CONCLUSION

Images of Order in the Asia-Pacific and the Role of the United States

G. John Ikenberry and Michael Mastanduno

What will the Asia-Pacific look like in the years ahead? This great question of contemporary world politics will remain widely debated. Will the region take on a more coherent political and economic identity? If so, will it be increasingly an Asian region organized around Japan or China, or a wider Pacific region anchored by the United States? Will the region's relationships be driven by an antagonistic geopolitical rivalry between China and the United States, or will deepening economic interdependence lead political elites to expand cooperative political and security institutions? How will Japan's role in the region be redefined after a decade of economic stagnation? In short, will the Asia-Pacific be a stable core of world politics in the decades ahead or an epicenter of instability and conflict?

The chapters in this volume have addressed these questions individually and collectively. Each chapter has taken a distinctive cut into the policies of and relationships among Japan, China, and the United States, and from an array of theoretical positions. Taken together, they demonstrate that a multiplicity of variables have merit in illuminating the regional dynamics of the Asia-Pacific. In our view, three findings are particularly salient in the volume as a whole.

First, "Western" theoretical frameworks have much to say about international relations in the Asia-Pacific. There may have been a time when political

relations among Asians were truly distinctive, and David Kang's paper points provocatively to that possibility. But over the course of the last century the nation-states of the Asia-Pacific have been integrated into the larger international system, and have taken on the behavioral norms and attributes associated with that system. Variables and concepts that are the everyday currency of international relations theory—e.g., hegemony, the distribution of power, international regimes, and political identity—are as relevant in the Asia-Pacific context as anywhere else.

But, the chapters also show that the application of those concepts must be sensitive to the particular historical and cultural dimensions of relations in the Asia-Pacific in order to enjoy full explanatory power. The security dilemma operates differently when historical antagonisms and ethnic hatreds are factored into resource competition. Alleviating the security dilemma is more difficult when political identities are contested; consider the impact on China's calculations when the United States ships purely "defensive" weapons to Taiwan. The deepening of economic interdependence affects relations among "developmental" states differently than it does relations among liberal states. Hegemony has different implications for regional stability depending on whether it is informed by Japanese, Chinese, or United States political culture and historical experience. The analysis in this volume serves as a reminder that the "value-added" in social science explanation often results from the interplay of general theoretical insight and deep knowledge of the particular political and cultural circumstances of a state or region.

Second, the challenges to stability in the Asia-Pacific are multiple and interactive. Security relations, economic relations, and the legacies of history can be mutually reinforcing in positive or negative ways. Traditional security contests can take on smaller significance in a prosperous regional economy. Elites can take credit for successful economic performance and can downplay, for example, unresolved territorial claims. New political identities can take hold—witness Japan's self-image, cultivated postwar until the early 1990s, of a powerful "economic superpower" enjoying prosperity and prestige and being emulated by its smaller neighbors.

In a similar way, all bad things can go together. Security contests disrupt interdependence; slower economic growth encourages security contests by raising the incentives for elites to divert attention from sluggish economies by appealing to base nationalism. Economic stagnation can lead to a reappraisal of the sources of national identity and pride. If a modernizing China with great power ambitions falters economically, does it adjust its ambitions or shift its emphasis to military or political sources of power? To what extent is Japan's remarkably pacific postwar identity tied to its success in the international economic arena? Political, economic, and security challenges can be neither analyzed nor addressed in isolation.

Third, the analyses of this volume demonstrate that the United States is and will remain a crucial determinant of the stability of the Asia-Pacific. The U.S. security commitment to Japan, as well as its bilateral security ties to South Korea, Taiwan, the Philippines, and other countries in Southeast Asia, reassures partners and helps to mitigate security dilemmas. The U.S.-Japan alliance "solves" the problem of Japanese power in the region; it enables Japan to play a constructive role without exacerbating security fears that could jeopardize regional order. As the chapters by Henry Nau, Masaru Tamamoto, and Tom Christensen demonstrate most clearly, the United States is the pivotal actor in the U.S.-China-Japan triangle.

Though perhaps not to the same extent, the same holds true in regional economic relations. The chapters by Dale Copeland, Jonathan Kirshner, and Robert Gilpin show in different ways that U.S. behavior has the potential to make the greatest impact on whether the regional economy heads in the direction of cooperation or conflict. For better or worse, the United States has proved to be the market of last resort, the principal nation-state player in the stabilization of financial crises, and the strongest advocate of deeper interdependence and market liberalization.

It is crucial to recognize that an engaged, leadership role by the United States in regional economic and security affairs can neither be assumed analytically nor taken for granted politically. The role of the United States is itself a variable that merits examination. Variations in assumptions made about the U.S. role in the Asia-Pacific lead to different expectations about the emerging character of the region. In that spirit, our conclusion lays out alternative future orders for the Asia-Pacific. Each order is premised on a different U.S. role. We then go on to examine the major policy choices facing U.S. officials and the factors most likely to influence the path taken by the United States.

FOUR IMAGES OF ORDER IN THE ASIA-PACIFIC

IMAGE #1: U.S.-CENTERED HEGEMONIC ORDER

Our first image anticipates a continuation and consolidation of current patterns. The United States would retain its central role, and would organize regional stability around its bilateral security ties and multilateral economic relations. This image presupposes that the United States remains fully engaged in regional affairs, making good on its commitment to a significant troop presence in the region and intervening diplomatically and even militarily to reduce security tensions and ameliorate territorial disputes.

The organizing principle of this order would remain a "hub and spoke" system of bilateral security relationships. The United States would maintain and strengthen the U.S.-Japan alliance, and U.S. bilateral security ties with South

Korea, Taiwan, and countries in Southeast Asia. U.S. officials would also need to develop further and strengthen the strategic partnership between the United States and China. The U.S. strategy, in effect, would be to have a special relationship with each of the major regional players—even though those players may remain suspicious and resentful of each other.

An underlying premise of this order is that strategic relationships run through Washington, D.C. In light of the tensions in the region described elsewhere in this volume, U.S. officials would need to manage regional relationships through a complex game of deterrence, engagement, and reassurance. They would have to discourage revisionist challenges and reward cooperative behavior, but in a way that did not trigger anxiety in the region. In short, U.S. diplomacy has to ensure that both China and Japan accommodate themselves to U.S. preponderance and continue to integrate themselves into U.S.-centered economic and political institutions.

This image of order anticipates the completion of the U.S. hegemonic project in the region. The most important unfinished task would be to convince China that, despite its size, economic power, or political ambition, it is best served as a partner in a U.S.-centered order. Beyond that, great transformations in the foreign policies of other major states or the development of new regional institutions would not be required. Robust, multilateral security institutions, in fact, would run counter to this image of order—unless they were crafted and dominated by the United States.

The potential durability of any U.S.-centered order rests on several considerations. First, the United States must maintain its dominant position in resources and capabilities. The disparity in power between the United States and other major regional actors is the foundation of a hegemonic order, but by itself is not sufficient. U.S. officials also need to maintain their array of political, economic, and security commitments. Both power and purpose are necessary; in the absence of either the order will unravel.[1] Second, other countries in the region, and in particular China, must view U.S. power in the region as relatively benign and subject to influence.[2] If U.S. power appears overwhelming, or if its foreign policy strikes others as too unilateral, arbitrary, or coercive, the willingness of China and other states to accept U.S. leadership in the region will dissolve. Third, other major powers must find U.S. hegemony not only tolerable but also beneficial. For example, the United States must continue to convince Japan that its security is best served through participation in a U.S.-led alliance. At the same time, U.S. officials must signal China that existing U.S. bilateral ties do not threaten China, and in fact may be a useful way to dampen military competition by discouraging governments in Tokyo, Seoul, and Taipei from pursuing more provocative security policies. U.S. alliances, particularly that with Japan, must serve multiple purposes. They must credibly protect the allied state, and must reassure neighboring states that the allied state is itself restrained.[3]

It should be clear that the durability of the U.S.-centered order depends on more than simply the preservation of a unipolar distribution of power. The effectiveness of U.S. diplomacy—the ability to deter through the exercise of power and reassure by moderating the exercise of power—is equally critical.

IMAGE #2: MULTIPOLAR BALANCE OF POWER

The unipolar distribution of power and U.S. hegemonic order may be enduring or short-lived. Many analysts expect the latter, and foresee the return of a more traditional multipolarity in the Asia-Pacific.[4] Order, instead of resting on a series of special bilateral relationships orchestrated by the United States, would be created the old-fashioned way—through the operation of a fluid balance of power among three or more major players.

The realization of a multipolar Asia would require significant transformations in the foreign policies and power positions of regional actors. Great-power status for China would necessitate steady improvements in economic modernization and military capability, and the maintenance of political stability. Japan would need to evolve a more independent diplomatic posture, including the development and utilization of independent military capabilities. This image of order anticipates the termination, or at least significant weakening, of the U.S.-Japan security alliance. As China and Japan increased their power capabilities, the United States would become in relative terms less an extraordinary superpower and more an ordinary great power. Other states that might plausibly join the great power ranks and round out the multipolar order include a revived Russia, satisfying its traditional ambition as a Pacific as well as European power; a rising India, combining its huge size and population with technological competence and great-power ambition; and a unified Korea no longer beholden to the United States.

Could an Asian multipolar balance endure? The nineteent-century European order maintained itself for roughly a century between two great European wars. Stability rested on the existence and consolidation of an international society. Leaders of the great powers shared an interest in the preservation of the order, and developed informal rules proscribing their behavior and institutions to help make the rules effective.[5] They exercised strategic restraint in fighting limited wars, recognized the principle of compensation in the taking of territory, and maintained flexibility in alliance commitments to reduce the chances of major war or the unambiguous dominance of the order by a single state. World War I, of course, signaled the breakdown of these practices.

The operation of a multipolar balance in contemporary Asia would face significant challenges. The existence of nuclear weapons could dampen the incentives for states to engage in any types of military conflict, while the uneven spread of those capabilities to major and lesser powers in the region would ren-

der deterrence and crisis stability less than robust. Smaller conflicts could escalate into larger ones as states perceived temptations to test resolve or gain advantage through preemption. The existence of numerous flashpoints in the region—e.g., the Kashmir dispute between India and Pakistan, the troubled relationship between China and Taiwan, competing territorial claims in the South China Sea, the unresolved division of the Korean peninsula—would increase the chances that conflicts would begin with the potential to escalate and draw in the major powers.

The stability of the nineteenth-century balance was reinforced by flexible alliance commitments. How flexible might a contemporary Asian multipolar system be? Longstanding friendships—e.g., the United States and Japan—and longstanding rivalries—e.g., China and Japan, or Russia and the United States—might inhibit flexibility. The inclination of democratic states to identify with each other might also constrain the multipolar balance in a region containing nondemocratic as well as democratic states.

In the current unipolar context, many analysts tend to accept the spread of globalization and liberal economic practices (i.e., the preferences of the dominant state) as natural occurrences. In a multipolar setting, however, a group of independent great powers may not so readily agree on the most appropriate way to organize their domestic economies and foreign economic relations. The traditional appeal of developmental capitalism in the Asia-Pacific suggests that geopolitical competition in multipolarity might be complemented by geoeconomic competition.[6] High levels of energy and export dependence among some of the major actors would increase the political stakes. Mercantilistic competition could easily become an additional source of instability in the multipolar system.

The longstanding tendency for states to balance power makes multipolarity a plausible future world. Significant changes would be required to get there, however, and once there the prospects for stability are uncertain.

IMAGE #3: BIPOLAR BALANCE OF POWER

It is possible that two major actors will emerge rather than three or more. Although several combinations are plausible, the most likely candidates for a bipolar order in the Asia-Pacific are the United States and China. In this order states with lesser capabilities would have incentives to line up behind one or the other of the major powers. Alliance commitments would be more fixed than flexible. As was the case during the cold war, societal and ideological differences between the two major players would be accentuated in the contest for geopolitical primacy.

Bipolarity would likely emerge as the result of a process of action and reaction. A precondition would be the sustained growth of China's economy and the translation of those resources into more modern military capabilities. De-

spite China's recent, rapid growth, the United States still enjoys significant relative advantages in traditional great power attributes such as economic size, technological capability, and the sophistication of deployed military systems. China can narrow that gap, but only with sustained performance over time.

An increasingly powerful China might be tempted to "test the waters," that is, probe the willingness of the United States to engage as Chinese officials spread their influence regionally. Tests could occur over Taiwan, the South China Sea, political instability in Indonesia, or perhaps the use of nuclear threats by one party or the other. As China sought to challenge the legitimacy of a U.S.-dominated regional system and propose its own alternative, we could expect it to enlist the support of other states in the region.

The United States, of course, could reinforce this pattern by shifting from a strategy of engagement to one of confrontation against China. Any combination of China's questionable human rights practices, its nuclear espionage, its transfer of chemical and nuclear know-how to "rogue" states in the eyes of the United States, its refusal to recognize U.S.-supported investment and intellectual property regimes, and its frequent use of anti-American rhetoric would provide ample political opportunity to justify the shift to confrontation. In this scenario the United States would likely strengthen its alliances with Japan and South Korea and direct them far more explicitly at the Chinese target. China would counter by soliciting its own regional allies—perhaps even Russia and India, with whom it began conversations after the war in Kosovo to stem what was mutually decried as excessive or hyper U.S. hegemony. It would be plausible to expect regional economic interdependence to be disrupted as states were forced to orient their commercial and financial relationships in the direction of one or the other leading powers.

The bipolar order of the cold war lasted some forty-five years. Whether a U.S.-China system could sustain itself for anywhere near as long is impossible to say. The durability of this order would depend, first and foremost, on the staying power of the two rivals. China is the more vulnerable in this regard. It faces the potential for political upheaval as it continues the difficult experiment of centralized political control combined with decentralized market reform. A generational transition in the ruling elite, the continuation of uneven economic development between the heartland and the coastal regions, and a shaky financial system that has yet to open itself to the full impact of globalization each place additional pressure on Chinese political stability.

Bipolarity also presupposes the primacy of two and only two major powers. If China can develop sufficient capacity to challenge U.S. hegemony, then Japan, with a more powerful and sophisticated economy, is certainly capable of challenging China. Russia and India, major land powers with sizable populations, share many, if not all, of the potential great power attributes of China. A future bipolarity could end with one pole standing or with several more emerging.

Finally, the two major powers would need to manage the risks that made the cold war so predictably dangerous. Bipolarity encourages intense ideological conflict and the tests of resolve associated with brinksmanship. The United States and Soviet Union managed those tests well—or were they simply lucky? China and the United States would face additional challenges as long as their nuclear capabilities remained asymmetrical, and as long as the United States claimed as an ally a political entity that China considers part of its own territory.

IMAGE #4: PLURALISTIC SECURITY COMMUNITY

A fourth image is one of a mature security community. In this order a group of states share interests and values with sufficient commonality that the use of force to settle conflicts among them becomes essentially unthinkable.[7] This regional future would entail, in effect, the "Europeanization" of the Asia-Pacific—a coherent and self-conscious political community organized around shared values, interconnected societies, and effective regional institutions. Political community would become the core organizing principle of regional order, offering to states within it the value of joint membership and a sense of identity beyond their borders. The community would possess institutions and mechanisms to foster integration and resolve political conflict.

The circumstances required for the emergence of pluralistic security communities are difficult to attain, and as a result, this regional order may be the least likely.[8] The existence of a shared and deeply felt sense of political community among peoples across the borders of sovereign states is an elusive condition that cannot easily be engineered by state leaders. Perhaps Western Europe has achieved this outcome, but even in that case a common European identity is still evolving. History and geography in the Asia-Pacific are less congenial to shared political identity. Would that identity be trans-Pacific or East Asian? What are its core values, and on what common cultural, religious, or other type of foundation does it rest? Therefore, the presence of a political community is not likely to be a feature of the Asia-Pacific region anytime soon.

Another characteristic of pluralistic security communities absent in the Asia-Pacific is the universal presence of democratic government. Open, democratic polities are a prerequisite of security communities for several reasons. Democratic states tend to acknowledge the legitimacy of other democratic states and in relations with them are more likely to refrain from the use of force to settle disputes.[9] The like-mindedness of democratic polities provides a common experience around which community can be built. People are not simply citizens of individual countries, but have shared identities as members of the democratic world. The openness of democratic government also allows the complex processes of transnationalism to go forward. The barriers to the development of

deep interdependence between democratic states are lower than the barriers to such integration between nondemocratic states.[10]

The Asia-Pacific is marked by a significant diversity of regime types, and many of those that are democracies are still in the early phases of political development. China, in particular, would need to undergo a fundamental political transition toward democracy before a regional security community could be viable. It may be that movement toward democratic government is a trend among states in the region. Nevertheless, that movement is still contested and incomplete, and some prominent leaders in the region continue to argue that democracy and especially Western notions of human rights are incompatible with Asian values.

If there is any leading edge in the development of an Asia-Pacific political community, it is probably the shared aspiration of economic development and integration within the regional and world economy. This aspiration is shared by countries with different political systems and with economies at different stages of industrialization, and it provides the basis for much of the region's contemporary institutional initiatives. More than anything else, this mutual embrace of economic modernization has the potential to spark movement toward political community.[11] This does presuppose that continued economic integration would promote spillover pressures for democratic reform and complementary security institutions, rather than the political divisiveness and conflict that also has the potential to emerge as interdependence intensifies.

Because the emergence of pluralistic security communities requires precise initial conditions, once such a community does emerge it is likely to be quite stable. A community comprised of states with democratic governance and high levels of economic development is not likely to be shaken in the absence of cataclysmic political developments. As one study recently concluded with even stronger confidence, "once a country is sufficiently wealthy, with per capita incomes of more than $6,000 a year, democracy is certain to survive, come hell or high water."[12] States in the Asia-Pacific region would need to sustain a convergence of economic and political development in the decades ahead to foster the necessary preconditions for a security community.

THE ROLE OF THE UNITED STATES

As the dominant actor in both the regional and global settings, the United States will play the pivotal role in determining which of the above described images of regional order will prevail. A U.S. retreat from its alliance commitments in the Asia-Pacific would likely drive the emergence of a new multipolarity by forcing Japan to reconsider its security strategy and other states to respond in kind. A U.S. decision to shift its strategy toward China from engagement to confrontation would increase significantly the probability of a new bipolar order. The

successful continuation of what Assistant Secretary of Defense Joseph Nye termed a U.S. strategy of "deep engagement" in the region would improve the prospects for a consolidation of the current hegemonic order.[13]

In the years ahead the United States will face three critical choices in crafting its strategy for the Asia-Pacific. The first and broadest issue will be whether to continue deep engagement or to disentangle itself from its alliance commitments and forward military presence. A second issue, directed specifically at the relationship with China, will involve whether to continue what Clinton administration officials have called comprehensive engagement or shift to a more confrontational posture. The third issue, obviously related to the other two, is whether to continue to support a "hub and spoke" security architecture of bilateral alliances centered on Washington, or to promote a regional security community even if that implied a diminished role in the region for the United States.

These choices will be driven by the complex interplay of U.S. state strategy, U.S. domestic politics, and the reactions and behavior of other states. U.S. officials, in effect, will be forced to play an ongoing set of two-level games, crafting and pursuing their own preferred strategies while simultaneously managing domestic political constraints and the reactions of the Japanese, Chinese, and other major governments in the region.

ENGAGE OR PULL BACK?

By the middle of the 1990s it became clear that U.S. officials preferred a strategy of deep engagement in Asia. But, in the absence of the cold war and a readily identifiable security threat, a gradual disentanglement from Asian commitments remains a viable option for the United States as well. Area specialists who believe that the U.S. role in Asia is outdated, and who fear that Asian resentment of U.S. occupying forces will result eventually in a rupture on bad terms, have made the case for withdrawal. They argue, in effect, that it is better for the United States to bow out gracefully than to be thrown out.[14] A similar line of argument is made by geopolitical strategists who cite the advantages of the United States adopting the role of "offshore balancer"—extricating itself from permanent security commitments and focusing instead on the revitalization of the domestic economy and political system.[15] These analysts consider the transition to multipolarity to be imminent and inevitable, and believe there is little the United States can do to forestall it. Proponents of deep engagement counter that there are multiple responses to U.S. hegemony and that U.S. behavior can help to forestall the emergence of a balancing coalition. U.S. hegemony and the unipolar moment can be prolonged significantly if not indefinitely.[16]

What will drive the choice of U.S. strategy? U.S. officials clearly prefer engagement and the effort to prolong hegemony, but they face several sets of interrelated challenges. One set is domestic. During the cold war, the U.S. public

could be easily mobilized for the grand strategic purpose of containing communism. But mobilization to preserve "stability," or to freeze the geopolitical status quo in the absence of any well-defined threat, is difficult. It is especially so because U.S. public opinion has become highly sensitive to the costs of maintaining hegemony, whether they be in national lives or in national treasure.

The strategy of U.S. officials, in Asia as well as generally, has been to pursue hegemony as cheaply and as quietly as possible. They have sought to satisfy geopolitical objectives in Asia and Europe while avoiding direct military intervention. When they have judged intervention necessary, they have tried to circumscribe missions so that casualties are minimized and exit strategies are emphasized. To manage the economic costs of hegemony, they have pursued burden-sharing aggressively, prodding allies to bear the costs of U.S.-led initiatives such as the Persian Gulf War, the reconstruction of Bosnia after the Dayton Accords, and the North Korean nuclear arrangement.

A military crisis in the Taiwan Straits or the Korean peninsula would strain and possibly undermine domestic support for this hegemonic strategy in Asia. The test would be most severe if the United States found itself intervening militarily and taking casualties, while its closest ally in the region, Japan, begged off a direct role for political or constitutional reasons. State Department officials have sought assiduously to head off this "nightmare scenario" by resolving conflicts prior to military escalation and by strengthening and clarifying the responsibilities of Japan under the U.S.-Japan Security Treaty. Whether these tactics will work indefinitely remains to be seen.

A prolonged economic downturn in the United States would similarly complicate U.S. strategy. The remarkably long expansion of the U.S. economy during the 1990s served to minimize the domestic political significance of U.S. trade deficits in general and sizable bilateral ones with Japan and China in particular.[17] It is important to recognize that the export strategies of many Asian states hinge on the willingness of the United States to absorb their goods and run chronic trade deficits. The incentives for Asian trading states to embrace a U.S.-centered security order are increased to the extent U.S. officials tolerate these deficits.[18] Slower growth in the United States, however, could rekindle both protectionist pressures and the resentment directed at Asian trading partners perceived to benefit unfairly from the asymmetrical openness of the U.S. market. In relations with Japan and Korea, the politically charged issues of whether the United States should be defending states with prosperous economies, and that are perfectly capable of defending themselves, would be raised anew. Any strategic partnership with China—a potential adversary perceived to be taking advantage of the United States economically—would similarly come under strain.

The broad choice of whether to engage or withdraw will also be affected by how others react to U.S. diplomacy. Other major states in the region could tolerate, or even embrace, the U.S.-centered order. Or they could defy

and challenge it. This decision, of course, will be driven in part by their respective geopolitical ambitions. China, Russia, and India, and to a lesser extent Japan, seek status and international recognition commensurate with their self-perception as great powers. Subordination to the United States runs counter to this goal. On the other hand, each of these states is a seeker of material benefits as well as status. To the extent the U.S.-centered order can help to provide those benefits, U.S. hegemony may seem less objectionable.

These choices will not be made in isolation, but will be affected significantly by U.S. behavior. To the extent the United States is perceived as arbitrary or coercive—in effect, viewed as a malign hegemonic power—others will be inclined to challenge and balance U.S. preponderance, individually or collectively. Evidence of this reaction was apparent during the late 1990s and early into the current decade. A series of U.S. initiatives—NATO expansion, the bombing of Kosovo, the failure to ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, National Missile Defense, and the announced intention to modify or abandon the ABM Treaty—combined to stress the U.S.-Russia relationship and prompt Russia to explore "anti-hegemonic" diplomatic options. Similarly Chinese officials reacted negatively to what they perceived as U.S. heavy-handedness in the May 1999 bombing of the Chinese embassy in Belgrade, the scandal over Chinese nuclear espionage, the 2001 American spy plane incident, U.S. arms sales to Taiwan, and renewed public criticism from the United States over China's human rights practices. By the end of 1999, Russian arms exports to China increased substantially, and China and Russia moved closer together diplomatically and militarily.[19]

The management challenge faced by U.S. officials is exacerbated by the fact that their responses to these domestic and foreign challenges sometimes work at cross-purposes. The typical state response to public or congressional criticism is to get tough with other states, whether it be over trade, human rights practices, or arms control. Lashing out at the foreigners sells well at home but reinforces the view of the United States as unilateral and coercive abroad. Accommodating policies work better abroad, but they expose U.S. officials in domestic political discourse to the charge of appeasement.

CHINA: PARTNERSHIP OR CONFRONTATION?

The relationship between the United States and China will shape the Asia-Pacific region profoundly in the years ahead. That relationship is still evolving and its prospects remain uncertain.

The U.S. strategy of comprehensive engagement toward China was premised on the expectation that U.S. officials could employ a series of positive economic and diplomatic incentives, combined with deterrence when necessary, to convince China to be a responsible partner in a U.S.-centered

order. The underlying logic is that China is not unalterably committed to mounting a revisionist challenge to U.S. hegemony. U.S. behavior can steer China to a more accommodating posture. Trade and technology transfers, in particular, can strengthen Chinese reformers, further open the Chinese economy, and help to steer Chinese foreign policy in a more peaceful direction.[20] Policies associated with this overall strategy have included moderating criticism of China's human rights abuses, delinking trade relations from human rights, lobbying for China's accession to the World Trade Organization, and developing closer communication and partnerships between the U.S. and Chinese militaries.

Although comprehensive engagement characterized U.S. policy through the 1990s, an alternative perspective began to crystallize by the end of the decade. Members of the so-called "Blue Team"—a loose collection of academics, members of Congress and their staffers, and some intelligence and military officials—promote the view that China is a rising and hostile power destined to threaten U.S. vital interests.[21] Blue Team advocates call for the United States to take a harder line on China's human rights and unfair trade practices, restrict technology transfers with military significance, and provide more vigorous support for Taiwan. In short, they support a more confrontational stance against what they view as an adversary with whom future conflict is probable if not inevitable. The second Bush administration, while not committed to depicting China as an enemy, has been far more eager than was the Clinton team to treat China with suspicion and adopt more hard-nosed policies.

U.S. China policy is tied intimately to U.S. domestic politics. During the 1990s, U.S. corporate interests provided key political support for comprehensive engagement in general, and trade-promoting policies such as delinking Most-Favored-Nation status from human rights concerns in particular.[22] Human rights activists, the Taiwan lobby, opponents of religious persecution, and conservative foreign policy analysts were arrayed in favor of a harder line. The business view, shared by the foreign policy establishment in Washington, generally prevailed. Even conservative legislators who were skeptical of China, such as House Majority Leader Richard Armey, tended to support the expansion of bilateral economic relations and Chinese accession to the WTO. By the end of the decade, however, the harder line position clearly had gained momentum, and U.S. China policy had become ripe for serious political debate.

China's own behavior has had and will continue to have a significant effect on that U.S. debate. The proponents of engagement are bolstered when China makes progress on privatization and the decentralization of economic authority. When Chinese authorities increase pressure on Taiwan or crack down on domestic dissidents, advocates of a U.S. strategy of confrontation gain ground. If China were to initiate military conflicts in the region, it is likely that U.S. policy would shift decisively to confrontation.

China's behavior is both a function of the regime's own domestic political calculations and a response to U.S. behavior.[23] It is not surprising that as U.S. officials push China harder on human rights or sell advanced weapons to Taiwan, Chinese officials react with the kind of intransigent behavior that reinforces the perspective of U.S. hardliners. The U.S.-led intervention in Kosovo in 1999, which took place without UN Security Council authorization and which Chinese leaders perceived as an unlawful attack on the territory of a sovereign country, seemed to reinforce in China a view of the United States as unpredictable and a unipolar world as dangerous. Chinese officials reacted with similar alarm to U.S. plans to develop theater missile defenses in Asia. U.S. officials may intend these systems as protection against a "rogue" North Korean attack; the Chinese view them more ominously, as having the potential to undermine the credibility of their own nuclear deterrent.

It is likely to become more difficult for U.S. officials to sustain domestic support for comprehensive engagement in the years ahead. First, as long as Chinese economic growth continues to stall, China's reformers will find themselves on the political defensive against conservatives who question the prudence of close economic integration with the West and who advocate more forceful Chinese military and diplomatic strategies against Taiwan and in the region more generally. The adoption of those strategies reinforces the appeal of more confrontational U.S. policies and the view of China as America's new enemy. Second, the U.S. domestic consensus on comprehensive engagement may continue to erode. That consensus, formed during the Nixon years, was ruptured by the end of the cold war, the loss of the Soviet threat, which drove the United States and China closer together, and the harsh crackdown at Tiananmen Square. It has been further strained by revelations of Chinese nuclear espionage, the escalation of China's rhetoric against Taiwan, the veiled nuclear threats against the United States made by Chinese military officials in 1995 and again in 2000.[24] U.S. supporters of comprehensive engagement will be hard pressed to regain the political initiative. They can take some comfort in the fact that the most vocal opponents of the engagement strategy are found on the far right of the Republican Party and far left of the Democratic Party, and thus are not as potent politically as they would be if unified. Proponents of engagement can also count on broader international constraints to limit the appeal of confrontation. U.S. allies in Europe and Japan will remain reluctant to isolate China economically or diplomatically—unless Chinese leaders act in a far more provocative manner than they have thus far.

The divisiveness of the U.S. debate over China reflects the uncertain future of China itself. On the one hand, China is well-positioned to assume the role of "new enemy" to the United States. It combines a dynamic economy with longstanding great-power ambition and a sense that the West has failed to grant it the political status and recognition it deserves. On the other hand, China is preoc-

cupied with its difficult political and economic transition. And, it is far more dependent on the world economy than the previous hegemonic challenger, the Soviet Union, ever was. China has based its economic growth strategy on deeper integration with the West, and in so doing has granted the West in general and the United States in particular potential sources of strategic leverage through the use of economic statecraft.[25]

BILATERAL ALLIANCES OR REGIONAL SECURITY COMMUNITY?

America's bilateral security relationships with Japan, South Korea, and Taiwan proved to be the centerpiece of U.S. grand strategy in Asia during the cold war. U.S. officials have continued to rely on these constructs after the cold war to promote regional stability and inhibit what they perceive as disruptive geopolitical change. The system of hub and spoke security relations has become, in effect, a way to freeze the cold war status quo with U.S. allies. At the same time, it offers the opportunity to broaden the U.S. hegemonic system by incorporating former adversaries such as China and Russia.

An alternative strategy for the United States would be to encourage the multilateralization of security relations in Asia.[26] U.S. officials promoted this type of system in postwar Europe. They prompted West European states to band together in NATO and reinforced that effort in the economic realm by supporting European cooperation in the OEEC, the EC, and recently the EU. As John Duffield's chapter notes, U.S. officials explored the possibility of a regional security system in Asia early in the postwar era, but eventually defaulted to the bilateral security arrangements that remain in place today.

The promotion of a regional security community would have several advantages. The bilateral security relationships are essentially a holding operation, a *realpolitik* effort to prevent the deterioration of the Asian security environment. Pushing for a regional security community, in contrast, would be a progressive step, an attempt to improve security conditions. As such, it would complement more comfortably the U.S. ideological inclination to "make the world a better place," i.e., promote peace and democracy through multilateral institutions. Working to create a security community would be an effort to resolve, rather than simply contain, the historical animosities among states in the region. A multilateral security system would also provide a robust political foundation for the regional economic interdependence that is expanding so rapidly in the Asia-Pacific. And, multilateralism might help to ease the political tensions that naturally arise in asymmetrical bilateral relationships.

Despite these advantages, it is difficult to anticipate that U.S. officials will push for a multilateral security community at the expense of their bilateral arrangements. As noted earlier, the prospects for the success of a security com-

munity in the Asia-Pacific are currently remote. The region lacks uniformity of political regime type and a shared sense of political identity. One of its major powers, Japan, seems less comfortable in multilateral settings than in bilateral or otherwise hierarchical political arrangements. A democratic revolution in China would improve the prospects for a regional security community, but in the short or medium term that event itself is uncertain at best. U.S. officials are unlikely to abandon a set of security arrangements that have worked well—and, that have afforded the United States a considerable measure of hegemonic control—in favor of a security experiment that is appealing ideologically but unlikely to bear fruit in the near term politically.

We should expect U.S. officials to focus instead on what might be called "bilateral arrangements plus." That is, the maintenance of bilateral alliances and special relationships, reinforced by attempts at multilateral or minilateral cooperation where practical. The North Korean nuclear arrangement, institutionalized through KEDO and involving cooperation among the United States, Japan, and South Korea, is an apt example of a minilateral agreement on a specific security issue. Similar efforts—the strengthening of the Asian Regional Forum, for example—might help to tilt the Asia-Pacific, in the absence of hegemony, in the direction of a security community rather than to the more widely anticipated order of a multipolar balance of power.

CONCLUSION

Much of international relations theory, in particular realist theory, has focused over the past twenty years on the role of international structure in the determination of international order and stability. The analysis of this volume, with an eye on the volatile region of the Asia-Pacific, reinforces the view of many scholars that structure is not enough. Future stability in the Asia-Pacific will be informed by structure, but will depend as much on the old-fashioned interplay of diplomacy and statecraft among the major powers. U.S. officials will need to be especially deft in managing domestic constraints and international responses in order to maintain and expand their hegemonic order.

Both the United States and Japan have powerful reasons to maintain the U.S.-centered system, and it does have stabilizing features. The binding character of the alliances works to restrain and reassure the various states in the region. The United States is connected to the region in a way that makes its preponderant power less threatening and uncertain. Japan gains predictability for its own position in the region. Other states can be less fearful of the remilitarization of Japan's foreign policy. To be sure, China may not find this bilateral arrangement, with itself on the outside, as the most desirable security arrangement. But it does have the advantage of restraining the outbreak of serious military competition between itself and Japan.

There is one further reason to maintain the U.S. hegemonic order while striving to make it more acceptable to China and other states in the region. Perhaps the most dynamic agent of regional integration that will set the stage for greater multilateral security cooperation is the "new economy" that is emerging globally. South Korea, Japan, China, the United States, and others in the region are embracing, in varying degrees, the technology and information revolutions that are washing over the globe. The common embrace of internet capitalism may eventually pave the way for a more ambitious security community. But, as during the cold war, a stable political and security foundation is needed in the first place for that economic interdependence to advance.

ENDNOTES

1. See Michael Mastanduno, "Preserving the Unipolar Moment: Realist Theories and U.S. Grand Strategy after the Cold War," *International Security* 21, no. 4 (Spring 1997): 49–88.

2. On the importance of restrained U.S. hegemony for the maintenance of international order, see G. John Ikenberry, "Institutions, Strategic Restraint, and the Persistence of American Postwar Order," *International Security* 23, no. 3 (Winter 1998–99): 43–78. See also Ikenberry, *After Victory: Institutions, Strategic Restraint, and the Rebuilding of Order after Major War* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001).

3. In much the same way, the NATO alliance has both protected German security and reassured Germany's neighbors that German foreign policy would be less provocative and more predictable. For an elaboration of this argument see G. John Ikenberry, *After Victory*.

4. See, for example, Aaron Friedberg, "Ripe for Rivalry: Prospects for Peace in a Multipolar Asia," and Richard K. Betts, "Wealth, Power, and Instability: East Asia and the United States After the Cold War," *International Security* 18, no. 3 (Winter 1993/94): 5–33, and 34–77.

5. Hedley Bull, *The Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in World Politics* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1977), especially ch. 3.

6. It is not surprising that the anticipation of multipolarity right at the end of the Cold War inspired numerous forecasts of geoeconomic competition among major powers. See, for example, Jeffrey E. Garten, *A Cold Peace: America, Japan, Germany, and the Struggle for Supremacy* (New York: Times Books, 1992, and Lester Thurow, *Head to Head: The Coming Economic Battle Among Japan, Europe, and America* (New York: Morrow, 1992).

7. See Emmanuel Adler and Michael Barnett, eds., *Security Communities* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), and Karl Deutsch, et al., *Political Community in the North Atlantic Area* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1956).

8. For a discussion of community-based security orders and their prerequisites, see Bruce Cronin, *Community Under Anarchy: Transnational Identity and the Evolution of International Cooperation* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999).

9. For an overview of the democratic peace literature, see Michael Brown, Sean Lynn-Jones, and Steven Miller, eds., *Debating the Democratic Peace* (Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1996); and Bruce Russett and John Oneal, *Triangulating Peace: Democracy, Interdependence, and International Organizations* (New York: Norton, 2001).

10. Bruce Russett, "A Neo-Kantian Perspective: Democracy, Interdependence, and International Organization in Building Security Communities," in Adler and Barnett, *Security Communities*, pp. 368–96.

11. There is some evidence that Asia as a whole is moving to embrace the internet and other features of the "new economy." See Peter Montagnon, "Catching the New Wave," *Financial Times*, December 28, 1999. The emerging vision of regional community articulated by the ASEAN + 3 grouping—the ten ASEAN countries together with Japan, China, and Korea—is based primarily on the shared embrace of economic modernization.

12. Adam Przeworski, et al., "What Makes Democracies Endure?", *Journal of Democracy* 7, no. 1 (January 1996): 49.

13. Joseph S. Nye, Jr., "The Case for Deep Engagement," *Foreign Affairs* 74, no. 4 (July/August 1995): 90–102. For a later reflection, see Joseph S. Nye, "The 'Nye Report': Six Years Later," *International Relations of the Asia-Pacific* 1, no. 1 (2001).

14. For example, Chalmers Johnson and E.B. Keehn, "The Pentagon's Ossified Strategy," *Foreign Affairs* 74, no. 4 (July/August 1995): 103–114. This theme is also developed in Johnson, *Blowback: The Costs and Consequences of American Empire* (New York: Metropolitan Books, 2000).

15. See Charles William Maynes, "The Perils of (and for) an Imperial America," *Foreign Policy*, no. 111 (Summer 1998): 36–48, and Christopher Layne, "The Unipolar Illusion: Why New Great Powers Will Rise," *International Security* 17, no. 4 (Spring 1993).

16. See Mastanduno, "Preserving the Unipolar Moment: Realist Theories and U.S. Grand Strategy after the Cold War," and Ikenberry, "Institutions, Strategic Restraint, and the Persistence of American Postwar Order."

17. The U.S. merchandise trade deficit in 1999 was a record $271 billion. In 1989, at the height of U.S. economic conflict with Japan, the overall deficit was only $92 billion. John Burgess, "It's a Record: A $271 Billion Deficit," *Washington Post National Weekly Edition*, February 28, 2000.

18. The link between security commitments and trade arrangements is emphasized by Robert G. Gilpin, most recently in *The Challenge of Global Capitalism: The World Economy in the 21st Century* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000).

19. See, for example, James Hackett, "A New Anti-American Axis?" *Washington Times*, February 24, 2000. In the summer of 2001, China and Russia further revived their relationship and signed a Good Neighbor Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation. See Reuters, "Russia and China Sign Friendship Agreement," *New York Times* web edition, July 16, 2001.

20. President Clinton articulated this view in an important speech on China in October 1997: "China's economic growth has made it more and more dependent on the outside world for investment, markets, and energy. Last year it was the second largest recipient of foreign direct investment in the world. These linkages bring with them

powerful forces for change. Computers and the Internet, fax machines and photocopiers, modems and satellites all increase the exposure to people, ideas, and the world beyond China's borders. The effect is only just beginning to be felt." Remarks by the President in Address on China and the National Interest, White House Press Release, October 24, 1997.

21. Robert G. Kaiser and Steven Mufson, "Blue Team Draws a Hard Line on Beijing," *Washington Post*, February 22, 2000. Popular writings that reflect this perspective include Richard Bernstein and Ross H. Munro, *The Coming Conflict with China* (New York: Knopf, 1997), and Arthur Waldron, "How Not to Deal with China," *Commentary*, March 1997.

22. For example, David Sanger, "Diplomats Trail US Business on China Links," *New York Times*, October 28, 1977.

23. David Shambaugh, "Containment or Engagement of China? Calculating Beijing's Responses," *International Security* 21, No (Fall 1996).

24. Bill Gertz, "China Threatens U.S. With Missile Strike," *Washington Times*, February 29, 2000.

25. Good recent discussions include Paul Papayounou and Scott Kastner, "Sleeping with the Potential Enemy: Assessing the U.S. Policy of Engagement with China," *Security Studies* 9, no. 1 (Fall 1999): 164–195, and William J. Long, "Trade and Technology Incentives and Bilateral Cooperation," *International Studies Quarterly* 40, no. 1 (March 1996): 77–106.

26. Discussions of multilateral security arrangements in East Asia include David Dewitt, "Common, Comprehensive, and Cooperative Security," *Pacific Review* 7, no. 1 (1994); Young Sun Song, "Prospects for a New Asia-Pacific Multilateral Security Arrangement," *Korean Journal of Defense Analysis* 5, no. 1 (Summer 1993); Paul Evans, "Reinventing East Asia: Multilateral Security Cooperation and Regional Order," *Harvard International Review* 18, no. 2 (Spring 1996); and Amitav Archarya, "A Concert for Asia?" *Survival* (Autumn 1999).