

THE HENRY L. STIMSON CENTER

Chinese Perspectives on Confidence- building Measures

Michael Krepon, editor

Report No. 23 May 1997



Pragmatic steps toward ideal objectives



Copyright© 1997 by
The Henry L. Stimson Center
21 Dupont Circle, NW Fifth Floor
Washington, DC 20036
tel 202-223-5956 *fax* 202-785-9034
e-mail info@stimson.org
<http://www.stimson.org>

Contents

<i>About the Project</i>	v
<i>Preface</i>	vii
<i>List of Abbreviations</i>	xi
<i>About the Authors and Editor</i>	xiii
Confidence-building Measures in Asia <i>Liu Huaqiu and Zheng Hua</i>	1
The Evolution of Chinese Views Toward CBMs <i>Xia Liping</i>	15
Asian Security and CBMs Over the Next Decade <i>Tian Xinjian and Feng Haixia</i>	39
Sino-Japanese Relations and Measures to Enhance Mutual Trust <i>Yang Bojiang</i>	53

About the Project

Confidence-building measures (CBMs) served to help reduce tensions and promote European security during the Cold War. The theory and practice of confidence building — such as giving prior notification of military exercises or establishing “hotlines” — are now being developed in other conflict-prone regions. The Stimson Center’s CBM project is primarily focused on South Asia and China, with additional attention paid to the Middle East and the Southern Cone of Latin America.

The CBM project has five main elements:

- Washington meetings for foreign diplomats and military attachés, participants from the executive and legislative branches, representatives of non-governmental organizations, and journalists to discuss how CBMs might help to solve regional security problems.
- CBM workshops within regions of interest, with local co-sponsorship, that reach key target audiences: military officers, government officials, journalists, and academics.
- Commissioned papers to stimulate thinking and problem-solving approaches within regions of interest. Accordingly, commissioned work is underway in South Asia, China, the Middle East, and the Southern Cone. The third edition of the Stimson Center’s *Handbook on CBMs* is forthcoming in 1997.
- Publications for distribution to interested diplomats, government officials, military officers, journalists, and academics.
- A Visiting Fellows program for talented individuals from China, India, and Pakistan who are invited to Washington to conduct research and to become immersed in the theory and practice of CBMs, arms control, and disarmament.

Support for the Stimson Center’s CBM project is provided by the Carnegie Corporation of New York, the W. Alton Jones Foundation, the Ford Foundation, and the Winston Foundation.

Preface

China's economic growth and military potential have commanded the attention of its neighbors, and with good reason. China has fought wars with the United States and Japan, and has clashed with Russia and India over disputed borders. Beijing's relations with all four of these countries remain critical "works in progress." How these bilateral relationships evolve will define key contours of international relations in the twenty-first century.

China's neighbors wonder whether Beijing's declared interest in good neighborly relations is real or feigned. Is China buying time so that its economic growth will translate into effective political and military muscle, allowing Beijing to "improve" relations on its own terms? Or will the very process of Chinese economic development and political interaction promote changes that will ease regional security concerns?

These are hugely important questions, the answers to which remain unclear except to those with blinders on. The rest of us must watch carefully for indicators of China's uncertain and, at times, dramatic evolution. One set of indicators is China's approach to the use of confidence-building measures (CBMs). Nations that relate to their neighbors in zero-sum terms will use CBMs sparingly, postponing resolution of contentious issues until power balances have altered in their favor. In contrast, nations that truly wish good-neighborly relations can use CBMs extensively to establish new patterns of cooperative security.

Where is China heading? How will Beijing practice the use of CBMs, which the extraordinary Norwegian peace-maker and strategic analyst, Johan Jørgen Holst, defined twenty years ago as instruments to convey "credible evidence of the absence of feared threats"?¹ Chinese views toward the theory and practice of confidence-building measures matter a great deal, which is why the Henry L. Stimson Center has published this English-language collection of essays on CBMs written by Chinese authors. This volume offers a rare glimpse of Chinese views and thinking on these important issues.

In recent years, Beijing has publicly endorsed the practice of confidence-building measures, and has begun to employ them to improve bilateral relations, especially with Russia and India. Moreover, Beijing has rhetorically embraced the practice of multilateral CBMs, participating in Asia-Pacific regional fora devoted to discussions on how to deal with potential flashpoints such as disputed islands in the South China Sea. There is nothing unusual for states that enjoy political and military advantages over smaller neighbors to call for bilateral CBMs, but it is quite noteworthy when two powerful states take steps to resolve border disputes and

¹Before Holst brokered a dialogue between Israeli and Palestinian political leaders in Oslo, he laid the intellectual groundwork for the "Helsinki process," which led to the negotiation of many CBMs across a divided Europe. See, "European Security and Confidence-building Measures," *Survival* 19, no. 4 (July/August 1977): 146-154 (with Karen Alette Melander), and "Confidence-building Measures: A Conceptual Framework," *Survival* 25, no. 1 (January/February 1983): 2-15.

otherwise repair once-strained relations. It is also somewhat unusual for China to accept so quickly the concept of multilateral CBMs, given the reluctance of other large states to endorse this practice.²

China's public commentary and negotiating record on CBMs have barely begun, however, and it remains to be seen how these will unfold. Bilateral CBMs between China and Russia have facilitated the almost complete resolution of their border dispute. China's CBMs with India to improve lines of communication, reduce tensions, and disengage forces along disputed border areas are significant, but do not seem to presage final accords, at least in the near-term. In contrast to its progress in negotiating bilateral accords, Beijing's rhetorical embrace of multilateral CBMs has yet to be reflected in concrete agreements of this kind.³ China's plainly visible reluctance to negotiate multilateral CBMs undercuts its professed interest in replacing bilateral security alliances forged during the Cold War. Moreover, multilateral accords will be essential to resolve this region's complex offshore island and resource disputes. The Stimson Center hopes that the publication of this collection of essays will help English-speaking audiences to observe and understand the evolution of Chinese views toward CBMs, whether bilateral or multilateral.

The first essay on CBMs, by Liu Huaqiu and Zheng Hua of the China Defense Science and Technology Information Center, describes the "Asian approach" to CBMs. Liu and Zheng call for the negotiation of CBMs on the basis of general principles adopted by the 1955 Bandung Conference, and stress the need for "No-First-Use" declarations by nuclear-weapon states. They call on Asian states to issue defense white papers and to foster more military exchanges. Finally, Liu and Zheng call for enhanced arms control research in China, including the creation of professional arms control research institutes and the promotion of more educational exchanges between Chinese and non-Chinese arms control experts.

Xia Liping of the Shanghai Institute of International Studies traces the evolution of China's approach to CBMs over several decades. He notes that China's negative attitude toward CBMs changed significantly in the mid-1980s with the thawing of the Cold War and with China's need to focus on economic development. Chinese attitudes toward greater transparency are in transition and the subject of debate; otherwise, Xia asserts, there is little debate among Chinese scholars on the current significance of CBMs. Xia then turns to a review of the evolution of Chinese views toward CBMs for the Korean Peninsula, the Soviet Union/Russia, India, and the United States. With regard to Sino-US CBMs, he calls for high-level military exchanges, enhanced military transparency, exchanges between military academies, port visits for naval

²India, for example, still refuses to endorse the creation of a regional security forum for southern Asia. The tepid endorsement of multilateral CBMs by the United States and the Soviet Union in the early phases of the Helsinki negotiating process was surmounted by the enthusiasm of other participating states.

³The 1996 border accord with Russia, Kazakstan, Kyrgyzstan, and Tajikistan was conceived and negotiated more in a bilateral Sino-Russian context than in a multilateral context.

vessels, more coordination and cooperation on preventing proliferation, and cooperation on defense conversion. As for CBMs to prevent maritime and resource conflicts, Xia calls for incidents at sea-type accords and the installation of hotlines.

The third essay, by Tian Xinjian and Feng Haixia of the Academy of Military Science, looks at Asian security over the next decade and how CBMs might be utilized to promote regional development and security cooperation. They note that the gaps in economic development within Asia are great, which could prompt regional conflict, as could territorial and maritime disputes and the increase in regional armaments. Tian and Feng characterize “Asian-style” CBMs as adhering to the principle of consensus, proceeding at a “proper” and comfortable pace, and developing a comprehensive security framework.

Of particular interest are Chinese views toward CBMs with Japan — the subject of the fourth and last essay, by Yang Bojiang of the China Institute of Contemporary International Relations (CICIR). Yang’s essay — the only one submitted to the Stimson Center after the 1996 Taiwan Strait crisis — catalogs China’s concerns about current trends in Japanese politics and military developments, as well as the strengthened US-Japanese security alliance. After placing these developments in a harsh light (and opening a window on contemporary Chinese anxieties toward Japan in the process), Yang recommends several Sino-Japanese CBMs, including an increase in military contacts, more exchange of defense-related information, increased transparency regarding military exercises, and carrying out dialogue on maritime safety issues.

The editing process for these essays has been far from easy. Our Chinese contributors have worked very hard to express their thoughts in English — for which the editor is most grateful. However, the gulf between the English and Chinese languages is not an easy one to navigate. Rhetorical modes of expression and analytical extrapolations that may be unexceptional in Chinese discourse are foreign to most Western strategic analysts. Part of the difficulty for Western observers is distinguishing between “rhetorical” and “real” Chinese security concerns.

The Stimson Center has worked with our Chinese contributors to make these essays accessible to an English-reading audience, while trying not to change the meaning intended by our authors. Any failure in this regard is due to the editor, not to our Chinese contributors. The Stimson Center strongly endorses the practice of CBMs in the Asia-Pacific region, but the publication of this collection of essays should not be construed as an endorsement by the Stimson Center of the views expressed by our Chinese contributors.

The editor wishes to acknowledge the assistance of Kathleen Walsh in preparing this manuscript and in expanding the Stimson Center’s CBM programming into China. Ms. Walsh has also been instrumental in setting up the Center’s fellowship program for Chinese visitors.

The Stimson Center’s work to promote confidence-building measures would not be possible without the generous support of the Carnegie Corporation of New York, the Ford

Foundation, the W. Alton Jones Foundation, and the Winston Foundation. Their support is deeply appreciated.

Michael Krepon
President
19 May 1997

List of Abbreviations

ACSA	Acquisition and Cross-Servicing Agreement (US-Japan)
AMS	Academy of Military Science
APEC	Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation forum
ARF	ASEAN Regional Forum
ASDF	Air Self-Defense Forces (Japan)
ASEAN	Association of Southeast Asian Nations
CBMS	Confidence-building Measures
CDSTIC	China Defense Science and Technology Information Center (PRC)
CFE	Conventional Forces in Europe Treaty
CICIR	China Institute of Contemporary International Relations (PRC)
CIS	Commonwealth of Independent States
COSTIND	Commission on Science, Technology, and Industry for National Defense (PRC)
CSCA	Conference on Security and Cooperation in Asia
CSCE	Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe
CTB(T)	Comprehensive Test Ban (Treaty)
CWC	Chemical Weapons Convention
DPRK	Democratic People's Republic of Korea (North Korea)
FSU	Former Soviet Union
GNP	Gross national product
GSDF	Ground Self-Defense Forces (Japan)
ICBM	Intercontinental Ballistic Missile
IISS	International Institute for Strategic Studies
ISG	Inter-sessional Support Group (ARF)
ISM	Inter-sessional Meetings (ARF)
JDA	Japan Defense Agency
km	Kilometers
LAC	Line of Actual Control
LDP	Liberal Democratic Party (Japan)
MSDF	Maritime Self-Defense Forces (Japan)
MTCR	Missile Technology Control Regime
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
NDU	National Defense University
NFP	New Frontier Party (Japan)
NFU	No-first-use
NIRA	National Institute for Research Advancement (Japan)
NPT	Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty
ODA	Official Development Assistance (Japan)
OSCE	Organization on Security and Cooperation in Europe
PDMA	Prevention of Dangerous Military Activities (Sino-Russian Agreement)
PLA	People's Liberation Army (PRC)

PRC	People's Republic of China
R&D	Research and development
ROK	Republic of Korea (South Korea)
SDF	Self-Defense Forces (Japan)
SIPRI	Stockholm International Peace Research Institute
START	Strategic Arms Reduction Treaties
TMD	Theater missile defense
UN	United Nations
UNGA	United Nations General Assembly

About the Authors and Editor

FENG Haixia holds the rank of first lieutenant in the People's Liberation Army (PLA). She is also an assistant professor and assistant researcher with the Second Office, Department of Strategic Studies at the Academy of Military Science (AMS) in Beijing.

Michael Krepon is president of the Henry L. Stimson Center. He is the author or editor of seven books and has written over 300 articles on arms control and international security issues.

LIU Huaqiu is a senior fellow and director of the Program on Arms Control and Disarmament at the China Defense Science and Technology Information Center (CDSTIC). A nuclear physicist by training, he is one of China's senior-most arms control experts. Dr. Liu is the chief editor of the recently published, *Handbook on Arms Control and Disarmament* and author of *China and the Neutron Bomb*. Dr. Liu was a Visiting Fellow at the Henry L. Stimson Center for a two-month period in late 1996.

TIAN Xinjian holds the rank of senior colonel in the People's Liberation Army (PLA). He is an associate professor and director of strategic studies at the Academy of Military Science (AMS) in Beijing. Sr. Col. Tian is also the chief secretary of the Special Committee for Pacific Security and a member of the China Pacific Society.

XIA Liping is senior fellow and deputy director of the Department of American Studies at the Shanghai Institute for International Studies (SIIS) as well as guest senior research fellow at the Center for Development Studies under the State Council. Col. Xia specializes in security and arms control issues affecting the Asia-Pacific region. In addition to being a research fellow and associate professor at the Institute for Strategic Studies of the National Defense University in Beijing for several years, Col. Xia spent one year (1994-95) in the United States as a fellow at the Atlantic Council. He has written numerous articles on Asian security issues and international relations.

YANG Bojiang is deputy director and associate research professor for the Northeast Asian Studies Division of the China Institute of Contemporary International Relations (CICIR) and serves concurrently as deputy director for the Liaison Department of the Chinese Association for Japanese Studies. Professor Yang joined the CICIR in 1989. He also served as a guest researcher at the National Institute for Research Advancement (NIRA) and at the Japan Forum on International Relations. Professor Yang has written numerous essays on Japanese domestic politics and Japan's relations with China and the United States.

ZHENG Hua is an assistant researcher for the Program on Arms Control and Disarmament at the China Defense Science and Technology Information Center (CDSTIC). Ms. Zheng joined the Program on Arms Control and Disarmament at the CDSTIC in 1991 and is a graduate of the China Defense Science and Technology University. She received a masters degree in international relations in 1995.

Confidence-building Measures in Asia

*Liu Huaqiu and Zheng Hua*¹

With confidence-building measures (CBMs) increasingly becoming an important means of enhancing security and facilitating the disarmament process, there has been growing interest in the development of regional CBMs in Asia during the 1990s. The factors behind it are manifold. First, many countries in Asia have made remarkable economic progress and have enjoyed a relatively stable environment. However, there are long-standing territorial disputes and unresolved issues of reunification as well as lingering suspicions among Asian countries. This situation makes confidence-building measures all the more relevant to states in the region as an element to enhance confidence and security cooperation so as to promote the positive momentum toward economic prosperity and political stability. Second, CBMs themselves do not necessarily involve the reduction of military forces of countries involved, but they have the practical effect of reducing suspicions, relaxing tension, maintaining regional stability, and making it easier to reach agreement on issues of contention. Moreover, CBMs can serve as precursors to create conditions for arms control and disarmament. This advantage makes it more appealing to employ CBMs to address security concerns in Asia. Third, Europe has made significant progress in CBMs for the past two decades and more. Under Europe's influence, many regions in the world, including Asia, are embarking upon the undertaking of confidence-building measures. This trend reflects the fact that confidence-building measures are widely accepted as an important component in the creation of supplemental approaches to national security and international peace in the interdependent and interactive regional and global context of today.

Strategic Reality and Strategic Culture in Asia

By examining the experience of confidence-building measures in Europe, two general conclusions result. One is that the European experience in the field of confidence-building measures has been productive in promoting transparency, openness, and predictability in the military environment. This experience helped to improve the political climate among the states belonging to the two blocs as well among the European neutral and non-aligned states. It also contributed somewhat to the process that led to the signing of the Conventional Forces in Europe (CFE) Treaty, the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaties (START I & II), and the unilateral reduction of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization's (NATO) and the former Warsaw Pact's theater nuclear weapons.

The other point is that Asian states can learn much from the European experience. The question is how to apply the lessons learned. Asian states should not mechanically copy the

¹The views expressed in this paper are entirely the authors' own, and do not necessarily represent the position of China Defense Science and Technology Information Center (CDSTIC).

Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE, now called the Organization on Security and Cooperation in Europe or OSCE) model of CBMs in the Asia-Pacific region. What has been learned must be tailored to the unique cultural, historical, political, and economic conditions of our own region. Accordingly, in approaching the issue of probable Asian CBMs, it is necessary to look first at the situation in Asia as distinct from that in Europe.

The Strategic Landscape

During the Cold War, Europe was divided into two major military blocs in direct confrontation, where any accidental event might have ignited a world war or even a nuclear world war. Thus, one of Europe's imperatives was to build various confidence and security measures so as to prevent the eruption of a world war caused by miscalculation and/or by accident. As for Asia, distinct blocs have not been formed. For countries in Asia, the demarcation lines between friend and foe intersect or overlap and often change with the passage of time and the evolution of events. Accompanying the intricate relationships among Asian countries is a mixed attitude towards many international issues.

The most salient feature in Asia, however, is the vast diversity within the region. The heterogeneity of Asia includes various aspects. First, there is a difference in historical tradition. While some Asian states have several thousand years of history, there also are newly independent nations. Secondly, there is a wide diversity of religions in Asia. Not only is there Confucianism and Buddhism, but also Islam and Christianity as well. A third factor is the divergence in national composition. Some countries like Japan, North Korea, and South Korea consist of only one ethnic group, but other countries like China and India are composed of multiple ethnic groups. Fourth, there is a disparity in the level of economic development among Asian nations: Japan is one of the world's most economically advanced states, while Singapore and South Korea are newly industrialized states. However, most of Asia consists of developing countries. Furthermore, there is a wide range of ideologies and political systems, including capitalist and socialist countries as well as monarchies. Finally, there exist quite a number of bilateral disputes, such as the Kashmir issue between India and Pakistan, Sino-Russian and Sino-Indian border issues, a dispute between Japan and Russia over the Northern Islands, and disputes in the South China Sea. Because of this diversity, countries in Asia have some mistrust and quite different interests. Thus, it could be envisaged that the creation of CBMs in Asia would be more difficult than in Europe.

The Asian Way of Thinking

In the East, people tend to think first in general terms, then in the specific, while in the West it is the opposite. A simple example of this is the following: when a Chinese or Japanese person writes an address on an envelope, the order of the address is from state, province, city, and street to the apartment number and name of the recipient. But the order of an address in the West is just the opposite. In terms of confidence building, therefore, it is understandable that Asians will usually stress general principles and guidelines such as the Five Principles of Peaceful Co-existence (*i.e.*, mutual respect for sovereignty and territorial integrity, non-

aggression, non-interference into the internal affairs of other nations, equality and mutual benefit and peaceful co-existence) as preceding specific measures and steps.² The Western style of confidence-building measures, however, starts with specific issues such as promoting greater transparency.

State Sovereignty

For a period of a hundred years before 1949, China was invaded and plundered by alien forces. The Chinese people suffered grievously from the loss of sovereignty, concession of territory, and payment of indemnities under a series of unfair treaties imposed on China. Consequently, Chinese security perceptions are closely associated with concerns over issues of sovereignty. Although national sovereignty and security are both vital concerns, the former is even more fundamental. In fact, violations of China's sovereignty and interference with China's internal affairs is often regarded as more serious than a military threat. Issues concerning China's national unity, especially with regard to Taiwan, are China's most sensitive security interests. With such security perceptions in mind and out of a fear that security measures initiated by Westerners might undermine a state's sovereignty, people in China and in the Asian region at large tend to be more cautious toward adopting confidence-building measures.

An understanding of the strategic characteristics in Asia is the starting point for identifying suitable CBMs for Asia. Nevertheless, there are some difficulties and obstacles to employing and implementing CBMs in Asia and for China in particular.

Obstacles to Implementing CBMs in Asia

A lack of tradition in arms control and disarmament has been an impediment to the progress of CBMs in Asia. During the Cold War, the issue of arms control and disarmament was not put on the Asian security agenda, given the fact that countries in Asia considered their weapon systems to be rather backward. Some Asian states, especially China, took a very critical view toward arms control and disarmament between the former Soviet Union and the United States, describing it as "sham disarmament and real arms expansion." Only after the Cold War did China and other Asian countries begin to change their old perceptions of arms control and begin to gradually participate in this process.

Another difficulty is that there is little experience with transparency in Asia. Many countries in the region do not publish defense white papers, and there is little transparency with regard to force structures or intentions and motivations behind military buildups, especially current weapons acquisition programs. It is well known that military doctrines in Asia exclude transparency. According to ancient Chinese sayings: "Military planning requires absolute

²The Five Principles of Peaceful Co-existence were initiated by the late Chinese Premier Zhou Enlai and leaders of India and Myanmar during his visits to these two countries in 1954.

secrecy.” Also, “a plot succeeds by maintaining secrecy and fails if secrecy is compromised,” and so forth. Such military doctrine remains the mainstream in China and most other Asian countries, since most states view their military strength as being relatively weak.

In addition, research on arms control in Asia has lagged far behind that of the West. For example, there is currently no professional institution in China devoted solely to research on arms control. Less than 100 people dispersed among many institutions do research work on arms control, and most of them do it only part time. Obviously, this research is far from satisfying the demand for development of theory and practice on arms control. As a matter of fact, China is concentrating on economic development, and this will require a continuously stable regional and international environment. Thus, arms control, disarmament, and various sorts of confidence-building measures are in China’s security interests. But due to the shortage of research, on the one hand, China has been unable to respond quickly to international proposals for arms control. On the other hand, China finds it difficult to work out practical and concrete steps for its own excellent proposals.

Approach to CBMs for Asia

CBMs, in both a narrow and broad sense, are important measures for improving regional situations and preventing military sources of conflict. CBMs narrowly defined refer to military confidence-building measures, which include increasing transparency, communication, constraining military activities, and so forth. CBMs broadly defined involve the development of political, diplomatic, and economic relationships among countries on the basis of the UN Charter and the Five Principles of Peaceful Co-existence. The two are different from each other, yet they are closely related and complementary. Broad CBMs aim at improving the security environment as a whole, and are thus conducive to the establishment of military confidence-building measures; narrow CBMs can contribute to improving the macro-climate by adopting limited military measures from the small to the great, and gradually opening up new prospects.

In light of the above definitions of CBMs and the characteristics and challenges distinctive to Asia, it will be impossible to establish a Conference on Security and Cooperation in Asia (CSCA) as modeled on the CSCE. However, an incremental approach (*i.e.*, a step-by-step approach) is both desirable and feasible for the establishment of CBMs in the region at this time. That is, norms regulating state-to-state relations should be established first, before specific CBMs are pursued. Bilateral arrangements should be given priority, followed by multilateral arrangements. Furthermore, CBMs that can be easily accepted should take precedence, followed by security arrangements and disarmament agreements. Stress should first be laid on scholarly discussions and low-level official contacts, and then on high-level meetings. Actually, this step-by-step approach has already yielded many positive results in Asia. Confidence- and security-building measures have been established between China and states of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS), India, Vietnam, ASEAN states, and with India and Pakistan. States

within ASEAN have also improved political relations and promoted regional peace and development.

Recommendations³

CBMs should be established in a broad sense on the basis of the United Nations Charter and the Five Principles of Peaceful Co-existence. The spirit of the Five Principles of Peaceful Co-existence was embodied in the ten principles adopted by the Bandung Conference in 1955⁴ and was reaffirmed by the declaration on principles of international law concerning friendly relations among states adopted by the United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) in 1970, and the declaration on a new international economic order adopted by the UNGA in 1974. They also conform to the principles of sovereignty and equality specified in the United Nations Charter. These five principles are of practical use in creating a new political and economic world order. On this basis Asia could build more confidence measures in a broad sense, such as:

- The settlement of disputes between countries strictly through negotiation and peaceful means;
- Agreement by all countries on taking a restrained attitude regarding their own armament buildup and not seeking to surpass legitimate defense requirements. The military strategy and structure of armed forces of all countries should universally become defense-oriented through joint efforts; and
- Agreement on the establishment and development of economic relations between countries on the basis of the principle of equality, mutual benefit, and mutual assistance with a vision of promoting common economic development in the region.

The historical experience of Asia has shown that the establishment of confidence-building measures in a broad sense is helpful for the development of benign relations between countries and conducive to the improvement of the regional security environment as a whole. In addition, this approach also conforms to the Asian way of thinking, which stresses the general first, then the specific.

³For a detailed analysis on CBMs for Asia, see Liu Huaqiu, "Step-by-Step Confidence and Security Building for the Asian Region: A Chinese Perspective," in *Asia Pacific Confidence and Security Building Measures*, Ralph Cossa, ed., Significant Issues Series, vol. 17, no. 3 (Washington, DC: Center for Strategic and International Studies, 1995), 119-136.

⁴The Asia-Africa Conference was held in Bandung, Indonesia on 8–24 April 1955. The purpose of this conference was to unite Asian and African peoples to struggle against imperialism, and to strive for and safeguard national independence.

All nuclear countries should reach an agreement undertaking not to be the first to use nuclear weapons under any circumstances. The reasons for this are as follows:

- No-first-use (NFU) is a very useful CBM. Nowadays, many countries are keen on establishing CBMs, so why not establish a CBM in such an important field as prevention of nuclear war?;
- During the Cold War, the argument against a commitment to no-first-use by the United States and its allies was that the former Soviet Union had massive superiority in conventional weaponry in Europe that could be balanced effectively and with less expense with nuclear weapons. This argument ceased to be valid in the radically different situation following the end of the Cold War. So it should now be feasible to conclude a treaty on no-first-use of nuclear weapons;
- If all nuclear powers were to cooperate to conclude such a treaty, then the United States and Russia could abandon their extended deterrence and cut their respective nuclear arsenals to a level comparable to that of the medium nuclear states. The latter would then join the nuclear disarmament process, leading to a total ban on nuclear weapons. This is also China's ultimate goal on nuclear disarmament and is in keeping with China's security interests;
- Since a no-first-use treaty would include the guarantees of non-use, or no threat of use against non-nuclear-weapon states or use in nuclear-free zones, a NFU treaty would enhance the non-proliferation regime; and
- The 1925 Geneva Protocol was, in fact, a no-first-use treaty in relation to chemical weapons (some countries kept the option of retaliation). The negotiation of the Chemical Weapons Convention has shown that the route from non-use or no-first-use to a total ban was both correct and effective.

Agreement on no-first-use of nuclear weapons is of pragmatic significance in the near term as nuclear strategy and deterrence in Asia are inter-related. Pakistan closely watches the nuclear development of India, and India has great concern over China's nuclear weapons. China developed its nuclear capability under pressure from the threat of nuclear weapons being used against China by the United States in the 1950s⁵ and the USSR threatening to do a "surgical

⁵White House Assistant Sherman Adams says in his memoirs that President Eisenhower once told him that "it was indeed the threat of atomic attack that eventually did bring the Korean War to an end on July 26, 1953." See Sherman Adams, *Firsthand Report: The Story of the Eisenhower Administration*, Reprint ed. (Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishing Group, 1974), 48. According to the White House document, "US Policy Towards Communist China" (NSC 166/1, 6 November 1953), in the event of all-out conflict with China, United States power would employ "all available weapons, [and] could impose decisive damage on the Chinese Communist air force and its facilities," though this "might absorb a considerable proportion of the US atomic stockpile." United States

operation” on China’s nuclear bases in the 1960s.⁶ An agreement of no-first-use would, to a certain extent, de-link such associations. Given the present difficulty of reaching a multilateral treaty on no-first-use, it may be practical as a precursor to reach bilateral no-first-use agreements between China and the United States as well as Russia and the United States. In this respect, China and Russia have already reached such an agreement.

All states in Asia should be encouraged to issue a defense white paper to increase transparency in the region. The issue of military transparency is a significant item on the arms control agenda today. Its potential effectiveness is two-fold. Military transparency can be conducive to enhancing international confidence, relaxing tense international relationships, and helping countries to restrain their arms build-up. However, for military powers, more transparency is to their advantage because it shows their strong deterrent forces, while for militarily weak countries it exposes their vulnerabilities, thus creating an unfavorable security equation for militarily weaker countries. China’s position on the issue of military transparency, therefore, is as follows:

- The purpose of military transparency should be to promote peace, security, and stability for all countries, regions, and the world at large. That means, greater security for all, not just for some;
- Military transparency should be pursued in accordance with the principle that the security of each country will not be undermined. Accordingly, one can not expect to demand the same degree of transparency on the part of strong military powers as on the part of weak ones; and
- Concrete measures for military transparency would be appropriate and feasible if derived from equal consultation and consensus of the parties involved.

Given its size relative to other powers in Asia, China should have no difficulty being transparent. But, military transparency is not bilateral; rather, it is open to all. Therefore, it will be impossible for China to allow the same degree of transparency — given China’s limited nuclear arsenal — as exists with regard to the Russian or American nuclear arsenals. Such a degree of transparency would call into question the survivability of China’s nuclear weapons. Accordingly, a better political climate will be necessary before China can be more transparent. Such a change in the political climate would require the establishment of broad confidence-building measures, based on the Charter of the United Nations and the Five Principles of Peaceful Co-existence, to promote political will as the foundation for enhancing military transparency. As a matter of fact, this was also an important part of the CSCE experience. In the

Department of State, *Foreign Relations of the United States 1952-54*, 14.I (Washington, DC), 278-306.

⁶John Newhouse, *War and Peace in the Nuclear Age* (New York, NY: Knopf Publishing, 1989) Chapter One.

very early stages of the CSCE, consensus was reached on such fundamental principles as equal sovereignty, non-use or threat-of-use of force, territorial integrity, peaceful settlement of conflicts, and non-interference in the internal affairs of other states.⁷

In November 1995, China issued its first white paper on arms control that addresses China's defense policy, arms control policy, military expenditure, and efforts toward disarmament, defense conversion, and the prevention of nuclear proliferation.⁸ The publication of this white paper, in our judgement, has laid the foundation for the issuing of China's first Defense White Paper in the not-too-distant future. Moreover, it also shows that China is in an evolutionary process toward increased transparency.

Fostering of Military Exchanges and Cooperation

Although confidence-building measures in the military sphere are essential for promoting security, for a long time military cooperation among Asian States has not been vigorously pursued. With the improvement of political and economic relations in Asia, enhanced mutual understanding and confidence can be expected among the armed forces of Asian countries. As an initial step toward confidence building, the possibility of increasing the scope and extent of contacts among military officers in the region would be worth pursuing. Regular consultations of top Asian defense ministry officials should be held, as well as military exchanges at all levels of the armed forces, including the exchange of military specialists and officers at military schools and an increase in the number of military attachés posted in other capitals. Such practices would serve to increase the exchange of information on, and mutual understanding of, military doctrine and force structure.

For China, the objective of increasing military contacts is to strengthen cooperation between the Chinese People's Liberation Army (PLA) and armies of neighboring countries. Leaders of the Central Military Commission and Chiefs of the General Staff of the PLA recently led PLA delegations on visits to a dozen Asian countries. Moreover, China has signed a multilateral agreement on increasing military confidence with four countries — Russia, Kazakstan, Tajikistan, and Kyrgyzstan on 26 April 1996.⁹ The agreement, the first of its kind in Asia, reportedly stipulates a non-attack policy for the military forces of all countries stationed along border areas, rules out military exercises aimed against any other signatory, specifies limits on the scale, scope, and number of border-area military exercises, and provides that signatories will inform other concerned signatories of any major military exercises or activities taking place within 100 kilometers of shared borders. Under the agreement, the concerned sides will invite each other to observe their military exercises, and they will not engage in any military activities

⁷See "Experience of CSCE," Appendix of Document on the Inaugural Meeting of ASEAN Regional Forum, July 1994.

⁸*China: Arms Control and Disarmament* (Beijing: Information Office of the State Council of the People's Republic of China, November 1995).

⁹As this is written, this agreement has yet to be formally agreed to by all parties.

that could be considered dangerous by another signatory. According to the agreement, the five countries should exchange with each other information about military affairs within 100 kilometers of the border. This agreement is just the onset that signals further PLA efforts to broaden and deepen military exchanges with other armed forces. For example, defense conversion in China has made considerable progress. There is great potential for military cooperation among China, Russia, and the United States in the field of defense conversion, which can serve as an important means of expanding military contacts for enhancing trust.

The “China Threat” Theory

The “China threat” theory is not grounded on facts, works against confidence-building measures in Asia, and to some extent may even stimulate an arms race in the region. In the so-called “China threat” theory, one of the arguments is that due to low labor costs, exports of Chinese-manufactured goods would damage the manufacturing industries of Western countries and even give rise to global trade protectionism. In 1993, some people declared that China had become the third largest or even second largest economic power in the world, and that China’s development would adversely affect trade balances. Such an assertion was, and is, simply ridiculous. In fact, exports from China have accounted for a very low percent (just 2.9 percent in 1994) of the world’s total exports.¹⁰ Although it is true that the ratio of manufactured goods to exports has been rising over the past few years, such goods are for the most part labor-intensive, low-technology products with low value added. For instance, China would have to sell one ton of porcelain products in order to buy an advanced computer and to import an airbus plane, China would have to export the equivalent of 25 million pairs of shoes.

Actually, China is still a developing country with a very low per-capita national income. According to the *World Development Report* released by the World Bank in 1994, in terms of per-capita GNP, China ranked 105th among 132 countries and regions.¹¹ Furthermore, some 70 million Chinese still live under the poverty line.¹² It is obvious that it will take several decades before China is able to achieve a relatively comfortable living standard and become a moderately developed country.

China’s development is vital to world peace and development. The facts have shown that China’s economic growth is playing an increasingly important role in promoting the development of the global economy. One leader of a Southeast Asian country pointed out that people had never worried about a prosperous China but rather an impoverished one. Indeed, if China had not developed its economy, the situation could conceivably be much worse; if all 1.2 billion Chinese lived in dire poverty and chaos ensued, millions of refugees would flee the country, thereby constituting a real threat to the world, especially China’s neighbors.

¹⁰“Examining the ‘China Threat’,” *Renmin Ribao (People’s Daily)*, 22 December 1995.

¹¹*World Development Report 1994: Infrastructure and Development*, and appendix, “World Development Indicators” (Oxford: Oxford University Press for the World Bank, 1994).

¹²*Ibid.*

Another argument raised by the “China threat” theorists is that China poses a military threat. However, history and experience has shown that the threat posed to another country is not directly related to a nation’s strength. Great powers are not necessarily aggressive, while smaller ones can be provocative. This is similar to the case of a person of big size who does not necessarily bully other people, and a shorter person who may pick a quarrel.

Although some are alarmed by the rapid increases in China’s military spending, the facts paint a different picture. China’s military spending as a percentage of its gross national product has been on the decline over the past two decades. China’s defense spending has consistently been kept at a low level sufficient to ensure that the requirements for national security are met. Between 1979 and 1994, defense spending increased 6.22 percent annually in absolute terms. Over that same period, the general retail price index of commodities increased 7.7 percent annually. During these sixteen years, an expenditure of 581.294 billion yuan would have been needed to maintain the 1979 level of defense spending.¹³ However, only 71.65 percent of this figure (416.499 billion yuan) was appropriated. Expenditure on living expenses for military personnel was increased by a large margin in order to keep up with the spiraling costs of living. In recent years, increases in annual defense spending have, for the most part, simply matched price increases or been allocated so as to ensure the standard living costs of personnel.

In 1994, China’s expenditure on national defense totaled 55.071 billion yuan; 34.09 percent (18.774 billion yuan) was spent on living expenses, principally on salaries, food, and uniforms; 34.22 percent (18.845 billion yuan) was spent on maintenance of activities, principally military training, construction, and maintenance of facilities, water, electricity, and heating; 31.69 percent (17.452 billion yuan) was spent on equipment, including research, testing, procurement, maintenance, transportation, and storage thereof. Thus, maintenance-type activities absorb the largest portion of the defense budget. Moreover, of this expenditure, in addition to monies spent to ensure the normal living expenses for military personnel, a considerable sum (nearly 3.7 billion yuan) was spent on activities associated with social welfare, such as pensions for retired officers and schools and kindergartens for children of military families.

Compared with defense budgets published by other countries, China has a fairly low level of defense spending. China spent only US\$6.39 billion on defense in 1994, only 2.3 percent of that spent by the United States, 18.3 percent of that allocated to defense spending by Britain, 18.6 percent of that spent by France, and 13.9 percent of that spent by Japan. Per capita defense spending of 1994 was only US\$5.36.¹⁴

Some people argue that the PLA is involved in commercial ventures through which it garners additional revenues. It is true, insofar as this is within its capacity, that the PLA

¹³The average annual exchange rate of the yuan to the US dollar was about 1.555 in 1979 and 8.62 in 1994.

¹⁴*China: Arms Control and Disarmament* (Beijing: Information Office of the State Council of the People’s Republic of China, November 1995).

participates in agricultural and industrial production and engages in business. However, these activities are primarily undertaken to provide employment for the families of military personnel, to improve their standard of living, and to support the nation's overall economic construction.¹⁵

Similarly, China's export of weapons is often used to advance the "China threat" theory. Actually, compared with the world's largest arms exporters, China holds only a small proportion of the world arms market. Therefore, it is totally unjustifiable for the largest arms-exporting countries to accuse others of posing a military threat.

China's nuclear testing has also been cited by some people as evidence of China's ambition to be a hegemonic power. In fact, China's behavior has been restrained over the issue of nuclear testing. The number of Chinese nuclear tests is less than one-25th of those conducted by the United States and one-17th of those conducted by the former Soviet Union. China's consistent position on nuclear disarmament advocates the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons. Within this context China supported the conclusion of a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). After the treaty comes into effect, China will abide by it and not carry out more nuclear tests.

Whether a country poses a threat to world peace or not depends not on its national strength but on its foreign policy. China has stated time and time again that it adheres to an independent foreign policy for peace and will not pursue hegemonism, even when China becomes stronger in the future. A statement made by Deng Xiaoping in an internal meeting of the central government on 24 December 1990 illustrates this point:

Some developing countries would like China to become the leader of the Third World. But we absolutely cannot do that, this is one of our basic state policies. We can not afford to do it and besides, we aren't strong enough. There is nothing to be gained by playing that role; we would only lose most of our initiatives. China will always side with the Third World countries, but we shall never seek hegemony over them or serve as their leader.

Nevertheless, we can not simply do nothing in internal affairs; we have to make our contribution. In what respect? I think we should help promote the establishment of a new international political and economic order. We do not fear anyone, but we should not give a sense to anyone either. We should act in

¹⁵For example, in Beijing COSTIND runs a couple of beauty shops and has opened three Baskin Robbins ice-cream cafeterias in a joint venture with an American firm. Income from these sources is primarily used to enhance the living standard of military service members. The salary of a typical military officer is still rather low. For example, for a military officer whose rank is equivalent to division leader, the monthly salary is the equivalent of only US\$150.

accordance with the Five Principles of Peaceful Co-existence and never deviate from them.¹⁶

Deng Xiaoping once told a United Nations meeting that if China pursues hegemony in the future, the whole world “should expose it, oppose it and defeat it along with the Chinese people.”¹⁷ The above principle put forward by Deng Xiaoping, the general architect of socialism with Chinese characteristics, has become the fundamental state policy of China.

Nevertheless, there is a strange phenomenon China can not understand. Japan is much stronger than China in terms of economic power, technological development, and military strength, particularly its powerful naval forces. Japan’s defense spending is seven times that of China. Japan was the aggressor during World War II, although this fact is still denied by some top Japanese leaders. Moreover, in its nuclear energy program, Japan has pursued a “plutonium economy” policy that will lead Japan to accumulate eighty to ninety tons of plutonium by the year 2010, the largest amount of power-reactor grade plutonium to be stored in any one country in the world. Power-reactor grade plutonium can be used to make crude nuclear weapons. Meanwhile, Japan is developing laser-isotope separation technology, which can be employed to separate weapons-grade plutonium. Therefore, provided that there is a need, Japan would be able to make advanced nuclear weapons in a short period of time. But why are there no remarks on a “Japan threat?” More concern should be directed toward Japan’s intentions.

There are two types of people who spread alarm about a possible “China threat.” The majority are people who have an insufficient understanding of China. The minority are those people with ulterior motives who do not wish to see a prosperous and strong China and hope to set China’s neighboring countries against China so as to contain China’s development.

China has suffered immensely from being invaded and pressed by alien powers since the 1840s, for more than 100 years. As a result, the Chinese people have lived a life of poverty. Today, when China is just beginning to develop toward prosperity, some people vigorously accuse China of posing a threat to other countries. The Chinese people find this assertion both maddening and repugnant, the negative consequence of which is that the Chinese people feel distrust with regard to the West. This distrust is actually polluting the atmosphere of confidence-building in Asia. Therefore, proliferation of the “China threat” theory must be prevented.

Improvement in Sino-US Relations for the Promotion of CBMs

The United States has been acting as a world leader, imposing its significant influence on regional affairs. Due to its size alone, China is an important power in Asia. As a result, Sino-US relations have a direct bearing on Asian stability and, thus, will continue to play an important

¹⁶The statement was included in the *Third Volume of Deng Xiaoping’s Collection* (Beijing: People’s Publishing House, October 1993), 363.

¹⁷“Examining the ‘China Threat’,” *Renmin Ribao (People’s Daily)*, 22 December 1995.

role in the establishment of confidence-building measures in Asia. Therefore, improved Sino-US relations are of vital strategic importance and should be possible given two significant factors:

- China and the United States share interests and responsibility in safeguarding world peace and stability, and in promoting security and prosperity in the Asia-Pacific region in particular; and
- The economic relationship between China and the United States is complementary and of mutual benefit. The potential for economic cooperation between the two countries is enormous.

The China policy of the United States is the main source of the current friction in Sino-US relations. Although there has been no open declaration from the US side that it intends to contain China, the United States' actions demonstrate an attempt to contain China's development in various aspects. There are two purposes evident in US policy toward China, according to the analysis of many Chinese scholars: One is to "Westernize" China and the other is to Balkanize China.¹⁸ But Americans with insight should realize that Westernization and Balkanization will not work in China. China is a country with such a long history and ancient civilization that it is impossible to impose Western values on the Chinese people. The fact that Chinatowns in Western countries are well known around the world shows that Chinese people would like to preserve their cultural tradition although they live in foreign countries.

Similarly, due to humiliating past experiences, China will allow no room for maneuver on issues of sovereignty and territorial integrity. The question of Taiwan is the most important and sensitive issue in Sino-US relations. As the facts have shown, when the Taiwan question was handled properly, Sino-US relations went smoothly; when handled improperly, relations were snagged and suffered setbacks. To maintain high-level contact and dialogue between China and the United States is the best approach toward increasing mutual understanding, defusing suspicion, strengthening confidence, and addressing problems. In terms of high-level contact, the following specific measures are suggested: regularized meetings of the presidents of both countries; establishment of a "hotline"; increased and expanded exchanges of legislatures; increased bilateral visits by high-ranking military officials; and establishment of a standing committee of senior specialists to deliberate on a regular basis on problems concerning bilateral relations. If Sino-US relations continue to be sour, China will feel that the United States has dealt with China as an adversary. Accordingly, China would have to take corresponding action that would have a negative impact on the situation in Asia. A deterioration of Sino-US relations may well be one of the biggest obstacles to confidence-building measures in Asia.

¹⁸To "Westernize" China means to transform China into a country with the same political, ideological, and democratic values as Western countries.

Enhanced International Security and Arms Control Research

As compared to Western countries, international security and arms control research in the Asian developing world lags behind. For instance, as mentioned above, there is still no professional institute devoted to arms control research in China. Just a small number of people do research in this field, and most of them do it part-time. Many officials and the broader public have little background in arms control, and there are few reference materials in this field available in China. This is also the case in most Asian developing countries. Therefore, the following recommendations are put forth as both reasonable and practical solutions.

- The establishment of professional arms control research institutes;
- The enhancement of international security and arms control research¹⁹; and
- The promotion of academic and educational exchanges among countries, in order to provide training and more professional skills.

Undoubtedly, all these efforts will be conducive to confidence-building in the Asia-Pacific region. In sum, as Asian countries are still at the very early stages of establishing CBMs, it is first of all important to make efforts to explore and identify what are practical and realistically feasible CBMs rather than placing too much emphasis on the structural mechanisms of confidence and security building. Second, it is helpful to encourage the states of the region to recognize the value of confidence-building measures so as to pursue unilateral and bilateral measures that can serve as the foundation for broader-based multilateral cooperation. Third, it is necessary for CBMs to be guided by regional and global norms and to be in tune with Asian underlying historical, political, economic, and cultural characteristics in order to make them most effective.

###

¹⁹At present, the China Defense Science and Technology Information Center (CDSTIC) is editing a *Handbook on Arms Control and Disarmament*, to be published in Chinese for distribution to China's political, military, and foreign-policy leadership as well as the interested public.

The Evolution of Chinese Views Toward CBMs

XIA Liping

During the era of the Cold War, China faced military pressure from both superpowers. Since the end of the Cold War, however, China's security environment has improved and has some new features, which include the following:

- The structure of relations among major powers in the Asia-Pacific region — the United States, Japan, Russia, and China — has been in transition. Economic interdependence continues to develop and will be beneficial to peace and stability in the region. But there are still some factors of potential uncertainty and instability in the region, and stable relations have yet to be established between China and some other major powers.¹
- There are some uncertain factors and potentially worrisome trends in the internal politics of Japan and Russia, which may have significant effects on their foreign policies. In Japan, there are some important politicians who still have not admitted that Japan committed war crimes during World War II. Furthermore, it is still a question what kind of political power Japan will become: a political power that will contribute to world peace and stability or one that will seek a dominant role in the Asia-Pacific region. At present, Russia is facing internal political instability, economic difficulties, and intense ethnic conflict. The future of Russia's internal situation will not only determine its Asia-Pacific policy, but also affect to some extent the security of the region.
- Although the Asia-Pacific region is relatively stable now, there are still some potential factors of uncertainty and instability in the region. Some developed countries are dumping large quantities of sophisticated conventional weapons into this region so as to increase their influence in the region and to make enormous profits. Furthermore, proliferation of nuclear weapons casts a shadow over the security of the region. At the same time, there exist ethnic, territorial, and religious contradictions and disputes — some of which are very complicated — among many Asian countries due to a variety of historical reasons. If the contradictions are not dealt with properly, they may intensify to such an extent so as to lead to new conflicts. Moreover, although the Cold War between the United States and the Soviet Union has ended, the divisions of some Asian

¹China has a long coastline and currently shares boundaries with 14 countries, namely: Afghanistan, Bhutan, Burma, India, Kazakstan, North Korea, Kyrgyzstan, Laos, Mongolia, Nepal, Pakistan, Russia, Tajikistan, and Vietnam. China also borders Hong Kong and Macau.

countries caused by the Cold War have not yet been settled. The Taiwan independence movement, for instance, has become one of the major factors in the Asia-Pacific region.

- The Asia-Pacific region is currently the most dynamic region in the world in terms of economic development. Most Asian countries are focusing their efforts on economic development and have created their policies and development programs to suit local conditions. At the same time, Asian-Pacific countries are increasing their economic cooperation in the region.

China has experienced a process of gradually deepening its understanding of the concept of confidence-building measures (CBMs). From the early 1950s to the early 1970s, China did not embrace the concept of CBMs because during this period the concept of CBMs had not fully developed, and China had attached little importance to international arms control negotiations and theories. At that time, China was only involved in CBMs in relation to the Armistice Treaty following the Korean War and some taken unilaterally by China following the Sino-India Border War in 1962. China has since adopted CBMs with regard to some nuclear issues as the method to resolve and/or to prevent conflicts and as a way to show China's sincere goal of peace in the region.

The process of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE), which led to the 1975 Helsinki Final Act, presents the most fully developed model for CBMs. At first, China had a negative attitude towards the process, thinking it was the manifestation of a policy of appeasement taken by Western countries towards the hegemony of the Soviet Union.

Since the mid-1980s, there has been a significant change in Chinese thinking and China's approach toward the idea of CBMs. The main reasons for this change are the following:

- With the relaxation of the international situation, especially after the end of the Cold War, CBMs are emerging as an essential means of preventing accidental wars and unintended escalation in strife-ridden regions;
- The importance of economic factors in international relations and economic interdependence is increasing among Asian-Pacific countries. This has made states in the region more willing to resolve territorial disputes and political problems through peaceful means, including CBMs;
- China has been focusing its efforts on internal economic development, so it is trying its best to seek a peaceful international security environment; and
- China's policy of reform and openness has made much progress, rendering Chinese scholars and officials much more open to accepting new concepts from abroad in the field of arms control. In this context, some Chinese scholars have gradually come to view in a positive way the role and process of establishing CBMs in Europe. CBMs have

been introduced in China with the idea that CBMs are one of the important means of maintaining peace and stability.

There is little debate among Chinese scholars on the significance of CBMs, except on the issue of military transparency. During the Cold War era, China faced the threat of large-scale military invasion by the Soviet Union. Under the very strong pressure of the Soviet armed forces, China had to try its best to keep its military information secret. Thus, any concept of military transparency was refused so as to make ambiguous to the Soviet Union China's intentions and to increase the Soviet leadership's difficulties in making the decision to launch a large-scale attack against China. With the end of the Cold War, the threat of a large-scale Soviet invasion against China is no more.

In this context, Chinese views on military transparency have been in transition. Now most Chinese scholars think that different countries should have different degrees of military transparency; the United States is the most transparent of all countries because it is now the only military superpower in the world, and the United States also uses military transparency as part of its military deterrence policy. China should have some military transparency in the future, but China should proceed step by step. China can not have as much military transparency as that of the United States, because China's defense forces are much weaker than those of the United States.

At present, the debate among Chinese scholars is not over whether China should have military transparency, but how much transparency is suitable for China. The Chinese government is gradually accepting CBMs as an important means of safeguarding China's security and regional peace. China has been making an effort to establish bilateral CBMs with some countries and supporting the efforts to establish regional multilateral security cooperation.

On 1 August 1995, at the Second Ministerial Meeting of the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF), Chinese Foreign Minister Qian Qichen outlined some principles of the Chinese government policy regarding CBMs:

- To establish CBMs so as to improve the Asia-Pacific security environment and to bring stability and prosperity in the region to the twenty-first century;
- To put good political desire as the first precondition of the establishment of CBMs between countries; "without good and common political desire, it is impossible for them to cooperate voluntarily";²

²Chinese Foreign Minister Qian Qichen, speaking before the Second Ministerial Meeting of the ASEAN Regional Forum on 1 August 1995. *Renmin Ribao (People's Daily)*, 2 August 1995.

- To attach importance on pushing CBMs in its broad sense so as to improve the regional security environment as a whole; “it is not enough to establish CBMs only in [the] military field, and the establishment of CBMs should include political, economic and social contents”;³
- To think highly of mutual respect and equal consultation among all parties that participate in the regional security cooperation framework;
- To establish CBMs according to both the reality of diversification in the Asia-Pacific region and the new features of the international situation, and not to blindly imitate the models of other regions and those of the past; and
- To establish some pragmatic and feasible CBMs step by step. Regional security cooperation should be developed according to the spirit of doing easier things first, then taking on more difficult issues, while seeking common ground and setting differences aside for the time-being. In the future, Asian-Pacific countries can discuss the principles, contents, extent, and methods of security cooperation and consult among themselves, and carry out some concrete cooperative projects.⁴

Furthermore, the Chinese government has accepted many CBM concepts in its foreign policy thinking, such as establishment of hotlines, prior notification of military maneuvers and troops movements along the border, restriction of military development or military activities along the border, and declaration of no-first-use of nuclear weapons. In 1994, China even accepted the concept of on-site inspections of its chemical plants when it signed the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC). In March 1995, China took an important step toward military transparency, beginning a process of briefing US officials on its defense budget and military strategy. On 1 August 1995, Chinese Foreign Minister Qian Qichen also said that the Chinese government is preparing to publish its Defense White Paper at a proper time in the near future.

The Evolution of CBMs between China and Other Countries

The establishment of CBMs with other countries has been a process of gradual development for China, and can be divided into two phases. The first phase was from the early 1950s to the mid-1980s, and the second covers the mid-1980s to the present. The major differences between these two phases are the following:

- **Purpose.** In the first phase, China’s main reasons for adopting CBMs were to end regional wars and to prevent newly emerging armed conflicts. In the second phase,

³*Ibid.*

⁴*Ibid.*

China has pursued CBMs in order to eliminate or reduce military confrontation and to prevent unwanted armed conflicts.

- **Form.** During the first phase, the main form that China's CBMs took were unilateral and bilateral agreements. In the second phase, China's CBMs with other countries are mainly through bilateral agreements. At the same time, China has begun to participate in some multilateral CBM processes.
- **Importance.** In the first phase, China did not attach much importance to CBMs. During the second phase, CBMs are gradually becoming an important means by which China is seeking to maintain a peaceful international environment that will be beneficial to the economic development of China and to a long-term peaceful security environment.

Up to now, China has participated in or established CBMs in the aftermath of the Korean War, with the Soviet Union (now Russia and the Newly Independent States), with India, and with regard to disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation.

CBMs in the Armistice Treaty of the Korean War

On 25 June 1950, the Korean War broke out. Soon after, the United States and fifteen other countries' troops under the "United Nations Command" were involved in the war. In October of that year, the Chinese People's Volunteers participated in the war side-by-side with the Korean People's Army.

The peace talks between the two sides began on 10 July 1951. After more than two years of hard negotiations, on 27 July 1953, the People's Republic of China (PRC), the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK), and the United States signed the "Military Armistice Agreement" at Panmunjom, effectively ending the Korean War.⁵ The "Military Armistice Agreement" included several CBMs:

- **Establishment of a Demilitarized Zone.** According to the Armistice Agreement, a military demarcation line would be fixed and troops from both sides would withdraw two kilometers from this line so as to establish a demilitarized zone between the opposing forces. The demilitarized zone would be established as a buffer zone to prevent the occurrence of incidents that might lead to a resumption of hostilities. Neither side would execute any hostile act with, from, or against the demilitarized zone. No person, military or civilian, would be permitted to cross the military demarcation line unless specifically authorized to do so by the Military Armistice Commission.

⁵In fact, the Commander-in-Chief, United Nations Command was the formal signatory to this agreement. However, the United States can be considered a signatory given that the United Nations Command was established by the United States. "Military Armistice in Korea and Temporary Supplementary Agreement," signed at Panmunjom, Korea and entered into force on 27 July 1953. *U.S. Treaties and Other International Agreements - Cumulative Index 1950-1970*, 4 UST. Pt. 1, TIAS 2782 (1953), 234-355.

- **Withdrawal of the military forces from the rear of the other side.** According to the Armistice Agreement, within ten days after the agreement became effective, each side would withdraw all of their military forces, supplies, and equipment from the rear and the coastal islands and waters of Korea.
- **Cessation of introduction into Korea of reinforcement military personnel and weapons.** According to the Armistice Agreement, both sides would cease the introduction into Korea of reinforcements of military personnel, combat aircraft, armored vehicles, weapons and ammunition; personnel rotation would be conducted on a man-for-man basis, and no more than 35,000 persons in the military service would be admitted into Korea by either side in any calendar month under the rotation policy; combat aircraft, armed vehicles, weapons, and ammunition that were destroyed, damaged, worn out, or used up during the period of the armistice could be replaced on the basis of piece-for-piece of the same effectiveness and the same type; such combat aircraft, armored vehicles, weapons, ammunition, and rotation personnel would be introduced into Korea only through the posts of entry, where Neutral Nations Inspection Teams would be stationed; daily reports concerning arrivals in and departures from Korea of military personnel and reports concerning every incoming shipment of these items would be made to the Military Armistice Commission and the Neutral Nations Supervisory Commission by both sides.
- **Establishment of a Military Armistice Commission.** According to the Armistice Agreement, the Military Armistice Commission would be composed of ten senior officers, five of whom would be appointed by the Commander-in-Chief of the United Nations Command, and five of whom would be appointed by the Supreme Commander of the Korean People's Army and the Commander of the Chinese People's Volunteers.
- **Establishment of a Neutral Nations Supervisory Commission.** According to the Armistice Agreement, the Neutral Nations Supervisory Commission would be composed of four senior officers, two of whom would be appointed by neutral nations nominated by the Commander-in-Chief of United Nations Command, namely, Sweden and Switzerland, and two of whom would be appointed by neutral nations nominated jointly by the Supreme Commander of the Korean People's Army and the Commander of the Chinese People's Volunteers, namely, Poland and Czechoslovakia. The Neutral Nations Supervisory Commission would be initially provided with, and assisted by, twenty Neutral Nations Inspection Teams.
- **Recommendation of a high-level political conference of both sides.** According to the Armistice Agreement, in order to insure the peaceful settlement of the Korean question, the military commanders of both sides would recommend to the governments of the countries concerned on both sides that, within three months after the agreement was

signed and became effective, a high-level political conference of both sides would be held by representatives appointed to settle through negotiation the questions of the withdrawal of all foreign forces from Korea, the peaceful settlement of the Korean question, and so forth.

The CBMs that were stipulated in the Armistice Agreement have played an important role in preventing large-scale conflict during the long-standing military confrontation between South Korea and North Korea.

CBMs between China and the Soviet Union/Russia

China and what is now the former Soviet Union (FSU) shared a border about 7,000 km long. During the 1950s, China and the Soviet Union had allied relations based on the “Treaty of Sino-Soviet Friendship, Allies and Mutual Aid,” signed by them on 14 February 1950. But in the late 1950s, the Soviet Union put more and more pressure on China and attempted to make China subordinate to its interests in political and military spheres. China was unable to accept this. At the same time, the ideological disputes between them gradually intensified. As a result, relations between China and the Soviet Union deteriorated.

In this context, the alliance between China and the Soviet Union broke down, and both sides became seriously antagonistic in terms of national interests. Since the mid-1960s, the Soviet Union had begun to increase its military forces in the Sino-Soviet border region, making the situation along the border more and more tense. From February to August 1969, the military forces of the two countries had several bloody encounters along the Sino-Soviet border. Afterwards, the Soviet Union greatly increased its military forces on the Sino-Soviet and Sino-Mongolian borders to about one million soldiers, equivalent to one-third of the total number of Soviet armed forces. In 1969, the Soviet Union had at least twenty-five divisions in the Sino-Soviet border region, but by 1978 the number had increased to fifty-two divisions. At the same time, the Soviet Pacific Fleet had made much progress in its war-fighting capabilities and activities. In 1969, the Soviet Union even prepared to launch a preemptive nuclear attack against China’s nuclear facilities.

The Sino-Soviet Attempt at Confidence Building in September 1969

After several bloody encounters on the eastern section of the Sino-Soviet border in early 1969, on 24 May of that same year, the Chinese government issued a statement, reaffirming its consistent position that China and the Soviet Union should comprehensively settle their disputes over the border through negotiations and should not resort to force. The statement also suggested that both sides guarantee to maintain the status quo on the border and should not move the border line of actual control forward in any way. Furthermore, the statement proposed that the frontier guards of the two sides not shoot one another.

However, Soviet and Chinese troops continued to clash in several bloody incidents. In order to relax the tension and confrontation between the two countries, Chinese premier Zhou

Enlai met with his Soviet counterpart Alexei Kosygin at the Beijing airport terminal on 11 September 1969. According to the proposal by China, both sides reached an understanding that included the provision that the two countries would first sign an agreement on temporary means for maintaining the status quo on the border, preventing armed conflicts, and separating their military forces in disputed areas. Only then would the two sides settle the border issue through negotiations. This understanding reached by the premiers of the two countries led to the negotiations on the Sino-Soviet border in Beijing in October 1969. But because the Soviet Union drew back from the understanding, both sides did not sign this kind of agreement for a very long time.

Normalization of Sino-Soviet Relations: 1982-1991

The Soviet invasion of Afghanistan and Soviet support of the Vietnamese invasion of Cambodia in 1979 caused a rift in Sino-Soviet relations once again. However on 24 March 1982, former Soviet leader Leonid Brezhnev made a speech in Tashkent in which he said that the Soviet Union would not support the concept of “two Chinas” and would fully recognize the People’s Republic of China’s sovereignty over Taiwan. The Soviet Union, he said, would not have any claim over Chinese territories, and Brezhnev suggested that the two countries begin to negotiate the border issue. The Chinese government reacted positively to the speech. In August 1982, China and the Soviet Union held the first round of negotiations at the level of deputy foreign minister to discuss the normalization of their relations.

In 1985, China announced that it would unilaterally reduce its armed forces by one million persons within two years. This was the largest unilateral disarmament in the world during the 1980s. From the late 1980s to the early 1990s, China also withdrew 80,000 to 100,000 troops from the Sino-Soviet border region.

On 28 July 1986, former Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev made a speech in Vladivostok in which he expressed that the USSR was willing to discuss the establishment of good neighborly relations with China “at any time and at any level.”⁶ Gorbachev also agreed to delimit the Sino-Soviet border area where rivers divided the two states according to the principle of the main navigable channel. In addition, Gorbachev declared that the Soviet Union would withdraw its troops from Afghanistan in stages and that he had been discussing with the Mongolian government the issue of withdrawing Soviet troops from that country. In February 1987, China and the Soviet Union began a new round of negotiations on the border issue, during which both sides decided that they would discuss resolution of the entire Sino-Soviet border and that the talks would begin with discussion of the eastern section of the border.

⁶“Speech by Comrade M.S. Gorbachev at a Ceremonial Meeting Devoted to the Presentation of the Order of Lenin to Vladivostok,” *Pravda*, 29 July 1986, as quoted in the chapter on “Asia and American-Soviet Relations,” in Raymond L. Garthoff, *The Great Transition: American-Soviet Relations and the End of the Cold War* (Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution, 1994), 623-677, specifically 652.

Since that time, the Soviet Union gradually made progress in eliminating three main obstacles hindering the normalization of Sino-Soviet relations, which included withdrawal of its troops from Afghanistan and Mongolia, reducing Soviet military presence in the Sino-Soviet border region, and impelling Vietnam to withdraw its military forces from Cambodia. In February 1989, the Chinese government determined that the Soviet Union had “made substantial progress in eliminating [the] three obstacles.”

In May 1989, China and the Soviet Union held a summit meeting in Beijing marking the normalization of relations between these two countries. Published on 18 May, the Sino-Soviet Joint Communiqué outlining the results of the summit meeting stipulated the basic principles to govern relations between the two countries in this new period.⁷ The parties agreed to the following terms:

- Development of relations would proceed on the basis of universal principles of mutual respect for territorial integrity and sovereignty, mutual non-aggression, non-interference in each other’s internal affairs, equality and mutual benefit, and peaceful co-existence;
- Resolution of all disputes would be achieved through peaceful negotiations rather than the use of force or threats to use force in any form;
- Agreement on measures to reduce their military forces in the Sino-Soviet border region to a minimum suitable to the normal and good-neighborly relations of the two countries. Efforts to strengthen mutual trust and maintain security in the border region would also be made by both sides;
- Resolution that boundary questions would be resolved both fairly and reasonably on the basis of the established principles of international law, in line with the spirit of equal consultation, mutual understanding, and mutual accommodation; and
- Agreement to actively develop their relations in areas of economics, trade, science, and culture so as to improve the understanding and exchanges between the two peoples.

From the second half of 1989 to February 1990, working groups comprised of foreign affairs and military specialists from China and the Soviet Union held two rounds of talks. As a result, on 24 April 1990, China and the Soviet Union signed in Moscow the “Agreement on the Guidelines of Mutual Reduction of Military Forces in the Border Region” and on “Building Confidence in the Military Sphere across the Border.” These were the first bilateral agreements promoting disarmament in the Asia-Pacific region since the end of World War II.

⁷“The Sino-Soviet Joint Communiqué,” signed in Beijing on 18 May 1989. *Renmin Ribao (People’s Daily)*, 19 May 1989.

The Sino-Soviet agreements of 1990 were also the first to establish CBMs between the two sides. As a result, since April 1990, several top Chinese leaders and military officers have visited the Soviet Union. Also in late April 1990, Chinese Premier Li Peng visited Moscow, resulting in the signing of several agreements on mutual cooperation in areas of economics, science and technology, and peaceful use and research of space, etc. Both sides also agreed that leaders of the two countries' military departments should exchange friendly visits so as to improve their mutual understanding. Soon thereafter (May-June 1990), General Liu Huaqiu, Vice Chairman of the Chinese Central Military Commission, paid an official visit to the Soviet Union. The talks held between General Liu and Soviet military leaders "formed some essential principles for the establishment of mutual relations in [the] military economy." Furthermore, the Chief of the Soviet General Staff said at the time that the Soviet Union hoped to establish long-term cooperation with China not only in military economic matters, but also in military technology.

General Liu's visit was followed the next year by a visit by Communist Party General Secretary Jiang Zemin. During Jiang's visit, the two countries signed the "Agreement on the Eastern Section of the Sino-Soviet Border." In the Sino-Soviet Joint Communiqué signed at the end of the visit, both sides expressed their willingness to continue to have military exchanges.

Establishment of CBMs between China and Russia: 1991-Present

Following the disintegration of the Soviet Union at the end of 1991, Russia as a sovereign state inherited most of the authority and responsibilities held by the former Soviet Union, including two-thirds of its armed forces and status as a permanent member of the UN Security Council.⁸ Delegates representing the Chinese government and the Russian government held talks in December 1991, affirming that the principles stipulated in the two previous Sino-Soviet Joint Communiqués, signed respectively in 1989 and 1991, would continue to serve as guidelines for Sino-Russian relations. Both governments also expressed a willingness to commit to the treaties and agreements signed by China and the former Soviet Union and to the further development of friendly relations on the basis of the Five Principles of Peaceful Co-existence. Furthermore, in March 1992, Chinese and Russian foreign ministers also exchanged instruments of ratification for the "Agreement on the Eastern Section of the Boundary Between the People's Republic of China and the Russian Federation," allowing the agreement to enter into effect at that time.

Russian President Boris Yeltsin visited China in December 1992. During his visit, Yeltsin and his Chinese counterpart at the time, Yang Shangkun, signed the "Joint Statement on the Basis of Relations Between the People's Republic of China and the Russian Federation," which went further to increase mutual trust and establishing friendly relations than had the two

⁸The Sino-Soviet border exceeded 7,000 kilometers; Russia and China, however, share a 3,645 km border.

previous Sino-Soviet Joint Communiqués of 1989 and 1991.⁹ The Sino-Russian Joint Declaration of 1992 included the following provisions:

- The two countries agreed to establish dialogues in order to resolve all disputes between them through peaceful means;
- Both sides agreed to oppose any arms races and to take measures to strengthen the mechanism of nuclear non-proliferation and to prevent the spread of other kinds of weapons of mass destruction; both sides reaffirmed that they would not use nuclear weapons first nor threaten to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear states or in nuclear weapons-free zones;
- Both sides agreed to make an effort to promote peace, security, stability, and prosperity in the Asia-Pacific region and to accelerate the implementation of bilateral and multilateral cooperation plans, which are beneficial to the mutual understanding and economic development of Northeast Asia;
- Both sides agreed to extend bilateral consultations, to discuss ways in which to consolidate peace and security, to develop cooperation in Asia and throughout the world, to seek resolutions to significant global and regional problems, and on other issues of mutual interest;
- Both sides agreed to maintain regular political dialogues at every level, including senior-level dialogue. Furthermore, the foreign ministers of each country are to maintain close cooperation;
- Both sides agreed to continue negotiations over their disputed boundary on the basis of existing Sino-Russia border treaties according to established international law, and in line with mutual understanding and mutual concession, so as to fairly and reasonably resolve the border issue;
- Both sides agreed on the need to reduce the armed forces in the border region to a minimum that is suitable for the normal and good-neighborly relations between them;
- Both sides affirmed a willingness to continue negotiations on concrete measures on the basis of an agreement signed on 21 April 1990 between China and the former Soviet Union and to make efforts to strengthen trust and maintain security in the border region; and, lastly,

⁹“The Sino-Russia Joint Declaration on the Basis of the Relations between the Two Countries,” signed in Beijing on 18 December 1992. *Renmin Ribao (People’s Daily)*, 19 December 1992.

- Both sides agreed to engage in military exchanges according to normal international practice, so as to strengthen mutual trust and cooperation in the military sphere.

Russian Prime Minister Viktor Chernomyrdin visited China in late May 1994. During his visit, an agreement on regulations for managing the Sino-Russian border was signed by the two countries. In the press communiqué summarizing the positive results of the visit, both sides expressed a desire to speed up the preparation of the agreement on the Western sector of the Sino-Russian border.¹⁰ Soon thereafter, in July 1994, the Chinese and Russian governments signed the “Agreement on the Prevention of Dangerous Military Activities” (PDMA), stipulating that both sides agreed to prevent common military accidents such as unintentional border crossings by fighter planes or warships, accidental missile launches, use of laser equipment that may do harm to those on the other side of the border, or hinder operations on the other side of the border, and so forth.

Visits by Chinese leaders to Russia have also resulted in agreements between the two states. Chinese President Jiang Zemin visited Russia in September 1994 and again in May 1995. During both visits, Jiang and his Russian counterpart, Boris Yeltsin, expressed the willingness of both countries to forge ahead toward a cooperative partnership for the twenty-first century. During Jiang’s earlier visit, China and Russia issued a joint communiqué in which both countries pledged not to use or to target nuclear weapons against one another. Also, during Jiang’s second visit, China and Russia signed the “Agreement on the Western Section of the Boundary Between the People’s Republic of China and the Russian Federation.”

In the area of exchanges of high-level military officers, China and Russia signed in November 1993 an agreement on military cooperation (over a five-year period) and promotion of friendly relations between the two countries’ armed forces. This agreement was signed during a visit by Russian Defense Minister Pavel Grachev to Beijing, who returned for a follow-up visit in May 1995.

Since 1992, official talks have continued between China and Russia on the border question as well as on the implementation of the “Agreement on the Guidelines of Mutual Reduction of Military Forces in the Border Region” and the agreement on “Confidence Building in the Military Field Along Border Areas” signed jointly by official delegations from the PRC, the Russian Federation, Kazakstan, Kyrgyzstan, and Tajikistan. The proposed CBMs in Sino-Russian negotiations include the following:

- Exchanges of military observers in the border region;
- No large-scale military maneuvers within 100 kilometers of the border;

¹⁰See the “Agreement on the Western Section of the Boundary Between the People’s Republic of China and the Russian Federation,” signed 3 September 1994.

- Prior notification of troop movements in the border region; and
- Dedicated communication links or “hotlines” between the regional military headquarters of the two countries along the border.¹¹

In the Sino-Russian Joint Communiqué issued on 26 June 1995 during Chinese Premier Li Peng’s visit to Moscow, both sides expressed the view that it would be best to work out an agreement on strengthening confidence in the military sphere across the border as a separate document.¹²

Sino-Indian CBMs

The border between China and India is more than 3,380 kilometers long. Beginning in August 1959, there occurred several armed clashes along the Sino-India border. Under these circumstances, in late 1959 and culminating in his trip to India in April 1960, Chinese Premier Zhou Enlai put forward several proposals and confidence-building measures to help resolve the issue through peaceful means. Zhou suggested that in order to maintain the status quo of the two countries’ border, to guarantee the tranquility of the border, and to create a good atmosphere for friendly resolution of the border issue, the two countries’ armed forces should withdraw twenty kilometers from their current Line of Actual Control (LAC). Zhou also suggested that both countries should pledge not to send armed personnel to the areas from which both sides would have withdrawn their armed forces.

The Indian government refused these proposals put forth by China, and Indian military forces continued to provoke armed incidents. Consequently, China had to counter-attack Indian troops in January 1962. As a result, Chinese frontier guards recovered lost Chinese territory where Indian troops occupied when they passed over the Line of Actual Control of 7 November 1959. In order to show again China’s sincerity and desire to resolve the Sino-Indian border issue through peaceful means rather than with military forces as well as to express China’s willingness to maintain friendly Sino-Indian relations, on 21 November 1962 the Chinese government issued a statement proposing a cease-fire and, once again, a number of CBMs. The main proposals put forth by the Chinese government were: 1) that beginning on 22 November 1962, Chinese frontier guards would carry out a cease-fire along the entire Sino-Indian border; and 2) beginning 1 December 1962, Chinese frontier guards would withdraw twenty kilometers from the Line of Actual Control. In its statement, China also asked that Indian military forces not cross the Line of Actual Control and not restore the position that India had occupied within China’s territory before 8 September 1962. By 28 February 1963, Chinese frontier guards had fulfilled the plan of withdrawal on its own initiative, which led to the cease-fire and separation of the two countries’ military forces.

¹¹A. Pinkov, “The Analysis of Current Status of Talks on Arms Reduction in the Border Area and Arms Trade Between Russia and China,” Kanwa Translation Information Center Canada, August 1994, 1-2.

¹²“The Sino-Russia Joint Communiqué,” signed by Chinese Premier Li Peng and his Russian counterpart, Viktor Chernomyrdin, in Moscow on 26 June 1995. *Renmin Ribao (People’s Daily)*, 27 June 1995.

From the early 1980s to 1987, Chinese and Indian officials held eight rounds of negotiations on the border issue, but no substantial progress was made. In 1988, the Indian government under Rajiv Gandhi gave up the long-standing “Parallel Policy” (a policy stating that India should resolve border problems with China and improve Sino-Indian relations at the same time) and began to carry out a new policy aimed at taking steps toward developing India’s relations with China in other spheres before resolving the border issue.

Since the visit to China by Indian Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi in 1988, relations between the two countries have improved. On 6 June 1989, China and India began to hold Joint Working Group Talks on the border issue. Under the principle of mutual understanding and mutual accommodation, the talks have made satisfactory progress. At the same time, the China-India Joint Working Group also negotiated CBMs to avoid unwanted conflicts and to provide the basis for their increasing cooperation.

Upon Indian Prime Minister Rao’s visit to China in September 1993, the two countries signed an “Agreement on the Maintenance of Peace and Tranquility along the Line of Actual Control in the India-China Border Areas,” which stipulated that before the border question between India and China is finally settled, both sides should strictly respect and observe the Line of Actual Control and that each would keep their respective military forces along the Line of Actual Control to the lowest level, in accordance with good-neighborly and friendly relations between the two countries. Lastly, on 4 March 1995, after a three-day meeting, the China-India Joint Working Group made a decision that the two countries would open two more border points for contacts and talks between the two militaries.

CBMs on Nuclear Issues

Soon after China successfully tested its first atomic bomb in October 1964, the government of China declared that it would not be the first to use its nuclear weapons, at any time, or under any circumstances. This was the one of the earliest CBMs on nuclear issues in the world.

With the end of the Cold War, China holds that if all declared nuclear-weapons states should make a pledge of no-first-use (NFU) of nuclear weapons, this would be one of the most effective measures to prevent nuclear war and nuclear proliferation. It would also give impetus to the process of nuclear disarmament. At the same time, China has repeatedly appealed for the following measures to be adopted:

- That nuclear-weapons states conclude an international convention on unconditional no-first-use of nuclear weapons and on the non-use and non-threat-of-use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear states and in nuclear-free zones;
- That the international community support efforts to establish nuclear-free zones;

- That the UN Convention on Disarmament in Geneva speed up the process of negotiations so as to conclude a comprehensive, effective, and universal nuclear test ban treaty as early as possible and no later than 1996;¹³
- That the UN Convention on Disarmament in Geneva begin negotiations at an early date on the treaty to prohibit the production of nuclear fissile materials used for weapons;¹⁴ and
- That all nuclear weapons states commit themselves to thorough destruction of all nuclear weapons and to participate in negotiations to sign a treaty on the comprehensive prohibition of nuclear weapons, to be implemented under effective international supervision.¹⁵

Thus far, there have been some bilateral declarations between China and some other countries, in which China has committed itself, or both sides have committed themselves, to no first-use of nuclear weapons, non-use, and non-threat-of-use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear states and in nuclear-free zones. Examples include the Sino-Russian “Joint Declaration on the Basis of Mutual Relations” signed on 18 December 1992, and the Sino-Kazakhstan “Joint Declaration on the Basis of the Friendly Relations,” signed on 21 October 1993. Furthermore, on 3 September 1994, during Chinese President Jiang Zemin’s visit to Moscow, a joint communiqué was issued in which China and Russia pledged not to use nuclear weapons against one another and not to target each other with nuclear weapons.

On 5 April 1995, China issued a national statement on security assurances, which not only reaffirmed its above-mentioned pledges, but also made new security assurances that in case any non-nuclear-weapon state is attacked by nuclear weapons, China will take actions within the United Nations Security Council so that the Council can take appropriate measures to provide the state with necessary assistance and to impose severe and effective sanctions against the offender according to the UN Charter.¹⁶

At the same time, the four other declared nuclear-weapons states — namely the United States, Russia, France, and Britain — also made security assurances that they will not use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon states that have agreed not to possess nuclear weapons.

¹³The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) was signed on 24 September 1996. Signatories include the People’s Republic of China and the other nuclear weapons states.

¹⁴Ambassador Sha Zukang, head of the Chinese Delegation, speaking before the UN Convention on Disarmament in Geneva on 6 April 1994. *Renmin Ribao (People’s Daily)*, 7 April 1994.

¹⁵Chinese Foreign Minister Qian Qichen, speaking before the 48th UN General Assembly, 19 September 1993. *Renmin Ribao (People’s Daily)*, 20 September 1993.

¹⁶“China’s National Declaration on Nuclear Assurance,” published by the Chinese Foreign Minister in Beijing on 5 April 1995. *Renmin Ribao (People’s Daily)*, 6 April 1996.

Through the efforts of China and other UN Security Council members, on 11 April 1995 the Security Council passed an historic resolution (Resolution No. 984), in which China and the other four declared nuclear states pledged to stand by non-nuclear-weapon states that are parties to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) who come under nuclear threat. The resolution stipulates that signatories of the NPT have the legitimate right to security assurances; in case non-nuclear signatories suffer nuclear aggression or nuclear threat, any state can call the UN Security Council's attention to this issue and impel the Council to take emergency measures and to provide it with assistance, which would include the following:

- Investigation of the situation;
- Implementation of appropriate measures to resolve the dispute;
- Provision to the victim state of technical, medical, and scientific as well as humanitarian aid; and
- Request for compensation.¹⁷

This resolution is one of the important steps taken by the five declared nuclear powers to establish CBMs on nuclear weapons issues, and it will be beneficial to halting the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

CBMs between China and the United States

China is the largest developing country with a great potential market and rapid economic growth. The United States is the largest developed country with modern science and technology. Both countries are permanent members of the United Nations Security Council, which have special responsibilities with regard to international security. Events since the end of World War II have proved that one of the most important factors for maintaining peace and stability in the Asia-Pacific region is the continuance of productive ties between China and the United States.

During the Cold War, the United States was engaged in global confrontation with the former Soviet Union, while China faced the danger of a full-scale Soviet military invasion. Under these circumstances, in the early 1970s China and the United States established strategic relations based on common confrontation against Soviet hegemonism. In the late 1970s, when the Soviet Union was carrying out an expansionist global policy in an aggressive way, China and the United States quickened the pace of the development of relations between them, which eventually led to the establishment of full diplomatic ties. Furthermore, since 1980, both countries have begun to develop military relations. The strategic relations between China and the United States are among the most important factors in preventing a world war from erupting and in spurring the end of the Cold War.

¹⁷“Security Council Resolution 984 (1995) on Security Assurances,” passed by the UN Security Council in New York on 11 April 1995 (reprinted in *World Journal*, 12 April 1995).

Since the end of the Cold War, Sino-US relations have changed a great deal, but common interests are still much greater than are the contradictions. The importance of Sino-US relations to each country's interests and to regional security has not been reduced. Sino-US relations during the Cold War were based mainly on military security interests and the shared need to confront the Soviet Union. During the post-Cold War era, Sino-US relations have been based on more comprehensive factors, in which the role and position of the economy is becoming more prominent. However, military security issues are still very important and cannot be separated from economic security.

The common interests of China and the United States can be sorted into three categories. First, with regard to regional security, China and the United States need to cooperate on preventing and resolving regional conflicts, halting the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, and establishing a regional security mechanism. Second, in their bilateral relations, both sides have a large amount of trade with each other, so economic cooperation between the United States and China will be beneficial to both countries. Third, in terms of global issues, both sides can benefit from coordination and cooperation on reducing environmental pollution and the prohibition of drug trafficking, and so forth.

Both China and the United States have endeavored to increase mutual exchanges and cooperation, which has led to the establishment of some bilateral CBMs beginning in September 1993. From the valley after the Tiananmen Incident of 4 June 1989 until May 1995, Sino-US relations had improved gradually and took on some new features. Between September 1993 and May 1995, progress made by China and the United States to establish CBMs was as follows:

- **The restoration of high-level military exchanges.** Following the Tiananmen Incident of 1989, the United States imposed sanctions against China, suspending high-level military exchanges. In September 1993, the Clinton administration began its policy of "Comprehensive Engagement" toward China. In November 1993, Chas W. Freeman, Jr., then US Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs, visited Beijing. Following this visit, the process of restoring military-to-military ties to something resembling their pre-1989 level was begun, with one important exception: sales of military equipment. In August 1994, China's Deputy Chief of Staff Xu Huizi visited the United States, followed by a visit to China in October 1994 by US Defense Secretary William J. Perry, the first American Secretary of Defense to visit China since 1989. In the summer of 1994 and in April 1995, Admiral Charles Larson and Admiral Richard Macke, respectively (both former Commanders-in-Chief of US Pacific Command), visited China. General Merrill McPeak, then US Air Force Chief of Staff, also paid a visit to Beijing in September 1994.
- **Enhanced military transparency on both sides.** During the visit to China by US Defense Secretary William Perry in October 1994, China and the United States reached an agreement in which both sides agreed to begin regular military consultations, exchanging information on both sides' strategies, defense budgets, and defense plans.

In December 1994, Edward L. Warner, US Assistant Secretary of Defense for Strategy and Requirements, visited Beijing to brief high-level Chinese military officers on the US defense budget and defense plans over the next six-years. In March 1995, General Xiong Guangkai, then Assistant to Chief of General Staff, visited the United States to brief US Defense Department officials on China's defense budget and military strategy. According to mutual agreement, such regular consultations would continue to be held each year.

- **Restoration of exchanges of military academic units.** In 1994, Lieut. General Ervin J. Rokke, president of the US National Defense University (NDU), visited China's NDU. In January 1995, General Zhu Dunfa, president of China's NDU, met with his counterpart again in Washington, DC, both sides agreeing to restore academic exchanges between the two institutions to the level resembling those before the 4 June incident of 1989. Since 1994, delegations of students from the two NDUs have exchanged visits.
- **Coordination and cooperation on preventing proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.** On 4 October 1994, Chinese Foreign Minister Qian Qichen and US Secretary of State Warren Christopher signed two joint declarations, one on efforts to stop production of fissile materials used in nuclear weapons and another on non-proliferation of ballistic missiles. In the former joint declaration, China and the United States agreed to joint efforts giving impetus to reaching a multilateral, non-discriminatory, and effectively verifiable convention at the earliest possible date, one that would prohibit production of fissile materials used for nuclear weapons and other nuclear explosives. In the latter agreement, the United States committed itself to taking necessary measures to lift sanctions levied against China since August 1993, and China made the promise that after the lifting of US sanctions, China would not export surface-to-surface missiles, which have been banned under the Missile Technology Control Regime (MTCR).
- **Cooperation on defense conversion between the two countries.** During the visit to China by US Defense Secretary William Perry in October 1994, China and the United States founded the China-U.S. Joint Defense Conversion Commission, to be headed by Secretary Perry and Minister Ding Henggao of the Chinese Commission on Science, Technology, and Industry for National Defense (COSTIND). The main task of the China-US Joint Defense Conversion Commission was to provide a senior channel of communication between the governments of China and the United States to promote mutual understanding of, and cooperation on, issues relating to the area of defense conversion. The Defense Conversion Program was expected to advance China's transparency as more US companies work with China's defense-related industries and installations.
- **Reciprocal visits of naval warships.** In late March 1995, the US navy missile cruiser USS Bunker Hill (CG-52) visited Qingdao, a coastal city in East China. This was the first

US navy warship to visit a Mainland harbor of China since the Tiananmen Incident of 1989, and only the third US navy warship to visit a Mainland harbor since the establishment of the People's Republic of China (PRC) in 1949.

However, on 23 May 1995 the US government announced that it would allow Lee Teng-hui of Taiwan to pay a so-called "private visit" to the United States. The Chinese government believed this action contravened the fundamental principles enshrined in the three Sino-US Joint Communiqués and undermined China's sovereignty as well. So, China had to show a strong reaction to this decision, including suspension of some high-level military exchanges and security consultations between the two countries.

Prospects for CBMs with Other Countries

China has recently made some progress in the establishment of bilateral CBMs with other countries and has begun to participate in various processes to establish multilateral CBMs. In the future, China will continue as its central task to carry out its basic national policy of reform and openness and to implement economic development. Thus, the goal of China's foreign policy will be to continue to maintain a peaceful international environment so that it can concentrate its limited resources and energies on domestic economic development. China hopes to build a safe and prosperous new Asia-Pacific region with all the countries in the region. To this end, China will use the establishment of CBMs as one of its important means to achieve this goal.

Generally speaking, in the future China will actively push the establishment of bilateral CBMs with some countries, such as Russia and India, and will try to implement them. Furthermore, since 1994, Chinese and Japanese foreign ministry officials and military officers have begun a series of security dialogues to try to improve mutual understanding and trust. China will continue this process of establishing bilateral CBMs with Japan. At the same time, China will have both a positive and cautious attitude toward multilateral CBMs.

Prospects of CBMs between China and the United States

The process of establishing CBMs in the military and security spheres between China and the United States is only at the initial stage; there are many more important things to be done in the future. It will be necessary for both countries to establish a framework of CBMs between them. This framework would be multi-tiered, multi-sphered, and multi-formed. A multi-tiered framework would include high-level reciprocal exchanges as well as working-level exchanges. A multi-sphered framework would include CBMs in many spheres, such as nuclear weapons, navy warship exchange visits, military academy exchanges, and defense conversion cooperation. A multi-formed framework would include many forms or types of CBMs, such as mutual declared commitments of no-first-use of nuclear weapons, measures to prevent misunderstandings that may lead to unwanted conflicts, enhanced military transparency, emergency consultations in crises, and so forth. If China and the United States are able to establish a framework of CBMs

between them, it would serve to increase mutual understanding and trust, prevent possible security crises, and guarantee peace and stability in the Asia-Pacific region.¹⁸

However, following a decision by the US government in 1995 to grant Lee Teng-hui of Taiwan a visa to visit the United States, relations between China and the United States have deteriorated, leading to a halt in the process of establishing Sino-US CBMs. Because this process is in the interest of both China and the United States, and beneficial to regional security and prosperity as a whole, it is important for the two countries to re-start this process. To this end, both countries should try their best to restore and improve their political relations. The primary pre-condition for the establishment of CBMs is a shared political desire and will to proceed, without which it would be impossible for either party to cooperate voluntarily. For this reason, the United States should stick to a “one China” policy and handle the Taiwan question in accordance with the three Sino-US Joint Communiqués. The Taiwan question remains a key obstacle blocking the development of improved Sino-US relations.

Establishing Multilateral CBMs in the Asia-Pacific Region

With the end of the Cold War, there has been some progress in the establishment of a multilateral security mechanism in the Asia-Pacific region. In 1993, The ASEAN post-ministerial conference meeting in Singapore the decision was announced to establish the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF), in order to bring together foreign ministers from eighteen Asia-Pacific nations for formal discussions on regional security issues. The first ARF meeting, held in Bangkok in July 1994, called for serious consideration of confidence- and security-building in the Asia-Pacific. At the Second Ministerial Meeting of the ARF held in Brunei on 1 August 1995, the foreign ministers of 18 nations and representatives of the European Union discussed security issues in Asia, and decided to set up two standing organizations to deal with the issues of establishing CBMs among member countries and for international cooperation.¹⁹ At the end of this meeting, the chairman of the meeting declared that the ARF would proceed in three general areas: increasing trust, development of preventive diplomacy mechanisms, and dispute resolution.

Since the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) forum held its first Leaders’ Meeting in Seattle in 1993, APEC has made some progress in regional cooperation. At the 1994 Jakarta meeting, leaders of APEC member nations issued the Bogor Declaration, in which they agreed to reach the goal of free and open trade and investment in the Asia-Pacific by the year 2020. Furthermore, the APEC Leaders’ Meetings have provided opportunities for exchange of views on political and security issues among leaders of the Asia-Pacific.

¹⁸Chinese Foreign Minister Qian Qichen, speaking before the Second Ministerial Meeting of the ASEAN Regional Forum, 1 August 1995. *Renmin Ribao (People’s Daily)*, 2 August 1995.

¹⁹It was agreed at this meeting that an Inter-sessional Support Group (ISG) on Confidence Building and Inter-sessional Meetings (ISMs) on Cooperative Activities would be established to advise the ARF. “Chairman’s Statement,” presented at the Second ASEAN Regional Forum Meeting in Brunei Darussalam, 1 August 1995.

The establishment of multilateral security mechanisms in the region, however, is still in the initial stages. It is important to understand that in the Asia-Pacific region, a NATO-style alliance aimed at containing a specific threat was impossible even during the Cold War, and in the post-Cold War era it will be even more impossible. So, Asia-Pacific multilateral activities should be seen more as CBMs aimed at avoiding, rather than reacting to, crises and conflicts.

China holds that any future Asia-Pacific security mechanism should take several forms, including multilateral security cooperation, bilateral CBMs, unilateral CBMs, and disarmament. Both the ARF and APEC should be included in a future Asia-Pacific security mechanism as two of the most important components. In the future, the ARF should focus its efforts on the establishment of CBMs, solution of disputes, and prevention of crises in East Asia. The APEC forum should focus its efforts on dialogue among leaders of member nations and the development of economic interdependence among nations, which is generally speaking one of the best CBMs. The Chinese government's standpoint on Asia-Pacific security cooperation, especially with regard to the ARF and APEC, has been clearly outlined in statements made by Chinese Foreign Minister Qian Qichen.²⁰

CBMs in the South China Sea

China has had sovereignty over the Nansha Islands (also known as the Spratly Islands) since ancient times. Even foreign scholars have acknowledged that, "China's historical claims (over the Nansha Islands) are quite well documented."²¹ For a long time, there were no disputes concerning China's sovereignty over these islands. Only since the early 1970s have some countries around the South China Sea made claims over all or part of these same islands. However, China has restrained itself and is willing to develop the region in a cooperative way, putting aside disputes. China also hopes to resolve the problem over the Nansha Islands issue through negotiations.

At present, among 102 islands and reefs of the Nansha Islands, Vietnam and Philippine have occupied twenty-seven and fourteen, respectively. Together with Malaysia and Brunei, these states have competing territorial claims over the Nansha Islands with China as well as among their four nations. In order to prevent conflicts that may be caused by misunderstandings and misconceptions, it will be necessary for China and other parties concerned in the region to establish CBMs. On 30 July 1995, during a dialogue of ASEAN foreign ministers in Brunei, Chinese Foreign Minister Qian Qichen said that, "China is willing to properly solve the disputes over the Nansha Islands with parties concerned through peaceful negotiations according to the established basic principles of the generally acknowledged international laws and modern maritime laws including the United Nations Maritime Convention. Every party concerned

²⁰See the first part of this paper.

²¹Abdul Razak Abdullah Baginda, Malaysian Strategic Research Center, "Strategic Scenarios in the South China Sea," a paper for the Conference on the South China Sea, held at the American Enterprise Institute, Washington, DC, 7-9 September 1994.

should abide by principles of international law about relations between countries and about peaceful resolution of disputes, and should not make the problem more complicated and more enlarged.”²² During recent years, China has put forward the proposition to shelve the disputes and co-develop the region. If all sides can reach bilateral or multilateral agreement and understanding on this issue through talks, it would be one of the most important CBMs in the region and would greatly reduce the possibility of armed conflict in the region. Agreements and understanding of this sort would show positive political will, which is the primary precondition for the establishment of other CBMs in the region.

In April 1994, during a visit to China by Philippine President Fidel Ramos, China and the Philippine leader agreed that to shelve the disputes and to co-develop the region would be the best way to resolve the problem. In late March 1995, after the incident over the Meiji Reef (also known as Mischief Reef), the Chinese and Philippine Deputy Foreign Ministers reached a four-point understanding:

- 1) Both sides agreed to probe into the possibility of cooperation in the region;
- 2) Both sides agreed to resolve their disputes through peaceful means and bilateral negotiations;
- 3) Both sides agreed that disputes over the island region should not influence the development of relations between the two countries; and
- 4) Both sides agreed to continue their consultations on this issue.

China has also worked to set aside differences with other Nansha Island claimants. Since 1994, the Malaysian government has shown a positive attitude towards China’s proposal of putting aside disputes and developing the region in a cooperative way. In November 1994, upon returning from an Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) informal summit meeting, Chinese President Jiang Zemin stopped over in Vietnam. During Jiang’s visit, China and Vietnam agreed to structure a Joint Working Group to settle their territorial disputes over the Nansha Islands, including their territorial waters disputes. In mid-July 1995, during the third round of border negotiations between China and Vietnam, a Joint Working Group was formally set up, beginning negotiations over the Nansha Islands dispute.

Conclusion

There are many possibilities for CBMs in the Asia-Pacific region. This author would like to posit the following as potential CBMs for the region:

²²Chinese Foreign Minister Qian Qichen, speaking during the dialogue with foreign ministers of ASEAN nations in Brunei, 30 July 1995. *Renmin Ribao (People’s Daily)*, 31 July 1995.

- Signing of treaties on avoidance of incidents on the high seas between warships of different countries. This would serve to lessen the danger of military conflict caused by misunderstandings and misconceptions throughout the region;
- Installation of “hotlines” between countries involved in disputes so that they can get in touch immediately in case of crisis in the region; and
- Exchanges and visits of high-level defense officials and between military academies, universities, and institutions for strategic studies.

###

Asian Security and CBMs Over the Next Decade

Tian Xinjian and Feng Haixia

In recent years, with rapid economic development and an increase in economic cooperation among Asian countries, regional security has advanced, becoming the common concern of all Asian countries. The basis upon which regional security cooperation will succeed is mutual trust. Confidence-building measures (CBMs) in Asia are not only an important step in the process of security cooperation, but also a major topic for a security dialogue.

The Security Situation in Asia Over the Next Decade

The next decade will be an important time for Asian regional economic development as well as for the possibility of making significant progress in regional security cooperation. Although it is difficult to foresee the future security situation in Asia, the emerging trends can be grasped. First, in general, all the countries in Asia are pursuing the main goals of maintaining regional security and seeking economic development. Second, economic interdependence and regional zones of economic cooperation will enhance Asian stability and development. Third, peaceful negotiation of disputes has become a common pursuit for most Asian countries. Fourth, crisis escalation and mismanagement will be contained by development of and improvements in regional security mechanisms. Economic cooperation will give impetus to security cooperation, and security cooperation will promote economic development. This relatively stable relationship will not change significantly for a fairly long time.

Attention must also be paid to factors suggesting instability or that may adversely affect security in the region in the years ahead. Some of these potentially destabilizing factors are discussed below.

Economic Competition and Conflicts are Likely to Increase

Over the next ten years, with the sustained and rapid development of Asian regional economies, more capital and resources will be needed and market competition will be more intense. Of the six largest infrastructure projects in the world, five are in Asia. By the end of this century, a total of one trillion dollars will have been spent on infrastructure development in East Asia. Asia, not the United States, will be the largest oil-importing region in the world. Most goods for export from developing countries in Asia are similar in kind and quality, and go to the same export markets — the United States, Japan, and Hong Kong. This situation will mean that competition for capital, resources, and markets will be more intense among the Asian developing countries. As a result, economic security will be an important problem to be faced by all Asian countries. Economic disputes between big powers, especially between the United States and Japan, have become more serious in recent years and will surely be of increasing influence on economic security in Asia. At the same time, the progressive realization of free

trade and investment will, on the one hand, improve Asian economic integration and, on the other hand, force all countries to make significant adjustments in their economic relationships, thus touching off new economic clashes and disputes.

The economic gap among Asian countries is quite obvious. For example, the proportion of gross national product (GNP) per capita between the richest and the poorest countries in the European Union is only 5:1 or 6:1, 8:1 or 10:1 in the North America Free Trade Area (NAFTA), but about 20:1 for the members of the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) organization. This gap in GNP per capita levels may result in reduced progress toward increased free trade and investment in the region, as well as the emergence of new and more controversial issues, such as reducing tax rates, further opening of markets, and capital outflow. Thus, economic issues will become the dominant factor in a comprehensive Asian security regime. Economic trade disputes influence not only economic security of the countries concerned, but also normal relationships between countries, and may even weaken or destroy the foundation of regional security cooperation.

Territorial and Maritime Disputes May Become New Crises

Because several historical quarrels remain and potential hot spots will persist for a long time, the possibility of new crises erupting in the region cannot be eliminated. For instance, many obstacles remain in the peace process for the Korean Peninsula. The deep-seated concern over the possibility of military confrontation cannot be thoroughly dismissed in the short term. A nuclear crisis has been alleviated for the moment, but the situation in the Demilitarized Zone could turn abruptly hostile.

Although North Korea proposed direct dialogue with the United States and the signing of a peace agreement, the United States did not react positively to this idea and South Korea opposed it. North Korea also showed indifference towards the four-party meeting proposal that was put forward by the United States and by South Korea. Because the countries concerned differ greatly and are on high military alert, new political and military crises may take place on the Peninsula. A recent example of this was the crisis caused by the “submarine incident” in September 1996.

Maritime disputes, in particular, may aggravate and adversely affect the regional security situation over the next ten years because countries that rely on and pay more attention to maritime resources will scramble for more rights to the sea. For example, several countries claim ownership of the Nansha Islands (Spratlys), Diaoyu Islands, as well as some other islands, and it will be difficult to resolve this situation in the short term. In addition, some great powers invariably want to meddle in other countries’ internal affairs, and the trend toward the internationalization of maritime disputes has increased. These factors make resolution of

maritime disputes in the region more complicated. If disputes on the sea cannot be settled properly and, as a result, escalate out of control, the result will be military maritime conflicts.

In addition, there is another potential hot spot in Asia that is characterized by long-term confrontation and frequent military conflicts: the dispute between India and Pakistan over Kashmir. Both are powerful military countries and each has the ability to make nuclear weapons. In recent years, the two countries have improved greatly in terms of armament and conventional war-fighting ability. If a territorial conflict or even a local war were to occur, the result would be instability in South Asia, an increased danger of a nuclear weapons arms race, and a potential nuclear confrontation. Other powers might also seize the opportunity to interfere in South Asian internal affairs, to the point of potential great power conflict. From all the points mentioned above, historical problems are many and will be difficult to resolve. If these potential hot spots become crises, they will lead to increased local tension and may affect stability in the entire region.

Increased Regional Armaments

In recent years, some Asian countries such as Japan, South Korea, India, and the ASEAN countries have maintained a regular increase in military spending. Japan has worked out a "Mid-Term Defense Build-up Plan (FY1996-FY2000)," in which the total defense budget is \$251.50 billion.¹ Under this plan, the Japanese defense budget per year will exceed \$50 billion and will increase each year by 2.68 percent. Thus, Japan's military spending is slightly less than the military budget of the United States, which is the highest in the world. Many Asian countries want to accelerate the modernization of their forces by purchasing foreign advanced weapons and equipment, especially naval and air force equipment. By updating and upgrading their weapons and equipment, the ASEAN countries will improve and modernize significantly their respective air and naval forces by the year 2000. The total number of submarines among ASEAN states will increase from four to sixteen, destroyers and escort vessels will increase from forty to 100, and their navies will be equipped with helicopters, missiles, and computers.

The level of sophistication and modernization of the Japanese Self-Defense Forces' (SDF) weapons and equipment is at the forefront of Asian military programs. But modernization plans are accelerating to include new types of weapons, including four new Aegis cruisers before 1997 and four giant transport ships that could be used as helicopter carriers by the beginning of the next century. Cooperating with the United States, the Japanese Air Self-Defense Forces (ASDF) are rapidly trying to update their air-to-ground support fighters and to develop long-range carrier rockets. The SDF are also participating in the research and development of missile defense systems, such as the theater missile defense (TMD) system.

¹The "Mid-Term Defense Build-up Plan (FY1996-FY2000)" was adopted on 15 December 1995, to fulfill provisions set in the "National Defense Program Outline In and After FY1996," which was passed in November 1995. Japan Defense Agency (press release).

Overall, arms sales from great powers to Asian countries have increased. From the year 1987 to 1990, the volume of conventional weapons sold to Asian states accounted for about twenty-six percent of the total volume in the world. Between the years 1991–1994, this rate reached thirty-nine percent, and the total volume came to \$42 billion. Of the total sales to Asia during the period 1991–1994, the United States ranked first (forty-three percent) among suppliers, with Western European states accounting for twenty-six percent and Russia twenty-three percent. Thus, the danger of a new arms race exists and may destroy the regional military balance. In fact, as long as some countries and regions have fairly powerful offensive capabilities, these countries will take a hard line when negotiating to resolve disputes, which may cause further, unforeseen conflicts to emerge.

Uncertainties Over the Post-Cold War Security System

A “containment” policy may be the choice of some countries but, if so, this will shake the foundation of regional security cooperation and stability in Asia. At present, there are bilateral security treaties such as those between the United States and Japan and the United States and South Korea, both of which were products of the Cold War, which were the key foundations for these relationships since the end of the Cold War. These bilateral security treaties will not disappear. On the contrary, they will be strengthened over the next ten to twenty years. An example of this is the US-Japan Joint Declaration signed on 17 April 1996. It has been noted that the new declaration has been extended from simply safeguarding Japanese territorial and maritime borders to include the Far East, the Korean Peninsula, the Taiwan Strait, and the South China Sea. The revised agreement also includes the right to collective self-defense and exceeds previous provisions for bilateral cooperation by including involvement in regional security issues.

Accordingly, one can draw the conclusion that the future security mechanism in Asia will be built upon two different foundations. One is the multilateral security system based on the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF), the other is the bilateral security system based on the military alliances left in place after the end of the Cold War. Security cooperation will be carried out under these two security frameworks and, consequently, the complexities of regional cooperation will increase. At the same time, countries that maintain bilateral security treaties cannot avoid being governed and affected by their alliances when handling regional security problems. That is, though joined in an alliance, conflicting national security interests may limit the amount of security cooperation. Some great powers have even put forward once again the policy of containment and put pressure on other states by using many different methods, such as bilateral military treaties, in order to confine these states and keep them from playing a proper role in regional security issues. These trends indicate that Cold War thinking is returning to the region. The danger still exists that confrontation may take the place of negotiation. For this reason, bilateral agreements or security treaties in Asia, and the containment theory used by some countries, remain the primary obstacles to regional confidence building.

The Main Obstacles to and Prospects for CBMs in Asia

Thus far, Asia has already made a good start and achieved some obvious progress toward establishing CBMs. For example, China and India have signed a military confidence-building agreement with regard to their common boundary, which includes the withdrawal of armed forces on either side of the border, establishment of a border hotline, and an agreement to hold regular talks on boundary issues between the two sides. China has also signed a military confidence-building treaty with Russia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, and Tajikistan. The ASEAN Regional Forum has had fruitful results on the issue of Southeast Asian CBMs as a result of regional dialogue and consultation resulting in a common understanding of “comprehensive security” among ASEAN states. Some countries, including China, have published or provided white papers on defense policy, and arms control and disarmament. China has put forward a proposal that advance notification should be required when joint military exercises are to be carried out, to which members of the ARF have agreed. In early 1997, the International Support Group (ISG) meeting of the ARF convened in Beijing. All of these efforts will have an important and profound influence on the improvement of security cooperation in Asia.

There are many characteristics unique to East-West CBMs and to Asian CBMs; Asia has its own political, economic, social, and cultural concerns as well as a unique historical legacy. These characteristics will certainly have a direct impact on how Asian CBMs develop. During the Cold War, CBMs between the East and West were the product of the two large military blocs’ long-standing hostilities. The two sides had to reach a compromise under the specter of nuclear war, giving CBMs both a passive and compelling justification. This was due to the superpower conflict at the time between the United States and the Soviet Union. The resulting arms race escalated and accelerated to the point of each side being faced with a potentially devastating attack by the other. This realization forced both East and West to seek dialogue and a relaxation of tensions. The dynamic of two highly centralized blocs also served to maintain the East-West CBMs.

The Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) played an important role in building the security mechanism in Europe given that members of the bloc had common interests and relatively identical foreign policies. By comparison, Asian security cooperation is the product of a regional effort to promote closer economic cooperation among countries following the end of the Cold War. Regional economic cooperation is also the best means of promoting regional stability and development. There is no pressure from the outside world, in other words, no sense of crisis or urgency, and no highly centralized foundation for building Asian security cooperation, which is different from East-West CBMs. Step-by-step confidence building in Asia will work best in a stable environment and within a relatively loose framework. As a result, the East-West CBM experience does serve as a reference and an example for CBMs in Asia, but not one to be copied indiscriminately. From this time forward, the prospects for CBMs in Asia have as many favorable conditions as key obstacles.

Difficulties With Asian-Pacific Territorial and Maritime Disputes

Two outcomes are possible when resolving territorial and maritime disputes in the context of post-Cold War economic development in Asia. One possible outcome is proper and pragmatic resolution of disputes in order to pursue economic development in a more stable environment. For example, China has reached agreements with both India and Russia on the alignment of the respective boundaries and with regard to provisions for military CBMs.

A second possible outcome is that territorial and maritime disputes become more contentious. Such disputes may become international military conflicts as countries scramble for maritime resources, rights, and interests. The typical case of this is the dispute over the Nansha and Diaoyu Islands. Because these disputes involve questions of sovereignty and economic interests on the sea, they are more difficult to resolve. The Chinese government has raised the possibility of “shelving” conflicting interests. In other words, in order to resolve the disputes over these islands and to promote regional stability, conflicting claims should be set aside and joint development undertaken. However, some countries with claims to these islands continue to conduct oil exploration studies and resource extraction in the disputed areas as well as unilaterally erecting structures on disputed islands in the region. Such actions only serve to intensify these disputes and hamper opportunities to resolve the issue peacefully. If all sides cannot find a way to solve the problem, any compromise will necessarily be temporary. Potential crises may explode at any time, making it very difficult to establish CBMs for the long term.

Given that there are Asian states that may have animosity towards others as a result of historical events, CBMs are not likely to succeed until relations between these countries improve. CBMs are not an expedient, but a representation of a normal relationship between countries. It is impossible to build a normal state-to-state relationship or to build confidence in a real sense between countries that are hostile and on the alert toward each other. Examples of some Asian countries that have historical animosities toward each other are North and South Korea in Northeast Asia, and India and Pakistan in South Asia. These lingering animosities are the result of the psychological scars left by war; the sense of hatred by one nation toward another; and long-standing territorial disputes over boundaries. It will be a long and tortuous process to put aside old hatreds and to realize reconciliation. If the two sides do not bury old grudges, they will not be able to bring about normalization of their bilateral relations, a prerequisite for establishing CBMs. At the same time, the psychological scars left by Japanese militarism on other Asian countries can not be easily dispelled. Although half a century has passed, no previous Japanese government has engaged in earnest and profound introspection about Japanese guilt in World War II. On the contrary, they gloss over or even deny their guilt with regard to Japan’s past military aggression. As a result, all other Asian countries must remain vigilant against signs of re-emergent aggressive tendencies by Japan, especially a revival of Japanese militarism. Nevertheless, this justifiable vigilance will also affect the progress of CBMs in the future.

Bilateral Security Arrangements and Emerging Multilateral Accords

The possibility of interference in regional affairs by great powers using military means has increased. As a result, a foundation of trust among states remains fragile, which retards progress toward long-term CBMs. It is an historical legacy that the United States maintains troops in Asia and that the US-centered bilateral system still exists. Although the Cold War is over, the United States maintains its military presence in Asia and continues its efforts to strengthen the Cold War bilateral security alliances. This indicates that the American global strategy extends over all of Eurasia — the United States energetically advocates NATO's eastward expansion in Europe and renews its bilateral security relationships in Asia, including the security alliance with Japan. These are two important steps in the U.S. neo-global strategy and also major steps that have profound strategic significance for its main potential adversaries — China and Russia.

In China's view, the United States is pursuing a new policy of military interference, which is actually very dangerous. In the future, the United States would not only be involved militarily in a local war if conflict erupted on the Korean peninsula, but could also interfere with armed forces if a crisis were to erupt in the South China Sea. These actions would definitely lead to direct great power confrontation and leave a turbulent and chaotic East Asian environment. All of the above potentially critical factors lead to the conclusion that there will be two distinct approaches to regional security cooperation existing simultaneously in Asia: one is a multilateral organization for security dialogue based on the ASEAN Regional Forum; the other is the bilateral security system centering on the security alliance of the United States and Japan. These contrasting approaches suggest two very different prospects for resolving regional disputes: eliminating differences through peaceful negotiation or interference by using military forces. Given such a complicated situation, it will be difficult for Asian countries to establish CBMs and to maintain confidence in these CBMs.

CBMs are also impeded by the diversified political structures in the region and the lack of a unitary security organization. Asian countries are much different in social structure, ideology, history, cultural tradition, and in their level of economic and social development. Although there has been no significant regional strife nor dynamic change in the geopolitical environment in Asia since the end of the Cold War, Asia is the only region in the world with both large socialist and capitalist countries. Asia is also a region where the interests of powers and regional blocs intersect. Broadly speaking, Asia, too, is the birthplace of several world-wide religions: Buddhism, Islam, Christianity, Hinduism, and, arguably, Judaism as well. At the same time, most of the highly competitive, newly industrialized countries are located in Asia. The variety of political and economic structures among Asian countries has resulted in a loose confederation of relatively independent states. Even ASEAN members have disputes on some important and controversial issues. For instance, there are disputes between Vietnam and the Philippines, Brunei, Malaysia, and Indonesia over continental shelf delimitation; Vietnam and Thailand over fishing rights; and various ASEAN members have disputes concerning the delimitation of territorial and maritime issues. As a result, no unitary regional security organization has been set up in Asia as of yet. While active, the ARF is a relatively informal

security dialogue, and the fact is that this regional security forum is still in the process of development. Consequently, establishing CBMs in the region will be difficult, especially on a multilateral basis, and novel approaches will be required.

Thus, in order to further develop CBMs in Asia, many complicated and long-term problems will have to be resolved. The key tasks are these: to promote confident relationships; to establish military CBMs, reflecting political, economic, and social differences; and to build first upon CBMs relating to territorial boundaries and borders, followed by maritime CBMs, since security cooperation on disputed maritime borders will be much more difficult to achieve. Bilateral CBMs should be pursued as an important first step by all countries and to serve as the foundation for multilateral agreements. In the future, sub-regional efforts at security cooperation in Southeast Asia, Northeast Asia, and South Asia will serve to promote and to push forward the CBM process in the entire region. If the goal is to develop quite substantial CBMs in Asia, the establishment of a regional security dialogue mechanism is needed as is the realization of comprehensive security goals, including political, economic, military, and social security.

Pursuing CBMs in Asia

The manner in which regional cooperation, security dialogue, and CBMs are developed will affect the level of uncertainty and insecurity in post-Cold War Asia. The successful management of regional crises as well as sustained and stable growth in Asia will also depend on how CBMs are pursued and established. Recommendations follow on how best to establish CBMs in Asia.

Proper Measures to Alleviate Territorial and Maritime Disputes

The most immediate root causes of conflict and crisis in the region are territorial and maritime disputes. As such, these are the key areas in which to carry out security cooperation and to strengthen mutual trust. These problems are so difficult to handle and the situation so complicated that proper care must be taken in addressing them. First, peaceful dialogue should be insisted upon for resolving disputes; frequent use of force or threat of force should be opposed. Differences cannot be avoided altogether due to the existence of territorial and maritime disputes among several countries. However, the critical point is that one state can deal with the other in good faith and seek common ground while reserving differences and eliminating conflict on the basis of equality and mutual benefit. Examples of this are a recent five-power military confidence-building treaty signed by China, Russia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, and Tajikistan, mainly concerning the delimitation of a border line, and an agreement between China and the Philippines over the disputed Meiji Reef.²

²Other provisions in the five-power agreement reportedly include a pledge not to attack forces deployed on the opposite border, an agreement not to carry out military exercises directed against a party to the agreement, a limit on the scale and frequency of military exercises and notification of important military activities within 100

Maintaining the Military Balance and Decreasing Military Confrontation

In order to establish CBMs, balanced military forces and a relatively stable security situation must be maintained, combined with a gradual reduction in the level and intensity of potential military confrontation over disputed areas. If large differences in military strength in the region grow and a military imbalance becomes readily apparent, or if regional security is threatened due to changes in the military situation in disputed areas, then the tensions and the dangers of military conflict in the region will increase significantly. Thus, maintaining the military balance is a necessary safeguard to strengthen mutual trust. To avoid military imbalances, some pragmatic steps can be taken by states in the region including: restrictions on the scale and quantity of military forces in disputed areas; refraining from deployment of advanced weapons, especially weapons of mass destruction; reduced frequency of military exercises; and even gradual cuts in overall military force levels.

Active Dialogue and Negotiation to Enhance Crisis Management

CBMs can be implemented to avoid crises, to smooth the way for dialogue, and to keep crises that do occur from escalating into conflict. Specific measures that can be implemented in the region include military-to-military exchanges on territorial and maritime issues, establishment of hotlines devoted to border relations, more frequent high-level visits, and establishment of standard procedures to be implemented in times of crisis and unforeseen events in the region. These measures have been used in resolving boundary disputes between China and India, China and Russia, and China and Vietnam, as well as in maritime disputes between China and the Philippines, and the results have been fairly good. Although the above measures alone cannot resolve territorial and maritime disputes, they will assist in the avoidance of crises and conflicts resulting from territorial and maritime disputes in the region.

Asian-style CBMs

Asia should not copy indiscriminately the experience of the CSCE in building CBMs in Europe because Asia has its own characteristics. An Asian style of CBMs that meets the needs of the region is needed. Asian-style CBMs would have the following characteristics:

- 1) **Adherence to the Five Principles of Peaceful Co-existence.** One cannot use CBMs as an excuse to encroach upon state sovereignty and to interfere in the internal affairs of other countries. Most Asian countries suffered under colonial rule of other countries and so are particularly sensitive to potential threats to a country's sovereignty and national dignity. In establishing CBMs in Asia, the Five Principles of Peaceful Co-existence are a common foundation that all the Asian countries can accept. CBMs founded on this basis will be quite stable and will serve to increase confidence. By contrast, CBMs characterized by encroachment of other countries' sovereignty and slights to national dignity should be opposed and boycotted. Examples of this approach include: the

kilometers of the boundary, as well as prevention of dangerous military actions, and increasing frequency of visits to the border by military officials of both sides.

establishment of a so-called regional registry for weapons procurement, production, and international arms sales beyond the United Nations framework; demands for public declarations regarding establishment and deployment of army units; and proposals to devote specific naval signals and frequencies to sea search and rescue cooperative efforts.

2) **The principle of negotiation to reach a consensus.** All Asian countries are equal whether they are powerful or weak. In the process of establishing CBMs, a wide-range of issues should be discussed and negotiated in order to reach common understanding. Pressure put on any state to agree to CBMs should be resisted. The ASEAN Regional Forum dialogue has followed the principle of negotiation and consensus-building fairly well; this is why the ARF has accomplished so many achievements in pursuing CBMs. For example, members of the ARF have raised proposals for CBMs in the areas of regional peacekeeping, sea search and rescue, notification of military exercises with official military observers, reciprocal visits of national defense officials, training to prevent piracy and drug trafficking, etc. Proposals such as these, where a common understanding is possible, have gained support. More controversial issues have been shelved or negated. Although there exist many differences among ARF members, if countries continue to abide by the principles of negotiation and consensus, then the favorable atmosphere now present will be maintained and efforts to reach CBMs will progress.

3) **Proceeding at a proper pace at which all countries feel comfortable.** CBMs in Asia can be realized only gradually, not all at once. Given the absence of opposing blocs or power struggles, the pursuit of CBMs in Asia does not seem urgent. Enduring CBMs will not arise from short-term regional crises because of a variety of complicated reasons. For instance, the two sides on the Korean Peninsula continue to confront one another, and India and Pakistan have unrelenting friction over the Kashmir region. If these “hot spots” continue to heat up such that neither side would feel able to promote dialogue or negotiations over these disputes, then CBMs would be impossible to achieve. With regard to sovereignty disputes in the South China Sea, some countries concerned have continued to improve their military presence in the region and to develop economic interests in the area rather than agreeing to “shelve” the issue of sovereignty. These actions will, of course, intensify existing disputes and sharpen differences to the point where CBMs will also not be feasible in such an environment. In addition, although the existing regional security forum continues to be a fairly loose organization to facilitate dialogue, the number of member states is expected to increase in the future. Agreement by consensus is difficult and often slow going, which may not be in keeping with the aspirations of all countries involved in the process. As long as all countries continue to pursue actively CBMs, moving at a pace that feels comfortable to all parties, a foundation of trust in the region will grow.

4) **Coordinate efforts on developing a comprehensive security framework.** Since the end of the Cold War, Asian states have viewed regional security far differently. The old view, which was dominated by military and security considerations, has begun to be

replaced by a more comprehensive view of security that includes political, economic, military, and social aspects of security. CBMs in Asia have already expanded beyond military CBMs to include non-traditional issues of comprehensive security. Economic CBMs — such as agreement on principles of equality and mutual benefit; opposition to the politicization of economic problems or the transformation of political problems into economic disputes; opposition to settling economic disputes by economic sanction or trade wars; and realization of mutual development and benefits — have been put on the Asian agenda. As a result, economic cooperation is increasing day by day in Asia, which will serve as a very important motivation and foundation for improving regional security cooperation. CBMs in the economic field will not only provide the necessary assurance to Asian countries of their own economic stability, but will also help avoid economic and trade wars as well as encouraging the establishment of CBMs in other fields.

The founding of the ARF in 1994 provided a necessary arena for discussion of issues affecting regional security, and the ARF has played an active part in the establishment of CBMs in Asia. However, there exist two problems with the structure of the ARF. First, Northeast Asia, South Asia, and other sub-regional security-related problems will be brought to the ARF at the same time that the number of member states is growing. In the effort to establish multilateral CBMs, Asian countries will come across increasingly complicated problems and will have great difficulty reaching consensus. Second, bilateral relationships between certain countries will be of greater importance than multilateral relationships, given post-Cold War adjustments in, and recent upgrades of, bilateral military agreements. Bilateral interests will also become key factors influencing the ARF and other dialogues on CBMs, which will in turn hinder the building of multilateral CBMs.

Sub-regional fora for Northeast Asia, South Asia, and Central Asia must be devoted to resolving local security issues. The sub-regional CBM experience will also aid region-wide, and ultimately multilateral, CBM efforts in the future, eventually eliminating the need for bilateral security alliances. Bilateral security treaties presently constitute the greatest obstacle to establishing multilateral CBMs and are the main cause of insecurity felt by Asian countries. For example, with the announcement of the US-Japan “Joint Declaration on the Security Alliance for the 21st Century,” Japan has established a new defense policy, enlarged the scale of its defense interests, and adopted a new policy on sending troops overseas and toward its use of defensive weaponry. Asian states are concerned about these changes in Japanese policy, and an enlarged role for Japan’s military is viewed by its neighbors as a worrisome trend. China also feels anxious about the joint threat from the United States and Japan toward China. Nevertheless, it is unrealistic to expect an end to all the bilateral security alliances in the near future. A consensus should be reached that security alliances have negative effects, and that they ultimately should be cast aside. These negative aspects include an adverse reaction by Asian states toward multilateral cooperation if bilateral military ties are upgraded or strengthened under the new post-Cold War environment. Furthermore, the reaffirmation of the US-Japan cooperative treaty has led Asian states to the conclusion that the United States supports a more advanced and strong Japanese military, which will be given more autonomy, and that this will

lead to an acceleration of Japan's development toward becoming an independent military power. The result would be instability in Asia and a hindrance to efforts at reducing tensions on the Korean Peninsula, increasing the danger of conflict. Absent a consensus on the negative effects of security alliances and efforts toward eliminating the need for bilateral alliances, the process of carrying out wide-ranging security cooperation efforts and pursuing multilateral CBMs will be slow, and the prospects for success discouraging.

Promoting Confidence Among Powers to Improve Regional Stability

Since the end of the Cold War, and with the accelerating trend of multipolarity of the world, five power centers have appeared in Asia: China, the United States, Japan, Russia, and ASEAN. The ARF is playing an increasingly important role in Asian security cooperation and although the other four powers are also members of the ARF, these relationships cannot replace the various bilateral relationships and security alliances in the region, all of which will affect the development of CBMs in Asia in different ways. For example, China and Russia have signed military CBMs on boundary issues, which will help to build a relationship of mutual trust into the twenty-first century and contribute to continued stability in the Far East. By contrast, disputes between China and the United States are continuous and troubles are many, affecting not only the level of confidence and the overall bilateral relationship, but also the relationship between China and Japan, as well as that between the United States and Japan. The Asian security situation as a whole will be affected by whether or not China and the United States can really establish a relationship of mutual trust on the basis of the Five Principles of Peaceful Co-existence and the joint declarations of the Three Communiqués.

There is no doubt that China and the United States have wide-ranging common interests as well as many differences. The existing disagreements are different from those between the United States and Russia during the Cold War. There is no conflict of interest contending for hegemony and spheres of influence between China and the United States. Whereas China seeks to increase mutual trust and reduce confrontation in Sino-U.S. relations into the twenty-first century, and the United States has expressed a policy of comprehensive engagement toward China, U.S. actions show that Washington considers China to be a potential opponent. The United States frequently puts pressure on China regarding issues of human rights, trade, arms proliferation, and intellectual property rights and so on, resulting in Chinese resentment and a loss of mutual trust. Thus, the possibility of CBMs between China and the United States will be decided by the future course of the US policy toward China — whether or not the United States changes its present China policy and begins dealing with China as an equal, actively working to resolve remaining differences. If China and the United States can resolve their differences and work together to gradually implement CBMs, then this will provide a good example for advancing wide-ranging CBMs in Asia as a whole. Both China and the United States must share this responsibility, which would be a significant contribution to the coming Pacific Century.

###

Sino-Japanese Relations and Measures to Enhance Mutual Trust

YANG Bojiang

In the new configuration gradually taking shape in the Asia-Pacific region in the wake of the Cold War, the triangular relations among China, the United States, and Japan play a dominant role. As one line of this triangle, the relationship between China and Japan is undoubtedly one of the most important bilateral relationships in Asia and is, at present, in a crucial stage of transformation.

It is very important for China to maintain long-term, stable, friendly, and cooperative relations with Japan. With this in mind, there are at least two points that deserve attention when addressing the so-called “problem” issues between these two countries. First, China and Japan should have frequent and frank dialogue. This is a precondition for any good, neighborly relations and has been advocated by the new generation of Japanese statesmen and academics. Second, the dialogue should be sober and rational, based upon objective facts, conform to logical analysis, and be free from prejudices.

Sino-Japanese relations are complicated and the issues involved are vast. One essay will not be able to cover them all. What this essay attempts to achieve is simply to provide an explanation of China’s security concerns about Japan and to explore ways for both China and Japan to lessen or eliminate these concerns.

Chinese Concerns about Japan

China’s concerns about Japan fall under the following four categories: Japan’s current and potential military strength; an expanding role for Japan’s Self-Defense Forces and the lingering psychological effects on the region due to modern Asian history; revisions to the US-Japanese security alliance; and changes in Japanese society and domestic politics, and their impact on Japanese foreign policy.

Japan’s Military Strength and Potential

In the early 1950s, Japan made use of the Korean War as an opportunity to re-arm itself, resulting in the formal restoration of its armed forces under the name of “Self-Defense Forces” (SDF). Soon thereafter, Japan completely rebuilt its army, air-force, and navy. In the forty years since, Japan has built a modernized force of modest size but extremely high quality. Although it is very hard to find a suitable justification for this self-labeled “self-defense” force, even in Japan’s Constitution, no one questions the fact that it has become a powerful force in the military configuration of the Asia-Pacific region. The development of the Japanese navy deserves special attention.

A High Level of Military Expenditure

In 1976 the Japanese Government made it a principle that its military expenditures would not exceed one percent of its gross national product (GNP). But this ceiling has since been exceeded several times. With the end of the Cold War, the growth rate of Japanese military expenditures has slowed down markedly, and its military expenditures have fallen again below one percent. In the five years from 1992 to 1996, the growth rate of Japanese military expenditures was 3.8 percent, 1.95 percent, 0.9 percent, 0.86 percent, and 2.58 percent, respectively.¹ Nevertheless, close attention should still be paid to this issue for several reasons.

Japanese military expenditures are already at a very high level. The current slow growth rate in military expenditures, in other words, is based upon an already high level of military expenditure. In the 1960s and 1970s, the annual growth rate of Japanese military expenditures reached ten to fifteen percent. During the 1980s, total military expenditures per year grew from ¥2,094.5 billion in 1980 to ¥3,919.8 billion in 1989, an increase of 87.14 percent. In 1987, 1988, and 1989, military expenditures broke the one percent limit, reaching 1.004 percent, 1.013 percent, and 1.006 percent, respectively. By 1996, Japanese military expenditures had reached a total of ¥4,845.5 billion (\$45.1bn).²

The symbolic significance and psychological impact of the one percent limit on Japanese military expenditures is extensive. The one percent limit is often viewed as the yardstick by which to judge whether or not Japan is committed to its pledge of having a defense-only military force, and to discern Japanese national will as well as trends in Japanese foreign policy. In 1987, it was in the political name of a “General Re-examination of Post-War Politics” that Japan first broke the one percent limit.³ At that time, some people in Japan believed that the one percent stipulation was equivalent to “spiritual shackles” and “a symbol of a defeated nation,” impairing construction of Japan’s national defense forces.

The criteria used to calculate Japan’s military expenditures are questionable. Japanese military expenditure figures exclude some items that should be counted as military expenditures and would be included under the standards used by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) countries. If these items were counted, then Japanese military expenditures would reach 1.5 percent of GNP. Unaccounted items include pensions for Japan’s army servicemen, research

¹*Defense White Paper 1996* (Tokyo: Japan Defense Agency, 1996).

²In 1996, the US dollar to Japanese yen was \$1:¥107 (all \$ are in US dollars). The Japanese defense budget for 1997 is ¥4,985bn (\$46.8bn). *The Military Balance: 1996/97* (London: Oxford University Press for the International Institute for Strategic Studies, 1996), 184.

³The “General Re-Examination of Post-War Politics” has been the consistent position of Yasuhiro Nakasone. After becoming the prime minister in 1982, he announced a plan to “apply new perspective without any inhibitions to re-examine the past basic system and structure.” This announcement had widespread impact upon Japan’s diplomatic and military policies, making the Nakasone cabinet (November 1982–November 1987) an important turning point in the history of post-World War II Japan.

and development (R&D) funds for Japanese aviation, space, and other advanced-technology industries, and expenditures for the Japanese Maritime Safety Agency.⁴

The fast appreciation of the Japanese yen has not only served to eliminate the impact that might have occurred due to the decrease in the growth rate of military expenditures, but also has elevated Japan's ability to acquire military equipment from other countries. Taking 1995 as an example, in this year the exchange rate of the Japanese yen against the US dollar rose by about twenty percent.⁵ Thus, even though the increase in Japanese military expenditures in terms of the Japanese yen in 1995 were less than one percent more than in the previous year, in US dollars the increase in military expenditures was about twenty percent higher, having grown from \$46 billion to \$56 billion.⁶

The possibility of Japan further increasing its military spending cannot be excluded. The declining growth rate in Japanese military expenditures in 1992 occurred against two backgrounds: first, the reduction of military expenditures by major Western countries (except France); second, low, or even negative, fiscal growth caused by the collapse of a bubble economy in Japan.⁷ Furthermore, Japanese military expenditures may rise again given Japan's economic recovery in the autumn of 1995, the batch production of a new generation of support fighters (the F-2, formerly called the FS-X), the introduction of a theater missile defense (TMD) system, and given "the pay later" fiscal system.⁸ In fact, the Japan Defense Agency is currently working very hard for an increase of 4.5 percent in military expenditures in 1997.⁹

⁴According to *The Military Balance: 1993/94*, Japan surpassed Germany, France, and Britain in military expenditures in 1993 to become second overall in national military spending. *The Military Balance: 1993/94* (London: Oxford University Press for the International Institute for Strategic Studies, 1993).

⁵In April 1994, the exchange rate of the Japanese yen against the US dollar fluctuated between 1:100/105, but after twelve months it was 1:79/86.

⁶According to *The Military Balance: 1995/96*, released on 10 October 1995, in this year, military expenditures for France and the United Kingdom were \$37 billion (US) and \$34 billion (US), respectively. *The Military Balance: 1995/96* (London: Oxford University Press for the International Institute for Strategic Studies, 1995).

⁷For three consecutive years, from 1992 to 1994, the Japanese economy had almost zero growth. In 1992, 1993, and 1994, the real growth of the GDP in the fiscal budget were 0.3 percent, 0.2 percent, and 0.6 percent, respectively. *Toyokeizai Statistics Monthly*, August 1996.

⁸In brief, the "pay later" system means that the Japanese government does not make full payment when purchasing equipment. Instead, the complete payment is deferred to the following several fiscal years by adopting an "installment" plan. Thus, when Japan makes big-ticket purchases, it is hard to lower the growth in the defense budget in consecutive years. A more detailed discussion of the F-2 and TMD programs is provided later in this essay.

⁹"The Principles of the Defense Agency: 4.5% Increase of the Defense Budget — A Sharp Increase of the Expenditure to Purchase Equipments," *Yomiuri Shimbun*, 17 July 1996, 2.

Modernization and High-Tech Innovation of Weapons

Given the global trend toward international disarmament and pressure from political opposition at home, the Japanese Cabinet approved a new “National Defense Program Outline” in November 1995 in which a dual-track principle of “reduction on the one hand and increasing efficiency on the other” was adopted.¹⁰ The goal set for the Japanese Self-Defense Forces (SDF) was to build “small but well-trained and high-qualified forces.” In the initial military budget drafted by the Japan Defense Agency (JDA) for 1996, expenditures for weapons acquisition increased for the first time in five years. After many years’ efforts, the Japanese Self-Defense Forces have already had, and will continue to seek, the best weapons available in the world.

Japanese Air Self-Defense Forces (ASDF). The main fighters used by the ASDF are F-15s, the comprehensive capability of which is superior to that of the Russian Su-35. In addition, the well-known F-2 program is now under way. In the next twelve years (from 1996 to 2007), 141 F-2 fighters will enter service. The E-2C early warning airplane, introduced from the United States in 1982 for air or sea surveillance and updated several times since then, will remain in service into the next century. In addition, Japan imported Patriot missiles from the United States in 1985 and has begun to import the PAC-2, an improved version of the Patriot missile with the capability to intercept ballistic missiles. At present, only the Russian SV-300 ground-to-air defense system can match the PAC-2.

Maritime Self-Defense Forces (MSDF). Two Aegis “corvette” cruisers have been completed as of March 1995. Each has 7,250 ton displacement, which by world naval standards would classify them as destroyers. In addition, 104 P-3C anti-submarine, early warning airplanes went into service in 1994. Furthermore, the United States has supplied to other countries altogether 548 P-3C airplanes, among which more than 100 went to Japan. Also, the electronic system for Japan’s anti-submarine warfare uses a large database, for which data have been accumulated by the US Navy since World War II. For a country like Japan that claims an “exclusively defense-oriented” strategy, these acquisitions merit attention.¹¹ As a result, Japan has the newest fleet in the world.

According to Japan’s New “National Defense Program Outline,” a naval vessel must retire after sixteen years in service. Such a rapid replacement schedule is rare. The average service age for Japan’s eighteen submarines is seven and a half years, and all of them have a base

¹⁰The “National Defense Program Outline” will henceforth be referred to as the “Outline.” *Defense Handbook 1996* (Tokyo: Choun News Press, 1996), 27-36.

¹¹Kensuke Ebata, *The Future of a Military Power Japan* (Bestseller Press, 30 May 1995), 25. Kensuke Ebata is a military commentator who has, in the past, done research in weapons technology. His views were taken seriously because of his objectiveness and unbiased opinions.

displacement of over 2,200 tons. Consequently, one international analyst predicts that Japan will have the strongest naval force in Asia by the early twenty-first century.¹²

A Growing Capability to Deploy Military Forces Overseas

The impressive Japanese military strength and development potential can be seen more clearly when compared with those of other countries. For instance, both Japan and Great Britain are island states with scarce resources; both of them depend upon sea transportation for survival and prosperity. But Japan has three-times more tanks and twice the number of warships and fighters than does the United Kingdom. Because of the constant reduction in British forces, Japan has in fact gradually surpassed the United Kingdom in terms of military strength. The only difference between the military strength of Japan and that of the United Kingdom is that the latter has nuclear submarines and aircraft carriers while Japan has neither, at least not yet.

Another useful comparison is between Japan and China, in terms of both military budgets and weapons systems. According to the research released by the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) in 1994, China's military expenditure in 1993 was \$44.6 billion, six-times more than the figure released by the Chinese government. Even so, Japanese military expenditures in 1993 were \$100 million more than the SIPRI figure for China's military expenditures for that same year.¹³ Second, China's air force has 4,500 fighters while the Japanese air force has 380. In quantity, China has more than ten times the number of fighters than has Japan. In terms of function and performance, however, only about eighty Chinese fighters are of the same level as the Japanese fighters; the remainder are older models.¹⁴ Furthermore, with regard to long-distance transportation — which is a key indication of a state's actual outward fighting capability and determines whether or not a state will become a threat to other states — Japan has great potential.

Until 1995, the Japanese Maritime Self-Defense Forces had the capability to transport only one light-armored infantry battalion at a time and did not have the troop transportation capability that would "threaten neighboring countries." But on 27 April 1995, the Japan Defense Agency made a decision to import Harrier VTOL fighters, a provision included in the five-year "Mid-Term Defense Build-up Plan (FY1996-FY2000)."¹⁵ Since this type of fighter is supposed

¹²Paul Dibb, *Sankei Shimbun*, 24 April 1995. Paul Dibb is the director of the Strategic Defense Research Center at National Australian University.

¹³SIPRI, *SIPRI Yearbook 1994* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), 443-444. In 1993, military expenditures announced by the Chinese Government were US\$7.3 billion, which was one-seventh that of Japan's military expenditures for that same year. SIPRI, *SIPRI Yearbook 1994* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), 441.

¹⁴Kensuke Ebata, *The Future of a Military Power Japan* (Bestseller Press, 30 May 1995).

¹⁵VTOL stands for vertical take-off and landing. *Defense Handbook 1996* (Tokyo: Choun News Agency, 1996), 116-121.

to accompany light aircraft carriers, the move to import Harrier fighters is seen as a step in the direction toward possessing aircraft carriers in the future.¹⁶

Even before the decision to import Harrier fighters, the Japanese Navy had begun building in 1993 four cargo ships, each with 8,900 ton displacement and escalators. As a result, if Japan equips these four cargo ships with the Harrier fighters, then Japan will have aircraft carriers capable of attacking other fleets and bases. If these four cargo ships (which have a displacement five-times larger than any other current Japanese cargo ship) go into service, the highest cruising speed attainable by the Japanese fleet will be increased to twenty-two knots from the current fourteen knots. What is more, this would also enable Japan to carry out fast, joint-force exercises by making use of landing boats as well as helicopters on the cargo ships. The cargo ships can each carry 1,000 soldiers and 1,400 tons of military equipment at a time and are capable of transporting two light-armored battalions. Though it is called a “cargo ship,” it is in fact an “amphibious assault ship” by world naval standards. Once these ships go into service in 1997, the transportation and combat capability of the Japanese Navy will have increased substantially.

Rapid Development of Military Technology

The fact that Japan has become a military power seems to have caused some concerns in the international community. But on the whole, the international community has failed to pay close attention to this fact. To be more precise, Japan is a military power in reality but not in name. This is because, on the one hand, Japan has a solid economic and technological base and has devoted much effort to basic research on military technologies. On the other hand, the Japanese military has adopted research, science, and technology developed for military use in the civilian sector and has adhered to a development principle of researching more and supplying less, as well as stockpiling key technologies.

There are no military enterprises in Japan; the production of all weapons is entrusted to civilian enterprises. But, in each and every large Japanese enterprise, there are specialized departments devoted to military production. At present, there are more than 2,000 such enterprises in Japan that are capable of receiving orders from the government to produce military products. Consequently, a military research and production system with advanced technology, a comprehensive departmental system, and great potential has now taken shape. According to the prediction made by one Japanese research institute, Japan will control sixty percent of the world ship-building market, forty percent of the world military electronics market, and twenty to thirty percent of the world space market, if allowed to export arms.¹⁷

¹⁶Actually, the Japan Defense Agency has said in the Diet that Japan should be allowed to have defensive aircraft carriers.

¹⁷For more information, see Chen Feng, *The Defense Policies of the World Major Countries After the Cold War* (Beijing: Junshiyiwen Press, August 1995). This unique system permits advanced technology in the civilian sector, which provides a good umbrella for Japan to develop military technology. At the same time, differences

The F-2 fighter, which was first manufactured by Japan in late 1994, embodies the Japanese military technology program. The F-2 fighter has an excellent performance record, much superior to the US-made F-15 and F-16, and its air-control and combat capabilities are very impressive.¹⁸ The F-2 also employs a compound, integrated technology, which means that the airframe and the wings are integrated without any seams. This can reduce the weight of the fighter and enhance its maneuverability.

In the fields of radar, semi-conductors, and basic materials, Japanese military technology is also very impressive. It is said that Japan suffered heavily from its poor radar technology during World War II, and that one of the key factors that accounted for Japan's defeat in the Pacific War was its backward radar technology. But fifty years after World War II, the United States has turned to Japan for radar technology transfers. For example, the visible scope for a general radar is limited, but Japan solved this problem. The new Japanese radar can detect any target within a 360 degree range. In basic materials, Japan is in a leading position as well. The manufacture of advanced weapons requires light, heat-resistant, solid, and long-lasting materials. The new, solid-titanium and tungsten alloy recently developed by Kobe Steel Complex and two other Japanese companies meets these requirements. Another example of Japanese military technology is carbon fiber resin, which is an indispensable material for making airplanes. (The production of Boeing 767 and 777 airplanes consumes several dozen tons of carbon fiber resin.) Three Japanese companies control up to fifty percent of the market share in the world.¹⁹

In fact, it can be said that Japan, to some extent, possesses the core technology of modern warfare. The intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs) of the United States are computer-controlled. But American computers rely on new-generation computer chips from Japan. From fighters to warships, ninety-five percent of the ceramic parts used in electrical systems in American sophisticated weapons are made by Japan. Thus, it is not surprising when some Japanese leading figures say that, "if Japan sells these chips to Russia and not to the US, the military balance between them will be altered."²⁰

between military and civilian technology have become increasingly blurred, which means that Japan can convert civilian facilities to military use whenever necessary.

¹⁸When flying at its highest speed, the radius of gyration for both the F-15 and the F-16 is 5,000 meters, whereas it is 1,600 meters for the F-2. From 24 to 28 August 1995, the *Dong-A Il Bao* of the Republic of Korea published the essay entitled "Japan's Military Might," by Professor Kim Kung-min of Han Yang Dae Hak (Han Yang University). Professor Kim is the first foreign scholar to have conducted research regarding Japanese military might for the Defense Research Institute under the Japan Defense Agency.

¹⁹*Ibid.*

²⁰Shintaro Ishihara and Akio Morita, *Japan Can Say No: New Cards in Japan-US Relations* ("No" to ieru Nihon: shin Nichi-Bei kankei no hosaku) (Tokyo: Kobunsha Press, 1989), 14-15. Shintaro Ishihara was a former member of the Diet and Akio Morita was then the chairman of the Sony Corporation. They said in their book, "The fast development of technology renders the US and the Russia less extraordinary. In the accuracy of missiles they can only rely on the innovating spirit of Japan and feel powerless and frustrated. This age will soon come."

Outward-Looking Japanese Military and Security Policy

Great changes have taken place in the international strategic situation following the end of the Cold War. The contest for comprehensive national strength is now under way, and economic growth has become the first priority for a majority of countries in their strategic thinking. In contrast, military factors, relatively speaking, are not as important as they once were. But this trend does not apply to Japan in its strategy to become a political power. Following the end of the Cold War, Japan adjusted its military strategy. It expanded the scope of its military activities and augmented the tasks given to the Japanese Self-Defense Forces. Japan's strategic goals changed from the inward-looking "prevention of an invasion" to the outward-looking goal of the "contribution to creation of a more stable security environment."²¹

In October 1976, Japan put forward its first, post-war independent military strategy — "the exclusively defense-oriented" strategy. According to the Japan Defense Agency, the main points of this strategy are: (1) to build minimal defensive forces, while developing the economy and augmenting national economic strength; (2) to emphasize the development of conventional weapons but refrain from possessing strategic offensive weapons, which may become a threat to other countries; (3) to refrain from launching pre-emptive attacks against other countries and resort to limited self-defense when under military attack; (4) to safeguard only Japanese territorial air, waters, and adjoining sea areas as its defensive perimeter; (5) to abstain from attacking others' bases and conducting strategic surveillance and counter-attack deep into others' territory; and (6) to resort to its own forces when under small-scale invasion and relying upon support from US armed forces when under invasion of medium or above-medium scale.²²

If a comparison of Japanese military strategy is made between then (1976) and now, it is apparent that the strategy Japan used to adhere to has changed completely. Although Japan still adheres to defensive thinking, Japan has consistently strengthened the offensive and active nature of its defensive strategy. In fact, "the exclusively defense-oriented" strategy has become an "offensive defense" strategy, which is apparent in the following changes made to Japanese strategic doctrine.²³

²¹Japan Defense Agency, "A New Era in Defense," 27 November 1995 (press release).

²²For more information, see Pan Zhenqiang and Xia Liping, eds., *International Military Megatrends* (Beijing: Defense University Press, 1994), 256.

²³This transformation began in 1979. In this year the Ohira cabinet put forward the "Comprehensive Security Strategy," which stood for the use of a combination of economic, political, diplomatic, and military means to deter and eliminate military or non-military threats and invasions. "The core of this strategy is to strengthen and build up defensive forces." In November 1982, when Nakasone formed his cabinet, he made an even bigger step on the road to developing military forces, and making the Japanese military strategy more extensive and concrete than before by adding many new aspects to it. Especially in the latter half of the 1980s, when the confrontation between the former Soviet Union and the United States moved toward relaxation, Japan still kept a 5.2 percent–6.58 percent high increase in expenditure, improved its weapons systems, and strengthened its military muscle against the main trend of arms reduction by many of the major countries in the world. As a result, the "exclusively defense-oriented" strategy began to change substantively. See *International Military Megatrends*, 258.

- Japan has begun to emphasize the deterrence function of military forces. The clause, “to resort to armed forces after being invaded by the adversary” has been replaced by “to deter any attempt of the adversary to invade.”²⁴
- In defining the area to be defended, “sea areas of 300 nautical miles on the side of the Pacific Ocean and 200 nautical miles west of Kyushu” was expanded to “the sea areas of several hundred nautical miles around Japan and the areas of 1,000 nautical miles along the sea route.”²⁵ Consequently, the Japanese navy then began to enter the high seas.
- In terms of operational principles, Japan was prepared to “defeat the enemy on the high seas” rather than “in Japan’s own territory.”

In addition, Japan has made it clear that, in case of war, Japan will blockade the “three straits” — the Soya Strait, the Tsugaru Strait, and the Tsushima Strait — in collaboration with the United States and will share the defense burden of the United States in the Western Pacific.²⁶ If US forces are engaged in fighting around Japan, Japan will inevitably get involved, even if Japan itself is not under invasion. Thus, Japan will resort to force not *only* after being invaded, as emphasized in the “exclusively defense-oriented” strategy.

New Security Assessments

Japan, unlike other countries, has a rather pessimistic view of the international situation since the end of the Cold War. Japan’s views can be summarized from official documents and speeches as follows:

*On the whole, “unpredictability and uncertainty persist in the international community.”*²⁷ Accordingly, inherent regional contradictions will tend to surface and become acute, as will the danger of the occurrence and escalation of regional conflicts.²⁸ The Japan Defense Agency made it clear in the draft of the new “National Defense Program Outline” written in December 1994 that “there are various destabilizing factors in the international

²⁴For the first time, Japan’s *Defense White Paper 1987* claimed that merely relying upon political, economic, diplomatic, and cultural efforts may not be sufficient to prevent invasion from occurring, nor to eliminate the possibility of invasion from happening. The buildup of military forces, it said, is the key means to deterring invasion and maintaining national survival and independence as well as peace and stability. The primary objective of a military force buildup should not merely be actual use of this force. More emphasis should be put on the role played by this force before its actual use. *Defense White Paper 1987* (Tokyo: Defense Agency, 1987).

²⁵*Defense White Paper 1983* (Tokyo: Defense Agency, 1983).

²⁶*The Defense Policies of the World Major Countries After the Cold War*, 267.

²⁷This language taken from the “National Defense Program Outline,” 1995.

²⁸*Defense White Paper 1995* (Tokyo: Defense Agency, 1995).

situation, and there is no way to predict whether a structure to safeguard the stability of international society can be established or not.”²⁹

In the Asia-Pacific region, “there are different concepts of security in different countries and many destabilizing factors.” Furthermore, “many issues remain outstanding.” There are no conditions in Asia such that changes as vast as those that occurred in Europe in 1989 or so will occur.³⁰ In several of the *Defense White Papers* released by Japan in recent years, much coverage is given to China and to the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea (DPRK) as potential sources of conflict.

Potential threats in the region may come from North Korea, Russia, and China. According to Japanese government statements, the DPRK is the number-one threat — for aggravating the intense military situation on the Korean Peninsula and as a serious, potentially destabilizing factor in Northeast Asia security. Similarly, Russia’s armed forces deployed in the Far East constitute another destabilizing factor in regional security, but they are not as threatening as they have been in the past.³¹ Concerns about China increasingly loom, as well.

Thus, Japan’s defense posture has changed from one of “emphasizing the North” (a strategy in which the Japanese Self-Defense Forces were required to pay close attention to the Russian armed forces in the Far East) to one focussed on strengthening the defensive posture toward the West and to the South and to deploy its troops in a “balanced way.” Japan’s defense focus has also changed in a gradual way. The Japan Defense Agency had decided by the fall of 1995 to change the “emphasizing the North” policy to that of “one step to re-adjust defensive forces after the Cold War.” The concrete aspects of this adjustment are: to re-deploy F-15s in Okinawa; to improve the mechanization, maneuvering, and combat capabilities of the Japanese Ground Self-Defense Forces (GSDF) in Kyushu; and to maintain the current scale of the P-3C anti-submarine early warning airplanes under the Fifth Air Self-Defense Battalion, while reducing the numbers of P-3C airplanes nation-wide.³²

²⁹“The Draft of the Defense Agency’s New Defense Outline” (Tokyo: Kyodo Press, 31 December 1994).

³⁰*Ibid.*

³¹The *Defense White Paper 1996* (just released) further confirms the negative tone in Japan’s assessment of the threat posed by the Russian army deployed in the Far East. *Defense White Paper 1996* (Tokyo: Japan Defense Agency, 1996).

³²“The Self-Defense Force Strengthens Its Alertness in Its the Western Side,” *Nihon Keizai Shimbun*, 20 September 1995, 2.

International Military Operations

Japan recently adjusted its diplomacy to: (1) intensify “diplomatic activities” at the United Nations (UN), especially in the field of international security; and (2) take an active part in the settlement of regional issues and advance Japan’s national development strategy by employing military forces.

In China’s view, Japan seeks the status of a political power by sending forces overseas. The Gulf War in 1991 is important for post-Cold-War Japan in part because it gave Japan the impulse to “contribute more to the international society in terms of personnel.”³³ In June 1992, the Japanese Diet passed the “UN Peace Keeping Operation Cooperation Act,” which symbolized a fundamental change in Japan’s international strategy. When meeting with the press after this act was passed, former Japanese Prime Minister Nakasone said that, “It was a major event of epoch-making significance in light of the international role that Japan plays. To some extent, Japan will take part in the world operation and shed the previous self-constraint.”³⁴

The Japanese Self-Defense Forces have taken part in peacekeeping operations in some remote countries on many occasions since April 1991.³⁵ These areas have, in fact, been included in “the active security scope” of Japan. The new “National Defense Program Outline” stipulates that the Japanese Self-Defense Forces will make contributions (including participation in peacekeeping operations) to the establishment of a more stable international environment, in addition to preventing invasion and handling of large-scale natural disasters. Japan is thus determined to “make international contributions” in the military sector. Japan’s participation in peacekeeping operations is now becoming systematic and routine. Consequently, the radius for active military involvement extends further to Africa, 13,000 km away from Japan and outstripping many times the 1,000 nautical miles sea-transportation line.

Japan and the Nuclear Option

For Japan, to develop nuclear weapons is an issue of political will rather than technical capability. This essay, therefore, will address the nuclear issue primarily from the perspective of policy rather than technology.

During the Second War World, Japan carried out secret research on nuclear weapons. Since the end of the war, there have been occasional rumors regarding Japanese efforts to make nuclear weapons in secret. With the rapid escalation of Japan to the rank of a political power and the post-Cold War changes in Northeast Asia, Japan’s nuclear potential looms again.

³³*International Military Megatrends*, 269.

³⁴*Ibid.*

³⁵The overseas activities of the Japanese Self-Defense Forces include: Angola, 1992; Cambodia, September 1992–October 1993; Mozambique, May 1993–February 1995; El Salvador, 1994; Rwanda, September–December, 1994; and the Golan Heights, February–August, 1996. *Defense Handbook 1996* (Tokyo: Choun News Press, 1996), 509-569.

Japan is a para-nuclear country of potentially great strength. Japan faces no technical or material barriers to making nuclear weapons. This view is widely accepted internationally, and one Russian specialist, in fact, believes that Japan can produce nuclear weapons within a one-year period.³⁶

Japan has a large stock of plutonium. At present, Japan imports plutonium (reprocessed from Japanese nuclear waste material) from France and the United Kingdom. Current plans are to import thirty tons of nuclear waste by 2010. At the same time, Japan has made a huge investment in Aomori (a small prefecture located in northern Japan) where the largest nuclear reprocessing facility in the world will be built that will be able to automatically extract fifty tons of plutonium by the year 2010. However, because the target date of operation for the fast-breeder reactor has been postponed, the demand for plutonium may decrease in the meantime. If so, then by the year 2010, Japan will be left with sixty tons of plutonium. As a result, Japan will in theory be able to manufacture 7,500 nuclear bombs equivalent in weight to that dropped on Nagasaki.³⁷

Japan has advanced delivery means. Japan has a sound technological and industrial base for missile and rocket development. In recent years, rapid progress has also been made in space exploration. Japan successfully launched the H-2, a large carrier rocket, on 2 February 1994. The H-2 carrier rocket was 100 percent the product of Japanese technology. It can use an inertial guidance system to send a satellite weighing two tons into orbit 36,000 km away from the earth. The H-2's technical performance is by no means inferior to the intercontinental ballistic missiles deployed by the United States and Russia for military purposes. *The Washington Post* newspaper commented after the initial launch that Japan could easily produce intercontinental ballistic missiles with the level of technology they had achieved and also that Japan possessed the technological capability to develop nuclear weapons.³⁸

The narrowness of Japanese territory, which makes it impossible to carry out nuclear tests at home, cannot constitute the "sole technical barrier" in the development of nuclear weapons. Specialists have pointed out that Japan has advanced science and technology, especially computer science technology. Thus, "even without actual nuclear tests the whole explosion process could be modulated in a three-dimensional space by using a high-speed

³⁶Vladimir Belovs is a Russian specialist on national defense and security. He was in the Strategic Rocket Forces of the former Soviet Union before the former Soviet Union collapsed. His current position is that of an advisor to the Russian Duma.

³⁷The Japanese *World Affairs Weekly*, published on 9 August 1994 carried an article entitled, "Japan is Suspected of Becoming Nuclear Armed," by a commentator of the *Korean Daily* of the Republic of Korea.

³⁸Chun-tu Hsueh and Lu Zhongwei, eds., *China and Her Neighbors: Prospects for the 21st Century* (Beijing: Current Affairs Press, 1995), 295.

supercomputer.”³⁹ Second, Japan’s ambiguous “attitudes towards nuclear weapons” are even more worrisome. One report in the *Sekai Nippo* in 1994 claimed that “the idea to nuclear-arm Japan” has been fixed in the United States “as a general impression.”⁴⁰ That is, Americans assume Japan is a nuclear weapons-capable state.

Passive attitudes towards the extension of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). At the G-7 summit held in July 1993, all participants except Japan agreed to the unconditional and indefinite extension of the NPT. Japan gave the following justifications for its opposition to the unconditional and indefinite extension: Given that “events that threaten Japan’s national security” may occur in the Asia-Pacific region, “to extend the NPT unconditionally and indefinitely will limit Japan’s options.”⁴¹

Indications that Japan has not given up completely the right to develop nuclear weapons. At the ASEAN conference held in the spring of 1993, Japanese Foreign Minister Muto emphasized that if the United States were to withdraw “the nuclear umbrella . . . it is very important for Japan to have the confidence to produce nuclear weapons.” Japanese Prime Minister Hata told the Diet on 17 June 1994 (before he stepped down) that Japan “had the capability to produce nuclear weapons,” but that Japan “did not produce them.” His speech attracted wide-spread attention in the international media.⁴²

The “Three Non-Nuclear Principles” are not immutable. In 1967, the Sato cabinet established the “Three Non-Nuclear Principles,” that is “not to possess, manufacture, and introduce nuclear weapons.” But Japan has accepted the US policy that does “not confirm nor deny” the deployment and transmittal of nuclear weapons and acquiesces to US nuclear submarines at anchor in Japanese harbors. Even during the period that Sato was in power, secret discussions about developing nuclear weapons were held. The then-confidential documents of the Japanese Foreign Ministry claimed that “Japan had the capability to produce nuclear weapons and would not accept interference from other countries.”⁴³ Furthermore, “The Presentation on the Use of Nuclear Weapons,” which the Japanese Foreign Ministry submitted to the International Court of Justice on 6 June 1996 states that the “consistent position” of the Japanese

³⁹Vladimir Belovs, “A Feeling About Japan Becoming a Nuclear-Armed State,” *Yomiuri Monthly*, March 1995.

⁴⁰Michio Kondo, “The View ‘To Be Vigilant About a Nuclear-Armed Japan’ On The Rise In The United States,” *Sekai Nippo*, 15 January 1994, 9.

⁴¹Song Young-sun, “The Current Situation and the Prospect of a Nuclear-Armed Japan,” *Journal of International Affairs* (Republic of Korea) (March 1996). Subsequently, Japan supported the indefinite extension of the NPT.

⁴²“Japan Acknowledges the Capability to Develop Nuclear Weapons, But the Prime Minister Says That Japan Cannot Manufacture Nuclear Weapons Because it Signed the NPT,” *Kyodo Press*, 17 June 1994.

⁴³Chu Shulong and Yang Bojiang, “American Nuclear Protection and Japan’s Nuclear Suspicion,” *Renmin Ribao* (*People’s Daily*), 20 June 1996, 6.

government is that “the use of nuclear weapons is not considered as a violation international law.”

Strengthened Alliance and US-Japan Relations

The “East Asia Strategy Report” issued by the United States in February 1995⁴⁴, the new “National Defense Program Outline,” approved by Japan in November 1995⁴⁵, and the Joint Security Declaration,⁴⁶ signed by the United States and Japan in April 1996 re-defined the US-Japan security alliance. The Joint Security Declaration affirms that the US-Japan security alliance (based on the “Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security between the United States and Japan”) will continue to be the foundation to maintain stability and prosperity in the twenty-first century in the Asia-Pacific region. According to the Declaration, “The two countries will carry out consultation and cooperation when events that occur in the area around Japan have an important impact on Japan’s peace and security.”⁴⁷ In China, the re-definition of the US-Japan security alliance is a matter of concern as it could turn the alliance from a “defensive shield,” containing the former Soviet Union and safeguarding Japan’s security, into an “offensive lance,” checking the uncertain and destabilizing factors in the region and dominating Asia-Pacific security.

In China’s view, the orientation of the US-Japan alliance has changed significantly, from the former Soviet Union to China and the DPRK. Public commentary in the United States, Japan, and elsewhere has noted that the Joint Declaration “connotes the qualitative change of the US-Japan security system which has maintained for the previous thirty-six years” and has “laid the foundation for the joint containment of China by the United States and Japan.” The renewed US-Japan alliance appears “tacitly aimed”⁴⁸ at China and “is an attempt to maintain balance with a growing China.”⁴⁹

Another qualitative change in the alliance relationship, in China’s view, is the expansion of Japanese operations in the Asia-Pacific region and elsewhere, including the Persian Gulf in the name of peacekeeping operations.

⁴⁴“The US Defense Department Published ‘The East Asia Strategy Report’ Explaining the Reasons Why the American National Interest Still Requires US Presence In Asia,” *Xinhua News Agency*, 27 February 1995.

⁴⁵*Defense Handbook 1996*, 27-37.

⁴⁶“The Full Text of the Joint Security Declaration,” *Gag Press*, 17 April 1996; *United States Security Strategy for the East Asia-Pacific Region (East Asia Strategy Report)* (Washington, DC: US Department of Defense, Office of International Security Affairs, February 1995).

⁴⁷News Bulletin of 17 April 1996, *Jiji Press*.

⁴⁸Charles Krauthammer, “Partners in the Pacific,” *The Washington Post*, 26 April 1996, A25.

⁴⁹Hiroaki Hayashida, “The US-Japan Security Alliance Stresses the Maintenance of Balance between China and Asia,” *Yomiuri Shimbun*, 18 April 1996.

A third qualitative change is the expansion of Japanese military cooperation with the United States from merely supplying bases to more substantial participation. According to the “Acquisition and Cross-Servicing Agreement” (ACSA), the United States and Japan should each provide military goods and services during regular joint exercises and peacekeeping operations.

The strengthened strategic alliance between the United States and Japan is the result of a decision made by the two countries in response to the profound changes that have occurred in the international strategic environment since the end of the Cold War and for the pursuit of common interests and goals. Only the United States has the strength of “the sole superpower” and, allied with Japan on the basis of common values, can support Japan to realize its dream of becoming a global political power. It would be hard for the US-Japan alliance to break up completely, because the Japanese Self-Defense Forces are highly dependant upon the US military presence. Furthermore, the collapse of the US-Japan alliance would force Japan to “run the risk of resisting the United States” in a strategic sense.⁵⁰

If Japan were to abandon the US-Japan alliance and had no other allies, Japan would be left with two options. The first would be to re-arm and realize an independent defense force. But this option would not only meet constraints set by Japanese domestic legislation and general opposition by peaceful political forces at home, but also would aggravate the worries of Japan’s neighbors. In addition, the United States would not allow Japan to do so. Japan’s second option would be to follow a strategy of “neutrality without arms,” but this option runs counter to Japanese intentions to play a bigger role internationally. Thus, the maintenance and strengthening of the US-Japan alliance will ensure that, at present, Japan’s gains are greater than its losses. Japan can continue to take advantage of the US-Japan alliance to alleviate the worries of its neighbors and to check China.

From China’s perspective, the strengthening of the US-Japan alliance will also have a big impact on the future of Japan’s national security strategy. The Joint Declaration and the ACSA are indications of growing Japanese influence on its allies, the attainment of status almost identical with that of NATO members, and increased opportunities for Japan to play a military role outside its borders.⁵¹

Some figures in the Liberal Democratic Party (LDP) have claimed that the collective rights of defense should be re-studied in order to strengthen US-Japan defensive cooperation. Despite reiterations by Prime Minister Ryutaro Hashimoto that Japan has no intention of changing its

⁵⁰Kazihiko Nakagawa, “How Will the US-Japan Security Alliance Change?,” *Toyo Keizai Shukan*, 17 April 1996, 106-111. It can be believed that the views expressed in this article represent the mainstream views on this issue in Japan.

⁵¹See *Contemporary International Relations*, no. 6 (1996), published by the China Institute of Contemporary International Relations.

consistent position, further revisions to the “Guidelines for Japan-US Defense Cooperation” could circumvent the constraints of the Constitution.

In China’s view, the strengthening of the US-Japan alliance shows that decision-makers in both countries have not rid themselves of the “Cold-War mentality.” In the post-Cold War era, maintaining regional security with bilateral alliances has become out-of-date. The effective prevention and proper settlement of regional conflicts depends on the joint participation of all interested countries. In addition, because regional security has become multilateral and more complex, the security arrangement that emerges should include consideration of all factors and not be confined to the military sector alone. Japan, for example, is the second largest economy in the world and has special ties with Asian countries. Japan’s interests and those of its neighbors are, therefore, probably best served by continued financial contributions from Japan to its neighbors.

Second, the strengthened alliance may cause a “Cold War effect” in Asia — the dividing-up of countries in the region into several blocs, causing more turbulence and tension in bilateral relations as well as more imbalance in the already shaky triangle of US-Japanese-Chinese relations. In the Asia-Pacific region, the triangular strategic relations between the United States, China, and Russia formed during the Cold War will be replaced by a pattern of China and Russia versus the United States and Japan. Although this does not indicate any immediate risk, the effects may be felt in any crisis. And the risk is by no means insignificant.

Third, the development of relations between Japan and its neighbors could also be adversely affected by the strengthened alliance. Small and medium-sized countries have, in general, viewed the strengthening of the US-Japan strategic alliance as designed to allow more intervention in regional conflicts or in the domestic affairs of other countries, despite the conditional welcome by these countries of the US military presence in Asia.

Japan appears to be trying to move from its “exclusively defense-oriented” strategy to a “joint offensive” strategy. But who can guarantee that Japan will not demand to be released from the constraints of the US-Japan security pact in the future?⁵² According to an editorial in one European paper, “all of the East Asian countries worry that Clinton, for election purposes, will invite the Japanese wolf into a flock of sheep while there is no guarantee to curb it forever.”⁵³ The strengthened US-Japan alliance could intensify the contradictions between China and Japan. As an editorial in a Singapore paper noted, “Asian countries are developing well and moving to convergence. If Japan at this time foments a split within this region, other Asian countries will have more distrust of Japan than the historical issues have caused.”⁵⁴ Although it is the common

⁵²Editorial, *Lianhe Zaobao* (Singapore), 12 April 1996.

⁵³*Le Monde*, 25 April 1996.

⁵⁴See editorial, “The US-Japan Security Pact Undergoes Qualitative Changes,” *Lianhe Zaobao* (Singapore), 12 April 1996, 20.

aspiration of many Asian countries to give a push to multilateral security dialogue — such as the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF) — and to the “Asianization of Asian affairs,” a resurgent Japan may reduce the impact and significance of the ARF. ASEAN countries “prefer the collective security arrangement in which China will participate to [counter] the US and Japan.” The strengthening of the US-Japan alliance, therefore, to some “looks like a trap that may re-ignite a regional Cold War and turn Southeast Asia once again into a Cold War battlefield.”⁵⁵

Perceived Threats to China’s Security Interests

The assertion in the Joint Security Declaration that “it is extremely important . . . that China play a positive and constructive role” in maintaining peace and stability in the Asia-Pacific region and that cooperation with China will be enhanced, as well as the repeated clarification that the Joint Declaration is not directed against China, may only serve to illustrate that the American and Japanese policies on China are not simple containment policies.⁵⁶ Rather, they are “check and engagement” policies aimed at engaging China in an “Asia-Pacific Security Arrangement,” which is based on military strength and the US-Japan alliance, and dominated by the United States so as to curb China’s rise and “regulate its behavior.”⁵⁷ Special attention, therefore, must be paid as to whether the United States tightens the links between its several bilateral strategic alliances in the region with the core alliance with Japan.

One of the purposes of Japan’s strengthened security alliance with the United States is to take advantage of this alliance to constrain China. The joint offensive posture, in particular, would allow Japan and the United States to limit China’s options regarding the settlement of the Taiwan issue in several ways:

In the assessment of the regional security situation. Since 1992, China has been regarded as one of the main defensive concerns in Japan’s annual *Defense White Paper*. The “National Defensive Program Outline” released in 1995 further emphasized the threat from China without mentioning China by name. The report stated that there were mighty military forces including nuclear weapons around Japan and that some countries were committed to military buildup and modernization against the background of a developing economy.⁵⁸ The “China threat” was further highlighted in Japan’s *Defense White Paper 1996*, following China’s nuclear tests and military exercises in 1996.

⁵⁵*Le Monde*, 25 April 1996.

⁵⁶“Joint Declaration on Security Alliance for the 21st Century,” signed 17 April 1996.

⁵⁷With regard to the China policies of the United States and Japan, Chinese academics have different views. The quotations are the author’s own.

⁵⁸“National Defense Program Outline in and after FY1996,” Part II.3: International Situation (Tentative Unofficial Translation), which reads as follows: “In the surrounding regions of Japan, . . . there still remain large-scale military capabilities including nuclear arsenals and many countries in the region are expanding or modernizing their military capabilities mainly against the background of their economic development.

In the deployment of military forces. The target of a stronger US-Japan alliance seems clear. In terms of military equipment and combat capabilities, the allied forces of the United States and the Republic of Korea (ROK) are obviously superior to those of the DPRK. The question then is how to prevent the DPRK from taking risks. In comparison, deterring the “China threat” may be of more strategic significance and may require more time and consideration. The US military bases in Japan at Kyushu and Okinawa are not far away from Taiwan and are ideal for intelligence gathering and for establishing a military blockade.⁵⁹

In legal terms. The Japanese government has made it clear on several occasions that it will not enlarge the “Far East area” in the US-Japan Security Pact. According to the interpretation made by the Japanese government in 1960, however, the “Far East area” includes the area north of the Philippines, the islands of Japan, and the areas around Japan, including the ROK and Taiwan. This interpretation has not been changed in the last thirty-six years. In other words, if tensions were to occur in the “Far East area” as defined above and led the United States to take military action, then Japan would have “legal basis” to offer assistance, which could well take the form of military assistance under a broad interpretation of the ACSA, as described above.

In diplomatic terms. There has been a change in Japan’s official “ambiguous attitudes” of the past towards Taiwan. On 10 April 1996, the head of the Asia Bureau of the Japanese Foreign Ministry said in the Diet that Japan “understands and respects” but does not recognize China’s proposition that “Taiwan is part of China.” In addition, he also emphasized that the assertion that the “Taiwan Strait issue is China’s domestic concern” is China’s position, not Japan’s.⁶⁰

The Uncertain Political Situation in Japan

Two American specialists have recently carried out a special study concerning Japan’s policy toward China. In this study, changes to Japan’s political system have, in turn, led to a “change in the underlying structure of Japan’s China policy” since the end of the Cold War. Leadership changes in Japan have had several consequences for Japan’s policy toward China, including: a loss of “some of Beijing’s strongest allies from the ranks of the conservatives in Tokyo” as well as “allies on the left in Japan.” Also, “political realignment has removed the structural bias against an open debate on China policy in Japan.”⁶¹ This analysis, though it may not be comprehensive nor delve deep enough, is a good place to start.

⁵⁹These views are taken from a public opinion survey in Japan. Kazihiko Nakagawa, “How Will the US-Japan Security Alliance Change?,” *Toyo Keizai Shukan*, 17 April 1996, 106-111.

⁶⁰Chen Kai-ju, “The Emperor Is Angry,” *Asiaweek*, 5 May 1996, 30-31.

⁶¹Michael J. Green and Benjamin L. Self, “Japan’s Changing China Policy: From Commercial Liberalism to Reluctant Realism,” *Survival*, vol 38, no. 2 (Summer 1996): 35-58. According to this study, the “four pillars” of Japan’s policies toward China involve the areas of security, domestic politics, historical legacy, and economics. With the end of the Cold War, fundamental changes in all four areas have led to a reassessment of Japan’s China policy.

The most striking characteristic to appear in the course of the dramatic, lasting split and reorganization of the Japanese political system over the last three years is a trend toward more conservative political and social policy. Before the collapse of its bubble economy in 1991, Japan accounted for fifteen percent of world GNP. Japan's GNP is currently about sixty percent that of the United States, or eighty percent of the United States if based on the exchange rate in the first half of 1995. As such, the mighty Japanese economy can be felt anywhere in the international arena, and Japanese officials can be seen more and more often in world hot spots. Japan's heightened subjective sense of itself, plus the unsatisfactory objective reality of Japan — domestic political disorder, economic decline, natural disasters, and distrust and resistance from neighboring countries — produce a complacent and depressed society, a result of Japan's failure to understand itself and to be understood. These social phenomena merit further attention.

The new mood in Japan is readily apparent. For instance, during the fiftieth anniversary of the end of World War II, the military anthem, "Marching Towards Xuzhou"⁶² (which was sung to encourage Japanese soldiers during that war) was again very popular in Japan. Novels, such as *The Joint Fleet*, describing the conquest of the world by the Japanese Empire, have become best-sellers.⁶³ So are other books, such as *The Plan to Change Japan*, published by Ichilo Ozawa in 1993, that advocate Japan becoming a world political power. Opinion surveys also reflect changes in the Japanese social mood. Those who approve of modifying the Constitution have grown by eleven percent in the past five years; seventy-two percent surveyed support Japan becoming an Asian leader; and 52.8 percent support Japan's bid to join the UN Security Council as a permanent member.

After three years of political turbulence, the sentiments of Japanese voters have changed from general dissatisfaction with the money politics of the LDP to aspirations for a more stable political situation and for a strongman to solve Japan's domestic and diplomatic problems while also raising Japan's international standing. Furthermore, the results of two important elections in Japan in 1995 reflect the aspirations of the Japanese people for "heroes." In September, Japanese Prime Minister Ryutaro Hashimoto, who had won applause by saying "no" to his American counterparts in the automobile trade negotiations, easily replaced the representative for the "doves," Yohei Komo, to become head of the LDP. In the December 1995 elections, the iron-handed man, Ozawa, defeated the moderate Hata by a large margin to become head of the New Frontier Party (NFP).

Implications of Growing Conservatism in Japan

Over the middle- to long-term, the main trend in Japanese politics will be a sharing and rotation of power by the two main conservative parties. The intention of the secretary-general of the LDP, Ichiro Ozawa, to split the LDP in June 1993 was to set up a two-party system in Japan.

⁶²A city in Jiangsu Province, China.

⁶³These novels are called "mimic warfare" novels in Japan.

For all practical purposes, this goal has been achieved. Given the changes in the Japanese Social Democratic Party's basic policies toward more conservative positions, the forces for reform have been removed from the Japanese political arena. The traditionally conservative forces at the core of the LDP and the new conservative forces at the core of the New Frontier Party have gained dominance.⁶⁴ Together they control about four-fifths of the seats in the Diet, with Hashimoto as the head of the LDP and Ozawa as head of the NFP. Despite what party and which leader wins the next general election, the conservative forces will be consolidated.

What merits greater attention is that the next general election will remove many senior parliamentarians from the Diet. Consequently, many new parliamentarians will appear. The reality in Japan is that traditional politicians such as Kiichi Miyazawa and Yohei Komo — who disapprove of revising the constitution, oppose Japan's joining the UN Security Council, and favor a low diplomatic profile — will lose more ground, and the new conservative forces supporting Japan's becoming a political power and adopting a harder diplomatic posture will gain ground. The fight for seats in the Japanese Diet, therefore, will be between the young parliamentarians of the two conservative parties.

The confrontation between Hashimoto and Ozawa has attracted the attention of the Japanese press. But this confrontation is between two people “who share the same views on big issues while differing on small ones.” In other words, their political positions are essentially the same.⁶⁵ Basically, both stand for the revision of the constitution to permit an expanded role and mission for Japanese military forces; both avoid making clear comments on the military past of Japan; and both wish to make Japan an “ordinary state.”⁶⁶ When both were young, Hashimoto and Ozawa each inherited their fathers' political careers and stepped into politics. They both belonged to the Tanaka faction (later to be called the Takeshita faction) of the LDP, which has

⁶⁴The New Frontier Party was established in 1994 following the election of Socialist Party leader, Tomiichi Murayama.

⁶⁵However, they do have differences are on some concrete measures. For example, both support Japan's participation in peacekeeping operations. But Ozawa stands for the downsizing of the Self-Defense Forces and setting up another UN police force under UN command. Hashimoto has a more cautious attitude on the dispatching of the Self-Defense Forces, although he approves of revising the constitution to expand the role of the SDF. He said in the book entitled, *On Re-Taking Power* (written in the summer of 1993 and after the LDP lost power), that “if the Constitution does not allow [Japan], including the Self-Defense Forces, to make contributions to the world in humanitarian ways, then the Constitution should be revised.” Hashimoto also stands for revising the Constitution so that Japan can become “a normal state.” He wishes to establish a “powerful Japan” and emphasizes that Japan should join the UN Security Council and resume a self-confident role in international society.

⁶⁶“State normalization” is a post-Cold War political phrase often mentioned by the new generation of Japanese politicians. They may have different interpretations among themselves, but the “normalization” of Japan's foreign policies appears to refer to enhancing Japan's diplomatic profile in relation to the United States, to establish “normal relations” with China, and to seek political status, including military status, comparable with Japan's status as the second largest economy in the world.

historically enjoyed good relations and communications with Beijing.⁶⁷ Both have mainstream conservative ideas and similar histories and political backgrounds. Now both Hashimoto and Ozawa are representatives for the young, conservative politicians.

The core of a “conservative” foreign policy is to become a member of the UN Security Council at the earliest possible date; to play a more important role in international society; to acquire a military force comparable in status to Japan’s world economic power; to give up “the exclusively defense-oriented” principle; and to establish a “collective security arrangement,” and dispatch Japanese Self-Defense Forces overseas. Lastly, conservative policy-makers would like to break the constraints set by the Constitution in order to build a powerful, national spirit for the Yamato nation and to get rid of the “sequelae of a defeated nation.”

The aspiration of any state to play a bigger role in international society is understandable. In general, “to be a normal state,” calls for nothing astonishing. But once Japan attains this status, all the above issues will take on added significance and meaning. To a certain extent, it is Japan’s “exceptionalness” that makes its desire to become “a normal state” so difficult.

In Japanese politics, there are too many concepts that exist in name only, and not in reality. “The Three Non-Nuclear Principles” exist in name only; “The Ban on Arms Exports” was breached in 1983; the commitment to a “one percent limit on military expenditure” was put aside in 1987; and the provision “prohibiting the dispatching of troops overseas” was repealed in 1992.

Concerns are also rooted in the legacy of Japanese history. Without an understanding of modern Asian history, the study and, even more so, analysis of the emerging political and security situation in Asia will be difficult. This is true for Asians as well as for Western scholars. What former German President Richard von Weizsäcker said in August 1995 may be instructive: “Whoever is unwilling to analyze their history can not understand his/her current situation and why it is so. Whoever negates the past will run the risk of repeating the past.”⁶⁸

⁶⁷Green and Self, 45.

⁶⁸“Since the end of the 19th Century, Japan has deviated from its Asian neighbors to some extent so as to expand its military and political forces. How one interprets this may differ. But, undoubtedly, all Asians in countries where Japanese troops once appeared are of the same view about the assessment of World War II and the role of Japan during the occupation period. This is not a fact of past significance; it is a fact that has significance in the present . . . It has been our experience that there must be open and wide-ranging debate about past events. Though arguments may arise, they are beneficial because debate brings frankness. For any nation, forthright attitudes are invaluable both at home and abroad. What we know from experience and personal contacts also applies to nations: sometimes, apologies are necessary. But apologies will be effective once when they are given out of sincerity.” *Die Welt*, 8 August 1995. This is part of the speech, “Germany and Japan After 50 Years of the War,” delivered 7 August 1995 by Richard von Weizsäcker when he visited Tokyo in a private capacity.

How to Enhance Mutual Confidence between China and Japan

The current security concerns that exist between China and Japan are mutual; the mitigation, or even the elimination, of them depends upon efforts by both sides. For improvement in Sino-Japanese relations, attention should also be paid to Japan's security concerns about China. This is a complicated subject worthy of a separate comprehensive analysis. The policy recommendations presented here are in need of new and innovative approaches so as to result in practical as well as effective proposals, though research findings such as these do not always lead directly to official policy.

Given the new regional strategic and security situation after the Cold War and the state of current Sino-Japanese relations, China and Japan should work hard to promote confidence-building measures (CBMs). At present, there is no universal definition of CBMs. It is the author's view that CBMs should include wide-ranging measures in the economic, political, and security fields with an aim to relax tensions, reduce the possibility of military conflicts, and enhance confidence. The main point is to reduce mutual suspicions and misunderstandings by increasing transparency. The establishment of CBMs is not only a process, but also an end in itself, because contact and consultation inspire mutual enthusiasm for further dialogue, which will contribute directly to mutual understanding and trust. Although the establishment of CBMs between China and Japan cannot move too fast at the beginning, given all of the constraining factors, the process itself is beneficial. CBMs can serve to reduce or even to avoid the emergence of incidents that threaten bilateral ties and an improved regional political climate. From this perspective, CBMs that China and Japan should consider establishing at various levels include the following.

Encourage More Military Contacts

China suspended military contact with Japan in August 1995 after Japan froze its aid program to China because of China's nuclear tests. This case shows that Sino-Japanese military relations were strictly restrained by the overall state of bilateral ties. It can be predicted that, for the foreseeable future, Sino-Japanese military relations cannot exceed their political and/or economic relations. Reciprocal visits by senior military leaders and delegations, as well as regular meetings of defense ministers, can probably only be regarded as long-term goals. At present, the items that can be considered for expansion are, first and foremost, cooperation on some specific issues such as mutual visits by junior military officials and professionals, and the establishment and implementation of joint-training programs.

National security should be maintained through external cooperation. Once one state learns of the real levels and types of armaments as well as the speed of arms reductions by its neighbor(s), the possibility that one state may react militarily against the other due to suspicion will be greatly reduced. Therefore, China should actively expand further the discussion of regional security issues among specialists from both countries so as to increase Japanese scholars' comprehension of China's defense policies. Also, China should publish Defense White Papers so as to make its national defense policy more transparent.

In the same way, Japan should also help China learn of its actual level of armaments and troop structures, exchange with China reports and assessments of the military situation in the Asia-Pacific region, as well as offering convincing explanations about Japan's national defense policies and military intentions. An example of this would be whether the principles that Japan observed after World War II are still valid. If not, what are the new principles? Discussions should include Japan's nuclear policies, arms export policies, the quality and speed of its military build-up, and the relationship between the Japan-US security pact and the Taiwan Strait issue.

Other concrete measures could include:

- Strengthening the exchange of defense-related information, such as the establishment of the Japan-US security consultations, and Japan's final decision on the deployment of a theater missile defense system (TMD);⁶⁹
- Increasing transparency and openness regarding military exercises, offering more detailed information about imminent military exercises, as well as inviting observers;
- Providing a forum for the exploration and exchange of different military ideas (for example, a bilateral discussion on Sun Tzu's, *The Art of War*, can be considered a means of expanding contacts through the exchange of military journalists); and
- Carrying out dialogue at the professional level on maritime safety issues, with the participation of both military and civilian specialists in maritime affairs from both countries. Also, cooperation against piracy in the region and on maritime search and rescue planning, in coordination with current regional and global efforts, may be possible. It may even be possible to establish a multilateral maritime rescue force or maritime safety inspection force with other countries included.

Conclusion

The preceding analysis shows that there are many causes for China's security concerns about Japan. These concerns are reflected in current Chinese security policies and the removal

⁶⁹Although Japan dramatically increased research expenditures on TMD in fiscal year 1996, there are some differences within the Japanese government on this issue. TMD is a strategic defensive system for Japan and has a different meaning than for the United States and will, therefore, involve many issues. In addition to the reliability and high cost of TMD, the most outstanding issue may be its infinite reliance upon the American early warning system, because Japan cannot develop TMD independently. Some Japanese figures even fear this may threaten Japan's diplomatic independence.

of these concerns depends upon efforts made in many fields. Otherwise, even if traditional CBMs, with their obvious limitations, are established, they will not achieve their stated goals.⁷⁰

The four types of security concerns that China has with regard to Japan involve changes in Japan's domestic politics, security policies, military strength, and in the strengthened US-Japan alliance. Since the end of the Cold War, the biggest issue in terms of Sino-Japanese relations has been mutual distrust.

The goals of Japan's China policy probably can be summarized as wanting to shape a rich but not strong, an open, and a politically stable China. Such a China is in the fundamental interest of Japan. Thus, the implementation of Japan's China policy varies within a set framework, the upper boundary of which is the avoidance of a too-strong China, while the lower limit is refraining from pushing China into chaos.

There are discrepancies between Japan's assessment of China's development — the pace and future direction thereof — and the reality. The Japanese assessment of China's growth sometimes shifts to the right and sometimes to the left. From predictions of a "China collapse" in 1989 to concerns about a "China threat" in 1992, only three years had passed.⁷¹ The "China threat" argument still receives some attention in the Japanese media. But the reason for this is the lack of a comprehensive and accurate understanding of China on the part of Japanese citizens and statesmen as well as a concerted effort by those who benefit from advocating a "China threat."

The following guidelines could promote CBMs between Japan and China:

- **Stop unjustified accusations of China, including the "China threat" argument.** On this issue, I would like to cite the comments from a third party: "The West advocated hysterically the China threat and its attacks on China exceed the normal limit . . . Why should China often stand on the defendant's seat? Why does the prosecutor not apply to China the criteria that are applied to itself and to its partners and allies?" China's

⁷⁰For example, some Japanese officials in the Hosokawa cabinet (August 1993 to April 1994) suggested that China and Japan should strengthen their cooperation in UN peacekeeping operations and re-establish friendly relations by abandoning previous resentments, as have France and Germany. Although this proposal sounds quite good, Japan may be puzzled by China's passive attitudes toward this proposal. The improvement in Franco-German relations were conditioned first upon Germany's deep introspection regarding its part in World War II. In this respect, Japan has done far less than has Germany. The real motives and trends behind Japan's active participation in peacekeeping operations are worrisome to China. This is a view that almost all Chinese share, at all levels in society.

⁷¹Four years ago, this author pointed out (in the paper "Opportunities and Challenges: Sino-Japanese Relations in the 1990s," completed at the Japanese International Forum as a guest researcher) that Japan should have a comprehensive understanding and a correct assessment of China. China will embark upon "the third road," different from the predictions made by both the pessimists and optimists.

military strength lags far behind other countries' in almost all aspects. China's modest military expenditures have even become a threat to other countries. It is better to compare China's nuclear weapons with Russia's, and modernized troops of the ROK, Japan, and Taiwan with China's troops, which have lagged behind the times."⁷²

- **Handle with prudence sensitive issues in bilateral relations.** In July 1996, the Japanese Prime Minister broke his pledge not to visit the Yasukuni Jinjya. This move left many Chinese with the feeling of having been deceived. The actions undertaken by the rightist organizations in Japan in the Diaoyudao (Senkaku Islands) — which many Chinese suspected had the encouragement of the Japanese Government — and the speeches made directly by the Japanese government on this issue, have intensified the situation. The Chinese, including the Hong Kong and Taiwanese press, were infuriated. On the Taiwan issue, Japan's declaration to "support China's peaceful unification" is not as clear as the stated position of the United States on this issue.⁷³
- **Speed up the establishment of personal relations.** The importance of personal relations in improving national relations cannot be ignored. In the effort to restore and develop Sino-Japanese relations after World War II, individuals like Liao Chengzhi on the Chinese side and Takasaki and Furui on the Japanese side, played vital and unique roles. The gradual passing of these people has caused a temporary shortage at present of experts devoted to Sino-Japanese friendship. This is in sharp contrast to the abundant personal channels that exist between the United States and Japan.
- **Explore and improve economic cooperation.** In addition to trade, investment, and loans, Japan should take more advantage of its technological superiority and increase technology transfers to China. Not all of these transfers need to involve sophisticated technology. For instance, it is said that if China could duplicate Japan's energy-saving know-how and replace all its incandescent lamps with energy-saving fluorescent lamps, the electricity saved could equal that generated by the Three-Gorges Power Station being built in Hubei Province. This would not only be significant to China, which suffers from a shortage of energy, but also beneficial to Japan's "comprehensive security strategy," given that many Japanese believe that China's energy shortage may sooner or later become a threat to Japan.
- **Restore and strengthen exchanges and contacts of various forms at the non-governmental level.** There are two devices that China has relied upon to restore Sino-Japanese relations following World War II: one is trade, the other is

⁷²"China Threat-Unjustified Charge," by Noordin Sopiee, *Yomiuri Shimbun*, 26 August 1996. Noordin Sopiee is Director-General of the Institute of Strategic and International Studies in Malaysia.

⁷³The United States' position on Taiwan and the unification of China can be found in the *Taiwan Relations Act*, Public Law 96-8, 96th Congress, signed on 1 January 1979 and approved by Congress on 10 April 1979.

non-governmental forces. Although bilateral trade between China and Japan is currently growing, non-governmental activities are declining. This has led to a reduction in communications between the citizens of China and Japan. Yet, one of the key lessons to be drawn from the aftermath of World War II is that both China and Japan should further encourage their citizens to build mutual trust and channels for exchange. They should rely upon non-governmental or semi-governmental institutions to hold seminars among students, journalists, and business people to discuss bilateral relations and regional security concerns. Japan might even consider using part of the Official Development Assistance (ODA) that it offers to China for support and training to individuals devoted to Sino-Japanese friendship.

As analyzed above, China's security concerns about Japan are rooted in history and caused by many factors. Thus, it will be a long, twisted, and painful process to eliminate or even to ease these concerns. The same may be true also of Japan's security concerns about China. Nevertheless, given the importance of Sino-Japanese relations, this process is unavoidable. As stated at the beginning of this essay, frank dialogue and straightforward suggestions are the first steps in this process. This essay may be regarded as part of this process.

Within the space of this paper, the issues between China and Japan have been analyzed from a bilateral perspective. In fact, as with any other bilateral relations, Sino-Japanese relations are neither isolated nor stagnant. To conclude this essay, the following three points deserve emphasis.

- **The improvement of Sino-Japanese relations is not only in the interest of China and Japan.** A look at China's and Japan's share of the world economy, at the important position both have occupied in international politics, and at the close relations both have with other Asian-Pacific countries leads to the following conclusion: good Sino-Japanese relations are in the interest of all countries in the Asia-Pacific region, and are imperative to maintaining regional as well as world peace. Both China and Japan will gain from harmony and suffer from antagonism.
- **The improvement of Sino-Japanese relations should be guided by the post-Cold War new thinking.** Interdependence among nations has deepened since the end of the Cold War, the speed, repercussions, momentum, and impact of which have far exceeded what could have been imagined by either China or Japan. Hence, for any sovereign state in this changed circumstance, security comes from cooperation. In turn, cooperation requires mutually beneficial relations rather than zero-sum proposals or situations.
- **The United States has a big impact on Sino-Japanese relations.** A review of the triangular relations between China, the United States, and Japan since President Nixon's visit to China in 1972 will show the interaction among the three bilateral (Sino-Japanese, Sino-US, and US-Japan) relations. When Sino-American relations developed smoothly,

Sino-Japanese relations were in a state of tranquility; when Sino-American relations were troubled, Sino-Japanese relations were also upset. This seems to have become a rule. In the future, if the US-Japan alliance continues to have the function of controlling Japan, no serious concerns will develop. What is worrisome from a Chinese perspective is that this aspect of the US-Japan alliance may weaken with the passage of time, and that the alliance will become a means for Japan to expand its strength and interests in the Asia-Pacific region.

###