Chapter 12

POWER AND PURPOSE IN PACIFIC EAST ASIA

A Constructivist Interpretation

Thomas U. Berger

If one looks at interstate relations in the East Asian region from a conventional International Relations theory perspective—Neorealism[1] and Neoliberalism[2]—one is bound to be simultaneously intrigued and puzzled. On the one hand some aspects of regional politics appear to bear out, at least on a superficial level, the predictions these mainstream approaches might make. For instance, Neorealist theorists may find comfort in the evidence of a growing rivalry between the United States and the People's Republic of China; whatever the fate of great power competition in the Atlantic region, the potential for hegemonic conflict appears to be alive and well in Asia-Pacific. Likewise Neoliberal institutionalists can note with satisfaction the proliferation of international institutions in the Asian region, most notably in the economic sphere, but—as predicted by the standard Neoliberal model—they increasingly spill over into other areas as well.[3]

On closer examination, however important aspects of interstate relations in the region do not fit the Neoliberal and Neorealist paradigms at all well. For instance, from a Neorealist perspective it is difficult to account for Japan's pronounced unwillingness to pursue a political-military role commensurate with its considerable economic power.[4] Likewise, Neoliberal institutionalists and Neorealists alike should be perturbed by the People's Republic of China's (PRC) readiness to risk a military confrontation with the United States over Taiwan despite the overwhelming preponderance of American maritime and

strategic power in the Pacific and despite the damage that such a belligerent policy inflicts on China's international image and the possibilities for international cooperation. Equally perplexing are the severe difficulties that Japan and South Korea have in cooperating militarily, despite their many common economic and security interests.[5] Japan's unwillingness or inability to participate even in a token form in the Gulf War poses a puzzle to both Neoliberal and Neorealist theories since Japan's failure to do so posed a threat to the multilateral institutions upon which it has come to depend.[6]

In short, East Asian regional affairs have been characterized by less great power tension than a classical Neorealist account might suggests.[7] At the same time the potential for conflict and the obstacles to cooperation are greater than what a Neoliberal institutionalist or a more moderate "defensive Realist" might expect, as anyone who has spent time in the region or has discussed security issues with experts form the region soon comes to realize.[8]

This essay argues that the problem with standard accounts of regional relations is that they neglect the way in which the structural, material forces emphasized by both Realism and Neoliberalism are mediated by cultural-ideational factors.[9] The primary source of the tensions that trouble the Asian region today are rooted not in their geo-strategic environment, their level of political economic development, or the character of the international institutions in which they are embedded. Rather they are the products of deep-rooted historically based suspicions and animosities, frustrated nationalism, and distinct conceptions of national identity and their differing understanding of the national mission in international affairs.

This is not to say that such Realist or Neoliberal factors as the balance of power or opportunities for interstate cooperation are irrelevant to the study of region. East Asian governments are keenly sensitive to shifts in the military balance, and are actively engaged in building international institutions in order to improve coordination on issues such as trade and the environment. However, the ways in which Asian nations in the region perceive and respond to these threats and opportunities are strongly conditioned by the manner in which these issues are defined in the context of their domestic political cultures.

In order to explore this dimension of East Asian regional affairs, this essay draws on a third theoretical approach that recently has emerged (or reemerged) in the field of International Relations, the so-called Constructivist school. Constructivism seeks to go beyond the narrow, rational-actor premises of Neorealism and Neoliberalism by problematizing aspects of the international system that traditionally have been largely ignored or taken for granted. In particular Constructivists focus on the ways in which state identity and interests are constructed through social-political processes that are only partially explainable within the rational-actor analytical framework.[10]

The main thesis this essay advances is that the stability of the Asian Pacific region in decades has to be attributed to the emergence of a far-reaching consensus among major countries in the region that economic development should be the overreaching national objective. The reasons for the emergence of this consensus—associated with the rise of what has been called the "East Asian developmental State"[11]—vary from country to country and are closely linked to historically contingent factors. The fact remains that the consensus on growth has become strongly institutionalized in their domestic political systems and has come to serve as the primary basis of governmental legitimacy. Consequently, East Asian nations—with the notable exception of North Korea—have chosen to set aside their traditional political-military rivalries and focus on a more cooperative pattern of relations, at least in the economic sphere.

Unlike Western Europe, however, this decision rested not upon a common sense of identity and (with the important exception of Japan) a profound longing for peace.[12] Asian regional cooperation has been much narrower in character and based on largely instrumental considerations. Consequently, regional cooperation is far more fragile in Asia than in Western Europe. Moreover, there exist various domestic cleavages in the region surrounding issues of national identity (Taiwan, Korea) and historically driven animosities (between the PRC and Japan and between Japan and South Korea) that sharply limit the prospects for cooperation and threatens to destabilize regional security. The recent sharp economic downturn in the region may greatly exacerbate these tensions as it casts into doubt the entire economic and political paradigm on which the existing East Asian order is based. In sum, viewing East Asian affairs through constructivist lenses brings into sharp relief some of the underlying sources of tension in the region and suggests that it may be far more unstable than either Neorealist or Neoliberal analyses might lead us to expect.

On the following pages this essay will outline the main features of the Constructivist approach to international relations and suggest some ways in which it might be applied to the analysis of East Asian regional affairs. The essay then briefly examines the domestic contexts of interstate relations, focusing in particular on the ways in which defense and foreign policy issues are framed in the public debate and linked to national identity and historically based understandings of the international system. Finally the essay concludes with some general reflections on the relative utility of the constructivist approach and the future of the region.

CONSTRUCTIVISM AND REGIONAL RELATIONS

Constructivism, like Realism and Liberalism, is not so much a specific theory per se as a broader theoretical approach to the analysis of politics in general. Many disparate and even contending schools of thought have been associated

with constructivism in international relations, including Critical Theory,[13] Post-Modernism,[14] Feminist IR theory,[15] and a less clearly defined, but fast growing school of what can be labeled interpretivists.[16] What these various schools of thought share in common is a view of human behavior, including state actions, as being fundamentally shaped by socially shared understandings of the world, both in terms of how the world is and in terms of the ways it should be.[17] Central to such understandings are actor identity and actor interests.

These understandings—which can be called cultures, mentalités, or discourses—are not simply subjective reflections of an objective, material reality, but rather emerge out of social interaction processes—through socialization, debate, and sometimes coercion. The particular cognitive lenses with which actors are endowed thus mediate the material world, including such features as the balance of military power or opportunities for trade and cooperation. As Alexander Wendt put it, "anarchy is what states make of it."[18] In the interest of theoretical even handedness one can make the same point with reference to conditions of complex interdependence.

From the constructivist perspective it is therefore impossible to analyze political behavior merely by examining the material-structural context in which actors find themselves. It is incumbent upon the social-scientific investigator to enter into the ideational and cultural world of his or her research subjects, seeking to uncover the meanings that they give to their actions and how the ideas and behavior of various actors then interact to produce outcomes. The method used is essentially a Weberian one of interpretation and understanding (*verstehen*).[19]

Three common misconceptions regarding the constructivist approach need to be briefly addressed. The first relates to the impression held by many commentators that constructivism is inherently associated with a progressive view of human affairs, along the lines of the Idealists so excoriated by an earlier generation of international relations scholars such as E. H. Carr.[20] In fact, the ways in which actor identity and interests are constructed can have profoundly illiberal consequences. Nationalism is one such example. Nationalism can be best understood as a particular socially constructed definition of collective identity that emerged in early modern Europe that had a profoundly destructive impact on European and world affairs, fueling interstate conflict, ethnic hatreds, and outright genocide in the first half of the twentieth century.[21] Many of the problems confronting the Asia-Pacific region today are attributable to similar kinds of forces.

A second common assumption holds that constructivism is fundamentally opposed to rational actor models of human behavior. This assumption sets up a false dichotomy between culture and rationality that obscures the extent to which the two are interlinked. Rationality can best be understood as a mode of cognition and standard for action whose application is itself culturally determined. On a certain level all actors at all times are acting rationally, even

as they pursue goals that are in large measure determined by the particular roles they have been given in society and within constraints of the culture in which they are embedded.[22] It should be taken as a given that Asian nations are sensitive to shifts in the balance of power and opportunities for cooperation and design their foreign policies accordingly. What goals they chose to pursue and how they assess the risks of their actions, however, is not.

Finally, in a similar vein, it would be a mistake to see constructivism as an approach to international relations that is necessarily at odds with Neorealist and Neoliberal understandings of international relations. From a Constructivist perspective both Neorealism and Neoliberalism are possible ways in which the international system may be structured by actors, and the predictions that either approach makes regarding the future of interstate behavior may prove correct. Constructivism maintains, however, that these responses are neither the inevitable result of the anarchic character of the international system and the distribution of power within it, nor are they the necessary byproduct of the emerging patterns of economic and other forms of interstate interaction that have been institutionalized through the creation of international rules and norms. Rather, these material factors are mediated by the actors' culturally derived cognitive lenses, which determine how the actor interprets these factors and how they chose to respond to them.[23]

Given the variable nature of cultures and collectively held understandings it would be futile to try to define a single, cookie-cutter methodological approach to investigating ideational-cultural structures. Rather, it is possible to speak of a number of common empirical tasks and methodological problems that researchers working within an interpretive framework need to perform. Three in particular will be focused on here: the identification of the relevant realm of discourse; the analysis of the actual contents of these discourses; and finally an exploration of their underlying inner dynamics.

The first task involves identifying those societal beliefs and values that are relevant to the particular set of behaviors or practices that the investigator is trying to explain.[24] In contrast to earlier generations of scholarship, which tended to see culture as discrete and monolithic, contemporary scholars emphasize that groups and individuals participate in a variety of different social contexts,[25] each of which may expose them to quite disparate, even contending, sets of ideas and beliefs about the world.

Constructivists investigating the practices of a given political actor or group of actors thus need to be sensitive to the extent to which those practices emerge out of a interactive process occurring between different subgroups within a given society—each of whom may hold very different conceptions of state identity and state interest—and the extent to which those ideas and behaviors emerge out of communicative processes that transcend the boundaries of the state and may be regional or even global in nature.[26] To put it differently,

the Constructivist analyst must first ask, what are the relevant social interactions driving actor behavior?

Second, the analyst must examine the actual contents of the relevant belief systems. How do the actors understand the situationconfronting them? What is their understanding of how the international system works (which necessarily is rooted in their particular interpretation of history)?[27] What do they understand their interests to be? Such cognitive artifacts are not only impossible to measure directly, but often are highly ambiguous and contested in nature.[28] In addition, the putative reasons given for any course of action may not be the real ones, either because of deliberate attempts at deception, because reasons are appended in a post-hoc fashion, or because the actors themselves may be unclear as to their motivations or the reasons for their actions. As a result, any statement analysts make with regard to the link between beliefs and action must itself be treated as a hypothesis and tested in a variety of contexts over time.

Finally, the social scientist must be sensitive to the issue of cultural change and evolution. Some types of belief systems may be highly stable over time and undergo little change. Evidence suggests, however, that many aspects of a belief system evolve constantly in response to internal dynamics within a particular universe of discourse and as a result of interactions with the outside world. In order to avoid falling into the trap of using cultural explanations as a post-hoc, tautological form of explanation,[29] while remaining open to the possibility of change, the analyst must be able to specify why changes in the existing patterns of beliefs occur and trace the process by which such changes take place.

In sum, in order to arrive at an explanation for any particular set of state policies or practices the Constructivist approach requires the investigator to engage in a sustained investigation of the debates surrounding those practices within the community of relevant policymaking actors and to place those debates in the context of the broader societal discourses in domestic and international politics. Such an effort, daunting enough in the context of a single country, obviously is nearly impossible to achieve for an entire region, and would require far more space than allowed for in a single essay. The following is intended simply as a suggestive first stab toward drawing a more comprehensive picture of the way in which constructivist factors influence international relations in contemporary East Asia.

THE FOREIGN POLICY CONSEQUENCES OF THE RISE OF THE EAST ASIAN DEVELOPMENTAL STATE

In surveying the contemporary situation in the East Asian region, it is possible to identify three sets of cultural-ideational factors that appear to be of particular significance for interstate relations. The first is the emergence of a general consensus in the countries in the region giving priority to economic growth and

development over the pursuit of political-military power. The second is the power of conflicting nationalism on the Korean peninsula and in the Taiwan Straits. Third and finally there are the diverse and mutually reinforcing fears, prejudices, and historically based animosities among China, Korea and Japan which encourage a sense of military insecurity among them and hamper efforts at cooperation in the military sphere. This section, and the two to follow, explore each of these group of variables in turn.

A single-minded focus on economic growth and development has been one of the dominant characteristics of Asian affairs since the late nineteenth century. Originally, however, economic growth was valued as the necessary complement to military power, rather than as an end in and of itself. After being forced out of their self-imposed isolationist stances in the first part of the nineteenth century, Asian countries, beginning with Meiji Japan, were intent on building a "rich nation, strong army" (*Fukokuky-hei*) in order to avoid being gobbled up by the Western Imperial powers. The fundamental view of international relations, in Japan and elsewhere, remained very much "Realist" in its emphasis on security concerns, and was reinforced by the balance-of-power thinking that dominated Europe at the time.[30]

After World War II, this basically instrumental approach to economic power was gradually displaced by a view of economic development as being of at least equal, or of even greater importance than the development of political-military power. The way in which this point of view developed, however, varied considerably from country to country.

The first nation in which this fundamental shift in thinking took place was Japan. Defeated, disarmed, and occupied by the western powers and the United States, Japan in 1945 was in no position to pursue political-military power. The Imperial elite, and in particular the members of the Japanese military establishment, had been discredited by the disastrous defeat, and the prewar militarist ideology was widely rejected. The United States, including the famous clause—Article 9—in which Japan foreswore the right to use military means to pursue foreign policy objectives, imposed a new constitution on Japan.[31]

Although of foreign origin, Article 9 was embraced by many in Japan, both on the idealistic left, but also by many in the Japanese political mainstream who developed a nearly pathological fear of the military as a potential threat to democracy. After having experienced its own military running amok in the 1930s and 40s, and fearing that right-wing elements in Japanese politics might once again make use of a foreign crisis to overturn the nation's fragile democracy, many Japanese were concerned with finding ways of containing the new, postwar defense establishment.[32]

This underlying fear of the military has remained strong into the present era. For instance, in 1988, when the Iran-Iraq war threatened to cut off the flow of oil from the Persian Gulf, it was the old conservative stalwart Gotoda Masaharu—

former Vice Minister of the Japanese Police Agency, implacable advocate of the death penalty, and one of the chief architects of deregulation of the Japanese economy in the 1980s—who was instrumental in preventing the dispatch of Japanese minesweepers. Likewise, during the Persian Gulf War of 1991–92, the Liberal Democratic Prime Minister of the time (Kaifu Toshiki) refused to allow military personnel to report directly to the cabinet for the first six months after the outbreak of the war for fear that civilian leaders might be "contaminated" by militarist thinking.[33] There are probably few countries in the world today who would deliberately cut themselves off from the advice of their own military experts in the midst of a major national security crisis.

During the 1950s fierce ideological battles were waged over the issue of defense and national security between the left, which advocated a stance of complete, unarmed neutrality, and the right, which was intent on restoring Japan as a great military power.[34] The uneasy compromise that emerged out of these struggles was a minimally armed Japan aligned with the West for the purpose of its own territorial defense, but refusing to take on a broader regional security role. Defense came to be widely viewed as the "third rail" of Japanese politics, and Japan's ruling conservative politicians generally preferred to focus on economic development. If Japan was to be neither the great military power that it had aspired to be in the prewar period, nor to accept the role of an unarmed, neutral "peace nation" advocated by the left during the postwar, than at least it could be a great economic power—a "merchant nation" (*Shonin Kokka*), to use the phrase originally invoked by the conservative Prime Minister Yoshida Shigeru.

Over time this view of Japan's national mission solidified and gained increased legitimacy among both the Japanese public and political elites. In the 1980s the Japanese government codified this view by officially adopting the concept of "Comprehensive Security." National security was no longer seen as merely a matter of defending against military threats, but was now redefined to embrace a broad range of goals, including strengthening U.S.-Japanese relations, fostering diplomatic and economic ties with Japan's Asian neighbors in the Asia-Pacific, ensuring energy security, guaranteeing the supply of food, and contributing to global progress through overseas development assistance.[35]

Underlying this shift in policy was a deeper shift in national identity. In the prewar period Japan had taken pride in its martial heritage, in the tradition of the Samurai and *Bushido*. It was Japan's warrior spirit that distinguished it from other nations and was regarded as the source of its national power. By the early 1980s, however, Japanese commentators and politicians increasingly stressed the nation's economic prowess and the supposedly unique cultural features of the Japanese people, which had made Japan's postwar economic accomplishments possible. So far-reaching was this cognitive transformation that increasingly Japanese intellectuals and policymakers began to deny Japan's martial past

altogether. They maintained that Japan differed fundamentally from other parts of the world in being an island nation that had never undergone the successive waves of conquest experienced elsewhere. As a result, even sophisticated and hard-nosed analysts of international affairs such as former Ambassador Okazaki Hisahiko argued that the Japanese people as such were peculiarly unsuited at the game of power politics as practiced by the rest of the world.[36]

In short, the peculiarly modest approach to defense and foreign policy that had been forced upon Japan by the United States and bitterly contested in the 1940s and 50s, by the 1980s had become the basis of a broader philosophy of international relations and was firmly anchored in a new understanding of Japanese national identity. Military weakness and dependency on the United States was not merely tolerated, but had come to be widely viewed as preferable to any of the likely alternatives. As a result, even after the constraints of the cold war fell away, public opinion data suggested that the country Japan most wished to emulate was Switzerland, even though Japan has a population of a 125 million compared to Switzerland's 7 million and the nations' geopolitical circumstances could hardly be more dissimilar.

The shift in the attitudes of other East Asian nations toward national security came at a later date, and has not been accompanied by as far-reaching transformations in their national self-understandings as has been the case in Japan. Nonetheless, substantial changes in attitudes and national priorities are discernible in virtually all of the major East Asian powers and are anchored in the shifting basis of regime legitimacy from ideological purity to economic performance.

South Korea and Taiwan began the cold war as embattled authoritarian regimes ruling over divided nations and confronted with massive security threats posed by their Communist neighbors. Fierce anti-communism combined with equally fierce postcolonial nationalism was the ideological message that South Korean President Synghman Rhee and Taiwanese dictator Chiang Kai-shek sought to propagate. A permanent state of crisis was maintained in both countries (martial law in Taiwan was lifted only in 1987) while all national energies were mobilized in preparation for a widely expected renewal of military hostilities. Not until well into the 1960s did South Korean and Taiwanese leaders abandon hope for a military defeat of their Communist rivals.[37] While fears of Communist attacks had very real foundations, the authoritarian rulers in South Korea and Taiwan to justify the suppression of internal dissent also exploited them.

The domestic and foreign policies of the PRC and North Korea in many respects presented a mirror image of the situation in Taiwan and South Korea. Harsh, dictatorial regimes mobilized their populations for potential conflict by exploiting nationalist longings for reunification and popular fear of foreign invasion.[38] While there were very real differences between the two sides in terms

of the ideological basis and the character of their regimes (among other things, the Communist systems in the North and on the Chinese Mainland proved much more destructive of human life and values than their authoritarian counterparts), there were striking similarities between them.

This harshly competitive, militarily oriented approach to international affairs gradually came to an end in the late 1970s and 1980s. In China the key shift came in 1978, after the forces of technocratic reform under Deng Xiaoping decisively defeated those elements in the Chinese political system that sought to perpetuate the Maoist revolutionary legacy. After twenty years of disastrous experiences with "putting politics in command" of the economy,[39] the new leadership was determined to rebuild the nation's economic strength and put an end to the destructive ideological mobilization campaigns that had characterized the Maoist period. Domestically this meant the gradual reintroduction of market mechanisms into the Chinese economy. Internationally it led to an intensification of economic ties with the outside world, as the PRC began to actively pursue trade with the West and to court foreign investment.[40]

The implications for Chinese foreign policy, and for regional affairs in general, were far reaching.[41] Whereas in the past China had frequent confrontational encounters with its neighbors (the PRC is the only country in the world which has deliberately attacked the forces of not one, but both nuclear superpowers—the United States in Korea and the Soviet Union along the Amur-Assuri River), in the 1980s—especially after 1982, it shifted to a far more cooperative stance to international relations.

This does not mean that China's leaders had turned into dewy-eyed idealists. On the contrary, most observers maintain that the PRC continued to view the world through largely Realist lenses.[42] At the same time, however, the Chinese leadership became increasingly technocratic in character, and came to be made up largely of pragmatic economic bureaucrats. For the first time after the changes in the Standing Committee of the Politburo in 1998 the highest level of Chinese government did not include a single member of the Chinese armed forces.[43] With the decline in the strength of Communist ideology, the CCP (Chinese Communist Party) increasingly came to rely for legitimacy on its economic performance and its ability to increase the national living standard. Having declared that "to get rich is glorious," the Chinese leadership's ability to use ideology to mobilize the population militarily has no doubt declined significantly.

In South Korea and Taiwan as well, changes in the political regime have been accompanied by a changing outlook on international relations. During the second half of the 1980s South Korea under Roh Tae Woo and Taiwan under Lee Teng Hui underwent remarkable transitions toward democracy. The reasons for these developments are complex and need not be explored here.[44] What is important to note is that in both countries the shift toward democracy was closely associated with moves toward more conciliatory relations with their

neighbors and engagement with potential adversaries through trade and investment.[45] While there remained considerable anxiety in some quarters regarding these moves, they enjoyed strong overall domestic political support.

Although this new emphasis on economic engagement was based on primarily instrumental calculations of national interest, they also contained a strong normative element. The shift toward engagement in South Korea and Taiwan was seen to be intrinsically linked to the liberalization of their domestic political systems. Distrust of Communism remained strong. At the same time there was wide spread suspicion—already long-held by members of the Korean and Taiwanese left—that calls for hard-line policies were tied, directly or indirectly, to conservative efforts to contain, if not roll back, liberal reforms, much in the same way that Japanese liberals suspected that calls for Japan to take on a larger military role could lead to a revival of militarism.

The reasons behind the shift toward increased reliance on economic tools of foreign policy are thus many and complex and vary from country to country. Nonetheless, taken together they had a number of important consequences for the development of interstate relations in the region. East Asian countries after 1978 have become increasingly preoccupied with the pursuit of economic development over and against the classical political military competition and ideological rivalry. Domestic political legitimacy has come to rest increasingly in these countries on their ability to fulfill the expectations of high growth and domestic stability that they have promised, making the diversion of scarce resources to costly foreign policy ventures a risky enterprise.

This development represents a novum in regional affairs that cannot be easily explicable through the reference to standard Realist or Neoliberal theoretical models of the international system. Prior to the spread of the post-1945 Development State model in the region, Asia had been beset by classical balance-of-power rivalries. Before the Second World War East Asia witnessed repeated great power clashes, culminating in the savagery of the Japanese invasion of China and the brutal American-Japanese war in the Pacific. Conflict and strife similarly beset the first few decades after 1945. In addition to the Korean and Vietnamese wars there had been low-intensity conflicts involving Australia, Malaysia, and Indonesia in the 1950s to mid 1960s, the Sino-Soviet confrontation of 1969–1970, the Vietnamese invasion of Laos and Cambodia in 1978, and the subsequent Chinese attack on Vietnam, as well as numerous military crises and savage internal conflicts which often involved some degree of external involvement. Not counting the victims of the wars of colonial independence and such largely internal conflicts as the guerrilla conflicts in Indonesia or Malaysia, in all as many as 5 million people lost their lives as a result of interstate violence, and at least three times—during the Korean war, the Vietnam War, and the Sino-Soviet conflict—serious consideration was given to the use of nuclear weapons.

Since 1978, while tensions have certainly continued to simmer, there has been a remarkable decline in actual armed conflict in the region. This shift is at least in part attributable to the settling of the decolonialization process and the creation of stable domestic political regimes throughout the region. Yet equally as important, however, has been the increased emphasis placed by the major regional powers on economic performance over the development of political military power.

A Neorealist might be inclined to argue that this increased emphasis on economic development was largely a consequence of the predominance of American military power in the region. Countries aligned with the United States such as Japan, Korea, and Taiwan could afford to concentrate on economic development while in effect enjoying a free ride on a security order provided at American expense. The PRC, for its part, chose to accept American hegemony for the time being in order to build up its economy so as to be able to possibly challenge the United States at a later point.

Contrary to the expectations of Neorealist theory, however, this redefinition of the national interest took place despite fundamental, and largely unexpected, shifts in the balance of power, from the bipolar world of the late 1970s through a brief period of apparently increased multipolar fluidity in the late 1980s and early 1990s to the de facto unipolar situation that obtains in the region today. While the United States remained the predominant maritime power in the region, at numerous points American power and commitment appeared to wane and waver. The shift toward giving priority to economic growth, however, continued unabated, regardless of the fluctuations in the distribution of power in the international system.

A Neoliberal institutionalist might argue that the increased emphasis on economic growth was the natural result of the increased sophistication and interdependence of the regions' economies as well as of the proliferation of international institutions that permit increased cooperation. These developments, however, occurred after the shift in actor interests and arguably were a reflection, not a cause, of the fundamental ideational shift taking place in the Asian region.

THE POWER OF NATIONALISM

While certain ideational-cultural developments in the East Asian region have increased stability in the region, others continue to act as considerable, even growing, sources of tension, one of the most readily apparent of which is the clash of nationalism on the Korean peninsula and in the Straits of Taiwan. From the perspective of structural IR theory there is no reason to assume that the North Korean regime should be tempted to risk an attack on the South. The balance of power overwhelmingly favors the United States and South Korea, especially since there is little prospect that China or Russia would come to the aid

of the North in the event of its making the first aggressive move. The chances of a military victory appear dim at best, and the risk of an escalation of hostilities that could destroy the regime in the North would seem large.[46]

From a Neoliberal point of view, in the long-term cooperation with the South could offer considerable economic rewards. With careful management of its external ties, the North Korean regime might well manage to sustain itself for decades to come.[47] Yet, the North continues to engage in highly provocative and risky actions that appear to be motivated by a deep-seated commitment to achieving national unity on its own terms, whatever the costs.[48]

In the case of Taiwan and China we are confronted with a case of two apparently irreconcilable nationalisms which, if anything, are growing in strength and virulence with each passing year. Although the Nationalist Kuomintang (KMT) government of Taiwan continues to maintain that Taiwan is an integral part of the Mainland, for the majority of the Taiwanese population unification with the motherland is at best a long-term objective of relatively low priority, and at worst an immediate threat to the nation's hard-earned liberty and prosperity. Moreover, a substantial portion of the Taiwanese population supports an outright break with the country's historical ties with China and favors the cause of Taiwanese independence.

For more than forty years the Taiwanese population were denied democracy and civil liberties because the KMT argued that it represented all of China, of which Taiwan was but one province. Through a variety of institutional means the Taiwanese found themselves a political minority in their own country, dominated by an ethnically distinct Mainland elite who controlled all the levers of political power. As a result, the indigenous democratic movement emerged in opposition to the myth of national unity. Many Taiwanese, particularly those of the younger generation, came to feel that democracy in Taiwan could only finally be consolidated through an outright declaration of independence.[49]

The political expression of these sentiments is the Democratic People's Party (DPP). Over the past decade the DPP has steadily increased its share of the vote and has won control of many important political institutions. The KMT, for its part, has chosen to bow to these pressures. Under the leadership of Taiwan-born Lee Teng Hui the Nationalists have tried to co-opt the Taiwanese nationalist mood by trying to increase *de facto* Taiwanese sovereignty without declaring *de jure* independence. Under these conditions, it is perfectly conceivable that either the DPP eventually will come into office, where it may try to implement its radical agenda regardless of the foreign policy consequences, or that the KMT will move so far toward the DPP's position that from the point of view of an outside observer—including the PRC—the differences between the two will appear irrelevant.

At the same time, as pressures for Taiwanese independence grow, the forces of emotive nationalism would appear to be on the rise on the Mainland. After

thirty years of mismanagement and two decades of compromising its Socialist principles, the CCP's domestic legitimacy rests on the relatively narrow grounds of maintaining internal order and achieving high rates of economic growth. In order to find a new ideological glue to hold a vast and disparate nation together, in recent years there have been signs of an increased readiness on the part of Chinese leaders and intellectuals to make use of an emotive, nationalist appeal, one that focuses on China's past humiliations at the hands of external powers—its so-called "Century of humiliation"—and makes the rectification of these past injustices a central mission of the nation.[50] Compounding these sentiments are suspicions that outside forces may seek to weaken and divide China, peeling off its peripheral territories—beginning with Taiwan and Tibet—before closing in to dismember the rest, much as the European powers and Japan did in the in the nineteenth and the first half of the twentieth centuries. These ideological trends threaten to make Taiwan a more sensitive issue for China than ever, and could put China on a collision course with Taiwan, and the United States.

From the point of view of an outside observer, be they either of the Neoliberal or a Neorealist persuasion, all three parties to the Taiwanese situation appear to be behaving in an irrational manner. Why should the PRC threaten military action when it has no hope of mounting a successful invasion of the island and is likely to manage to embroil itself in a potentially dangerous confrontation with the United States? In the long run, if they wait and continue to grow as they have over the past two decades, they will either become strong enough to succeed in an attack or the economies of Taiwan and the Mainland will grow so intertwined that Taiwan will effectively fall into its lap. The KMT as well appears to be more than a bit delusional if it really believes that it will be able to absorb all of China on their terms.[51] Finally the DPP for its part would appear foolhardy in its willingness to provoke Taiwan's giant neighbor by demanding outright independence.

All three sides, it could be argued, seem to be reasonably well served by the status quo of *de jure* unity but *de facto* division. Yet, within the context of their respective political cultures, each actor is not only acting in a perfectly rational manner, but also feels that they have virtually no other option than to behave as they do.

THE IMPACT OF HISTORICAL MEMORY

Constructivism draws our attention to the power of historical memory. Today, decades after the end of the War in the Pacific, the memories of the horrors of the war, and debates over Japan's role, remain as vivid as ever. More than ever, Japanese leaders find themselves under intense pressure to apologize for the atrocities committed during the war by the Japanese military.[52] Controversies continue to rage over the issue of Japanese compensation for the victims of the

war,[53] and in the United States books about Japanese war crimes and Japan's alleged historical amnesia continue to make the best seller lists.[54] Meanwhile, in Japan itself, a new generation has begun to confront the grim side of the past more openly.[55]

Conventional international relations theory tends to discount the impact of such memories on actual policy behavior. Yet, as almost any researcher who has done field research in the region can testify, their impact seems almost palpable. An excellent illustration of the way in which these factors influence national security policy can seen in the case of Japanese-Korean relations.

From a Realist point of view, security relations between South Korea and Japan have been determined overwhelmingly by three key factors: the existence of a clearly defined and very imminent security threat from the North; the latent security rivalry between Korea and Japan; and the moderating presence of the two countries' security relationship with the United States.

Throughout the cold war, the United States, South Korea, and Japan were united by their common interest in containing Communism in East Asia. For Seoul, the alliance with the West was a matter of national survival. For Japan's ruling conservative elites, denying control of the strategic Korean peninsula to Communist powers was of only slightly lesser importance. After the U.S.-Soviet rivalry had faded, this concern with Communism was replaced with a common desire to maintain regional stability and regional status quo in which all three powers had a very large stake.

While alignment with the United States might be viewed as inevitable from a Realist point of view, the Realist perspective also allows for the identification of various factors that limited direct military cooperation between the two Asian powers. South Korea, from its point of view, had every reason to be suspicious of a resurgent Japan using the alliance as an excuse to once again intervene in Korean affairs. Japan for its part wished to avoid being dragged into a costly military engagement on the Korean peninsula.[56]

The alliance with the United States provided a perfect solution for both these sets of problems. From Seoul's perspective, Japan's alliance with the United States provided reassurance against the threat of Japanese remilitarization. As long as Japan was dependent on the United States for its security there was little danger that Japan would be allowed to threaten South Korean interests. At the same time, the alliance was convenient for Tokyo because it allowed Japan to pass the costs of providing military protection to Korea onto the United States. From a Realist point of view it is therefore far from surprising that military cooperation between the two countries has been limited, and it was no accident that the security dialog between the two intensified whenever the United States appeared to be wavering in its commitment.[57]

From a Neoliberal perspective as well there exist strong reasons for Korea and Japan to cooperate on security. As resource-poor industrialized nations de-

pendent on exports and access to world markets, the two nations have a strong common interest in maintaining regional security in order to avoid disruption of the vital flow of commerce. At the same time, the two countries' commercial rivalry in such industrial sectors as steel, shipbuilding, and semiconductors is at least partially offset by their burgeoning trade and the substantial flow of Japanese investment in the Korean economy.[58]

In addition, Japan's and Korea's common membership in a broad range of international institutions serves to mitigate their mutual suspicions and distrust by improving the flow of information about each other's capabilities and intentions. Likewise, Neoliberal theorists would argue, Korea's recent democratization should help ameliorate any residual concerns that the two nations might harbor regarding each other's intentions and help to stabilize relations between them.[59]

In sum, while identifying some possible sources of tension between Seoul and Tokyo, a Neoliberal perspective would predict continued and growing cooperation between the two powers and would anticipate their becoming leading contributors to regional stability, especially within the framework of international institutions.

A Constructivist looking at the relationship between South Korea and Japan would, to put it mildly, be far less sanguine about the prospects for cooperation between the two. To be sure, a Constructivist would recognize that to the extent that Realist or Neoliberal ways of thinking influences Japanese decisionmaking the two countries may see strong reasons to cooperate with one another. In addition, a Constructivist might acknowledge that the staunch anti-Communist outlook of Korean and Japanese elites provides some basis for the identification of common national interests.

At the same time, however, despite some ideational bases for cooperation, the two countries remain divided by the legacy of a bitter past. On the Korean side the brutality of the Japanese colonial regime is still vivid in living memory, as most recently reflected in the public outrage triggered by the revelation of the complicity of the Japanese government in organizing the sexual slavery of an estimated 200,000 women, the majority of whom were Korean, during World War II.[60]

Beyond the physical and emotional scars borne by the victims of the Japanese colonial regime, there exists a yet deeper and longer lasting resentment of Japan that resides on the level of the Korean collective conscience. Modern Korean nationalism developed in opposition to Japanese Imperialism, and it survived in defiance of harsh assimilatory policies by the colonial regime. The trials and tribulations of that period play a central role in the Korean national myth and are recorded in countless memorials, books, plays, and histories on both sides of the demilitarized zone (albeit with very different interpretations).[61] Indeed, when North and South Korean military officers met for direct talks in

the early 1990s, one of the few things they could agree on was the existence of a potential Japanese military threat!

In Japan, the memories of the colonial period have been long suppressed and there is relatively little recrimination regarding Japan's treatment of Korea outside the circles of the liberal left. Instead of guilt for its own misconduct, the primary focus of Japanese memories of the pre-1945 period has been the suffering of its own people as a result of American fire bombings, the savagery of the campaign in the Pacific, the strangulation of its economy by American submarines, and, most important of all, the atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki.[62] Korea as a country occupies a relatively small space in Japan's national consciousness, and Japan's image of Koreans remains colored by a lingering attitude of superiority that is traceable to its prewar self image as the enlightened savior of East Asia.[63]

This does not mean, however, that Japan suffers from a form of historical amnesia—as is often charged—or that it has not drawn any lessons from the past. Rather, as is true of most countries, Japan's memories of the past are highly selective, and the dominant image left from the war can be described as "dual victimization." The Japanese feel first of all victimized by victorious Allied powers, who they feel waged the war with racially motivated ruthlessness and who were equally guilty of colonialism and imperialist expansion before the war. But what is frequently overlooked by Western commentators is that Japanese of all political stripes, left, right and center, also feel victimized by their own military and the ultra-nationalist far right, who they hold responsible for destroying Japan's nascent prewar democracy and who led them into a hopeless war which they should have known Japan could not win.

This image of an out-of-control military dominates both popular and scholarly accounts of the war in Japan, and continues to profoundly influence the Japanese view of national security and the military institution. To put it succinctly, the Japanese feel that they have been bullied and manipulated once in the name of nationalism and national security and they are determined not to allow it to happen again. As a result, there are is a strong consensus in Japan that it should minimize its involvement in security affairs and that the armed forces as an institution must be kept in constant check, so as to prevent it from once again exerting a corrosive influence on Japanese democracy.[64]

Although Korean and Japanese attitudes have evolved considerably over the course of the past fifty years, these features of their domestic political cultures have changed relatively little over time. In many respects they have even reinforced one another. Japanese expressions of superiority vis-à-vis Koreans and periodic statements by leading Japanese politicians that reflect an apparent incomprehension of the reasons for the depth of popular Korean resentment of Japan have time and again provoked outrage in Korea.[65] In turn, Korea's virulent and apparently implacable hatred of Japan makes many Japanese despair of

ever being able to find any common ground with their Korean neighbors. From a Constructivist point of view this enduring structure of Korean resentment and Japanese aloofness should make it very difficult to enable the two countries to cooperate with one another even within the framework of the two countries' alliances with the United States.

To what extent do the three models elaborated above provide insight on the actual empirical record? The Neorealist perspective provides an excellent guide to the overall direction that the Japanese-Korean security relationship has followed. In the 1950s, when the prospect of conflict on the peninsula seemed very real and the U.S. commitment to regional security seemed strong, Japan strenuously avoided any military commitment, which could lead to its becoming bogged down in a land war in Asia.[66] On the other hand, especially during both the early and late 1970s, when the threat of a general U.S. withdrawal from East Asia seemed very real, the two countries took steps to strengthen their security ties.[67]

The intensification of security ties between the two nations since the end of the cold war, including Japan's recent commitment to provide support to U.S. forces in the event of a security crisis on the Korean peninsula, becomes perfectly intelligible in this light.[68] The possibility of becoming entangled through Korea in a larger conflict involving both Russia and China has greatly diminished since 1991. At the same time, with the demise of the Communist threat to U.S. global interests, the U.S. stake in maintaining regional security is probably at its lowest point since 1945. In order to preserve the security structure that has been so successful in keeping the peace in the region in the past, Japan and the Republic of Korea have every reason to try to find ways to decrease the costs to the United States of maintaining its forward commitment in Asia.

The Neoliberal perspective also provides some insight on policy between the two countries. The 1965 normalization of relations between the two countries owed a great deal to growing interest among Japanese business leaders in improving economic relations with the Republic of Korea, which was just embarking on its remarkable economic takeoff in that period.[69] Since then trade between the two economies has exploded to the point where by the early 1990s each represented the other country's first or second most important trading partner.[70] The two countries' economies have become increasingly integrated with the economies of other countries in the region, feeding—precisely as Neoliberals would anticipate—the profusion of international institutions which increasingly have begun to spill over into other areas.

At first glance, Neorealism and Neoliberalism might seem to provide a fairly convincing set of explanations for the overall development of security relations between the two countries. A closer examination of how policy actually has been made, however, quickly reveals the extent to which domestic political factors, and in particular historical memories, have shaped foreign policy outcomes.

In the 1950s the intensity of personal animosity between Korean and Japanese leaders frustrated all U.S. efforts at fostering greater reconciliation and closer cooperation between its two chief allies in the region. When in 1953 the United States was able to lure Japanese Prime Minister Yoshida Shigeru into a conversation with his South Korean counterpart, President Synghman Rhee, at U.S. military headquarters in Tokyo, reportedly the two men sat silently without exchanging a word. Finally Yoshida, in order to make some conversation, asked politely, "Are there any tigers in Korea?" "No," Rhee replied, "the Japanese took them all." With that brief exchange all conversation ended.[71]

Only when the more pro-Japanese Park Chung Hee took power in the early 1960s did it begin to become possible to establish closer relations.[72] Even then, Korean resentment of Japan always simmered close to the surface, occasionally bursting forth with virulent fury. In 1974, when a second-generation Korean residing in Japan, and associated with pro-North Korean organizations, attempted to assassinate Park Chung Hee, the brunt of South Korean anger was directed at Japan, not the North. The Japanese embassy in Seoul was ransacked and enraged demonstrators cut off their own fingers and wrote anti-Japanese slogans in blood on the embassy walls. In the end U.S. mediation was required to repair the diplomatic rift and calm the over heated emotions.[73]

While a certain degree of Korean suspicion of Japan might appear perfectly reasonable in light of the power disparities between the two nations, the extent to which historically fed resentments color almost every aspect of their relationship appears less rational when viewed through the pristine lenses of mainstream international relations theory. Although at times military men from the two countries are able to interact in a professional manner, and even build up personal friendships, at other times national animosities flare up between them, complicating efforts to get the two armed forces to engage in even limited joint training away from their national territories and triggering pointless military standoffs.[74] Likewise, the Korean press and media remain highly sensitive to the possibility of Japanese military resurgence.[75]

A prime example of the persistence of animosities can be seen in the recent naval confrontation over the disputed territory of Takeshima/Tokdo Island. Although uninhabited and of relatively little economic value, the two nations dispatched naval forces to the island to underline their claims, and South Korean forces even landed and briefly occupied the islands in a televised show of force. The chance of an actual armed clash was admittedly negligible. Japanese public sensibilities virtually rule out the use of force in such a situation, while the South Korean government is well aware that its limited naval forces would be no match for Japan's in the event of a serious test of strength. Such maneuvers, however, appear to be largely motivated by extreme national passions. They have little chance of actually enhancing the prospect of a diplomatic solution to

the problem and hardly help the cause of improving military cooperation between the two nations.

Equally damaging to bilateral security relations has been postwar Japan's overall attitude toward national security. In the early 1960s, with U.S. encouragement, the Japanese Self-Defense Agency quietly began to draw up contingency plans on how to respond a renewal of hostilities on the Korean peninsula. When these plans—the so-called "Three Arrows Plans"—were leaked to the Japanese opposition, however, they provoked a storm of controversy. Although the Japanese government felt that in principle such research was necessary and in the national interest, many Japanese leaders, including apparently Prime Minister Sato Eisaku, feared that the armed forces might be tempted to use such a crisis to undermine civilian control of the armed forces. As a result, the plans were discarded and the uniformed officer formally in charge of the project reprimanded and eventually discharged. Further, Prime Minister Sato forbade the further drafting of such contingency plans indefinitely. This ban was to remain in effect for more than thirteen years and still today has been only partially rescinded.[76]

Even after 1978, when Japan began to cooperate more closely with the United States on security matters, the issue of whether Japan would offer even logistical support in the event of a crisis on the Korean peninsula was left deliberately vague. As a result, in 1993, when the United States was on the brink of taking military action to defuse the potential development of nuclear weapons by the North Korean regime, the Japanese government was unable to provide the United States with any assurance of support. Nor was it willing, because of domestic political opposition, to assist directly in a naval blockade directed at the North. As the United States prepared to evacuate its embassy in Seoul and military reinforcements were rushed to the region, the Japanese government informed the United States that if shooting started it might even be unable to provide medical facilities to wounded U.S. servicemen and women.[77]

From a Neorealist perspective passing the buck might seem a perfectly rational strategy, this utter inability of Japan to act is more than passing strange. Four years earlier, during the Gulf War, the Japanese had been faced with similarly strong demands to contribute to a Western military operation to rope in a rogue regime, and in a similar fashion domestic fears of entanglement and remilitarization had paralyzed government decisionmaking then.

After that crisis had passed, Japan's political leadership concluded that the country had barely avoided disaster. If the United States had taken serious casualties in the Gulf conflict while some of its chief allies had stayed at home, there had been every sign that the domestic backlash in the United States would have been enormous and could have undermined the alliance upon which Japan depends almost totally for its military security. Only the relatively happy outcome of the war, from the U.S. perspective, spared Japan from far

more serious political consequences.[78] Yet despite near unanimous agreement among the Japanese foreign and defense policy elite that nation's response to the crisis had been woefully inadequate, only a few years later, faced with a potentially even more serious situation on their doorstep, the Japanese once again lapsed into paralysis.

This time after its near brush with disaster in Korea, the Japanese political elite was at last galvanized to revise the 1978 Guidelines on U.S.-Japanese Security Cooperation. When unveiled in 1998, the new Guidelines appeared to promise a stronger Japanese response in the event of a new regional crisis, with special emphasis on rear area support for U.S. forces operating on the Korean peninsula.[79] To this day, however, direct Japanese participation in combat operations remains out of the question, leaving open the very real possibility that in the event of a costly campaign in Korea popular opinion in the United States would complain that Japan is willing to share the financial costs of the defense of Asia, but not the cost in blood. Moreover, direct cooperation between the Japanese and South Korean armed forces remains limited and greatly complicated by the fundamental divergence in attitudes of the two sides.

In sum, a Neorealist or Neoliberal perspective has no difficulty explaining why Korea and Japan should cooperate with one another militarily, and both provide good explanations for why ties between the two sides should be intensifying. The real puzzle for Neorealists and Neoliberals is why despite, all the good structural reasons for Japanese-Korean cooperation on national security, ties remain so limited and relations are so volatile. After more than forty years of U.S. efforts to bring the two sides together, despite the extensive integration of their economies, their increased integration in regional and global institutions, and all the other changes that have taken place, the legacies of the past make Japan and Korea—at best—hostile partners.

CONCLUSIONS

If a theoretical perspective is to have any utility it has to tell the analyst what factors in the complex and often seemingly chaotic world of empirical reality are important and hence worthy of investigation. By the same token, every theoretical approach must also tell the analyst what elements of his or her research subject can be safely ignored or treated as a residual variable.[80] In this way every theoretical research program both illuminates and occludes different aspects of reality. It is up to the investigator, and by extension to the broader scholarly community, to decide whether a particular approach produces accounts of reality which are more persuasive and/or useful than those produced by other approaches.

The Constructivist approach directs our attention to the ways in which collectively held beliefs and values influence and shape actor behavior. At the

same time it tends to divert our attention from the factors that other IR perspectives emphasize, such as the military balance of power, opportunities for trade, and international institutions. The question thus arises, to what extent does a Constructivist interpretation improve our understanding of the dynamics of East Asian regional affairs compared to Neorealism and Neoliberalism? The forgoing analysis suggests that it does so in a number of significant ways.

First, the Constructivist approach offers a convincing explanation for the historical shift of actor preferences from security to economic concerns. It allows us to trace the process whereby Chinese, Japanese, Korean, and Taiwanese elites came to institutionalize an approach to foreign policy which emphasizes economic over security issues, albeit in each case these approaches were based on very different underlying ideational-cultural understandings and emerged under very different circumstances. The account that emerges is at least as persuasive as the ones that might be offered by Neorealism or Neoliberalism, and considerably richer.

Second, Constructivism focuses our attention on aspects of regional politics, which tend to be largely discounted by system level theories such as Neorealism and Neoliberalism. While system theorists tend to treat such factors as nationalism and historic enmities as unexplained givens, Constructivism leads the analyst to take them seriously. Not only does this allow the analyst to account for behavior that appears irrational on a systemic level—such as the willingness of China and Taiwan to risk dangerous military confrontations over relatively minor symbolic issues—it also sensitizes the observer to the ways in which these forces develop dynamics of their own. The rise of the Taiwanese independence movement may appear to be a domestic political development rooted in the particular, but it is one with serious, indeed potentially profound, international political consequences.

The predictions that the Constructivist perspective offers differ markedly from those offered by other approaches in a number of respects. For instance, from a Constructivist perspective the evolution of Chinese and Taiwanese national identity will play a far greater role in determining the level of tensions across the straits than either shifts in the balance of power or the state of economic and formal political ties between the two nations. Similarly, Constructivism underlines the importance of resolving the history question.

Likewise, Constructivism makes rather different predictions from Neoliberalism or Neorealism regarding the probable regional response to structural changes. Many Realists predict that a decline in U.S. power or commitment to the region would lead to increased instability and possibly great-power rivalry between China and Japan.[81] Neoliberals would stress instead international institutions and the spread of democracy as the keys to stability. If institutions such as APEC and ARF grow, and the trend toward democratization in the region continues, a relatively optimistic outlook on the future of the region would be

warranted. If these conditions do not obtain, Neoliberals would contend that the prospects for conflict grow correspondingly.

Constructivism eschews such relatively simplistic prognostications. Were the U.S military presence in the region to decline significantly, each East Asian nation would be torn in different directions. On the one hand, there would be strong sentiment in favor of continuing the emphasis on economic growth and international cooperation. On the other hand, historically rooted suspicions and resentments, along with nationalist passions, could be expected to flare up and fuel pressures for competitive rearmament. The way in which these forces might be expected to play out will be different in different countries, depending on historically contingent circumstances as well as the different ways in which these sentiments are embedded in their respective domestic political cultures.

Japan, with its comparatively deeply embedded anti-militarism and traditional propensity for aloofness from regional affairs, might well be inclined to retreat into a hedgehog-like defensive stance. In contrast, on the Korean peninsula and in the Taiwan straits, where nationalist tensions run high, the likelihood of conflict would escalate dramatically, and full-scale military clashes would be likely in either or both cases.

Finally, in light of the theoretical considerations sketched out briefly in this essay the current economic crisis in East Asia takes on a rather different, and arguably deeper, significance than it does when viewed through Neoliberal or Neorealist lenses. What is at stake in the current crisis is not merely a transitory shift in economic power resources or an opportunity to better integrate Asian nations into the global trading order. Rather, the crisis has the potential to throw into question the dominant regional model of state-society relations—the East Asian Developmental State model—and in doing so fundamental issues regarding national identity and national interests are opened up for debate that may provide the most severe test of legitimacy the existing political regimes have faced since 1945. Whether the East Asian states reviewed will take up the alternative Western models offered by the United States and the IMF as a result of this process, or turn to the reformulated versions of their own approaches to these issues remains to be seen. In either case, the Constructivist approach suggests that the process will be contentious and volatile.

ENDNOTES

1. Realism views interstate relations as driven by the distribution of power, and in particular military power, in the international system. Key works that have helped define the realist approach include: Hans Morgenthau, *The Politics among Nations*, 6th edition (New York: Knopf, 1985); Kenneth Waltz, *Man the State and War* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1985); Kenneth Waltz, *Theory of International Politics* (Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1979); and Robert Gilpin, *War and Change in Inter-*

national Politics (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1981). For an interesting, and provocative analysis of the difference between classical Realism and its most recent, and most popular variant, Structural Neorealism, see Richard K. Ashley, "The Poverty of Neorealism," in Robert O. Keohane, ed., *Neorealism and its Critics* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1986).

2. Neoliberalism used here focuses on the ways in which patterns of interaction between states in an increasingly interdependent world gives rise to international institutions that provide a structure in which states can overcome coordination problems and are led to redefine conflicting interests. Central texts in the Neoliberal institutionalist program include Robert O. Keohane and Joseph Nye, *Power and Interdependence* (Boston, MA: Little Brown, 1977); Robert O. Keohane, *After Hegemony* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984); Kenneth Oye, ed., *Cooperation Among Nations* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986); and Robert Axelrod, *The Evolution of Cooperation* (New York: Basic Books, 1986). For an insightful overview of the relationship between modern neoliberalism and other forms of liberal theory in international relations see Andrew Moravcsik, "A Liberal Theory of International Politics," *International Organization* 51, no. 4 (Autumn 1997).

3. For a general overview of the development of international institutions, see Andrew Mack and John Ravenhill, eds., *Pacific Cooperation: Building Economic and Security Regimes in the Asia-Pacific Region* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1995).

4. As has been argued by a growing number of analysts, including Peter Katzenstein, *Cultural Norms and National Security: Police and Military in Postwar Japan* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1996); Peter Katzenstein and Nobuo Okawara, "Japan's National Security: Structures, Norms and Policies," *International Security* 17:4 (1993); Davis B. Bobrow, "Military Security Policy," in R. Kent Weaver and Bert A. Rockman, eds., *Do Institutions Matter: Government Capabilities in the United States and Abroad* (Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution, 1993); Glen Hook, Hans W. Maull, "Germany and Japan: The New Civilian Powers," *Foreign Affairs* 69, no. 5 (Winter 1990–1991); and Yoshihide Soeya, "Japan: Normative Constraints versus Structural Imperatives," in Muthiah Alagappa, ed., *Asian Security Practice: Material and Ideational Influences* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998). See also the author's own work on this subject, Thomas Berger, *Cultures of Antimilitarism: National Security in Germany and Japan* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998).

5. This argument is made at greater length in Thomas Berger, "Set for Stability? The Ideational Basis of Conflict in East Asia," *Review of International Studies* (Spring 2000).

6. For a more detailed look at Japanese reactions to the Gulf crisis and its implications for Japanese interests, see Thomas Berger, *Cultures of Antimilitarism*, pp. 171–177. See also Asahi Shimbun "Wangankiki" Shuzaihan, *Wangan Senso to Nihon* (Tokyo, Asahi Shimbunsha, 1991); and Courtney Purrington and K. A., "Tokyo's Policy Responses During the Gulf Crisis," *Asian Survey*, Vol.21, no. 4 (April 1991).

7. See for instance, Aaron Friedberg, "Ripe for Rivalry: Prospects for Peace in a Mutlipolar Asia," and Richard K. Betts, "Wealth Power and Instability: East Asia and the United States after the Cold War," both in *International Security* 18, no.3 (Winter 1993/1994).

8. Realism, like other well-developed schools of thought in international relations, contains many different variants. Defensive Realists differ from classical Neorealists in their view of the underlying motives of states. Classical Neorealists see states as power maximizers, striving to enhance their power at every opportunity. For an insightful discussion, see Fareed Zakaria, "Realism and Domestic Politics" *International Security* 17, no. 1 (Summer 1992): 190–196.

9. Although Neorealism and Neoliberalism differ in may respects, in particular regarding the power of international institutions to shape and guide state action, they share a fundamentally similar view of the international system as composed of state actors rationally seeking to maximize their national interests within the structural constraints imposed by their external environments. One consequence of this understanding of the international system is that both Neorealism and Neoliberalism predict that states are likely to behave in similar ways when confronted with similar external conditions, see Peter Katzenstein, "Introduction: Alternative Perspectives on National Security," in Peter J. Katzenstein, ed., *The Culture of National Security* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1996), pp. 11–17.

10. For recent, prominent exemplars of the constructivist approach see Peter Katzenstein, ed., ibid.; Friedrich Kratochwil, *Rules, Norms and Decisions* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989); John Ruggie, *Constructing the World Polity: Essays on International Institutionalization* (New York: Routledge, 1998); and Alexander Wendt, "The Agent-Structure Problem in International-Relations Theory," *International Organization* 1, no. 3 (Summer, 1987); and "Anarchy is what States make of it: the Social Construction of Power Politics," *International Organization* 46, no. 2 (Spring 1992). For reviews of the development of the constructivist approach see the introduction to Ruggie, *Constructing the World Polity*; Jeff Chekel, "The Constructivist Turn in International Relations Theory," *World Politics* 50, no. 2 (January 1998); John Gerard Ruggie, "What makes the World hang together? NeoUtilitarianims and the Social Constructivist Challenge," and Martha Finnemore and Kathryn Sikkink, "International Norms and Political Change," both in *International Organization* 52, no. 4 (Autumn 1998).

11. Chalmers Johnson originally developed the concept. He used it to explain the development of the Japanese approach to industrial policy. See Chalmers Johnson, *MITI and the Japanese Miracle* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1982). It has since been used widely to refer to the general pattern of development observable in the East Asian region.

12. For an interpretation of European affairs from this point of view, see Thomas Risse-Kappen, "Collective Identity in a Democratic Community: The Case of NATO," in Peter J. Katzenstein, ed., *The Culture of National Security*; and Ole Weaver, "Insecurity, Security and Asecurity in the West European Non-war Community," in Emanuel Adler and Michael Barnet, *Security Communities* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1998).

13. Critical theory is closely associated with the Frankfurt school of sociology, dominated by such figures as Theodor Adorno, Max Horkenheimer and Jürgen Habermas. For overviews of the main points advanced by this school see Raymond Geuss, *The Idea of Critical Theory: Habermas and the Frankfurt School* (Boston, MA:

Cambridge University Press, 1981). Applications of this approach to international relations can be seen in the works of Andrew Linklater, *Beyond Realism and Marxism: Critical Theory and International Relations* (London, UK: MacMillan, 1990); Robert Cox, *Production, Power and World Order: Social Forces in the Making of History* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1987); and Mark Hoffman, "Critical Theory and the Inter-paradigm Debate," *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 16 (1987): 231–249. The earlier writings of Richard Ashley are also clearly influenced by a Critical Theory perspective. See Ashley, "Political Realism and Human Interests," *Political Studies Quarterly* 25 (1981).

14. Inspiration for the post-modernist approach comes from the works of Michel Foucault, Jacques Derrida and Richard Rorty. International Relations scholars working within this approach include David Campbell, *Writing Security: United States Foreign Policy and the Politics of Identity* (Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, 1992); James Der Derian, *On Diplomacy: A Genealogy of Western Estrangement* (Oxford, UK: Basil Blackwell, 1987); and Rob Walker, *Inside/Outside: International Relations as Critical Theory* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1993). For an insightful analysis of the relationship between Critical Theory, postmodernism and other theoretical perspectives as applied to international relations, see Jim George, *Discourses of Global Politics: A Critical (Re)Introduction to International Relations* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 1994), chapters 7 and 8.

15. The past decade has seen a veritable explosion of Feminist writing on international relations, fueled by the broader interest generated by the growth of gender studies. For important representative works see Jean Elshtain, *Women and War* (New York: Basic Books, 1987); V. Spike Peterson, ed., *Gendered States: Feminist (Re)Visions of International Relations Theory* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 1992); Christine Sylvester, *Feminist Theory and International Relations in a Postmodern Era* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993); and Ann Tickner, *Gender and International Relations: Feminist Perspectives on Achieving Global Security* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1992).

16. Audie Klotz and Ceclia Lynch offer the term "interpretivist" for this school of thought. See Cecilia Lynch, *Beyond Appeasement: Reinterpreting Interwar British and U.S. Peace Movements* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1998).

17. For an excellent analysis of the basic postulates of a cultural theory of action, which can be applied to constructivist approaches in general, see Harry Eckstein, "A Culturalist Theory of Political change," in Eckstein *Regarding Politics: Essays on Political Theory, Stability and Change* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press, 1992), pp. 267–271.

18. See Wendt, "Anarchy Is what States Make of it."

19. See Max Weber, *Economy and Society*. Some Constructivists, especially so called "thick Constructivists," deny that even such a modest positivist approach to social science is possible, arguing that the very categories with which social scientists attempt to analyze the world—modernity, development, stability, democracy, and so forth—are themselves social constructs and correspond not necessarily to what is supposedly being investigated, but rather reflect the particular social, economic and ideological circumstances under which those theories were devised and in which social

scientists operate. Many other Constructivists—the so-called "thin Constructivists"—reject such a radical epistemology. For a brief review of the thick constructivist view of the relationship between power and knowledge, see the chapters by Richard Devetak on Critical Theory and Post-modernism in Scott Burchill and Andrew Linklatter, *Theories of International Relations* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995), especially pp. 148–155 and 180–184. On the differences between the different approaches to Constructivism, see John Ruggie, *Constructing the World Polity*, pp.35–37; Thomas Berger, "Ideas, Culture and Foreign Policy Formation: Towards a Constructivist Research Strategy," paper delivered at the annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association in San Francisco, September, 1996.

20. See E. H. Carr, *The Twenty Years Crisis, 1919–1939* (New York: Harper Books, 1946). For an interpretation of contemporary Constructivist IR theory that tends in this direction, see John Mearsheimer, "The False Promise of Institutionalism," *International Security* 19, no.3 (Winter 1994/1995): 37–47.

21. For an interesting discussion of nationalism from a constructivist perspective, see Rodney Bruce Hall, *National Collective Identity* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1998).

22. Bourdieu's notion of the "habitus" and "field" can be seen as one particular approach to culture that tries to capture its dynamic interaction with rational calculations and escape the static character of earlier models of culture. See Pierre Bourdieu, *Distinctions: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1984), chapters 3 and 4. Max Weber makes a not altogether dissimilar point through his distinction between "value rationality" and "instrumental rationality."

23. Note, however, that material-situational factors certainly do have an impact on the actual outcomes of interaction between different actors, and may have an impact on the continued development of cultures to the extent that these outcomes are perceived by actors as being different from what they had expected and desired. When cultures fail to allow actors to make sense of the material-situational environment and do not lead to the desired outcomes, actors may be impelled to reconsider the way they think about their environment, and possibly about themselves.

24. For an interesting discussion of some of these issues, see Stephen Welch, *The Concept of Political Culture* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1993), ch. 4.

25. For a brief review of the ways in which the current generation of international relations theorists' understanding of culture differs from that of their predessors, see Yosef Lapid, "Culture's Ship: Returns and Departures in International Relations Theory," in Yosef Lapid and Friedrich Kratochwil, eds., *The Return of Culture and Identity in IR Theory* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 1996), especially pp. 6–9.

26. Many Constructivists focus their attention on the emergence of regimes regarding such issues as human rights, arms control and foreign aid on a global scale. Others privilege domestic level discourses on these and other issues. Both approaches were well represented in the Peter Katzenstein, ed., *The Culture of National Security*. Ideally, both levels need to be integrated. For an interesting discussion of one influential approach to the study of global cultural regimes in international relations, see Martha Finnemore, "The Global Society Norms, Culture and World Politics: Insights from Sociology's Institutionalism," *International Organization* 50, no. 2 (Spring 1996).

27. For a fascinating study of the political uses of history, see Robert Gildea, *The Past in French History* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994). See also Ernst May, *Lessons of the Past: On the Use and Misuse of History in American Foreign Policy* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1973).

28. On the essentially contested nature of political concepts, see William E. Connolly, *The Terms of Political Discourse*, 3rd Edition (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993).

29. See Brian Barry, *Sociologists, Economists and Democracy* (London: Collier-Macmillan, 1970); Carole Pateman, "Political Culture, Political Structure and Political Change," *British Journal of Sociology* 1, no. 3 (July 1971); and David J. Elkins and Richard E. B. Simeons, "A Cause in Search of Its Effect, or What Does Political Culture Explain?" *Comparative Politics* 11 (1979).

30. On the origins of this view of economic power and its continuities with the present day, see Richard Samuels, *Rich Nation, Strong Army* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1994).

31. On American efforts at demilitarization, see Meirion and Susie Harries, *Sheathing the Sword: The Demilitarization of Postwar Japan* (New York: MacMillan, 1987).

32. I develop this argument at greater length in Thomas Berger, *Cultures of Antimilitarism*. Similar arguments are offered by Peter J. Katzenstein, *Cultural Norms and National Security: Police and Military in Postwar Japan* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1996).

33. According to a high ranking Japanese military official who served in a political liaison function during the crisis.

34. On the linkage of defense and domestic politics during this period, see Take Hideo, *Saigumbi to Nashyonarizumu* (Tokyo: Chuokoshinsho, 1989); George Packard, *Protest in Tokyo: The Security Treaty Crisis of 1960* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1966); and Yoshihisa Hara, *Sengonihon to Kokusaiseiji: Ampokaitei no Seijirikigaku* (Tokyo: Chuokoronsha, 1988).

35. See the report of the Comprehensive Security Research Group, *Sogoanzenhosho kenkyuu gruupu hokokusho*, delivered to the Prime Minister on July 2, 1980.

36. Hisahiko Okazaki, *Senryakuteki Kangaekata to wa Nani ka* (Tokyo: Chuokoshinsho, 1983), pp. 9–13, 24–26. For a more extended discussion of these issues, see Kenneth B. Pyle, *The Japanese Question: Power and Purpose in a New Era* (Washington, DC: AEI Press, 1992); and Thomas Berger, *Cultures of Antimilitarism*.

37. Kim Kwan-bong, *The Korea-Japan Treaty: Crisis and Instability of the Korean Political System* (New York: Praeger, 1971), pp. 80–82.

38. For a particularly fine analysis of the interrelationship of domestic politics and foreign policy in the PRC of the 1950s see Thomas Christensen, *Useful Adversaries: Grand Strategy, Domestic Mobilization and the Sino-American Conflict, 1947–1958* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996).

39. For a useful discussion of the differences of thought between the Maoists and the Reformers, see Lowell Dittmer, *China Under Reform* (Boulder, CO: Westview, 1994), chapter 2; and Joseph Fewsmith, *Dilemmas of Reform in China* (Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe, 1994).

40. For a detailed overview of the Chinese economic reform process, see Barry Naughton, *Growing Out of the Plan: Chinese Economic Reform 1978–1993* (Boston: Cambridge University Press, 1995); and Susan L. Shirk, *The Political Logic of Economic Reform in China* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1993).

41. For a nuance analysis of the implications of Chinese economic reform for its foreign policies, see Barry Naughton, "The Foreign Policy Implications of China's Economic Development Strategy," in Thomas W. Robinson and David Shambaugh, eds., *Chinese Foreign Policy: Theory and Practice* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994), pp. 65–69; David Lampton, "China and the Strategic Quadrangle," in Michael Mandelbaum, ed., *The Strategic Quadrangle: Russia, China, Japan and the United States in East Asia* (New York: Council on Foreign Relations, 1995), pp. 65–68.

42. See for instance Alastair Iain Johnston, *Cultural Realism: Strategic Culture and Grand Strategy in Chinese History* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998), and Andrew Nathan and Robert Ross, *The Great Wall and the Empty Fortress: China's Search for Security* (New York: Norton, 1997), as well as Thomas Christensen's and Ian Johnston's contributions to this volume.

43. On the increasingly technocratic character of the Chinese leadership see Lyman Miller, "Overlapping Transitions in China's Leadership," *SAIS Review* 16, no. 2 (Summer-Fall 1996); Kenneth Liberthal, *Governing China: From Revolution through Reform* (New York: Norton, 1995), pp. 230–240.

44. On democratization in Taiwan, see *The Great Transformation* and Jaushieh Joseph Wu, *Taiwan's Democratization* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995); Yun-han Chu, *Crafting Democracy in Taiwan* (Taipei: Institute for Policy Research, 1992); and Hung Mao Tien, *The Great Transition: Political and Social Change in The Republic of China* (Stanford: The Hoover Institution Press, 1988). For an overview of the South Korean experience with democratization, see Sung-Joo Han and Yung Chul Park, "South Korea: Democratization at Last," in James W. Morley, ed., *Driven by Growth: Political Change in the Asia-Pacific Region* (Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe, 1993). For a good overview of the wave of democratization that swept over the region during this period, see Minxin Pei, "The Fall and Rise of Democracy in East Asia," in Larry Diamond and, Marc F. Plattner, eds., *Democracy in East Asia* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998).

45. On the growth of Taiwanese investment in the PRC, see Tse-Kang Leng, *The Taiwan-China Connection: Democracy and Development across the Taiwan Straits* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1986); Barry Naughton, "Economic Policy Reform in the PRC and Taiwan," and Chin Chung, "Division of Labor across the Taiwan Strait: Macro Overview and Analysis of the Electronics Industry," in Barry Naughton, ed., *The China Circle: Economics and Technology in the PRC, Taiwan and Hong Kong* (Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution Press, 1997).

46. See for instance Michael O'Hanlon. "Stopping a North Korean Invasion: Why Defending South Korea is Easier than the Pentagon Thinks," *International Security* 22:4 (Spring 1998).

47. Marcus Noland, "North Korea's Staying Power," *Foreign Affairs* 76, no. 4 (July/August 1997).

48. On nationalism as a motivating force in intra-Korean affairs, see Han-Kyo Kim, "Korean Unification in Historical Perspective," in Young Whan Khil, ed., *Korean and the World: Beyond the Cold War* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1994).

49. For a review of these issues, see Alan Wachman, *Taiwan: National Identity and Democratization* (Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe, 1994). Reflecting the historically contingent nature of the process of identity creation, in South Korea, the trend has been in precisely the opposite direction, with the pro-democracy movement using nationalist themes of a unified Korea to attack the regime and calling for greater dialog with the North.

50. The rise of Chinese nationalist sentiment has been the focus of much scholarly and media attention. See for instance Lucian Pye, "Memory, Imagination, and National Myths," in Gerrit Gong, ed., *Remembering and Forgetting* (Washington, DC : The Center for Strategic International Studies, 1996), pp. 25–28 Chalmers Johnson, "Nationalism and the Market: China as a Superpower," (Japan Policy Research Institute Working Paper #22, July 1996), and *The Far Eastern Economic Review*, November 9, 1995, pp. 25–28.

51. Until the fairly recent past this was a not entirely uncommon point of view. See Wachman, *Taiwan: National Identity and Democratization*.

52. As reflected most recently by Kim Dae Jung's invitation of the Japanese Emperor to South. See the interview with Takamura Masahio, the new Foreign Minister *Asahi* 8/2/98, p. 2. For more background on the emerging role of the Japanese emperor as the conscience of the nation, see David A. Titus, "Accessing the World: Palace and Foreign Policy in Post-Occupation Japan," in Gerald L. Curtis, ed., *Japan's Foreign Policy After the Cold War: Coping with Change* (Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe, 1994), pp. 66–67.

53. Most recently the 200,00 or more women who are estimated to have been pushed into sexual slavery by the Japanese military. See George L. Hick, *The Comfort Women: Japan's Brutal regime of Enforced Prostitution in the Second World War* (New York: Norton, 1995).

54. Most recently Iris Chang, *The Rape of Nanking: The Forgotten Holocaust of World War II* (New York: Basic Books, 1997).

55. For an English-language review of some of the documents and testimony that has become available on Unit 731, especially in recent years, see Hal Gold, *Unit 731 Testimony* (Tokyo: Charles Tuttle, 1996).

56. For a theoretically informed and insightful analysis of post-1945 Japanese alliance behavior as the product of alternating fears of abandonment versus entrapment, see Jitsuo Tsuchiyama, "The End of the Alliance? Dilemmas in the U.S.-Japan Relations," in Peter Gourevich et. al., eds., *United States-Japan Relations and International Institutions after the Cold War* (La Jolla, CA: Graduate School of International Relations and Pacific Studies, University of California, San Diego, 1995).

57. See Victor Cha, *Alignment Despite Antagonism* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1999).

58. See Brian Bridges, *Japan and Korea in the 1990s*, ch. 6. This is not to understate the severity of the economic competition between Japan and Korea, especially in such sectors as shipbuilding, steel and the low end of the semiconductor market. See for in-

stance Jin-Young Chung, "The Eagle, the Goose and the Dragon: Cagemates in the Asia-Pacific Trade Order?" in Jonathan D. Pollack and Hyun-Dong Kim, eds., *East Asia's Potential for Instability and Crisis: Implications for the United States and Korea* (Santa Monica, CA: RAND, 1995) or John Ravenhill, "The 'Japan Problem' in Pacific Trade" in R. Higgot, R. Leaver and J. Ravenhill, eds., *Pacific Economic Relations in the 1990s: Cooperation or Conflict?* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 1993).

59. A vast literature has developed on the putative tendency of democracies not to war upon one another, following on Michael Doyle's classical article. One strand of this literature argues that the reason democracies do not wage war on one another has to do with their formal institutional arrangements. These arrangements increase both internal and external transparency, prevent the policymaking process from being hijacked by domestic groups which may have an interest in conducting war, and sufficiently slow the decisionmaking process as to preclude the possibility of a surprise attack. See for instance Bruce Bueno de Mesquita and David Lalman, *War and Reason* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992). These arguments bear a close family resemblance to the arguments regarding the pacifying effects of international institutions made by Neoliberal institutionalists.

Another strand of the literature emphasizes the way in which the internal norms and values of liberal democratic societies influence their external relations, and is thus far closer to constructivism in its view of nature of the forces that guide state action. See for instance John Owen, "How Liberalism Produces the Democratic Peace," *International Security* 19, no. 2 (Fall 1994). See also Bruce Russet, *Grasping the Democratic Peace: Principles for a Post-Cold War World* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993), chapter 2.

A certain degree of skepticism remains regarding the strength of Korean and Japanese democracy. In Korea the main focus of suspicion is the overweening, centralized power of the executive branch and the continued existence of harsh internal security laws that have continued to be used against political dissidents even under the liberal Kim Dae Jung government. In Japan the chief cause for concern is the excessive power of a fragmented, but only partially accountable bureaucracy. Despite these concerns, however, on the whole the arguments of the institutional strand of the democratic peace hypothesis would appear to hold. On the other hand, the intensity of the popular antagonism between the two countries suggests some important caveats for the liberal normative variant of the democratic peace argument.

60. See George Hicks, *The Comfort Women: Japan's Brutal Regime of Enforced Prostitution in the Second World War* (New York: Norton, 1995).

61. See for instance, Bruce Cummings, *Korea's Place in the Sun* (New York: Norton, 1997), p. 397.

62. For a fascinating discussion of the issue of war guilt in Japan, with comparisons to the dramatically different response in Germany, see Ian Buruma, *The Wages of Guilt* (New York: Farrar, Strauss and Giroux, 1994).

63. For polling data see Tsujimura Akira, "Japanese Perceptions of South Korea," *Japan Echo* 8 pp. 75–78. On the historical background of Japanese views of Korea, see Michael Weiner, ed., *Japan's Ethnic Minorities* (London, UK: Routledge, 1996), ch. 1 for an insightful discussion of these issues. It should be noted that Japanese prejudice

against Koreans has greatly diminished over time, leading to a significant improvement in the legal position of the resident Korean community in Japan and a liberalization of social attitudes. One reflection of this change is the fact that since the late 1970s over 50 percent of the marriages in the resident Korean communities are with Japanese.

64. These themes are developed in much greater detail in Thomas Berger, *Cultures of Antimilitarism*.

65. In 1953, when the United States first placed the two countries under pressure to normalize relations, statements by Kubota Kanichi, head of a Japanese diplomatic delegation to South Korea, about the positive aspects of Japanese colonial rule, helped derail negotiations for four years. See Brian Bridges, *Japan and Korea in the 1990s: from Antagonism to Adjustment* (Brooksfield, VT: Edward Elgar, 1993), p. 10. More recently, in November of 1995, the Director General of the Prime Minister's General Affairs Agency, Eto Takemi, was forced to resign because of strong international and domestic criticism of remarks he made to the effect there "also had been positive aspects to Japan's occupation of Korea." See *Asahi* 11/14/1995, p. 1, 2, 3 and 9.

66. Frank Kowalski, *Nihon no Saigumbi* (Tokyo: Simul Press, 1969), pp. 72–73.

67. See Victor Cha, *Alignment Despite Antagonism*.

68. For a useful English language review of the new Guidelines and their significance for U.S.-Japanese security cooperation, see Richard P. Cronin, "Japan-U.S. Security Cooperation: Implications of the New Defense Cooperation Guidelines," (Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service Report for Congress, October 30, 1997). See also *Asahi* February 13, 1998, pp. 1–2 on recent movement toward even closer cooperation in the event of a crisis.

69. Brian Bridges, *Japan and Korea in the 1990s*, pp. 32–33.

70. Ibid., chapter 6.

71. See John Welfield, *An Empire in Eclipse: Japan in the Postwar American Alliance System* (Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Athlone Press, 1988), pp. 91–93.

72. For an excellent discussion of background behind the normalization of Japanese-Korean relations see Victor Cha, "Bridging the Gap: The Strategic Context of the 1965 Korea-Japan Normalization Treaty," *Korean Studies* 20 (1996).

73. For a brief account of the incident, see Don Oberdorfer, *The Two Koreas* (Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1998), pp. 51–56.

74. Conversations with U.S. government and military personnel who have been involved in efforts to improve relations between the two sides provide a veritably inexhaustible store of anecdotes, which illustrate the difficulties involved. As one organizer of a recent (1997) seminar involving South Korean and Japanese participants put it, we can get the two sides together, they all agree that it was useful to get together, and they are equally unanimous in never wanting to do it again.

75. See for instance, the Korean Times commentary on the new U.S.-Japanese guidelines in *The Japan Times* September 29, 1997, p. 21.

76. For good overviews of the controversy, see Ishikuro Takeo, "Mitsuya Kenkyu to Shiberian Kontroruurongi," in *Rippo to Chosa* (June, 1980); Mammitzch, *Die Entwicklung der Selbsterveteidigungs-Streitkräfte und Aspekte der zivil-militärischen Beziehungen in Japan* (Ph.D. Dissertation, Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität, Bonn, 1985), pp. 156–174.

77. See Don Oberdorfer, *The Two Koreas*, ch. 13.

78. See Thomas Berger, *Cultures of Antimilitarism*, pp. 171–177.

79. Ibid.

80. The influential philosopher of science, Imre Lakatos, refers to these two aspects of theoretical as negative and positive heuristics, which he argues constitute the core of a scientific research program. See Imre Lakatos, "Falsification and the Methodology of Social Scientific Research Programs," in Imre Lakatos and Robert Musgraves, eds., *Criticism and the Growth of Knowledge* (Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press, 1970).

81. See for instance Friedberg, "Ripe for Rivalry."