

# **Chinese Military Modernization and Asian Security**

**Michael Swaine**

August 1998



## Chinese Military Modernization and Asian Security\*

*Michael Swaine*

I'll speak on the question of Chinese military defense modernization and its implications for the Asian security environment. I'll try to keep my remarks at a level where we can talk about broader issues and concepts, and the implications of all this for regional evolution in the security environment, U.S. security interests, U.S.-Japan relations, etc. I want to cover four different areas in my remarks.

First, I'll speak a little bit about the logic, as I see it, behind Chinese military modernization. What drives it and what are some of its objectives? Second, what can we say about the kinds of capabilities that will likely result from China's military modernization effort? I will look out roughly ten years and then as far as twenty years. Keep in mind that the longer you get out on this timeline, the more everything becomes informed speculation and subject to enormous caveats of various types. But I'll nonetheless try to assess capabilities from a reasonably long-term perspective. Then I'll address the implications of what I see in these capabilities for the Asian security environment—what do they imply for specific issues of interest for the United States and its allies? Finally, I'll say something about how to respond to all this. What sorts of things could be done today in the near term to deal with Chinese military modernization and its implications?

First, the logic of PLA modernization. It's important to draw a distinction between the conditions that drove Chinese military modernization or Chinese military thinking and military postures in the past—and by the past I mean up until the late 1970s during the Communist period, from the late '40s until the '70s—and what has been driving it under the reforms. During the past, the '50s, '60s, '70s, Chinese defense policy was driven by a specific set of conditions that the Chinese confronted at the time, both internally and externally. They had, obviously, a very large population with a low level of education; a relatively low level of technology; and a relatively underdeveloped economy, and they were existing in an

---

\* *This is an edited version of a lecture given at the Asia/Pacific Research Center on April 30, 1998.*

environment that was very much dominated for most of this era by the bipolar confrontation between the United States and the Soviet Union, both of which were much stronger powers than China militarily and both of which had considerable reach. Moreover, one of these powers shares a long border with China and the other is a Pacific power that had (and continues to have) an enormous Asian presence, right on the Chinese periphery. At the same time, after the breakup of the Sino-Soviet alliance in the fifties, the regime in China became very much wedded to a notion of self-reliance and to a Maoist approach to development, if you will—highly ideologically charged, centrally controlled in many ways. The defense posture resulting from these conditions was characterized by three major features.

The first was a concept of defense-in-depth. By this I do not mean the technical definition of defense-in-depth as it is used to describe the placement of forces on a battlefield, but rather a broader definition of the concept as a defense strategy keyed to the idea of dealing with a superior military force by absorbing that force into your own territory because you could not engage the enemy beyond your territorial borders, and then hoping to whittle that force down, exhaust it through attrition, through fluid mobile guerrilla warfare and the employment of massive ground forces. This strategy of absorption and attrition was also possible because China had a dispersed infrastructure; that is, critical social and economic resources were not concentrated in any one particular area, but tended to be dispersed across the country. This was a concerted policy by the Chinese leadership that began in the late '50s and early '60s and led to the transition of and movement of large amounts of industrial infrastructure from the northeast to the southwest of China.

The second major feature of China's past defense strategy was the use of the specific tactics of "people's war": relying upon a low-tech military structure centered on large ground forces, backed by massive reserves and militia forces, trained to live off the land and conduct fluid combat maneuvers. This involved an application in the postwar period of the kinds of tactics that were used by the Chinese against the Japanese and against the Nationalists during the 1930s and 1940s.

The third element of this defense strategy, which evolved in the mid-1960s, was the creation of a minimal low-tech nuclear force, which was regarded as the critical element of deterrence against an attack from these two larger and stronger military powers. This "counter-value" force contained a small number of relatively unsophisticated nuclear weapons and delivery systems that could pose a threat to a small number of cities and populations of either the Soviet Union or the United States. It obviated the need for a large, "counter-force" nuclear arsenal with a full second-strike capability and the accompanying doctrine of mutually assured destruction that was basic to U.S./Soviet thinking and strategic doctrine.

Those were the elements that drove a lot of Chinese military thinking and defense policy throughout these decades. What has happened in the last fifteen years is that many of these assumptions and conditions in the Chinese environment have changed radically. On the one hand, a new notion of development has emerged that rejects the past Maoist approach toward internal development, which was ideologically driven, mass-mobilization oriented, and stressed large-scale production campaigns. In its place, China has adopted policies and reforms emphasizing very much the idea of pragmatism, market orientation, opening to the outside, greater use of foreign technology, greater use of foreign markets, greater use of foreign know-how, etc.; all these phenomena have led to a much greater level of interaction with the outside world.

This transformation reflects in part an erosion in the legitimacy of the Chinese Communist Party and its communist ideology occurring after the tumult of the Cultural Revolution.

Rather than the use of Maoist ideology, we have seen a much greater reliance on economic growth and continued economic development—delivering the goods, in other words—in order to maintain the authority and legitimacy of the Chinese state. Reform-oriented economics has become increasingly important. Moreover, as part of this process, there also occurred a shift in the infrastructure in China, a concentration of Chinese industrial power and economic development along the coastline. This has become a pronounced feature of China's development under the reforms; it emerged in the '80s and is continuing to deepen. Despite efforts to increase the amount of development in the inland areas, there is still a pronounced emphasis on coastal areas.

On the military side, very significant changes have taken place. Globally, there have been major leaps in military technology that have increased the accuracy and the firepower of weaponry and that have also increased the speed of warfare and the scope of battlefield awareness. All of these things have eroded the ability of China's past military strategy to provide for China's security in a conventional sense. In addition, major changes have also occurred in the nuclear arena; these include increasing capabilities to detect and also to attack nuclear facilities and nuclear weapons, and the potential, at least, for the development of some type of missile-defense capability by the more advanced industrial states. These developments have eroded the efficacy of China's relatively unsophisticated, minimal deterrent nuclear force structure.

So what has all this led to? It has produced a transformation in the way the Chinese look at their security environment and what they need to do, in many respects, to ensure their future security. Doctrinally, it has led to a concept of what the Chinese call active offshore peripheral defense. In other words, in order to try to maintain security in this kind of situation, which has in many respects increased the vulnerability of China, as the Chinese see it, over the longer term, you have to establish the ability to defend China beyond its territorial borders, to engage and defeat a potential enemy before he reaches your borders. That doesn't necessarily mean extending your military reach to enormous distances from continental China. But it does require trying to deal with threats to China's territory that could emerge along China's periphery, especially its maritime periphery, and being able to control such threats, counter them, and in some cases act preemptively to prevent them in ways that the Chinese military has been completely incapable of doing in the past, and in many respects is still incapable of doing to this day. At the same time there is also a growing awareness that China's security interests are extending beyond simply that of the continent itself, that of the territory of China. China has a greater interest in foreign markets, and has a greater interest in and will have an increasing interest in foreign energy supplies. That has provoked discussion within Chinese strategic circles about how China goes about trying to ensure the security of those aspects of its economic growth and development that lie outside its territorial borders.

In terms of military modernization, this has led to an emphasis on trying to acquire types of conventional weapons that can be used to counter or eliminate some of the vulnerabilities that are presented by the evolution of global military technologies. It has also led to efforts to attain some capabilities in the areas of battlespace denial and battlespace control beyond China's borders. This has involved an increase in air and naval capabilities of various types, and has involved attempts to increase jointness within the Chinese military; that is to say, greater levels of coordination across the different services and among different components of the military. All of this is becoming the emphasis of military modernization because the PLA has shown consistently major weaknesses in being able to adjust to this kind of new

situation. It has large numbers of weaponry, but of very low quality—still '50s and '60s equipment. Most of the weaponry is of limited range, endurance, and maneuverability, including the ground forces as well—certainly, their air and naval components. They have very limited air and naval transport, including transport of combat troops, both across ground and even more so across water. They have poor coordination within and among their different units and very poor, until recently, command control and intelligence that would knit together large scopes of essential battlespace. Because of this poor coordination, military regions have long been the core of the Chinese military structure, reflecting in part the inability of the Chinese to coordinate large amounts of forces across relatively large amounts of territory. They have also had very poor early-warning and battle-management systems. They don't have such things as AWACS, they don't have such things as long-range or over-the-horizon radar for long-range surveillance. And, finally, they don't have a very strong, in my view, defense industrial base. The defense industrial base has in many ways been weakened, not strengthened, by the reforms, because of the emphasis on defense conversion—on converting defense industries and factories to commercial production to generate profit to ultimately then be used to try to improve the science and technology level, industrial level, and military capabilities of China. This process is still very much, in my view, in the early stages and has led to a decrease on the part of many defense industry infrastructures in China in their ability to produce weaponry of any kind, be it good, bad, or whatever.

In response to all this, the Chinese have been trying to acquire certain types of capabilities. What have they actually attained in terms of their military modernization effort to try to close some of these vulnerabilities and attain some of these other capabilities that would better protect their territory and also protect their force structure? They started off in military modernization in a very incremental, systematic way. They began by dealing with the living conditions and the lives of the troops themselves. They began by improving the situation of troops because that was, in some sense, the easiest to remedy and also the most immediate in need of attention. The Chinese military is very, very large; the educational level is very low; what it takes to maintain these troops is extensive; and they were living in very primitive conditions. There were improvements in these areas, and in the nature of the officer corps as well. In other words, there was a lot of emphasis on what we call “software” as the first stage of Chinese military modernization, rather than the acquisition of certain types of hardware capabilities.

The professionalization of the officer corps has gone forward and has shown some very significant improvements under the reforms. It's more merit based and it's developed according to professional criteria much more than in the past. It's much more technically oriented, and a much more regularized system of promotion and retirement for the Chinese military is in place which has in some ways revolutionized the officer corps in China. A decade ago the average age of officers at each level of rank was roughly six years above what it should have been according to regulations. Today there are officers at each level who are actually about six years younger, on average, than the regulated retirement age. In fact, they're often younger, on average, than their equivalents in the U.S. military, at many different levels. We've seen a real change in that sense and also a change in many of the more professional aspects of training.

On the force side, I would argue that there have been significant improvements in very narrow areas. The Chinese have concentrated a lot of resources on trying to reduce the size of the ground forces and to improve the quality of training of those remaining units, i.e., to

improve their equipment, readiness, and response capabilities. There have also been improvements in air and naval forces, largely through acquisition of Russian equipment. They have acquired advanced fourth-generation Su-27 fighters from the Russians, about fifty of them, and they are working to implement a co-production agreement to produce about 200 or more of these aircraft over the next decade or so. They've acquired four advanced diesel submarines from the Russians, and will probably purchase several more after that. They've acquired long-range Il-76 transport aircraft, about fifteen, which can transport significant numbers of men and equipment. Probably the most significant area in which they have improved, in the conventional sense, is in ballistic missiles, including both short-range ballistic missiles and cruise missiles. The Chinese have put an enormous amount of emphasis into these programs, in part because they see them as very important to the kind of battlespace denial and control capabilities I mentioned earlier. And because they are a relatively easier type of system for them to master than some of the more sophisticated avionics and naval and air systems that they've had to purchase from the Russians. I look at purchases from the Russians as, in some respects, a sign of failure of Chinese military modernization and not success. In each area where the Chinese have had to purchase significant weapon systems from the Russians, they've had indigenous programs under way for years that have not produced the kind of weapon systems that they were hoping to get. There were indications that the Chinese military was getting fed up with this effort and wanted to purchase systems off the shelf, when they could, from the Russians. In some ways it's a kind of stop-gap measure which I think they had little alternative but to rely upon.

Other areas in which they've improved in recent years are C3I, fiber-optic communication, and early-warning systems. There have been significant advances in some of these areas. They continue to have problems in the rate and level of technical innovation and absorption across the board in the military, in all sorts of areas. They have a big problem with civilian spin-off. They don't get a lot out of civilian technological innovation that is helpful to the military. They have problems with skilled manpower in the military, still. It's a big problem for them. They don't have enough educated people to work the kinds of systems that they've got, or that they're trying to acquire, on a modern battlefield. They have a poor quality production process; not only the level of production, but the quality of the production itself is not terribly good. They have, in some regards, a good theoretical R&D capability in certain areas. It's turning such capabilities into a production process capability that still gives them problems. And they have limited resources for production, acquisition, training, and maintenance. Despite what people say about the great increases in the Chinese defense budget, which is double digits in the last several years and has been close to real double-digit increases because of the drop in inflation in China, there is still a scarcity of essential resources in a whole host of areas in China to try to meet the kinds of demands that they have for the areas I just mentioned.

I should say a few more things about where the Chinese are focusing their greatest effort in military systems. One I've already mentioned is the acquisition of more advanced fighters and fighter-bombers. I mentioned the co-production effort in the Su-27. They're exerting significant effort in that area, although there is a certain amount of uncertainty as to whether or not they're actually going to reach and finalize a co-production agreement with the Russians that they can then go ahead and implement. There still is some arguing, apparently, between the Russians and the Chinese over what this agreement entails and what's required, including the level and extent of technology transfer. Nonetheless, it is an emphasis for them. Another emphasis is submarine-launched cruise missiles and intermediate-range ballistic

missiles. The development of a submarine-launched cruise missile is a priority. They probably will have such a device within five years or so. Long-range over-the-horizon radar is something that they have definitely put emphasis on, and battle management overall. Space-based real-time surveillance is another area of emphasis. They're not near that capability now, but they're putting more emphasis on it. Their space program, in general, is getting a large and increasing amount of resources. The Chinese are talking now about a manned space flight in the not-too-distant future, and some people believe that that is a distinct possibility. And, as I mentioned, long-range sea and land-attack cruise missiles. Long-range meaning hundreds of kilometers. They don't have anything like that right now, but they're certainly interested in acquiring that. They don't have land-attack cruise missiles at this point. Most of their cruise missiles are sea, anti-ship missiles.

Before turning to the question of what this means for capabilities, I'll tick off a few points about the uncertainties in looking at the future and what could inhibit the modernization program from continuing or what might accelerate it. First, of course, is funding. There tends to be an immediate assumption that because China is a big economy and it's growing fairly rapidly, it's going to generate a larger and larger amount of funds for military modernization. There will be increases, yes. The question always becomes how much, and over what time period. There, one has to begin assessing all kinds of other demands that are being made on funds in China. I mentioned that they still operate under a condition of relative financial scarcity in their defense sector. I think that's probably going to continue for some time unless some major change occurred in their external security environment that would absolutely force them to reorient their priorities. Defense modernization is still the fourth of the four modernizations in China. The funds that are earmarked for use by the central government are increasingly being used for things like state enterprise reform, where they need enormous amounts of funding to make up for what is probably going to be a lot of resulting social dislocation. Changing these massive enterprises that are basically social welfare units and being able to buffer the kind of dislocation on the social level that likely will occur will require significant amounts of capital, as will restructuring the banking and finance system in China, which is essentially, in many regards, if you agree with Nick Lardy, bankrupt. It needs to be refinanced, recapitalized, and that will involve a significant amount of investment as well.

Second is the ability to innovate, the ability to develop a defense-industrial infrastructure that can indeed absorb technology and transform that technology into sophisticated production capabilities. China's defense-industrial infrastructure is still deficient in many different ways, and the advances in that area are going to be fairly slow and only in pockets.

The third area is the level and type of foreign technical assistance China receives. The Chinese are getting a certain amount of assistance in their military modernization effort from the Russians, not just in terms of sales, but in technology and know-how. Russian technicians out of business after the collapse of the Soviet Union have been getting into business again in China. Factories in the former Soviet Union are actually being hired out, if you will, by the Chinese, to do production technology and innovation and research in different areas, to try to improve some of their capabilities. The Chinese also have assistance from other countries, such as Israel, in certain important areas.

A fourth area which can affect the modernization effort, of course, is the nature of China's external threat or perceived threat. Here the arguably most pressing threat for the Chinese concerns Taiwan. A marked change in the situation regarding Taiwan could alter Chinese calculations and priorities in significant ways that would lead them to try to



accelerate certain programs in certain respects. I think they've already done this to a degree, after the events of '95, '96, but I think it could go further than what we've seen thus far in stimulating military modernization.

A fifth factor is, of course, the leadership itself. A political change in the PRC and the impact of various possible types of evolutions or changes in the PRC leadership would alter the course of modernization.

A final area that is very important is what I call technologies that provide an asymmetric advantage: narrow technological areas where the Chinese could make breakthroughs that would give them a capability to deter, slow, or neutralize a superior force in certain kinds of political-military scenarios. I know that sounds very vague, but the idea of particular types of technologies being leveraged very highly in a particular contingency to lead to a significant increase in Chinese capabilities is something that can't be ignored.

What does all this say for capabilities now across the board, if you look out into the future? I hasten to add that what I am about to say is very speculative on my part. I have not done an intensive detailed analysis of all of the factors I've just mentioned to come up with the conclusions or the observations I'm about to offer. In many ways they are informed speculation about broad capabilities that assume a certain continuation and pace and emphasis on the part of the Chinese in certain areas.

By the year 2007 to 2010, I would say the Chinese will have acquired a limited ground, air, and sea presence capability perhaps as far as 250 miles from their continental borders. What does this mean? I think it means that they will be able to engage in limited battlefield denial activities; in maritime theaters, this will center on the use of mines, submarines, and surface vessels, as well as some limited level of air support for surveillance, to a distance of 250 miles from their shores, and within a limited region. In addition, by this time the Chinese will almost certainly possess a significant inventory of short and medium-range conventional or nuclear-armed ballistic missiles capable of striking counter-force targets such as military installations with considerable accuracy.

The scenario that immediately comes to mind, of course, is Taiwan. By the year 2007 to 2010, the Chinese will have significantly improved their ability to conduct air and sea denial operations around Taiwan, including efforts to prevent other forces from entering certain designated areas, operations that would require surveillance out to a distance beyond Taiwan itself. They will also have the capability to attack and/or hold at risk both specific counter-value and counter-force targets on Taiwan and targets beyond Taiwan, in Japan for example. These capabilities, taken together, would greatly complicate the lives of outside powers contemplating the deployment of forces to the vicinity of Taiwan, such as the United States and Japan.

Unresolved issues concerning Chinese capabilities by this time include the extent to which the Chinese would possess effective air caps—the ability of aircraft to protect naval vessels, which is where they're very weak—and the extent to which they will have by that time effective surveillance and queuing for long-range cruise missiles. These are all areas where you can have enormous variations in the types of capabilities the Chinese might be able to develop. But, at the very least, they're going to be able to project force out to a distance that is way beyond what they've had before, which has been basically a border defense—a shore defense in terms of air and naval power. And this is going to pose significant implications for a Taiwan scenario.

Pressing beyond this period, out to 2020 or so, involves a large amount of speculation. I use some very deliberate weasel words to describe what I see as a Chinese capability by that

time period, such as a significant, but not clearly superior, naval presence in East Asia. Routinely within a thousand nautical miles. What do I mean by that? I think in twenty years the Chinese will be able to routinely patrol areas within a thousand miles from their border in East Asia with significant numbers of naval assets: surface combatants and sub-surface elements. I'm not saying that they would have a carrier. It's highly unlikely that they would have an aircraft carrier over the next twenty years. It's not in their current defense budget, their ten-year program. They have it sort of ticking over in terms of spending, as far as we can tell. They've done a certain amount of very low-level thinking about different types of components that would have to go into a carrier, different types of training. They thought about acquiring a Russian carrier a couple of times a few years ago. But I believe they have essentially dismissed that. They're putting their emphasis more on other things like long-range aircraft, cruise missiles, submarines—the sort of things I've talked about already. They see those platforms and systems as being much more useful than a carrier for the kinds of concerns they have short to medium term, which essentially boils down to Taiwan.

They could be able to routinely patrol out to significant distances, although not with carrier battle groups. They could possibly have extensive sea and air denial along the coast: effective denial that goes out further than 250 miles, certainly, and probably out as far as 500 miles in some cases. And the ability to attempt a naval blockade of Taiwan with very significant air assets, short-range ballistic missiles. They might be able, by this time, to acquire significant amphibious capabilities. I'm not saying D-Day-type things, because I don't believe that even in twenty years, unless the Chinese plowed enormous amounts of resources into it, they could acquire an ability to move very large numbers of troops across a significant expanse of water. The distance from Taiwan to the mainland is approximately one hundred miles, over very rough water in most times of the year. It requires an enormous amount of capability to be able to undertake a serious amphibious attack on a locale that would be that far away from the originating forces.

I'm dubious as to whether or not the Chinese could do this, unless, as I say, they made it a crash program. And there's no sign that they're doing this. Their improvements in amphibious capabilities are fairly marginal. I don't think that's their strategy in dealing with Taiwan.

I'll talk now about the major implications of all of this, as I see it, for Asian security. In the short and medium term, it's obviously Taiwan. I put up a slide in the Pentagon not too long ago, in fact, on which I wrote "It's Taiwan, stupid," to focus on what I think does motivate a significant amount of thinking now in the Chinese military about their defense modernization. This is a real change in Chinese military thinking. It did not exist five or six years ago. The Nanjing military region, which is the one that's facing Taiwan, was essentially demilitarized for most of the 1980s. The Chinese didn't place a lot of assets there. They didn't train much in that area either. They very much deemphasized anything that could pose a military concern across the Strait. That's changed in significant ways, although it could change even more so. The Chinese are now trying to acquire capabilities which I think do have real implications for Taiwan, particularly in the area of ballistic missiles and in the ability to detect, track, and target naval assets, including carrier battle groups. These are capabilities that could be applied in other theaters and to other things, but I think the Chinese are interested in trying to develop capabilities that will, at the very least, complicate the way the United States thinks about when and how and under what conditions it might come to the assistance of Taiwan in a confrontation in the future. That, to me, is the greatest issue of concern in terms of the implications of Chinese military modernization for the

United States. This type of capability certainly has not given them and is not now giving them the confidence to prevail in a military confrontation with the U.S. over Taiwan. I think they are thinking more in terms of marginal improvements in areas that can increase the credibility of the threat of force and therefore will affect the political thinking on Taiwan, and, as I say, complicate our thinking. But they certainly don't want to test this proposition by trying to actually deploy forces to prevail in a Taiwan scenario because they know, obviously, what the consequences of that would be in terms of the region as a whole. They would have to be pretty sure that they could prevail if they were to undertake an effort to subdue Taiwan militarily.

The second major implication of Chinese military modernization is the psychological impact of an increasing PRC naval and air presence on Asia Pacific countries. This is something that is of course very difficult to get a handle on. In what way is China's ability to project force beyond its own borders going to affect the calculations of other Asian countries? My sense is that at this point most Asian countries are not scared that the Chinese are about to acquire some kind of major capability that's going to make their lives really difficult. I went to the region at the end of last year and had discussions with people in a lot of countries about precisely this issue. I wouldn't say I encountered a casual attitude, but there wasn't as much alarm about it, certainly, as there has been in certain quarters in the United States over the last couple of years and in writings about the "China threat." There isn't an enormous amount of worry about it, particularly for the short and medium term. The broader question in people's minds is the longer term, and what U.S. policy is going to be. There is a strong desire for the United States to take the lead, obviously, in serving as a deterrent to the Chinese, but also as the main point of engagement with the Chinese to try to deal with some of the issues that could come as a result of increasing Chinese capabilities. But that doesn't translate into a sense of alarm over the short and medium term, except in the case of Taiwan, where there is certainly a concern that the Taiwan issue could get out of control and flow over into other areas of the region and affect the region as a whole. There is a view, though, that certain arms acquisitions have been calculated in Asian countries with a view toward countering or trying to balance certain Chinese capabilities over time. I'm not so sure that these kinds of calculations are as robust today as they were, say, six or eight months ago, given the Asian financial crisis. The crisis has dampened a lot of the planning in some capitals over acquisitions in the near term. They've frozen them to a certain degree, or they're trying to renegotiate certain acquisitions, particularly arms purchases from the United States.

Raising the costs of U.S. action and presence in Asia over the long term is the third consequence of Chinese military modernization. Chinese military modernization, as I said, can complicate the U.S. calculus about the conditions under which the United States might use forces in Asia in support of various interests, including Taiwan. It could complicate U.S. planning in terms of the confidence the U.S. would have to defend the freedom of the seas over the longer term in certain areas such as the South China Sea. Clearly, a sustained or routine Chinese presence in areas like that could pose a threat to strategic lines of communication and to U.S. naval assets in the region. What that means in terms of U.S. forward deployments and alliance reassurances in the region over the long run is a question that is still under consideration in the United States. I don't believe that there have been any firm understandings concerning what to do about this. To speak to one dimension of it, there's the obvious concern that after the reunification of Korea—if it's a question of when, not if—there will be enormous pressure to downsize the U.S. force presence in Asia. The ground

force presence, certainly. That will create certain types of anxieties in the region if, in the context of that, there are increasing Chinese military capabilities. There has to be some alternative to what had heretofore been provided by way of assurance or presence in the region. How do you do that? What's the structure by which the United States maintains a forward presence in the region? Does it mean going back into Southeast Asia in some significant way? Does it mean adopting an entirely different type of strategy, one that doesn't rely so much on forward presence? That relies, in fact, on the ability to inject forces into the region quickly from long distances? All of these, of course, will be greatly impacted if, on the U.S. side, not only following a Korea unification, but also as a result in general of the downsizing of the U.S. forces, there is a significant reduction in the size of the U.S. Navy. If you drop down significantly below a 600-ship navy and you're not able to sustain twelve carrier battle groups worldwide, do you start trimming in a place like Asia? Those are three of the major areas for which Chinese military modernization has implications.

## Questions and Answers

*I have two questions for you, Mike. The first has to do with possible security objectives for China. What is the relative emphasis being placed on things like offshore oil, control of some of the islands—the Spratly islands and other islands north of Taiwan that are under contention—as opposed to the Taiwan issue per se? Is there a rising interest in this limited sea-denial capability? Is it more geared toward ensuring access or control over some of these kinds of issues versus Taiwan? The second question is, you mentioned asymmetric strategies, and one of the classic asymmetric strategies is acquiring weapons of mass destruction to go against the United States, be they nuclear, biological, or chemical. Yet, from what I know, it looks like China is pursuing weapons of mass destruction at a desultory pace. They signed the Chemical Weapons Convention, they're already signatories to the Biological Weapons Convention. I don't know what the estimates are, but I assume their programs are either small in the CBW area or are disappearing. The nuclear program, at least the strategic nuclear component that could be used to threaten the U.S. homeland, has been small for a long period of time, is not undergoing much modernization, and is a highly vulnerable component of their nuclear force. So if you think of it as a true deterrent, even a small deterrent, it's not a very robust capability and is one that could probably be destroyed preemptively rather quickly. And so when I think of the weapons of mass destruction arena as an asymmetric strategy, it's kind of an obvious one—I don't see a lot of activity in that area, at least geared toward the United States. Maybe the shorter-range nuclear stuff, but that doesn't influence the U.S. so much, unless it's tactical nuclear stuff.*

On the first question, I think that much of their military modernization, in fact, was driven by the more narrow kinds of sea trials in smaller islands, the smaller conflict issues that you mentioned. That is the concept of what they call limited wars that they saw as emerging out of the post-Cold War era. I think there's still a strong element of that argumentation within the Chinese military, that it's not just Taiwan that we have to worry about. In the absence of superpower rivalry and global war, in the emergence of what they see as, for lack of a better term, multipolarity—which I hate to use, because it conjures up all kinds of images of these equal poles that are out there, balancing each other, which is not the case—they see greater

concentrations of capabilities among neighbors around their periphery that didn't exist in the past. Given the regional rivalries that exist all along their periphery, they felt that there could very well be conflict, albeit limited conflict, that they would have to deal with in the future—over territorial claims, over resource issues, over a range of different issues. I think they believe that a great deal of the capabilities that they're acquiring to try to deal with those types of contingencies are also applicable, in many respects, to the Taiwan scenario. The scale of the Taiwan scenario is much bigger, and that has therefore tended to drive their calculations because it's a much more demanding set of requirements for the military. So I don't think it is an either/or kind of a situation.

Now, when you get to questions like longer-term offshore oil or strategic lines of communication or energy dependency, then you start dealing with longer-range strategic calculations that go well beyond periphery-defense issues. The extent to which those calculations drive Chinese military modernization is a mixed picture. People ask me this sort of question: well, isn't China's military modernization designed to eject the United States from the region and to take over the region? The Chinese write about all kinds of things, the way strategists and observers write about all kinds of things in this country. If you place emphasis on certain types of writings, you're going to get that kind of a conclusion. But if you look at the kinds of things that they're acquiring, if you look at the kinds of issues that they raise the most—privately in conversations as well as more publicly in documents—you don't get the impression that they're planning for the long haul. That they're thinking to themselves, okay, strategic rivalry with the United States, we know it's going to come, we'd better prepare now. They think more in terms of, we've got serious problems right now, both domestic and external. We can't deal with long-range problems x, y, and z, much less compete with the United States as a near-peer competitor thirty years from now. We've got to focus our attention on more immediate issues. I think that kind of thinking is what drives a lot of Chinese military modernization and Chinese defense planning. Also, I think they tend to be somewhat realistic about things like ensuring energy supplies, certainly through military capabilities. I see very little written about trying to ensure supplies from the Middle East where they have to act independently of other powers to try to attain that capability. Instead, they're trying to deal with this through political and economic means. They're trying to diversify their energy supplies. They're trying to improve, very much, their relations with Central Asian countries, with the hopes of developing and ensuring energy supplies from that part of the world. And they're, I think, hoping that they can augment their domestic production over time so that they can limit the degree to which they are dependent upon foreign energy supplies, if you use that as a major measure.

The second question I'll deal with briefly. On the asymmetric question, it's a complicated issue and I agree with your points that the Chinese have not placed an enormous amount of emphasis on the strategic level. They do have two particular programs under way that they feel, I think, are going to go some distance toward removing or lowering vulnerabilities, at least, if not giving them some sort of asymmetric edge in a strategic level, and that's the DF-31 and the DF-41, two more accurate, long-range ICBMs, multi-stage, solid-fuel ballistic missiles with smaller warheads than they've had in the past. And the potential exists for developing a MIRV-based warhead because of the smaller size of the warhead. Although they haven't, as you know, put much emphasis into the development, as far as we know, of an actual MIRV capability. I think that's got to be part of their calculus, though, if they see significant movement toward a TMD capability in the United States. I couldn't sit here and claim that I know where this argument lies in the Chinese military. Nonetheless, because of

the improvement in the reliability and the response time of these missiles, I think they believe their programs in those two areas are going to provide them with a greater degree of nuclear force survivability. You can argue about whether that's the case or not, but I think they believe that that could very well be an outcome of it. On the chemical and biological front, it's a really difficult thing to get into. I think the Chinese think more about this than signing the weapons conventions would suggest. In other words, I think that they're not necessarily dispensing with the option of developing either chemical or biological weapons.

*I have a semantic suggestion and a question. The semantic suggestion is this. You make an important distinction between denial and control. Denial is pretty clear. Control is ambiguous. The reason for this is that you say the Chinese are working on the ability to deny the ability to the United States to defend Taiwan. They could have that, let's say at some point in the future. But we might also be able to deny the mainland the ability to invade Taiwan. The question is this. You didn't mention something which has struck me ever since the so-called missile tests in 1996. Without nuclear weapons, couldn't the use of missiles make life in Taipei intolerable? And cruise missiles can be made cheaper and also hard to defend against. It shouldn't take twenty years if they decide they want to do that.*

I hope I didn't give the impression when I talked about the timelines that I thought that the Chinese could not attain a capability to create some real havoc on Taiwan in anything less than twenty years. They already have the capability to do that today. And the question is what the context would be in which they might choose to do that and what the likely outcome would be of that attempt. They already have the capability to fire short-range ballistic missiles at targets in Taiwan and hit them with a reasonably high level of accuracy. And they will have a greater capability to do that over time, unless countermeasures are developed in some respect that can deal effectively with that threat. This is one reason why the Chinese are so sensitive to theater missile defense, because they feel it erodes the only real leverage they have in a military sense at this point in dealing with the Taiwan problem. It's a significant issue, there's no question about it. I think it's part of the calculus of the Chinese; you hear this a lot when you talk to Chinese military officers. Part of the calculation is that a limited missile attack on Taiwan that did not necessarily strike its population centers, but showed unambiguously the ability to strike at will on the island, would be a critical, if not sufficient, component to get the Taiwanese populace to yield. It could be combined with certain other types of actions—limited actions on the military front through a declaration of a blockade of some kind or interdiction by submarines that would cause real problems, and maintain enormous pressure on the Taiwanese. Why would this be such a problem? Because we would be confronted with the possibility that in order to interdict these missiles absent a defense system, we'd have to strike the Chinese mainland. We'd have to hit these bases before they actually launched. And (a) our ability to do that is very limited—these are mobile missiles, they're very hard to detect; and (b) the decision to do that would be obviously one that would go well beyond simply defending Taiwan, in a passive sense, to striking at the mainland. You get into the whole question of, as Chas Freeman calls it, "the balance of fervor." How far are we willing to go up that escalatory ladder?

*Albright left China with an agreement to establish a hot line. Will there be any tangible military agreements that come out of Clinton's visit to China? I suspect you'll say no. And if not, what should have come out of this?*

First of all, I can't say to you that I have inside information on what is or isn't going to happen in this visit on the military side. My sense is that there will be some agreements, but they will be modest. What we had last time around was the Military Maritime Incidents at Sea Agreement. We also had an agreement to have regular exchanges at the sub-cabinet level on political, security, and economic issues. We also had something, I think, on joint planning for humanitarian relief efforts. It's possible that in this round there's going to be a movement toward what they call a tabletop version of these humanitarian exercises. In other words, having the Chinese and us sit down and start talking about what we might do in a humanitarian relief effort with our respective militaries. And there might be one or two other discussions or references to agreements or exchanges. But I don't see anything of an earth-shattering quality coming out of this particular visit on the military-to-military side.

*As the evidence begins to accumulate that Taiwan is the focal point of Chinese military development, in a way that was not the case, after all, when the 1982 agreement on arms sales to Taiwan was reached, I wonder what the implications will be for the United States in terms of our weapons sales to Taiwan. The United States has a legal obligation under the Taiwan Relations Act to maintain Taiwan's capacity for its self defense. At what point does that consideration begin to come into play, so that the burden of responding does not rest solely on the United States but would rest on Taiwan's own capacity to protect itself?*

My concern over this whole process is that thus far Chinese military modernization, and especially ballistic missile modernization, has been incremental enough and not so much in the public eye that it hasn't prompted a response on arms sales to Taiwan by the Congress that says we need to rethink this whole process of our limited arms sales. Over time, it's very possible that there's going to be greater attention by the Congress to this problem. There's going to be pressure to increase, not decrease, the level of arms sales we're providing to the Taiwanese. The question becomes what you can do to try to prevent this from becoming a major destabilizing element in the overall relationship with the Chinese, in the political sense. And, at the same time, also not drive the Chinese to make some kind of miscalculation about what they need to do now rather than later, because of any kind of system that we might sell the Taiwanese that could block off certain types of capabilities on the Chinese side. I don't have an easy answer to this question. My desire would be to try to get some level of linkage with the Chinese and to tell the Chinese that if they proceed in certain ways, with certain types of systems, and they deploy these certain types of systems, missile systems in particular, then they can't help but expect that we're going to respond in certain ways. If they don't do that, and if they can give enough assurances about it, in return for some restraint on our part in the area of arms sales to Taiwan, that might be stabilizing. But there are enormous difficulties involved here. For one thing, you're dealing with, in the most important case, mobile ballistic missiles. How would you get an assurance from the Chinese that you could sell in the United States Government that they're not developing a capability in that area, therefore you won't sell the Taiwanese x, y, or z as response? That's not even dealing with the question of the six assurances to Taiwan. And what we've already, in the

context of the '82 communiqué, what the United States Government has already stated we won't do in terms of Taiwan arms sales. One of those six assurances is we won't make calculations about what we sell to the Taiwanese based upon anything the Chinese tell us. We will just make our own independent calculation about their defense needs. This presents a major obstacle to any kind of linkage because the Congress is not going to say, we're not going to parley with the Chinese over this. We're going to talk to the Taiwanese as we do every year and we'll provide them with what we think they need. We're not going to provide the Taiwanese with something in response to the Chinese giving us some assurance. And that's the problem with it.

*I think the implication of your presentation, from my own point of view—not from a congressional point of view, which introduces the American domestic politics of it, but from an American point of view—is that American arms sales to Taiwan will have to increase. And the question is, at what point does one begin to introduce this into the Sino-American equation? Because the Chinese, I think, have to understand that if they wish to enter into an arms race, that is their choice. But they will surely lose. This is not something they can win. And their economy will suffer if they try it.*

I don't know if I would agree with that longer term. If the Chinese are able to acquire certain types of limited force-projection capabilities, our ability to counter those over time is going to demand more and more from us than it will from them. It will be less onerous for them to overcome the force projection capabilities that we could provide.

*We have to separate out here what the Taiwanese would be willing to sustain in order to retain their current de facto economy.*

There are a lot of problems. I've changed my thinking a little bit about the Taiwanese in the last five or six years and my assumption about Taiwanese capabilities is lower today than it was. I don't think the Taiwanese are, for a lot of different reasons, very good at absorbing the kinds of technologies and systems they've been getting from us. They haven't integrated them into their force structure very well. They are at saturation level, in many respects, in being able to cope with sophisticated weapon systems. From many points of view—financially, technologically, educationally. There are enormous manpower problems in the Taiwan military because personnel turn over every two years. They just get somebody trained to deal with a particular weapons system and they're gone. Their officer corps has a lot of problems. So it's a big question. Shifting the burden onto the Taiwanese presents another whole host of issues. And of course the other problem now is that the Chinese, right now, are moving in the opposite direction big-time. They are pressing very much for the United States to make some kind of commitment to reduce arms sales to Taiwan. I mean, forget this 'don't increase them.' They want decreases in arms sales.

*From what little that I have been able to glean in talking to Chinese, the Chinese not only have focused militarily increasingly upon Taiwan, but in order to elicit the cooperation from China that the United States seeks, in several areas, the Chinese are establishing a policy of linkage. And the linkage is with Taiwan. So that the Taiwan strategy that Mike has outlined*



*is on the military side, but it is also evident in other aspects of the Sino-American relationship at this time.*

*In this present military modernization on the military side from the Maoist era to the contemporary, do you see any parallel modernization in the PLA relationship to the party in terms of its political relation? In other words, is the PLA leadership involved in politics?*

It's quite significant, but with one big caveat. We don't know a whole lot about the Chinese officer corps in a political sense at the senior levels now, compared with what we knew a generation ago, or even five years ago, or in 1992 when I wrote a study at RAND about political succession in the Chinese military. At that time, the Chinese officer corps was pretty well known in terms of their backgrounds, their training. They had been in their positions for long periods of time. You had extensive biographies on who these people were. They also were old enough to have linkages with what we called elders—the PLA elders, the men of Deng's and Mao's generation, who looked at military-party issues in a different way than do the younger officers today. But the big caveat is, I don't jump from that to say, oh, we're looking at a professional military, i.e., that these guys today are like Americans, or like Europeans. We don't know enough anymore about what drives PLA leaders politically. I would say, in general, they don't have the political acumen and the skill and the knowledge and the influence that their predecessors had. But I wouldn't assume that they don't have political interests and that they wouldn't seek to try to advance those interests in some ways. We just don't know enough about these leaders to be able to tell what their relationships are, what their alliances are with one another and with civilian leaders. At the same time, I do think that their interests have become more institutional. That is to say, the interests of senior officers are more defined by the requirements of Chinese military modernization and what they see China having to do in order to advance those interests over time. If there's a political role for the Chinese military, it's more likely that it's going to be in the context of the success or the failure to advance certain types of institutional interests in the government as a whole. If they're frustrated in certain respects concerning such issues, that frustration could act to bring military leaders together. If they're not frustrated, then they're continually unable to act in a political way. I think that's where we are right now, by the way. I don't see the military as a major political force at present in the Chinese leadership that, say, dictates policy on Taiwan. They have influence and interests, certainly, but they don't dictate.

*Do you see any improvement of transparency from China on its military establishment? And if not, what can the U.S. do to push that process?*

There are some improvements, but they're marginal. Cohen got to see the defense command center in Beijing. He wanted to see the Western Hills Complex, which is their underground complex that they can direct defense from. They first said, oh, it doesn't exist. And then they said, oh, it no longer exists. We had it once, but it's no longer there. General Ryan, the chief of the Air Force, has asked to see Su-27s. He's flown an Su-27—this platform is not an unknown quantity to him. He knows what it is. He just wanted to go and take a look at it, and the Chinese said, it can't be done. The Russians won't let us do it, which is probably not true. Regarding the arguments in favor of greater transparency, two things. One, I'm not sure transparency is something we should fall on our swords over. I don't see it as the critical

dimension of military-to-military relations that we need to stress—saying, for example, if you don't advance on transparency, then we're going to bring the whole interaction to a halt. Because (a) it goes so contrary to the Chinese system in so many different ways; and (b) I'm not sure that they're able to change the system in major ways at this point, because there's nobody in the system who can circumvent it and who could say, Ryan gets to see an Su-27. Show him an Su-27. You know, the Chinese principle still stands that 'we don't show our front-line troops or forces to foreigners.' For a Chinese leader to say that that still stands, but to at the same time order the PLA to show Ryan the Su-27, I don't think anybody in the Chinese government, including Jiang Zemin, is going to say that and could necessarily make it stick with the military. That's one thing. And I think that there are other areas that are more important than transparency, because we already know a great deal about the Chinese military. I am more interested in developing a genuine strategic dialogue with the Chinese than with transparency issues, narrowly defined. But to the extent that we push transparency, we have to start thinking about quid pro quos—okay, if we don't get this, then we're going to stop showing you certain things that you've seen before or that you haven't seen before that we could show you or that we were planning to show you. The Chinese are going to respond only to that kind of a situation. I don't have an easy answer to it, though. It's a tough one.

*The picture you painted of the military establishment was intensely pragmatic. But there are counter evidences in your talk. You said that you thought that it was certainly possible that the Chinese would put a man in space. And, on the other hand, you said that the Chinese have simply not shown any indication of real interest in developing a carrier capability or a carrier battle group. One of the reasons, perhaps, they haven't done that is it's a sign that they're not interested in prestige items. I think of the Latin American states that have invested in carriers for God-knows-what reason, I mean why Chile has a carrier and so on. Not knowing this group, I suggest that possibly they're simply not interested in that sort of prestige item which would show that China is a great maritime power and so on. Again, on the other hand, you mentioned they might put a man in space, which has less applicability and would suggest that they really are interested in this prestige of demonstrating China as a major power.*

At one level, they do show that the Chinese are concerned with prestige. The question is, what best conveys that prestige for them? They've decided to emphasize the space program because they feel that a carrier just doesn't cut it well enough. In the carrier case, I wouldn't slam the door on it. I wouldn't say that they're not going to develop a carrier. It's a subject of debate within the Chinese military, I think. The navy has pushed it in the past very strongly, and they've I think been rebutted by the other services and by the civilian leadership, which have said, you haven't convinced us that (a) we really need it in the near term, and that (b) we can really make it work in the way in which it needs to work. You can also argue that the Chinese really can't do anything with one carrier. You need to have three carriers in order to really use them, in any comprehensible military sense. So what that means is, okay, then they choose the space program, if we're saying it's a rough corollary in some sense to a carrier, because it has more spin-off to it than other things do. This is pure speculation, by the way. But my sense is that if they're pushing a space program that involves a manned space launch, they're doing that because it serves the interests of other space programs, both commercial

and military. It's acting to channel—which is somewhat similar to what happened with us—technology and energy and resources into space-oriented programs. I can tell you that that is certainly evident. That, in other words, they haven't just developed a manned space program—they have a larger space program. And it's applicable to commercial and it's applicable to military spheres. It's increasingly applicable to military. In short, a manned space program, they're figuring, gives them much more bang for the buck, if you will, than a carrier program.

*What is the Japan factor? This is an extremely broad question, but as I heard you speak, it seemed to me that in addition to the Taiwan focus, there is a Japan—I wouldn't use the word focus, but concern. Have you stumbled, in your survey of materials and so on, and in your discussions with the Chinese, on concern as to what kinds of system development on the Chinese part might trigger the Japanese? What is it that they have to avoid in order to preclude a Japanese remilitarization, which they so much fear?*

The second one is a much harder question to answer.

*It's part of the answer, it seems to me, to the battle carrier, rather than a space program. A space program, in some ways, is more threatening, but it's less obvious symbolic evidence. China getting a carrier and having it in the vicinity probably militarily would be less significant. But symbolically, it would carry a different message. So it immediately raised in my mind the question, what is this lurking fear that we all know they have? In fact, part of what I think has brought the Taiwan issue more to the fore, in addition to Taiwan independence, is the fear that Japan is getting lured back into the defense of Taiwan and China has to begin to prepare for that.*

I think that's certainly a big part of it.

*So the question here is the specific one and the broader. The specific one is, has a concern for Japan shaped or constrained development of particular systems? And then secondly, how much of this modernization is indeed driven by some sense of eventual concerns with Japan?*

I don't think there's any particular aspect of military modernization that I would point to that is driven solely by concern over the Japanese. A concern over the Japanese is certainly a significant component in some of the systems. One of them, I would say—and it's one that bothers the Japanese as well, the Japanese military, at least—is the development of intermediate-range ballistic missiles—2,000 kilometer range, solid fuel, two-stage, quite accurate—that have the capability of hitting anywhere in Japan. There's no defense against them. And they can be both conventional and nuclear armed, as far as we know. The Chinese don't even acknowledge they exist, I don't think. Their existence is not classified in the West, they're called DF-21s. You can get information on them in Jane's or similar open sources. They originally were developed, as far as I understand, to counter the Soviet Union. Or the program originally was launched to cover short and intermediate-range targets in Russia. And the program continued, despite the implosion of the Soviet Union, and they've deployed these missiles in limited numbers, and I think they're going to expand the number they're going to deploy. The bothersome thing is that it's possible that in the Chinese thinking they

are part of a conventional strategy that deals not with their use as nuclear weapons, which would open up all kinds of doors that they don't want to go through, but in a conventional sense, to hold at threat U.S. military bases in Japan through a missile threat.

*Where are they deployed? Mostly in North China? Closer to Japan, or are they scattered?*

I couldn't tell you for sure. And such information is classified. But the existence of these missiles is not classified. The whole question of ballistic missile threats and countermeasures in Asia is an area we're trying to get some funding to study in a serious way, at RAND. In my mind, there's a question as to what really drives the Chinese about the Japanese. Whether they're more fearful about the prospect of a rift in the U.S.-Japan security alliance that would lead the Japanese to develop independent capabilities which they fear that the Japanese are capable of doing very quickly. They always say, oh, the Japanese could become a nuclear power very quickly, they could acquire this and that capability overnight. Their greater fear now, in light of the revised defense guidelines, is in fact a more robust relationship with the U.S. that integrates the Japanese more fully into our military posture in Asia, i.e., the Japanese then begin to play a role in tandem with us in a forward deployed sense that revises Japan's traditional restraints on the use of their military. I don't know which of those two types of scenarios the Chinese are more concerned with. I think it's more the latter these days, because of the defense guidelines. So they get more concerned about revisions of Japanese limitations under the constitution and that sort of thing, and whether Taiwan's applied to the defense guidelines. There's no specific capability that the Japanese have or that they could acquire in the near term, I think, in terms of discrete weapon systems that bother the Chinese. It's the overall change in Japan's posture that would bother them the most. They think that the Japanese could acquire a lot of things very quickly. I think that they know—as the Japanese have told me, by the way—that the Japanese could clean their clock in any kind of encounter in the near term or medium term. During the Taiwan crisis I was in Japan talking to a guy who's very nuts and bolts on defense planning in Japan. And I said, were you worried about the Chinese deploying from the North Sea Fleet and some of their submarines and starting to increase patrols around your area and that sort of stuff? He said, we did a scenario, a calculation, that if we had to act it would take us about three hours to destroy their navy. They're way better than the Chinese are, and I think the Chinese know that. So it's not a question of anything new that they could acquire in the near term that would really change the Chinese calculus, it's the overall posture of the Japanese and what they would be willing to do with their military in support of us, or independently, that bothers them the most.

*Well, I think the problem here is that the only thing the Chinese fear worse than a close Japanese-American relationship is a contentious Japanese-American relationship. Neither one is a winning combination for them. What they seek, it seems to me, is a relationship in which the United States limits Japanese military expenditures, but in which there is some Japanese-American rivalry into which the Chinese can fit themselves.*

That's right. It's interesting right now that the Chinese are courting the Japanese. And I wouldn't say vice versa in the sense that the Japanese are courting the Chinese. But there's a real increase now in the defense relationship between China and Japan. They are beginning

exchanges now that are similar to what we were doing with the Chinese, back and forth. And they're expanding their level of dialogue, their defense dialogue with the Chinese.

*Is it any less formalistic?*

*Is it more sterile or less sterile?*

That I can't tell you for sure. I think it's still too early to say. It's at the very initial stages, so you've got the first kind of meetings. Chi Haotian, the defense minister, has come over to Japan. You're going to have other lower-level Chinese military guys going over to Japan. And then the Japanese are sending more people over there. They've already sent, I think, the head of the JDA over there, at least once, and I think he's going again. These are sort of get-acquainted trips. But it's amazing—I know the guys involved in this on the Japanese side, and there is no acrimony in the conversation, they don't raise the issue—you know, Nanjing and all, they don't go through the litany of things that they beat the Japanese with. They're very plain, very nice with the Japanese. That's a change from what it was. They were trying to beat up on the Japanese quite a bit in '95-'96, trying to wag their finger at them, you know—don't you try anything funny with Taiwan. And now it's all very pleasant. I think that's a broader reflection, though, of the overall geopolitical shifts that are going on in the region.

*It's the capital.*

Part of it is, yes. The Japanese are increasing their commitment on the economic side to the Chinese economy.

*But I think the Japanese have also successfully drawn Chinese attention by improving their relations with Russia. That you can no longer take for granted Russian-Japanese animosity.*

That's right. That's a big part of it. You've seen this very interesting cycle since you had NATO expansion and the improvement of the U.S.-Japan security relationship: a series of responses that have been improvements in the relations of the different countries involved, instead of attempts to maneuver into a position of opposition. The Chinese and the Russians responded to those two things by moving closer. We, in turn, responded to that by improving ties with the Russians. Yeltsin comes over to Denver; Russia becomes part of the G-7. We begin to improve with the Chinese. Then the Chinese begin to improve their relationship with the Japanese.

*And for the first time the Chinese chief of staff is visiting India.*

Yes. In Mike Mochizuki's view, this kind of upward spiral in these relationships is overrunning the domestic base for it in these countries. He thinks there's not enough domestic support for—in the Russo-Japanese case, for example—an improvement that develops further. He wonders how far these leaderships can sustain domestic support for these policies.



## About the Author

Michael D. Swaine is a senior political scientist in International Studies at RAND in Santa Monica, California, and research director of The RAND Center for Asia-Pacific Policy (CAPP). Prior to joining RAND in 1989, Dr. Swaine was a consultant in the business sector, a postdoctoral fellow at the Center for Chinese Studies, University of California, Berkeley, and a research associate at Harvard University.

Dr. Swaine holds Ph.D. and master's degrees in political science from Harvard University and a bachelor's degree from George Washington University. He specializes in Chinese domestic politics and foreign policy, U.S.-China relations, and East Asian international relations.

Dr. Swaine's recent writings include *The Role of the Chinese Military in National Security Policymaking* (revised edition 1998); "The Modernization of the Chinese People's Liberation Army: Prospects and Implications for Northeast Asia" (1994); and *The Military and Political Succession in China: Leadership, Institutions and Beliefs* (1992).





## America's Alliances with Japan and Korea in a Changing Northeast Asia

### Project Discussion Papers

- Koji Murata. *The Origins and Evolution of the Korean-American Alliance: A Japanese Perspective*. August 1998.
- Byung-joon Ahn. *The Origins and Evolution of the Korean-American Alliance: A Korean Perspective*. July 1998.
- David Shambaugh. *China's Post-Deng Military Leadership: New Faces, New Trends*. June 1998.
- Nancy Bernkopf Tucker. *The Origins and Evolution of the Korean-American Alliance: An American Perspective*. June 1998.
- Jianwei Wang and Xinbo Wu. *Against Us or with Us? The Chinese Perspective of America's Alliances with Japan and Korea*. May 1998.
- Mike M. Mochizuki. *Security and Economic Interdependence in Northeast Asia*. May 1998.
- Yoshihide Soeya. *Japan's Dual Identity and the U.S.-Japan Alliance*. May 1998.
- Jörn Dosch. *The United States and the New Security Architecture of the Asia-Pacific—A European View*. April 1998.
- Charles Wolf, Jr., and Michele Zanini. *Benefits and Burdens: The Politically Dominated Economics of U.S. Alliances with Japan and Korea*. April 1998.
- Marcus Noland, Sherman Robinson, and Li-gang Liu. *The Costs and Benefits of Korean Unification*. March 1998.
- Wu Xinbo. *Integration on the Basis of Strength: China's Impact on East Asian Security*. February 1998.
- Richard Danzig. *Asian Futures, Naval Futures: How Do They Intersect?* William J. Perry. *Asian-Pacific Security Issues in the Post-Deng Era*. November 1997.
- Bonnie Glaser and Banning Garrett. *China and the U.S.-Japan Alliance at a Time of Strategic Change and Shifts in the Balance of Power*. October 1997.
- Bates Gill. *Proliferation and the U.S. Alliances in Northeast Asia*. 1997.
- Paul Giarra. *U.S.-Japan Defense Guidelines: Toward a New Accommodation of Mutual Responsibility*. 1997.
- Yu Bin. *East Asia: Geopolitique into the Twenty-first Century—A Chinese View*. 1997.
- Ralph Cossa. *Korea: The Achilles' Heel of the U.S.-Japan Alliance*. 1997.
- Andrew F. Krepinevich. *Future Prospects for the U.S. Defense Budget and Their Implications for Our Asian Alliance Commitments*. 1997.

Discussion papers may be ordered at \$5.00 per copy (including postage and handling) through the Asia/Pacific Research Center. To order, or for a complete list of the publications of the Asia/Pacific Research Center, contact A/PARC:

The Asia/Pacific Research Center  
Encina Hall  
Stanford University  
Stanford, CA 94305  
ph (650) 723-9741  
fax (650) 723-6530  
Asia-Pacific-Research-Center@stanford.edu

Complete texts of many of the Center's publications are also available at A/PARC's Web site:  
[www.stanford.edu/group/APARC](http://www.stanford.edu/group/APARC)

