affecting the debate in the United States and Japan. Such a "spin" strategy could also help justify at home and to regional actors more aggressive Chinese weapons development and diplomacy. Although I believe this probably was the intention of some of my interlocutors, given their large number, the diversity of opinions expressed on various issues over the five years of my discussions, and the controversial positions I sometimes heard expressed on issues such as the Tiananmen massacre or the Chinese missile exercises near Taiwan, I find it difficult to believe that Beijing, or any other government, could manufacture such complex theater over such an extended period of time.

9. Also in that year Japanese rightists built structures on the Diaoyu/Senkaku Islands, which are contested by both Japan and China. Many Chinese analysts saw Tokyo's complicity in their activities, especially after the dispatch of Japanese Coast Guard vessels to prevent protestors from Hong Kong and Taiwan from landing on the Japanese-controlled islands.

10. See Yinan He, "The Effect of Historical Memory on China's Strategic Perception of Japan," paper prepared for the Ninety-fourth Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association," Boston, Massachusetts, September 3–6, 1998. For example, my interlocutors generally did not believe that a militarily stronger Japan would try to occupy sections of the Asian mainland as it did in the 1930s and 1940s.

11. The problem of Japan's lack of contrition was raised in nearly every interview I conducted. See Zhang Dalin, "Qianshi Bu Wang, Houshi Zhi Shi" [Past experience, if not forgotten, is a guide for the future], *Guoji Wenti Yanjiu* [International studies], no. 3 (1995): 6–11. For a critical Japanese perspective on the textbook issue, see Saburo Ienaga, "The Glorification of War in Japanese Education," *International Security* 18, no. 3 (Winter 1993/94): 113–133. The Chinese view on the generational issue in Japan is similar to the Japanese pacifist view. See Kunihiro Masao, "The Decline and Fall of Pacifism," *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists* 53, no. 1 (January/February 1997): 35–39.

12. For published Chinese comparisons of postwar Germany and Japan, see Su Huimin, "Yi Shi Wei Jian, Mian Dao Fuzhe: Deguo dui Erci Dazhan de Fansi" [Take lessons from history and avoid the recurrence of mistakes: Germany's introspection about World War II], *Guoji Wenti Yanjiu* [International studies], no. 3 (1995): 12–16; and Sun Lixiang, "Zhanhou Ri De Liang Guo You Yi Shili zhi Bijiao" [A comparison of the postwar right-wing forces in the two nations of Japan and Germany], *Waiguo Wenti Yanjiu* [Research on foreign problems], no. 2 (1988): 1–10.

13. Nicholas D. Kristof, "Burying the Past: War Guilt Haunts Japan," *New York Times*, November 30, 1998, pp. A1, A10.

14. In 1993 government scholars pointed out that, in many ways, China's youth is more actively anti-Japanese than the government. They pointed to student protests against Japanese "economic imperialism" in 1986 as an example.

15. Interviews, 1996. See also Hafumi Arai, "Angry at China? Slam Japan," *Far Eastern Economic Review*, October 3, 1996, p. 21. It is clear that compared to students and other members of the public, the Chinese government was a voice of calm during the 1996 Diaoyu/Senkaku affair.

16. Pan Sifeng, ed., *Riben Junshi Sixiang Yanjiu* [Research on Japanese military thought] (Beijing: Academy of Military Sciences Press, October 1992), pp. 388–392 (internally circulated).

17. Multiple interviews, 1993–98.

18. In 1992 an internally circulated analysis of Japan's military affairs points out that Japan could easily spend 4 percent of GNP on its military without doing fundamental harm to its long-term economic growth. The examples of much higher levels of spending in healthy economies in the United States and Europe during the Cold War are cited as evidence. Ibid., p. 499. Similar positions were taken by active and retired military officers in 1996 and 1998.

19. This was a particularly sensitive issue in 1993 and 1994, and remains so today.

20. Multiple interviews, 1996. For written materials, see Gao Heng, "Shijie Junshi Xingshi" [The world military scene], *Shijie Jingji yu Zhengzhi* [World economy and politics], no. 2 (February 1995): 14–18. For a similar Western view on Japanese "technonationalism," see Richard J. Samuels, *Rich Nation, Strong Army: National Security and the Technological Transformation of Japan* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1994).

21. Interview, 1996.

22. This was a consistent theme in interviews from 1993 to 1998, and was repeated in 1998 during the financial crisis.

23. For the realist view, see Christopher Layne, "The Unipolar Illusion: Why New Great Powers Will Rise," *International Security* 17, no. 4 (Spring 1993): 5–51. For the argument that Japan will likely not remilitarize, see Thomas U. Berger, "From Sword to Chrysanthemum: Japan's Culture of Anti-Militarism," *International Security* 17, no. 4 (Spring 1993): 119–150; and Peter J. Katzenstein, *Cultural Norms and National Security: Police and Military in Postwar Japan* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1996).

24. The simplest versions of the most optimistic and most pessimistic forecasts about Japan's future were offered most frequently during my first three research trips from 1993 to 1995. After the Taiwan Strait crisis of 1995–96, one hears less often the most optimistic liberal argument that economic interests will trump security interests

in the post–Cold War world. Following the 1995 Nye report, one hears the simplest versions of the pessimists' scenarios less often because they were often predicated on fragility in the post–Cold War U.S.-Japan alliance.

25. Interviews, 1993–98. See also Pan, *Riben Junshi Sixiang Yanjiu*, p. 501. This book states in typical fashion, "Of all the factors that could compel Japan's military policy to change, U.S.-Japan relations will be the deciding factor." See also Wang Yanyu, ed., *Riben Junshi Zhanlüe Yanjiu* [Research on Japanese military strategy] (Beijing: Academy of Military Sciences Press, 1992), pp. 308–310 (internally circulated); and Liu Shilong, "Dangqian Rimei Anbao Tizhi de San Ge Tedian" [Three special characteristics of the current U.S.-Japan security structure], *Riben Yanjiu* [Japan studies], no. 4 (1996): 18–30, at p. 27. One article bases its optimism largely on the author's belief that, despite economic frictions, the U.S.-Japan alliance is stable. See He Fang, "Lengzhan Hou de Riben Duiwai Zhanlüe" [Japan's post–cold war international strategy], *Waiguo Wenti Yanjiu* [Research on foreign problems], no. 2 (1993): 1–4.

26. For an early discussion of the two very different potential paths to Japanese buildups, see Cai Zuming, ed., *Meiguo Junshi Zhanlüe Yanjiu* [Studies of American military strategy] (Beijing: Academy of Military Sciences Press, 1993), pp. 218–233 (internally circulated).

27. For the logic of reassurance in official U.S. defense policy, see the Pentagon's *United States Security Strategy for the East Asia-Pacific Region 1998*, which states: "In addition to its deterrent function, U.S. military presence in Asia serves to shape the security environment to prevent challenges from developing at all. U.S. force presence mitigates the impact of historical regional tensions and allows the United States to anticipate problems, manage potential threats, and encourage peaceful resolution of disputes."

28. This common view often ignores the clear benefits to the United States of the Cold War version of the alliance. The United States was guaranteed basing in Japan, and 70–80 percent of those basing costs were covered by the Japanese. Without this basing, the United States would have great difficulty maintaining its presence in the region. For a cost analysis, see Michael O'Hanlon, "Restructuring U.S. Forces and Bases in Japan," in Mike M. Mochizuki, ed., *Toward a True Alliance: Restructuring U.S.-Japan Security Relations* (Washington, D.C.: Brookings, 1997), pp. 149–178.

29. See Eric Heginbotham and Richard J. Samuels, "Mercantile Realism and Japanese Foreign Policy," *International Security* 22, no. 4 (Spring 1998): 171–203, at p. 179.

30. The Nye report, named for former Assistant Secretary of Defense Joseph S. Nye, Jr., is *United States Security Strategy for the East Asia-Pacific Region*, Office of International Security Affairs, Department of Defense, February 1995. For an insider's look at concerns about how acrimonious economic disputes were harming the alliance, see David L. Asher, "A U.S.-Japan Alliance for the Next Century," *Orbis* 41, no. 3 (Summer 1997): 343–375, at pp. 346–348.

31. For discussion of these issues, see Mike M. Mochizuki, "A New Bargain for a New Alliance" and "American and Japanese Strategic Debates," in Mochizuki, ed., *Toward a True Alliance*, pp. 5–40, 43–82, especially pp. 35, 69–70.

32. For the importance of the 1994 Korean crisis in officials' calculations, see Kurt M. Campbell, "The Official U.S. View," in Michael J. Green and Mike M.

Mochizuki, *The U.S.-Japan Security Alliance in the Twenty-first Century* (New York: Council on Foreign Relations Study Group Papers, 1998), pp. 85–87.

33. For discussion of these issues, see Bruce Stokes and James Shinn, *The Tests of War and the Strains of Peace: The U.S.-Japan Security Relationship* (New York: Council on Foreign Relations Study Group Report, January 1998). For the fear among U.S. officials that the Japanese public was moving away from support for the alliance in the 1990s, see Campbell, "The Official U.S. View."

34. In particular, three military officers whom I interviewed in 1994 stressed these themes. For fears about Democrats and neo-isolationism, see Cai, *Meiguo Junshi Zhanlüe Yanjiu*, p. 223; and Liu Liping, "Jilie Zhendanzhong de Meiguo Duiwai Zhengce Sichao" [The storm over contending positions on U.S. foreign policy], *Xiandai Guoji Guanxi* [Contemporary international relations], no. 6 (1992): 15–18. For a similar argument made before Bill Clinton was elected president of the United States, see Li Shusheng, "Sulian de Jieti yu MeiRi zai Yatai Diqu de Zhengduo" [The disintegration of the Soviet Union and U.S.-Japan rivalry in the Asia Pacific], *Shijie Jingji yu Zhengzhi* [World economy and politics], no. 7 (July 1992): 56–58. For an article about the emphasis on trade and the lack of strategic focus in Washington, see Lu Zhongwei, "Yazhou Anquanzhong de ZhongRi Guanxi" [Sino-Japanese relations in the Asian security environment], *Shijie Jingji yu Zhengzhi* [World economy and politics], no. 3 (March 1993): 23–35, 42.

35. Multiple interviews, 1995. For a published work arguing along these lines, see Yang Yunzhong, "Meiguo Zhengfu Jinyibu Tiaozheng dui Ri Zhengce" [Further adjustments in America's Japan policy], *Shijie Jingji yu Zhengzhi* [World economy and politics], no. 7 (July 1995): 61–65.

36. For elaborations of these arguments, see Thomas J. Christensen, "Chinese Realpolitik," *Foreign Affairs* 75, no. 5 (September/October 1996): 37–52; and an excellent article by Banning Garrett and Bonnie Glaser, "Chinese Apprehensions about Revitalization of the U.S.-Japan Alliance," *Asian Survey* 37, no. 4 (April 1997): 383–402. From various conversations it is still my strong impression that Beijing would be more fearful of a U.S. pullout if it were to occur. But this is no longer viewed as an imaginable outcome for the foreseeable future in Chinese foreign policy circles, so most analysts seem unwilling to discuss at length their views on such a hypothetical scenario.

37. Interviews, 1996. See also Liu, "Dangqian Rimei Anbao Tizhi de San Ge Tedian," pp. 20–22; and Yang Bojiang, "Why [a] U.S.-Japan Joint Declaration on [the] Security Alliance," *Contemporary International Relations* 6, no. 5 (May 1996): 1–12.

38. Liu Jiangyong, "New Trends in Sino-U.S.-Japan Relations," *Contemporary International Relations* 8, no. 7 (July 1998): 1–13.

39. See "The Guidelines for U.S.-Japan Defense Cooperation," in Green and Mochizuki, *The U.S.-Japan Security Alliance in the Twenty-first Century*, pp. 55–72, at p. 65.

40. Interviews, 1996 and 1998. The Jiang quotation comes from a Reuters news service report on October 18, 1997.

41. Interviews, 1996 and 1998. Taiwan is a former Japanese colony (1895–1945). It is near international sea-lanes that are important to Japan. In addition, Chinese analysts

argue that, for straightforward reasons relating to relative national power, Japan has a strategic interest in preventing Taiwan's high-technology and capital-rich economy from linking politically with the mainland. Moreover, some Chinese analysts view Taiwan as having geostrategic significance for Japan as a potential ally because of its location near the Chinese mainland. Another issue fueling mistrust of Japan is the feeling that Taiwan's president, Lee Teng-hui, who attended college in Japan and who speaks Japanese fluently, may be more pro-Japan than pro-China. For a particularly alarmist argument along these lines, see Li Yaqiang, "What Is Japan Doing Southward?" *Beijing Jianchuan Zhishi* [Naval and merchant ships], no. 6 (June 6, 1997): 7–8, in Foreign Broadcast Information Service Daily Report China, September 4, 1997. For a more sober analysis, see Yang Xuejun and Li Hanmei, "Yingxiang Weilai Riben Dui Wai Zhanlüe he Xingwei de Zhongyao Yinsu" [Important factors influencing future Japanese foreign strategy and conduct], *Zhanlüe yu Guanli* [Strategy and management], no. 1 (1998): 17–22, at p. 21.

42. This argument was made particularly forcefully in my interviews with three military officers in 1994. See also Pan, *Riben Junshi Sixiang Yanjiu*, pp. 502–503; and Wu Peng, "Riben Wei he Jianchi Xiang Haiwai Paibing" [Why Japan insisted on sending forces abroad], *Shijie Jingji yu Zhengzhi* [World economy and politics], no. 12 (December 1992): 46–50.

43. For the earliest discussions of joint U.S.-Japan development of TMD and Tokyo's resistance to the plan, see David E. Sanger, "New Missile Defense in Japan under Discussion with U.S.," *New York Times*, September 18, 1993, p. A1. A year and a half later, the language on TMD in the 1995 Nye report belies Japan's reluctance to agree to joint research, stating that the United States "is exploring with Japan cooperative efforts" in TMD.

44. Interviews, 1998. See also Wu Chunsi, "Tactical Missile Defense, Sino-U.S.-Japanese Relationship, and East Asian Security," *Inesap Information Bulletin*, no. 16 (November 1998): 20–23.

45. Jervis, "Cooperation under the Security Dilemma."

46. Although scholars differ on specific definitions of what constitutes a destabilizing offense and a stabilizing defense, all definitions in the current literature focus on states' capacity for fighting across borders and seizing enemy-held territory as the measure of the offense-defense balance. See, for example, Van Evera, "Offense, Defense, and the Causes of War"; and Charles L. Glaser and Chaim Kaufmann, "What Is the Offense-Defense Balance and Can We Measure It?" *International Security* 22, no. 4 (Spring 1998): 44–82.

47. For the various reasons why I believe China would risk war, perhaps even with the United States, to prevent Taiwan's independence, see Christensen, "Chinese Realpolitik."

48. See "U.S., Japan Agree to Study Missile Defense," *Washington Times*, September 21, 1998, p. 1; and "Japan Makes Missile-Defense Plan High Priority," *Washington Times*, November 6, 1998, p. 12.

49. Richard Fisher, quoted in Rob Holzer and Barbara Opall-Rome, "U.S. Anticipates Approval from Tokyo on Joint TMD," *Defense News*, September 21–27, 1998, p. 34. See also Peter Landers, Susan Lawrence, and Julian Baum, "Hard Target," *Far*

Eastern Economic Review, September 24, 1998, pp. 20–21. For a discussion of China's more general concerns about TMD, see Benjamin Valentino, "Small Nuclear Powers and Opponents of Ballistic Missile Defenses in the Post–Cold War Era," *Security Studies* 7, no. 2 (Winter 1997/98): 229–232.

50. Statements by Chinese arms control and missile experts in the United States in August 1998, and discussions with one active and one retired military officer in China in November 1998.

51. Interviews with civilian analysts, November 1998.

52. Demonstrating that they are much less sensitive than TMD or other aspects of the Nye initiative, minesweepers would usually only be discussed by my interlocutors after I raised the issue.

53. I base my conclusions about the particularly provocative nature of Japanese intervention more on a general understanding of Chinese attitudes toward Japan than on extensive interview data. In the relatively few interviews in 1998 in which I raised this issue, responses were mixed, and included the following arguments: Japanese intervention would be particularly provocative and likely to lead to crisis escalation; Japanese intervention would be only somewhat more provocative than U.S. intervention alone; and U.S. intervention alone would be sufficient to spark escalation, with or without the Japanese.

54. Of course, in a shooting war across the Taiwan Strait, calculations may be quite different because presumably such an event would severely harm Sino-Japanese relations in any case.

55. For an interesting discussion of a scenario involving a PLA blockade of Taiwan, see Paul H.B. Godwin, "The Use of Military Force against Taiwan: Potential PRC Scenarios," in Parris H. Chang and Martin L. Lasater, eds., *If China Crosses the Taiwan Straits: The International Response* (New York: University Press of America, 1993), pp. 15–34. In 1998 a Chinese military officer said that missiles are a much more likely PLA strategy than mine-laying, but the blockade possibility cannot be ruled out entirely.

56. In fact, for our purposes we can assume such a low-level Taiwanese provocation because, under current U.S. policy (President Clinton's "three no's"), a greater provocation would likely preclude a U.S. response. The "three no's," pronounced by President Clinton in Shanghai, are no [U.S.] support for Taiwan independence; no support for two China's, or one China, one Taiwan; and no support for Taiwanese entrance into international organizations for which statehood is a prerequisite.

57. According to one study, about 90 percent of minesweeping operations have been in areas with no discernible mines. See Captain Buzz Broughton and Commander Jay Burton, "The (R)evolution of Mine Countermeasures," *Proceedings of the Naval Institute,* May 1998, pp. 55–58.

58. The United States' general weakness in minesweeping is widely recognized. Although the United States recently has developed new minesweeping and minehunting equipment, much of it is based in the United States and would require a significant amount of time to be sent to the theater. A new naval plan, "the fleet engagement strategy," backed by former Secretary of Defense William S. Cohen, calls for increased "organic" mine-hunting and minesweeping capabilities within battle groups that would involve airborne (helicopters), surface, and submarine-based capabilities. It

is unclear how effective these initiatives have been in providing U.S. forces in East Asia with readily available capability in a crisis. See ibid.; "Cohen Expected to Respond This Week to Navy Brief on Mine Warfare," *Inside the Navy*, August 17, 1998, p. 3; and "Cohen Directs Navy to Add $53 Million to Develop Minehunting System," *Inside the Navy*, August 31, 1998, p. 1.

59. Although it demonstrates the potential problems of even Japanese defensive cooperation in the U.S.-Japan alliance, fortunately there are a lot of rather large "ifs" in the above blockade scenario. Even if most of these came to pass, one would hope that U.S. leaders would be wise enough to recognize the above dangers and would not put Japan into such a difficult dilemma.

60. For example, an internally circulated analysis of those Japanese buildups does not suggest opportunism or aggressive intent. See Pan, *Riben Junshi Sixiang Yanjiu*, chap. 14, and pp. 414–415.

61. Interviews, 1994.

62. For example, Beijing at times has tried to reassure Southeast Asian nations about its desire to settle the Spratly Islands disputes peacefully. Even if these are merely cynical tactics designed to buy time for China to concentrate on the Taiwan problem or develop force projection to handle the Spratlys dispute later, they demonstrate Beijing's ability to conceive of Southeast Asian fears about China.

63. For example, one book takes seriously Japan's fear of the Soviets during the Cold War, but places Japan's concern about China under the heading "Japan's Imagined Enemies," see Pan, *Riben Junshi Sixiang Yanjiu*, pp. 413–416. For another example, see Zhan Shiliang, "Yatai Diqu Xingshi he Zhongguo Mulin Youhao Zhengce" [The Asia-Pacific situation and China's good neighbor policy], *Guoji Wenti Yanjiu* [International studies], no. 4 (1993): 1–3, 7.

64. See Michael J. Green and Benjamin L. Self, "Japan's Changing China Policy: From Commercial Liberalism to Reluctant Realism," *Survival* 38, no. 2 (Summer 1996): 34–58.

65. The increased frequency of such statements over time may be one effect of China's relatively high rates of economic growth in the 1990s in comparison to Japan.

66. In separate interviews in 1994 a military officer and a civilian analyst lamented that the vast majority of Chinese are incapable of thinking in ways empathetic to Japanese concerns about China. In 1996 a civilian analyst complained that too many Chinese leaders and security analysts are unable to separate their analyses of 1930s Japan and 1990s Japan.

67. Multiple interviews, 1993–98. In fact, one military officer was even quite critical of China's last round of military exercises in March 1996 because he was afraid that China revealed too much about its military to a vigilant and highly capable U.S. defense intelligence network.

68. China has worked in the past to block the creation of formal multilateral reassurance regimes in East Asia, such as the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, that might lead to condemnation of China's development and/or deployment of its force-projection capabilities. As Jianwei Wang argues, China has been more open to multilateralism in the economic realm than it has been in the security realm. Jianwei Wang, "Chinese Views of Multilateralism," in Yong Deng and Feiling

Wang, *In the Eyes of the Dragon: China Views the World and Sino-American Relations* (Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 1999).

69. For example, at the July 1994 ARF conference and in earlier multilateral meetings with Southeast Asian representatives, China blocked any meaningful discussion of territorial disputes involving Chinese claims. See Allen S. Whiting, "ASEAN Eyes China," *Asian Survey* 37, no. 4 (April 1997): 299–322.

70. See Alastair Iain Johnston and Paul Evans, "China's Engagement of Multilateral Institutions," in Johnston and Robert S. Ross, eds., *Engaging China: The Management of an Emerging Power* (London: Routledge, 1999); Johnston, "Learning versus Adaptation: Explaining Change in Chinese Arms Control Policy in the 1980s and 1990s," *China Journal* 35 (January 1996): 27–61; Johnston, "Socialization in International Institutions: The ASEAN Regional Forum and IR Theory," paper prepared for the conference on "The Emerging International Relations of the Asia Pacific Region," University of Pennsylvania, May 8–9, 1998. See also Rosemary Foot, "China in the ASEAN Regional Forum: Organizational Processes and Domestic Modes of Thought," *Asian Survey* 38, no. 5 (May 1998): 425–440.

71. Interviews, 1996 and 1998. See also Wang, "Chinese Views on Multilateralism," in Deng and Wang, *In the Eyes of the Dragon*; and Wu Xinbo, "Integration on the Basis of Strength: China's Impact on East Asian Security," Asia/Pacific Research Center working paper, February 1998.

72. Interviews, 1996 and 1998. For an excellent analysis of ASEAN concerns and hopes about China, see Whiting, "ASEAN Eyes China." For Chinese reactions to changes in the U.S.-Japan alliance along these lines, see Zhou Jihua, "RiMei Anbao Tizhi de Qianghua yu Dongya de Anquan" [The strengthening of the U.S.-Japan security structure and the security of East Asia], *Riben Xuekan* [Japan studies], no. 4 (1996): 41–42; and Zhou, "Military Accords Create Suspicions," *China Daily*, October 7, 1996.

73. Interviews, 1996 and 1998. I was impressed that multilateral options, previously often discounted by my interlocutors, were now raised as legitimate alternatives to U.S. bilateralism without my prompting.

74. In the psychological literature on the security dilemma, one is not supposed to try to solve security dilemmas by applying pressure but by reassuring distrustful states. See Jervis, *Perception and Misperception*, chap. 3. In Alexander Wendt's constructivist approach, not only do tough policies merely reproduce realist fear and cynicism, but also gentle persuasion and appeasement are prescribed for even truly predatory regimes, such as Hitler's Germany or Stalin's Russia. See Wendt, "Anarchy Is What States Make of It," *International Organization* 46, no. 2 (Spring 1992): 391–425, at 409. In fact, recent work on Chinese foreign policy since Tiananmen suggests that the fear of material sanctions and social stigmatization helps explain a broad range of cooperative Chinese foreign policies from a general, more constructive regional strategy to accession to important international arms control institutions, such as the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty and the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. See Yu Bin, "China's Regional Views and Policies—Implications for the United States," and Hu Weixing, "China and Nuclear Nonproliferation," both in Deng and Wang, *In the Eyes of the Dragon*. See also Johnston and Evans, "China's Engagement in Multilateral Institutions."

75. These themes were still emphasized by my interlocutors in November 1998.

76. On the importance of Taiwan in the calculations regarding the scope of the U.S.-Japan alliance in the 1997 defense guidelines, see Michael Green, "The U.S. View," in Green and Mochizuki, *The U.S.-Japan Security Alliance*, p. 75. For more elaboration on my preferred position on U.S. strategy across the strait, see Christensen, "Chinese Realpolitik." For elaboration on the three no's, see note 56 above.

77. Multiple interviews, November 1998. Of course, Chinese analysts are concerned about U.S. development of TMD as well.

78. Many Chinese experts believe that the United States' encouragement of Japanese military development and foreign policy assertiveness will unwittingly fuel Japanese confidence and nationalism (a process that has already begun according to Chinese analysts), and that eventually U.S.-Japan security relations could still deteriorate. See, for example, Liu, "Dangqian Rimei Anbao Tizhi de San Ge Tedian," p. 3. In 1998 several Chinese analysts argued that Tokyo agreed to codevelopment of TMD in part to prepare a more independent Japanese defense capability for the future. I am grateful to David Asher, Bonnie Glaser, and Iain Johnston for helpful discussion on Japanese plans for satellites. For a Chinese statement linking the Japanese plans for satellites with the plans for U.S.-Japan joint development of TMD, see "China Concerned about Japanese Satellite Plan," Beijing (Associated Press), December 30, 1998. On the connection to the North Korean missile launch, see "Support Growing for Spy Satellite System," *Mainichi Shimbun*, September 8, 1998, Politics and Business Section, p. 2.

79. Another possible way to reduce some Chinese concerns about joint U.S.-Japan development of TMD would be to pursue a land-based theater high-altitude air defense (THAAD) system instead of a ship-based navy theater-wide system. If effective, a THAAD system could provide the Japanese home islands with missile defense, but because THAAD is immobile it could not travel to the Taiwan area or other regions, and therefore would be less likely to exacerbate Chinese concerns about real or perceived Japanese support for Taiwan independence. China still would be concerned about its deterrent capabilities against Japan and about general advancement in Japanese military technologies and assertiveness, but at least the fears about Taiwan would be somewhat reduced. But possibly because of high-profile test failures of THAAD in the United States, the United States and Japan have chosen to pursue the more provocative ship-based systems.

80. The Japanese sword and shield argument was made in China by a retired Chinese military officer and a civilian analyst in November 1998. The offense-defense indistinguishability issue and the ability to protect Japan from Chinese retaliation was raised by Chinese arms control and missile experts in the United States in August 1998. In 1998 an active military officer argued that U.S. transfer of TMD technology to Japan would likely violate the missile technology control regime. For critiques of offense-defense theory on the issue of distinguishability and responses to them, see Jack S. Levy, "The Offense-Defense Balance of Military Technology: A Theoretical and Historical Analysis," *International Studies Quarterly* 38, no. 2 (June 1984): 219–238; John J. Mearsheimer, *Conventional Deterrence* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1983), pp. 25–26; Lynn-Jones, "Offense-Defense Theory and Its Critics"; Van Evera, "Of-

fense, Defense, and the Causes of War"; and Glaser and Kaufmann, "What Is the Offense-Defense Balance?"

81. See Paul Bracken, "America's Maginot Line," *Atlantic Monthly*, December 1998, pp. 85–93.

82. For Japanese reticence on TMD, see Asher, "A U.S.-Japan Alliance for the Next Century," pp. 364–366.

83. There are no official published estimates of Japanese contributions to TMD. For some speculation, see Holzer and Opall-Rome, "U.S. Anticipates Approval from Tokyo on Joint TMD." The article states that Japan might pay up to 20 percent of the cost for developing a TMD system covering Japan. According to Landers, Lawrence, and Baum, in "Hard Target," such a system could cost about $17 billion over the next several years. I am grateful to Cindy Williams and Eric Labs for their help in analyzing the costs of additional mine-clearing equipment.

84. For a discussion of problems in marketing strategies, see Thomas J. Christensen, *Useful Adversaries: Grand Strategy, Domestic Mobilization, and Sino-American Conflict, 1947–1958* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996), chap. 2.

85. China and Japan exchanged visits by their defense ministers in 1998. In late 1997 there was a meeting between Premier Li Peng and Prime Minister Hashimoto, and in November 1998 there was a summit between President Zemin and Prime Minister Obuchi.

86. Even if China does not reform politically, a perceived "Japan threat" could still prove dangerous, because it could affect negatively the nature of Chinese authoritarianism. On the dangers of democratization, see Edward Mansfield and Jack L. Snyder, "Democratization and the Danger of War," *International Security* 20, no. 1 (Summer 1995): 5–38.

87. As Nicholas Kristof argues perceptively, the worst outcome would be if Japan became more militarily active before it reached a higher degree of understanding with its neighbors. See Kristof, "The Problem of Memory," *Foreign Affairs* 77, no. 6 (November/December 1998): 37–49, at pp. 47–48.

88. China has been building up these capabilities at a relatively fast pace in recent years, but in 1998 my interlocutors, however genuinely, said that joint U.S.-Japan TMD would lead China to increase the pace of this development.