2

East Asia's Cold War Security Agenda

In addition to identifying and categorizing the security agenda in East Asia, this chapter aims to explicate the processes responsible for its generation. Specifically, it will argue that it is necessary to examine the evolution and causation of the security agenda in East Asia in tandem with the evolution and characteristics of the political economy of the region from the postwar to the contemporary period. This can be comprehended only with reference to three interlinked processes: decolonization, bipolarization, and proto-globalization (and then globalization). The interrelation and cumulative effects of these three processes shaped the characteristics of the sovereign states and other security actors; created the conditions for military, economic, and environmental insecurity; and determined the range of capabilities and frameworks available to respond to security problems.

This political economy–oriented approach is vital. With it one can evaluate the degree of effectiveness of Japan's security policy. The true quality and worth of Japan's security policy can be ascertained only through an analysis of how far it seeks to address root causes of issues on the regional agenda, which in turn can be ascertained only by an analysis of its origins and causation.

In addition, the historical and political economy approach is crucial for comprehending the methods and tools that Japan has selected. Japan's comprehensive security policy traditionally placed great emphasis on economic alongside military power and on economic stabilization and state-building. Japan's past and continuing predisposition can be understood by reference to its realization that the East Asian security agenda, in the military, economic, and environmental dimensions, has been determined by major shifts in the region's political economy and the challenges of state-building. Finally, the historical and political economy approach is essential to provide the international context and analysis in later chapters.

The section below provides a historical framework for understanding the transformation of the political economy of East Asia as the outcome of

Hughes-2.Final 3/18/2004 3:17 PM Page 36

decolonization, bipolarization, and proto-globalization. It also explains the impact of these transformations on the regional security agenda, in terms of the military, economic, and environmental threats dimensions, the actors involved, and the types of responses.

East Asian Security Dynamics

Definitions of the Cold War

An examination of the historical phases and processes of political economy that influenced the rise and evolution of the contemporary security agenda in East Asia shows that they continue to influence it. The actual historical periodization of the Cold War is subject to some debate—with "traditionalist" studies locating the start of the Cold War in the immediate postwar period as the irreconcilable nature of U.S. and Soviet Union strategic interests became apparent (Painter and Leffler 1994); whereas "revisionists" trace the Cold War's initiation back to the later stages of World War II, when the United States foresaw "atomic diplomacy" directed at Japan as a means to check future Soviet expansion in Eurasia following Germany's eventual defeat (Sherwin 1994: 77–94; Alperovitz 1994). Almost as controversial are attempts to date the exact end of the Cold War. The fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989 is often taken as the symbolic date, whereas many commentators view the practical end as coming in the period of détente in the 1970s, with the "second Cold War" following the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in 1979 and stretching into the 1980s and 1990s, marking the last gasp of the Cold War system. Moreover, the problem depends on the regional context, with events in Europe and East Asia in related but not strict synchronization. Hence, some would argue that the Cold War never in fact began at all in East Asia; that the security issues from the late 1940s to the early 1990s were the product of nationalist struggles and thus unrelated to those in Europe; and that the term *Cold War* used with regard to East Asia is a misnomer. Other studies, however, insist that the Cold War in parts of the region such as the Korean Peninsula, with the continuing military standoff between North and South Korea, has been slower to fade or has yet to end.

The term *periodization* is used here in two senses that draw upon the major strengths of the above arguments and bridge the divides by picking up on the common analytical themes.

First, the Cold War is understood as the historical period that runs from late World War II and the immediate postwar years through to the late 1980s and early 1990s; it can be further split into "first" and "second" Cold War phases, divided by the détente of the 1970s. This chronological approach spans the initiation and cessation of the Cold War.

Hughes-2.Final 3/18/2004 3:17 PM Page 37

Second, the Cold War is also understood as a historical period that is given coherence and demarcated from other periods by the characteristics, confluences, and relative intensity of processes of political economy that generated certain security problems. Hence, "traditionalist" and "revisionist" views concur despite division over timing and responsibility; the Cold War period was characterized by the intensification of U.S.-Soviet strategic military competition and the imposition of a bipolar political economy.

Nevertheless, there is also the need to acknowledge that the Cold War as a historical period and set of security issues cannot be understood solely as the product of bipolarization. If the Cold War encompasses and encapsulates the period from the late 1940s to the early 1990s, this leads to the danger that other processes of political economy responsible for security problems will be obscured. In the case of East Asia, the Cold War period was characterized by intertwining processes of bipolarization, decolonization, and proto-globalization. Indeed, it is arguable that decolonization was in fact just as important as, or more so than, bipolarization in driving security issues in the Cold War period and has continued to be the underlying security dynamic today.

Bipolarization of the Global Political Economy

During the Cold War, the structure of the global political economy was dominated by great power and superpower confrontation between the United States and the Soviet Union. Superpower confrontation may have originated in ideological divisions over liberal democracy and socialism, but it generated and was subsequently sustained by military, political, and economic competition, giving rise to distinct forms of political economy on the global and regional scales and to the process of bipolarization. The bipolar political economy, by definition, was bifurcated with its respective halves centered upon the dual poles of U.S. and Soviet hegemony. The U.S. hegemonic pole was larger in geographic scope, being centered on the sovereign states of North America and Western Europe and extending into Latin America and East Asia. The U.S. pole was characterized by a system of political economy that promoted liberal capitalism and generated economic interdependence among sovereign states in production, trade, finance, and aid. In a sense, such economic interdependence actually constituted a form of proto-globalization, largely limited to the Northern and Western Hemispheres. It is possible to label the U.S.-dominated pole in the global political economy as the *world of interdependence* during the Cold War.

The Soviet pole existed on a smaller geographical scale, stretching across the Eurasian continent in the Northern and Eastern Hemispheres. The Soviet Union constructed a system of political economy that promoted increased economic interdependence among sovereign states in production, trade, finance and aid, all based upon principles of socialism and planned

Hughes-2.Final 3/18/2004 3:17 PM Page 38

economy. But the Soviet pole exhibited a lesser degree of economic dynamism with regard to its ability to integrate sovereign-state economies. Consequently, it is more appropriate to label the Soviet-dominated pole in the global political economy as the *world of independence*, resistant to absorption into the U.S.-dominated world of interdependence and proto-globalization.

However, the global political economy in this period was subject to greater complexity. First, the bipolar division of states, as well as the physical boundaries of the system itself, were unclear and fluid. The progression of the Cold War brought about fissures and defections at the regional level from both sides. In East Asia, the system was challenged by processes of tripolarization. The Sino-Soviet split of the 1960s rendered divisions within the world of independence and created a long-term struggle between the Soviet Union and China vis-à-vis one another and the United States for influence.

Second, many sovereign states defy easy compartmentalization into either the U.S. or Soviet camps. Instead, some states remained neutral, sitting on the margins of the bipolar divide or flitting in and out of both the worlds of interdependence and independence. Such states, predominantly developing states concentrated in the Southern Hemisphere, were integrated one way or another into the U.S. and Soviet political economies. The Soviet Union extended preferential production, trade, finance, and aid links to a number of developing states in Latin America, Africa, and East Asia to secure support in the political and economic struggle. In turn, the United States competed to extend similar links to developing states across these regions; it was successful in many cases in establishing a system of center-periphery economic relations that extended outward and gradually integrated states in the South.

Sovereign states accepted or resisted the economic tug-of-war, often seeking political and economic nonalignment and implementing policies of economic autarky such as import substitution. However, many states on the margin acquiesced to one side or carefully balanced their reliance upon the two so as to ensure economic development and survival. In this sense, then, it is important to refine our understanding of the process of bipolarization and to note that there was a third component of the global political economy, located mainly in the Southern Hemisphere. As the Cold War progressed, this *world of dependence* became increasingly merged and subordinated to the worlds of interdependence and independence (Spero 1997).

The section below investigates the process of decolonization, its impact on the ordering of the regional political economy, and its particular characteristics, which in combination with bipolarization were able to help form the security agenda.

Hughes-2.Final 3/18/2004 3:17 PM Page 39

Decolonization and the Political Economy

The Western Colonial Legacy

Prior to the end of World War II and the onset of the Cold War, colonization was principally responsible for the ordering of the East Asian political economy. By the middle of the nineteenth century the imperial and great powers of the West (or in the proxy form as trading companies such as the Dutch East India Company and British East India Company) had acquired a series of colonies in Southeast Asia and contributed to the gradual dismemberment of China. The process involved attempts to impose upon and replicate within East Asia a derivative of the modern sovereign state system then found in Europe and the United States (T. Shiraishi 2000: 106–112), although the colonial administrative territories subsequently created were mere adjuncts, dependent upon and oriented politically and economically toward colonial rulers.

More specifically, colonization required that existing political and economic space in East Asia should be reordered, delimited, and subjugated in accordance with the principle of territorial sovereignty. Hence, the ethnicities, religions, and languages that had defined precolonial political and economic space were replaced with or suppressed by the principle of territorial sovereignty. It dictated that the colonial powers exercise exclusive jurisdiction over a tightly demarcated territorial space and control all forms of political and economic interaction within and among sovereign territorial units. The effect was to truncate or redirect the ethnic, religious, and language ties and the forms of political and economic interaction that had existed prior to the imposition of sovereign borders. Moreover, the effects were accentuated when the imperial powers, for administrative convenience or as the result of horse-trading territorial acquisitions, imposed sovereign borders with total disregard for, or in contradistinction to, the precolonial ethnic ties in East Asia.

Colonization can thus be viewed as a process of remapping the political and economic space in East Asia into territorial and administrative units under the control of imperial powers based upon the principles of territorial sovereignty. This is the *territorialization* of the regional political economy. But territorial sovereignty as the ordering principle did not sit well with many in the region and engendered an array of political and economic contradictions and distortions.

First, within the territorial borders of a particular colony there could be forced together two or more hostile ethnic groups. Moreover, the policy of ascribing a distinct and rigid ethnic identity to loosely identified societal groups enhanced the sense of political and economic division among groups. Following their foundation of the new model colony of Singapore in the early nineteenth century, for instance, the British ascribed strict

Hughes-2.Final 3/18/2004 3:17 PM Page 40

administrative and ethnic identities to Chinese, Malay, Indian, Eurasian, and European populations, obliging them to divide not only physically into different residential quarters in the city but also cognitively into different political, economic, and societal units (T. Shiraishi 2000: 92–102).

Colonial possessions in Southeast Asia most typically consisted of a majority ethnic group accompanied by a variety of minority ethnic groups. In the Philippines, the United States grouped a population that was more than 90 percent Christian Malay, but it also included Muslim Malay minorities in Mindanao and a small Chinese minority; in Burma, the British formed a colony comprised a 70 percent Burmese majority, as well as substantial minorities of Shan and Karen tribes; and the Netherlands East Indies contained a population that was around half Javanese, with large Sundanese, Madurese, and other minorities scattered across the former kingdoms of the Indonesian archipelago. This shoehorning, this raising of the distinct consciousness, had the unintended consequences of laying the foundations of nationalist sentiment in Southeast Asia and creating ethnic tensions. These latent tensions were exacerbated by the political and economic policies of the imperial powers (Godement 1997: 31), which included the immigration of different ethnic groups into the colonies to provide cheap labor, as in the case of the Chinese and Indian traders and laborers encouraged to work in Singapore and the plantations of Malaya and Indochina, as well as the occasional policy of balancing minority against larger ethnic groups as a form of "divide and rule" policy.

The second contradiction was that one ethnic group could be divided physically by two or more colonial boundaries. In such instances, the imposition of colonial borders proved capable of suppressing, rather than extinguishing, precolonial ties, and a strong impulse remained to reunite and restore former political and economic links.

Third, it also hampered economic development in the colonial units. Colonization functioned to reorient the economies of East Asia away from the region, instead connecting them outward to the economic networks of the imperial powers. This incorporation into imperial economic networks brought a degree of economic development in rail and communications infrastructure, plantation agriculture, and heavy industries. Yet colonization also distorted economic development by converting regional economies into captive markets for the manufactures of imperial powers, with the consequent decimation of local handicraft industries. It led to forced reliance upon the exploitation of natural resources as the principal form of exports. And it led to the destruction of flourishing agricultural sectors as production was shifted from the supply of food for local needs to cash crops for export (Ayoob 1995: 34–37).

Colonization thus reordered the East Asian political economy into territorial units under the sovereign control of imperial powers from the seventeenth century to the middle of the twentieth century. The process of

Hughes-2.Final 3/18/2004 3:17 PM Page 41

colonization created latent political and economic distortions within territorial units, which were often suppressed by military force. The impact of colonization was nearly universal in geographical extent, with only Thailand and Japan escaping subjugation. Thailand evaded direct colonization due to its skillful balancing of diplomatic ties with the imperial powers; Japan became a modern sovereign state and imperialist power in East Asia.

Colonization brought about two intertwined reactions within Japan. On the one hand, Japan's leaders knew, even after the decline of the Chinese world order and the imposition of imperialism, that their country continued to form part of East Asia geographically, ethnically, and culturally. Thus, as expressed in sentiments such as pan-Asianism, Japan, as the first modern sovereign state in the region, had a special responsibility to take the lead in protecting East Asia from the ravages of Western imperialism. On the other hand, this vision of Japan's role in East Asia was counteracted by an awareness that Japan, to survive and prosper in a regional and global order dominated by the imperial powers, required similar physical, economic, and military resources. The outcome was Japanese colonialism in East Asia (Taiwan in 1895, the annexation of Korea in 1910), with the contest becoming one between Japan and the Western imperial powers for control of resources in the region, especially those on the Chinese mainland. Japan's fear that its economic development and imperial ambitions would be suffocated by Western imperial powers led it to challenge head-on the existing colonial order, leading to World War II. The rapid occupation of French (Indochina, 1940), Dutch (Netherlands East Indies, March 1942), and British and U.S. (Malaya, Singapore, Philippines, March 1942) colonial possessions in Southeast Asia, followed by the proclamation in 1942 of the Greater East Asian Co-prosperity Sphere (Daitōa Kyōeiken), enabled Japan to construct under its own imperial auspices a new political and economic regional order centered upon itself.

Japanese Colonialism's Impact

Japan's declared intent in proclaiming the Greater East Asian Co-prosperity Sphere was liberation of East Asia from Western colonial rule and to foster (under Japanese guardianship) regional solidarity and eventual independence (Beasley 1987: 245). The Greater East Asian Co-prosperity Sphere was viewed as a cynical exercise on Japan's part to disguise its intent to supplant Western colonial rule with its own (Dower 1986: 262–290). But regardless of pan-Asian sentiments, the rapid establishment and then collapse of Japanese colonial rule and the Greater East Asian Co-prosperity Sphere were responsible for initiating the process of decolonization. Movements for national independence had been in existence in many East Asian colonies prior to the outbreak of the Pacific War. But Japan's expansion of its presence into Southeast Asia from 1941 onward added momentum to these movements in two ways.

Hughes-2.Final 3/18/2004 3:17 PM Page 42

First, Japan's swift defeat of the Western colonial powers destroyed the "myth of white supremacy" (Storry 1979: 6–13). Japan, for instance, established control of French Indochina through the agency of a pro-Vichy administration, and it did not seek to dismantle French colonial rule in Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos (Ferro 2000: 263–266). Nevertheless, the demonstration of Japanese superiority over the French was to inspire the anti-French and communist movements in Vietnam (Mendl 1995: 113). Second, even though Japan's colonial rule generated a good deal of suffering and anti-Japanese feeling across the region and especially in the Philippines, Singapore, and Malaya, Japanese administrators in some newly acquired colonies were able to ameliorate hostility by encouraging popular national movements. Hence, Japan fomented anti-British feeling in Burma by granting it nominal independence in 1943, and it appealed to mass opinion and nationalist elites in the Netherlands East Indies and the Philippines by holding out the prospect of eventual independence (Leifer 1983: 1–2).

The final consequence of Japan's colonial experience was that it managed to unleash pro-independence and decolonization forces. Japan's defeat in 1945 and the collapse of its empire was thus accompanied not only by a legacy of anti-Japanese sentiment but also by a legacy of anticolonialism that hampered the ability of the Western imperial powers to reassert control. Indeed, in the case of Burma and the Netherlands East Indies, the military training provided by the Japanese enabled nationalist forces to frustrate the return of the Western colonial powers (Lebra 1977). The implications of decolonization, coupled with the onset of bipolarization, are considered below.

Decolonization and Bipolarization

The Emergence of "Weak States"

Japan's expulsion of the Western imperial powers from East Asia during the Pacific War, and its own subsequent defeat and forced withdrawal, opened considerable political and economic space, which was filled and reconstituted by the two interrelated processes of decolonization and bipolarization. The process of decolonization, set in motion by Japan's failed colonial experiment, led to the emergence of new sovereign states. Elite leaders of the majority ethnic groups in the colonies took advantage of the power vacuum to launch or relaunch movements for national liberation (fused with peasant movements for economic emancipation as in China, or movements to halt the socioeconomic advance of Chinese minority groups, as in Malaya; the selective adoption of forms of communist ideology, as in China, North Korea, and Indochina; and elements of religious movements as in early Indonesian and Burmese nationalism) and the creation of independent states (Godement 1997: 42–60; Leifer 2000a: 159–160). Hence, following

Hughes-2.Final 3/18/2004 3:17 PM Page 43

a struggle of national liberation in the Netherlands East Indies, the Dutch acceded to Indonesian independence in 1949. The United States and Great Britain also granted eventual independence to their colonies in the Philippines (1946), Burma (1948), and the Federation of Malaysia (1955), the latter splitting into Malaysia (1963) and Singapore (1965). In the meantime, France became engaged in a long-term and ultimately futile war against forces fighting for national liberation in Vietnam and Indochina, eventually acceding to the independence of Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia at the Geneva Conference of 1954.

By the early 1950s the colonial order in Southeast Asia had thus begun to be replaced by newly independent sovereign states. However, in most cases sovereign territorial borders were inherited unaltered from the previous colonial administrations. The result was that policymaking elites inherited the same internal consistencies and distortions left over from the colonial period's partitioning of political and economic interaction into territorial units.

The imperial powers bequeathed to many independent successor states territories comprising different majority and minority ethnic groups forced into uneasy political and economic cohabitation (Acharya 2000: 55–58). The majority ethnic groups in certain former colonies, such as the Malays in Malaysia and the Philippines, and the Thais and Vietnamese, formed a basis for the creation of sovereign states modeled along the lines of the sovereign nation-states of Europe and the United States, marked by cohesion among the territorial borders and the national identities and interests of the bulk of the citizenry contained within. Consequently, many colonies produced strong anticolonial and nationalist movements capable of unifying general populations in pursuit of national independence and statehood, as seen most in the case of the Vietnamese struggle against the French and the United States. At the same time, though, these newly established states also contained significant ethnic minorities, the presence of which mitigated against the formation of fully consistent nation-states. Ethnic and religious minorities in the Philippines, Malaysia, and Burma created the potential for internal ethnic tensions within these states and gave them the qualities of "semi-nation" sovereign states.

Moreover, ethnic divisions and inconsistencies in territorial boundaries and ethnic composition were multiplied many times over in the case of Indonesia; its highly pluralistic makeup of 490 ethnic groups were constantly in tension with attempts of the Javanese majority under the New Order of President Suharto (1966–1998) to create a unified sovereign and nation-state (Vatikiotis 1998: 92–118, 350–351). Furthermore, the independent states also faced the problem that territorial borders had been drawn arbitrarily and carried over from the colonial period. This continued to divide sections of the minority and majority ethnic groups across different states and to lock in within the body politic transmigrant ethnic groups

Hughes-2.Final 3/18/2004 3:17 PM Page 44

brought in under colonial labor policies. The result was to create the potential for minority ethnic groups to secede and join another state, giving rise to separatist movements; or for a majority ethnic group to demand the reabsorption of similar ethnic groups located within another state, giving rise to irredentism.

Finally, the inherited problems of ethnic composition were compounded by economic weakness. In certain cases, such as the Korean Peninsula (Kohli 1999), colonization laid the infrastructure for the rise of developmental states and future economic growth. But colonization also engendered distortions in economic development that carried over into the postcolonial period and limited the ability of governments to ameliorate disparities of wealth among ethnic groups and thereby dampen internal frictions.

The final outcome of decolonization created a series of newly independent sovereign states in East Asia that were not entirely "natural" or organic political and economic entities; they were systemically "weak" (Buzan and Segal 1994: 16–17; Acharya 2000: 55). Nationalism was undoubtedly an important force in the formation and binding together of these states. Nonetheless, few featured the internal cohesion found in Europe or the United States and thus did not fully approximate the typical model of the nation-state. Instead they were multiethnic in character; marked by internal contradictions between the delineation of sovereign territorial boundaries and the political and economic affiliations of large sections of their populations and citizenry; and consequently preoccupied with a security agenda dominated by ethnic tensions, separatism, and irredentism.

In turn, these sovereign states were to enjoy varying degrees of political and economic legitimacy in the eyes of their citizenries (Alagappa 1995: 56–57). They also reflected a gap dividing the security interests of the state and large segments of populations. As will be seen in later sections of this chapter and in Chapter 3, the test for the policymakers of these Southeast Asian states since independence and continuing into the contemporary period has been to try to resolve or at least ameliorate these contradictions, to moderate the gap between the security interests of states and substantial sections of the populations contained within their borders, and thereby maintain the integrity of these states as territorial, political, and economic units. Government policymakers in Southeast Asia have attempted to achieve these objectives through the assertion of the principles of sovereignty and nonintervention so as to shut out any form of external intervention that could threaten their exclusive control over their citizenry and create alternative ties of loyalty, while also engaging in top-down internal efforts at centralized state-building and state "resilience" (Emmerson 2001: 95) through the promotion of nationalist identities and economic development (T. Shiraishi 2000: 151–174). In short, Southeast Asian governments have been subject to the strictures of "performance legitimacy" and the delivery of economic stability to survive (Stubbs 2001: 38–39).

Hughes-2.Final 3/18/2004 3:17 PM Page 45

Sovereign states in Northeast Asia created in the immediate postwar period also were not immune to internal contradictions. China incorporates a large number of ethnic minorities within its borders (including Zhuangs, Hui [or Chinese Muslims], Uygur, Yi, Tibetans, Miao, Manchus, Mongols, Bouyei, and Koreans), accounting for around 8 percent of its total population, and is concerned with the implications of this for territorial integrity, separatism, and internal security (Wang 1995: 163–165). North and South Korea, as former colonies of Japan and as sovereign states newly established in 1948, are ethnically homogeneous, but the existence of a large Korean minority in the autonomous prefecture of Yanbian, Jilin Province, has long raised Chinese concerns about ethnic separatism or Korean irredentism in the event of reunification. Moreover, the entire problem of ethnic groupings, secessionism, and irredentism in Northeast Asia, and in parts of Southeast Asia as well, has been compounded by national division engendered by the onset of the Cold War. Hence, the Chinese government views the Taiwan issue as one of separatism produced by the Cold War, whereas other interpretations label it as one of Chinese irredentism.

Statehood and the Onset of the Cold War

Bipolarization was the second process introduced into the region as a result of Japan's defeat in 1945. In combination with decolonization, it reconstituted the political and economic order and influenced the regional security agenda. Joining the newly independent sovereign states were the two superpowers, which had become functionally regional powers due to their strategic interests and power projection capacities. The superpowers remained engaged during East Asia in the postwar period and initiated the process of the bipolarization due to their intrinsic function both in carrying forward and hampering the process of decolonization. The responsibility that the United States and Soviet Union took for the occupation of Japan and the dismantlement of its empire in Northeast Asia, and the U.S. role in terminating as well as prolonging European colonial rule in Southeast Asia, influenced the course of decolonization across the region. This became the starting point for the interconnection of decolonization and bipolarization.

In Japan, the United States occupied the mainland, as well as the Ogasawara (Bonin), Senkaku, and Ryū kyū (Okinawa) island chains; the Soviet Union took possession of the Kurile Islands (Northern Territories). In Northeast Asia, as mandated in the Cairo and Potsdam Declarations (1943 and 1945), Japan was stripped of its colonies in China, Taiwan, Korea, and the Pacific Islands. The withdrawal of Japan from its colonies on mainland China and Taiwan enabled the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) and Nationalist Party (Kuomintang, or KMT) to resume their civil war—resulting in a communist victory, the establishment of the People's Republic of China in 1949, the decampment of the KMT to Taiwan, and the de facto division of China. Meanwhile, in Korea the original plan had been to restore this former

Hughes-2.Final 3/18/2004 3:17 PM Page 46

Japanese colony to full independence through a U.S.–Soviet–British–Republic of China (ROC) four-power trusteeship agreed at the Yalta Conference of February 1945. However, as Japan's defeat approached in August, the United States and Soviet Union hastily agreed to partition the Korean Peninsula at the 38th Parallel into military zones administered by themselves. The division of Korea was meant only as a temporary stage in the decolonization process, and the problem of elections for a united government was entrusted to the UN between 1947 and 1948. Nevertheless, unification was to remain unresolved because of the Korean Peninsula's position as the point of convergence for the processes of decolonization and bipolarization.

The end of Japanese colonial rule and division of the Korean Peninsula released independence and nationalist factions, split into procommunist and anticommunist forces located north and south of the 38th Parallel. In turn, increasing bipolar confrontation in Europe encouraged both superpowers to back either the procommunist and anticommunist forces, leading to the establishment in 1948 of the Republic of Korea (ROK—South Korea) and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK—North Korea). The reasons for the eventual outbreak of the Korean War in June 1950 are subject to various historical interpretations. North Korea's decision to reunify the Korean Peninsula by military means was arguably the result of inter-Korean domestic and nationalist tensions (Cumings 1990), and the degree to which the United States and Soviet Union were willing to disturb the status quo in Korea is questionable. Nevertheless, the launch of the civil war, the U.S. pledge to defend South Korea in line with UN mandates, the Soviet Union's support for North Korea, and the entry of China into the war in October 1950 had the effect of interlinking, first on the Korean Peninsula and then throughout the rest of East Asia, the processes of decolonization and bipolarization. From its initiation in 1950, through the armistice of 1953, and finally the Geneva Conference of 1954, which affirmed the armistice and de facto division of the peninsula, the Korean War came to be perceived as a contest of strength between the two superpowers and their respective allies. It transmitted the bipolar pressures on the global level down to Northeast Asia on the regional level.

Likewise, the U.S. response was not only to commit men and matériel to the South; it expanded its security perimeter by signaling its preparedness in 1950 and again in 1954–1955 to interpose the U.S. Seventh Fleet in the Taiwan Strait to prevent any Chinese attempt to invade that island. Hence, Taiwan represented another intersection of U.S. superpower global interests with regional civil and nationalist struggles; this led to the intensification of bipolarization in East Asia along lines of demarcation established by the fall of Japanese imperialism and the process of decolonization.

In Northeast Asia, the intersection of decolonization and bipolarization was solidified by the conclusion of the San Francisco Peace Treaty in

Hughes-2.Final 3/18/2004 3:17 PM Page 47

September 1951 and the fuller incorporation of Japan into the U.S. half of the bipolar divide. The treaty completed the formal process of divestment of Japan's colonies by asserting in article 2 that it should renounce control over Korea, Taiwan, and the Pescadores, the Kurile Islands, and the Spratly and Paracel Islands, as well as administrative authority over the Nansei Shotō (Ryūkyū and Daito Islands) and Nanpō Shotō (including the Bonin Islands, Rosario Islands, and Volcano Islands). However, this process of decolonization was affected by bipolar tensions. First, even though Japan renounced its rights to the Kurile Islands, the bipolar tensions that led the Soviet Union to reject the peace treaty meant that the Kuriles issue remained unresolved—thereby reinforcing the territorial dispute over the Northern Territories between Japan and the Soviet Union and later Russia. Second, divisions among the Allied Powers over policy toward communist China meant that the neither the ROC nor PRC were invited to the peace conference, with the result that the treaty did not specify to which country or governmental authority Japan renounced Taiwan and the Spratly and the Paracel Islands (Hara 1999: 523). Third, the U.S. decision to assume administrative control over the Ryū kyūs to ensure continued control of its vital bases on Okinawa and military domination would sow the seeds of a territorial dispute between Japan and China over the Senkaku Islands.

Finally, bipolar pressures were transmitted across to Southeast Asia. In 1949 the United States had pressured the Dutch to grant Indonesia independence; by the 1950s it was providing massive financial aid and military hardware to support French attempts to maintain colonial rule in Indochina. Following France's defeat at Dien Bien Phu in May 1954 (the First Indochina War) and military withdrawal from Vietnam, the Geneva Conference on Indochina agreed to the partition of North and South Vietnam. Although the Geneva agreements on Indochina anticipated that Vietnam would later be united through elections, the final outcome was to establish a communist regime in the North oriented toward China and the Soviet Union, and an anticommunist regime in the South reliant upon the United States. North Vietnamese insurgency in the South, and attempts to reunify Vietnam by military force from the early 1960s onward, led to the increasing U.S. military commitment to defend South Vietnam and the onset of the Vietnam War (also known as the Second Indochina War). Hence, between 1961 and the Kennedy administration decision to deploy U.S. ground troops in Vietnam, and the final withdrawal of U.S. forces under the Nixon administration in 1973, the nationalist struggle in Vietnam was overlain by bilateral pressures and became another outlet for hot war.

The U.S.-Centered Worlds of Interdependence and Dependence

The consequence of East Asia becoming an arena for U.S.-Soviet confrontation introduced the process of bipolarization and "overlaid" the already ongoing process of decolonization and the newly established sovereign states

Hughes-2.Final 3/18/2004 3:17 PM Page 48

(Buzan 1994: 133). This would shape the regional political economy and security agenda. The most important feature was to replicate an approximate division of sovereign states into spheres of interdependence and independence, centered on the United States and Soviet Union, with each sphere associated with a third sphere of dependence. In the case of the sphere of interdependence, there was to be a merger with that of dependence into a sphere of asymmetric independence.

Indeed, the only state that appears to defy categorization throughout the Cold War period is Burma. From independence in 1948 onward, the Burmese state maintained a consistent policy of nonalignment. And following the imposition of military rule from 1962 onward, it advocated its own independent ideology of development, a mix of Marxism and Buddhism termed the "Burmese Way to Socialism." The failure of Burma's economic experiment by the late 1980s led to mass protests and challenges to military rule. The military reasserted its control through the bloody suppression in August and September 1988 of the prodemocracy movement led by Aung San Suu Kyi's National League for Democracy, then through the establishment in September 1988 of the State Law and Order Restoration Council (SLORC). SLORC promised free elections but overturned the results of the elections in May 1990 when the population voted in favor of the National League for Democracy. It then subsequently placed Aung San Suu Kyi under house arrest.

During the first Cold War, from the outbreak of the Korean War to détente in the early 1970s, the United States moved to consolidate its position vis-à-vis the Soviet Union by creating combined spheres of interdependence and dependence in East Asia. This sphere was centered on the United States itself, and extended to incorporate Japan, South Korea, and Taiwan in Northeast Asia, then across to the noncommunist states of Southeast Asia. In effect, the sphere was given cohesion through a series of U.S. bilateral security treaties with states in the region. However, it was also held together by U.S. efforts to promote economic interdependence. U.S. plans for ordering the regional political economy during the early phases of the Cold War envisaged a system of economic ties with the United States as the center, Japan as the semiperiphery, and Southeast Asia as the dependent periphery (Cumings 1984: 16–22; Schaller 1985: 178–211; Hook 1996: 173; Gilpin 2000: 54–68).

This system of economic linkages functioned through special U.S. economic dispensations. The United States at the center exported manufactured capital goods to the region and in return opened its markets to Japanese manufactures from the semiperiphery and supported Japanese efforts to enter Southeast Asian economies on the periphery to obtain raw materials. In time, the economies of South Korea and Taiwan, as well as those of noncommunist Southeast Asia, were encouraged to export to the U.S. market. Moreover, in addition to preferential access to its domestic market, the

Hughes-2.Final 3/18/2004 3:17 PM Page 49

United States assisted the economic development of these periphery states by providing advanced technology (Strange 1996: 6) and large-scale aid. Japan's economic revival during the early 1950s, for instance, was kick-started through its ability to purchase patents cheaply for U.S. technology (Johnson 1982: 223–227), as well as its receipt of up to U.S.$500 million in annual U.S. military procurement orders to support the war effort in Korea. South Korea and Taiwan also received close to U.S.$4 billion each in U.S. loans and military aid between the early 1950s and late 1960s, enabling both to upgrade their economic infrastructure and to finance trade deficits. South Korea, Taiwan, Singapore, and Thailand were also to gain from an increase in aid and a boom in orders for military equipment from the United States during the Vietnam War (Stubbs 1994: 367–369). Hence, by the late 1960s South Korea, Taiwan, Hong Kong, and Singapore had become the Newly Industrializing Countries (later Newly Industrialized Economies [NIES]).

The political economy of the sphere of interdependence and dependence created under U.S. auspices was certainly not static, and from the late 1960s onward it began to undergo structural changes. These were occasioned by the declining U.S. ability and willingness to single-handedly underpin the costs of its side of the bipolar political economy in East Asia, with the interrelated rise of Japan as the dominant economic actor in the region. The Nixon administration demonstrated the limits of U.S. political and military strength with its announcement on 25 July 1969 of the "Guam Doctrine," which sought to scale back the U.S. military ground force presence and increase the military contribution of its allies to their own defense; and with its announcement on 15 July 1971 of the forthcoming presidential visit to Beijing in February 1972 and the consequent decision to seek rapprochement with China, which ushered in a period of partial tripolarity in East Asia and paved the way for the U.S. withdrawal from Vietnam. The limits to U.S. economic strength were revealed a month later with the New Economic Policy (NEP) and the decision to abandon the gold standard and fixed exchange rates, as well as to impose a 10 percent surcharge on import tariffs, targeted at Japanese textile imports (Schaller 1997: 210–214; Nester 1996: 300–315). In addition, the limits to U.S. power were revealed with the first oil shock in October 1973. In this sense, the United States indicated its diminishing ability to provide special economic dispensations to Japan and other states.

The relative decline in U.S. political, military, and economic dominance in East Asia that produced the NEP was in part the result of and in reaction to the economic ascendance of Japan. By the early 1970s, encouraged at first by the United States, Japan had begun to create within East Asia its own economic order through the extension of trade, foreign direct investment (FDI), and ODA linkages. Japan had risen to supplant the United States as the principal supplier of capital goods, and following the rise in the value of

Hughes-2.Final 3/18/2004 3:17 PM Page 50

the yen brought about by the "Nixon shocks" and the rise in oil prices in the early 1970s increased its FDI in the NIES-4 (South Korea, Taiwan, Hong Kong, and Singapore) and the ASEAN-4 (Thailand, Malaysia, Indonesia, the Philippines). This investment was driven by the need to produce manufactures for consumption in the domestic markets of these states to circumvent import barriers, as well as for export to markets outside the region in the United States and Europe. In turn, the increased willingness of the NIES-4, and in particular the ASEAN-4, to accept Japanese investment and integration as export platforms into the changing economic structure of the region was the result of the oil crisis—declining revenues from primary exports forcing a switch from import substitution strategies of development to export-oriented industrialization strategies to take advantage of the New International Division of Labor (NIDL) (Higgott et al. 1985: 38–40; Robison et al. 1987: 4–10; Robison 1997: 34–35; Hutchison 1997: 68–70; Hewison 1997: 104–110).

Further upsurges in Japanese FDI in East Asia occurred in the late 1970s and early 1980s, with a massive increase in the mid-1980s, an indirect effect of the onset of the second Cold War and renewed signs of limitations to U.S. economic strength. The heavy military spending of the Reagan administration, accompanied by rising trade deficits with Japan, East Asia, and much of the rest of the world, convinced U.S. policymakers once again of their declining ability to bear alone the costs of supporting the structure of the political economy of interdependence and dependence. Hence, in addition to U.S. demands for Japan to increase economic and military burden-sharing, the United States attempted to reduce its trade deficit with Japan and the NIES through dollar devaluation. The Plaza Accord of September 1985 produced close to a 70 percent appreciation in the value of the yen against the U.S. dollar, compelling Japanese manufacturers to seek low-cost production and export bases in the NIES-4, then increasingly in the lower-wage economies of the ASEAN-4. The rise in Japanese FDI in East Asia from the late 1970s onward helped to produce a distinct pattern of trade within the region. Japan rose to become by the early 1990s the largest individual trade partner for Thailand, Indonesia, and Malaysia and the second largest partner for South Korea and the Philippines after the United States. Japan also increased its share of total exports to East Asia relative to its share of exports to the United States, but the trade relationship with the region has remained asymmetrical, with Japan running trade surpluses with the NIES-4 and the ASEAN-4. These surpluses are largely accounted for by an imbalance in exports and imports of manufactures, such as electronics, transports, and precision machinery (Hook et al. 2001: 195–198). Japan from the 1970s until the end of the Cold War thus became dominant in many sectors of the East Asian economy.

Certain Japanese academic and economic ministries portray this division of labor within the region—with Japan at the top of the production ladder

Hughes-2.Final 3/18/2004 3:17 PM Page 51

exporting high-tech products to the region, in return for the promotion of low-tech export industries in the NIES-4 and ASEAN-4—as the fulfillment of the "flying geese model" (Akamatsu 1962). However, to a large extent a triangular pattern of trade relations persisted among East Asia, Japan, and the United States. Even though the East Asian states and Japan decreased their share of total exports to East Asia, and intraregional trade increased by the end of the Cold War, the United States rather than Japan still continued to account for the largest individual share of manufacturing exports among the East Asian states. This pattern of trade suggests that Japan's economic activity in East Asia was characterized more by its role as an exporter of technology and capital goods to the region than as an importer of manufacturers, and that the United States continues to serve as a key market for the region (Pempel 1997: 76–82). Indeed, the patterns of Japanese FDI and trade that developed following the Plaza Accord suggest that one of the most important economic functions of states in East Asia for Japan remains as key offshore production bases for export to U.S. and European markets. Japan then possibly served more to create complex production links centered on itself as the source of production FDI, while the NIES-4 and ASEAN-4 functioned as production and export platforms, and the United States functioned as the market of last resort (Mitchell and Ravenhill 1995).

The history of the sphere of interdependence and dependence during the Cold War was characterized by a general decline in the will and ability of the United States to support its superstructure, punctuated by brief attempts in the early 1970s and mid-1980s to reduce its burdens or shift them to partners. Nevertheless, the overriding strategic imperative to maintain U.S. influence and to contain Soviet communism meant that the United States continued to endure the domestic political and economic costs of keeping its markets open to East Asian exports (Johnson 2000: 194–195). The extension of U.S. hegemonic power across its half of the bipolar divide in East Asia, accompanied by the establishment of an overarching framework of preferential market access and economic assistance (even if Japan was increasingly at its core), thus created an environment conducive to the economic development of many of the sovereign states of the region. These states were provided with an important "breathing space" (Cumings 1984: 9) to develop their own distinct forms of capitalism.

During the first phase of the Cold War, they faced only moderate U.S. pressure to liberalize their economies and provide market access to competing foreign imports and TNCs and were instead able to build up domestic industries for import substitution and then for export. Moreover, even as the Cold War waxed and waned in the 1970s and 1980s, and the interdependency of world and regional economies became enhanced, thus speeding globalization, the United States continued to insulate East Asian economies from the full impact of liberal capitalism. U.S. hegemonic power, even if in relative decline throughout this period, thus provided a

Hughes-2.Final 3/18/2004 3:17 PM Page 52

kind of "hothouse" within which was fostered increased integration among the core, periphery, and semiperiphery economies. This was carried out not only under the overall auspices of the United States but also increasingly through Japan's efforts at regional integration, thus in de facto terms merging the worlds of interdependence and dependence into one of greater interdependence and proto-globalization. However, at the same time, the insulation of these states from the full norms of liberal capitalism ensured that they could pick and choose the benefits of proto-globalization without fully taking on all its entailed economic and political costs.

The opportunities for economic development within this sphere of interdependence also influenced the political development of these states. The policymaking elites of the East Asian states were able to use economic development as a means to strengthen internal institutions, such as the central bureaucracy and military, as well as to diffuse economic benefits to the general population, provide compensation for those sections left out in the drive for development, and thereby ameliorate internal societal tensions and strengthen their political legitimacy. In turn, the internal political strengthening of the states also enabled them to further gain control of and mobilize domestic resources to promote economic development (Ōnō and Sakurai 2000: 184; Huntington 1976: 17–78).

In this way, many of the governments of Northeast and Southeast Asia were able to steer a middle course between the twin dilemmas of technocratic and populist models of development and state-building: the former implying an approach to growth based on strong restrictions of political freedom, which provides for rapid national economic growth but also the expansion of social inequality and consequent political unrest; and the latter implying an approach to growth based on wider political participation, which may handicap national economic growth but also lead to the stagnation of the economy and consequent political unrest. However, the ability to pursue economic growth as a means to secure the legitimacy of the state while restricting the political freedom of large sections of their populations became increasingly limited in the latter stages of the Cold War.

The first reason was that these developmental strategies and the effects of modernization could also generate a backlash in traditional and Muslim societies. The elites in Indonesia and Malaysia attempted to avoid the politicization of Islam and promoted its moderate varieties to prevent civil strife, but from the 1970s onward they faced an increasing resurgence of Islamic movements opposed to the values of modernization. In Malaysia this took form in the emergence of the Muslim Unity Movement as a major opposition party, in Indonesia the United Development Party. In response, in Indonesia the Suharto government sought to utilize the resurgence of Islam for its own political purposes, encouraging the formation of the Association of Indonesian Muslim Intellectuals. The second reason was that the economic

Hughes-2.Final 3/18/2004 3:17 PM Page 53

success of these states led to the rise of middle-ranking socioeconomic groups, or even a "middle class," more demanding of political as well as economic liberalism, thereby giving momentum to democratic movements less tolerant of authoritarian rule by the political elites (Acharya 1993: 25–26). The third reason was that the economic success of these states also strengthened demands by lower-ranking socioeconomic groups, as well as the middle-ranking groups, for a greater share of the benefits of economic growth. But any failure or economic crisis on the part of the state to provide these could also lead to demands for political change. The developmental strategies of the governing elites thus presented a means to secure their own position and to suppress economic and political instability; they also contained the potential causes of their own downfall.

Hence, the outcome was to provide conditions for the rise of the East Asia developmental states. These were characterized by public-sector and business-sector cooperation in the pursuit of rapid economic development, as well as various forms of "soft" and "hard" authoritarian governments (Johnson 1987: 137–138). Japan was very much the exception, evolving into an advanced democracy within the sphere of interdependence. South Korea and Taiwan were dominated by military dictatorships. In Southeast Asia, Thailand, although a constitutional monarchy and with alternating periods of democratic rule, was also subject to direct military control. By contrast, Malaysia and Singapore were controlled throughout this period by civilian and democratically elected governments, albeit with strong authoritarian tendencies to suppress internal opposition parties and dissident societal groups.

Clearly not all of the states contained within the U.S. half of the bilateral divide benefited equally from the reordering of the regional political economy. The authoritarian regime in South Vietnam until its eventual fall in 1975 failed to achieve significant economic development because of its position on the front lines of U.S. containment policy in Southeast Asia. This meant that it was engaged in civil war with North Vietnam and that its overreliance on U.S. financial aid perpetuated government corruption and a decline in popular legitimacy. Likewise, the Philippines, under democratic government until 1972 and then under the authoritarianism of Ferdinand Marcos (1972–1986), despite feigning attempts to build a strong centralized state, failed to shake off political and economic corruption and lagged behind its Southeast Asian neighbors in terms of development (T. Shiraishi 2000: 167–173). Moreover, economic development not only among but also within the region was uneven. Economic growth was concentrated away from the rural interiors and toward coastal and urban areas, often controlled by political and economic elites.

Furthermore, other states resisted integration into the political economy of interdependence. Indonesia under President Sukarno promoted the

Hughes-2.Final 3/18/2004 3:17 PM Page 54

Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) (its progenitor, the Asian-African Conference, was held in Bandung in April 1955) in an attempt to steer clear of incorporation into either the U.S. or Soviet camps during the early stages of the Cold War. But while maintaining a policy of nominal nonalignment, Sukarno also attempted to attract support from the Soviet Union and China in the late 1950s before finally siding with China at the time of the Sino-Soviet split in the mid-1960s. Sukarno's Indonesia following the imposition of the Guided Democracy in 1959 also embarked on the Konfrontasi (Confrontation) process and coercive diplomacy with neighbors. First, Indonesia pressed successfully its anticolonial campaign to recover Irian Jaya (the western half of the island of New Guinea) from the Dutch between 1960 and 1962, then later unsuccessfully tried to prevent the formation of Malaysia and its extension to border Indonesia in Borneo in 1963 (with a British-backed Malayan proposal to merge the Federation of Malaysia, Singapore, and the British colonies of Sarawak and North Borneo, and the British protected sultanate of Brunei). Consequently, Sukarno's Indonesia relied on policies of economic nationalism and "socialist" planning (Robison 1985: 303–304).

However, Sukarno's increasing reliance on the Partai Komunis Indonesia (PKI, the Communist Party of Indonesia), its abortive coup in 1965, and the subsequent fall from power of Sukarno and the rise of Suharto in 1966 (backed by the Indonesian armed forces and its violent suppression of communism) transformed the orientation of Indonesia within the regional political economy. Indonesia maintained its principles of nonalignment and a careful distance from China but also ended Konfrontasi with Malaysia and took a leading role in the establishment of ASEAN in 1967 (Leifer 1995: 17–19). Added to this, Suharto's New Order sought to integrate Indonesia more fully into the regional economy and NIDL, ending import-substitution industrialization policies and moving toward export-oriented industrialization. The result was the conversion of Indonesia into one of the quasi-developmental states of the ASEAN-4 and to demonstrate the inexorable economic pull of the sphere of interdependence for states in Southeast Asia. Much as with the other ASEAN states, the economic benefits of integration into the regional economy were used to construct a strong centralized state and thereby compensate for the weaknesses in the political legitimacy of the Indonesian state.

The Worlds of Independence and Dependence

The counterpart to interdependence and dependence was independence centered initially upon the Soviet Union and then on the Soviet Union and China. The Soviet-centered world of independence was given cohesion following the outbreak of the Korean War due to a series of bilateral mutual security treaties and the provision of military aid. In addition, the Soviet

Hughes-2.Final 3/18/2004 3:17 PM Page 55

Union extended economic and technical aid and preferential trading relations to sponsor the creation of dependent forms of communist political economies in the newly independent states of the region. China, North Korea, and Vietnam were all recipients of substantial Soviet aid (even if it did not always measure up to Chinese expectations, or was on a par with U.S. aid to other parts of the region) (Chandler et al. 1987: 449).

Soviet plans to mold the sphere of independence and dependence in East Asia went awry with the rise of China as a regional competitor and the Sino-Soviet split from the late 1960s onward (Yahuda 1996: 170–173). Although elements of Soviet capitalism continued to influence China's efforts at modernization, the latter pushed toward its own independent development programs, as did North Korea, which continued to pursue a hazardous middle path between accepting aid and trade assistance from both the Soviet Union and China, and seeking to secure autarchy in both economic and political development based on the principles of self-reliance, or *juche* (Hughes 1999: 117–119). North Vietnam (and later the successor state of a reunited Vietnam), having adopted Chinese collectivization and economic development strategies during the 1950s, did accept increased Soviet military and economic assistance in planning for modernization (Yahuda 1996: 203; Godement 1997: 134–136). In the meantime, Cambodia failed to navigate a path of neutrality during the Vietnam War and was subject from 1975 until 1978 to the extreme revolutionary and socialist ideology of the Khmer Rouge. Vietnam's fears of encirclement, resulting from the tacit alignment of the Khmer Rouge with China, caused it to initiate the Third Indochina War and to invade and occupy Cambodia between 1978 and 1989. The Chinese response in seeking, in Deng Xiaoping's words, "to teach Vietnam a lesson," and to prevent perceived Vietnamese attempts to dominate Indochina with the cooperation of the Soviet Union, was a punitive military expedition across its own borders into North Vietnam in February 1979. China's intervention failed to dislodge Vietnamese forces from Cambodia, although it did signal another open internal rift in the socialist bloc in East Asia and produced a China-ASEAN-U.S. anti-Vietnam coalition opposed to its occupation of Cambodia and the expansion of its influence in Indochina. As a consequence, the Khmer Rouge, provided with territorial sanctuary by Thailand and military supplies by China, rehabilitated itself as a guerrilla force and continued its war in Cambodia against Vietnam. In the meantime, Laos came under communist rule in 1975 and followed domestic and international economic and political strategies in line with its Vietnamese neighbor.

Hence, by the mid-1970s the world of independence was subject to internecine rivalries and displayed a wide range of forms of socialism. The orthodox Marxist-Leninism of the postrevolutionary Soviet Union clashed with the antirevisionist, revolutionary, and nationalistic communism of

Hughes-2.Final 3/18/2004 3:17 PM Page 56

China, which proved capable of the extremes of the Great Leap Forward of 1958–1959 and the Cultural Revolution of 1966–1969. By means of further contrast, North Korea produced a model of developmentalism based on an extraordinary amalgam of the principles of revolutionary socialism, anti-colonialism, Confucianism, and *juche* ideology. Nonetheless, it can be argued that these states did share sufficiently common characteristics in the makeup of their political economies to constitute a sphere of independence and that, despite the regional strategic competition between the Soviet Union and China, it was still Soviet military power, and to some degree its economic power, that underwrote the viability of these systems and their autarchy from the U.S.-centered sphere of interdependence. Moreover, even though the Soviet Union (in the same way as the United States) experienced difficulty in bearing the costs to support the political economy in East Asia, it continued to possess sufficient strength not only to provide economic dispensations to Vietnam and North Korea throughout the Cold War but also to attempt to extend communist influence in the period of the second Cold War from the late 1970s. Thus, the Soviet Union expanded its military at former U.S. naval ports of Cam Ranh Bay and Danang in Vietnam and embarked on a buildup of its fleet in the Soviet Far East (Leifer 1983: 20–21).

The diverse socialist systems of the sphere of independence engendered mixed results in economic development for the states within its ambit. Rigid socialist dogma produced costly mistakes in development, such as the Great Leap Forward in China and "millennarian" collectivization in Cambodia under the Khmer Rouge. Regional conflict also squandered the valuable resources of Vietnam and Cambodia. The structural limitations of the North Korean economy in terms of agriculture and production also became increasingly clear toward the end of the Cold War (Noland 2000: 172). However, at the same time, for long periods the sphere of independence also provided its newly independent states the opportunity to evolve their own forms of political economy, to achieve economic development, and to advance state-building. China's economic development during the Cold War may not have been spectacular, but it did ensure a general rise in living standards and the "iron rice bowl" social safety net for the bulk of its population.

Likewise, Vietnam's economic growth was slow, assisted by access to Soviet assistance. North Korea was able to exceed South Korea's economic growth until the mid-1970s, and its own efforts, combined with preferential economic access to the socialist economic sphere, enabled it to achieve relatively high standards in the development of infrastructure, industrialization, urbanization, education, and health. In this way, the states in the sphere of independence were still capable, after rejecting capitalism, of achieving internal legitimacy and internal economic and political success, even if ideological rivalries were capable of generating tensions.

Hughes-2.Final 3/18/2004 3:17 PM Page 57

Security Actors, Threats, and Responses

The next section examines the specific types of security actors, threats, and responses that the three processes of political economy generated during the Cold War. The description is brief but is necessary to understand the dynamics of the security agenda in East Asia. The roots of many security problems, and Japan's response, can be traced to this period.

Military Security: Threats and Actors

The superimposition of the three processes of decolonization, bipolarization, and proto-globalization produced a range of military threats and provided states with the identity of the referent objects and deniers of security.

U.S.-Soviet superpower interstate military conflict. First, these three dynamics, especially bipolarization, generated U.S.-Soviet great power and superpower military confrontation in East Asia, manifested in the form of nonconventional and conventional high-intensity threats. U.S.-Soviet bipolar strategic competition led both superpowers throughout the Cold War to upgrade, in both quantitative and qualitative terms, their land-, air-, and sea-based strategic and tactical nuclear arsenals. The United States deployed strategic nuclear weapons capable of striking Soviet allies in continental East Asia and provided an extended nuclear deterrent, or "umbrella," to its own allies; it also maintained tactical nuclear weapon stockpiles in South Korea and elsewhere in the region. Similarly, the Soviet Union targeted strategic nuclear weapons, including the SS-20, at U.S. allies and provided some form of implicit extended nuclear deterrent to China (until the Sino-Soviet split) and also to North Korea and Vietnam. A major part of the Soviet strategic nuclear arsenal was deployed on submarines from the Soviet Pacific Fleet.

The military position of the superpowers was further buttressed by the forward deployment of conventional land, sea, and air forces. U.S. deployments fluctuated greatly in accordance with the intensity of its involvement in the wars in Korea and Vietnam. Nevertheless, the periodic resurgence of Cold War pressures, and the onset of the second Cold War in the late 1970s, ensured that the United States continued to deploy some 350,000 personnel in the region until the early 1990s (Weeks and Meconis 1999: 31). U.S. Air Force, Army, Marine Corps, and Navy assets were concentrated in bases in the Philippines, South Korea, and Japan. In comparison, the Soviet Union deployed a large number of ground troops in the Soviet Far East to counter threats from the United States and its allies as well as from China, and from the late 1970s onward it undertook a major buildup of its air and naval forces in East Asia. The Soviet Union increased its combat aircraft in the region and introduced technologically advanced models, such as the Foxbat fighter and the nuclear-capable Backfire fighter-bomber. In addition

Hughes-2.Final 3/18/2004 3:17 PM Page 58

to its force of nuclear and conventional submarines, the Soviet Union deployed missile cruisers and Minsk-class vertical/short takeoff and landing (V/STOL) aircraft carriers—thereby demonstrating its intent to acquire an oceangoing fleet and challenge the dominance of the U.S. Seventh Fleet in East Asia and the Pacific (Kimura 1998: 286–289).

Superpower–major regional power interstate military conflict. Nonetheless, despite the deployment of extensive nonconventional and conventional arsenals in the theater, as well as fluctuating bipolar tensions, the United States and Soviet Union (with the possible exception of air combat during the Korean War) did not become involved in direct military clashes in the region. Rather than direct superpower-to-superpower conflict, there was greater potential for involvement in other forms of interstate military conflict in the region. The first was direct superpower and regional major power conflict, specifically a conflict involving either one of the superpowers and China, or the Soviet Union and Japan. In the case of the potential Soviet-Japanese conflict, the issue was the Soviet occupation of the Northern Territories and Japan's demand for the return of the four disputed islands of Habomai, Shikotan, Kunashiri, and Etorofu (Braddick 2001: 210). During the Cold War, the Northern Territories dispute never looked like it would provoke a direct conventional or nuclear conflict. The Soviet Union did use the issue to pressure Japan to detach from its U.S. alliance and also engaged in provocative military behavior (e.g., stationing of troops in the territories in 1978) (Hara 1998: 149–150). Japan was not overly intimidated by Soviet actions as long as the U.S.-Japan security treaty was in place, and it had no intention of attempting to recover the islands by force.

The conflicts involving the superpowers and China were primarily conventional in nature, but they also involved nuclear threats by both superpowers toward China at different times, as well as China's response: the development of its own small nuclear deterrent. China conducted its first successful test of an atomic bomb in October 1964, then a nuclear missile in October 1966, and then a hydrogen bomb in June 1967.

In the case of Sino-U.S. relations, China's ideological opposition to the U.S. sphere of political economy and hegemony, and China's alignment with the Soviet Union in the early stages of the Cold War, provided grounds for direct conflict. Hence, the Korean War marked a period of direct Sino-Soviet conventional military conflict, and threatened nuclear conflict, as the United States sought to extricate itself from the war (Foot 1988–1989). Following the conclusion of the Korean armistice in 1953, the strategic interests of the United States and China on the Korean Peninsula, and their consequent support for the South and North Korean regimes respectively, ensured that Korea remained a potential site for conventional and military conflict throughout the rest of Cold War. In addition, from the mid-1950s onward, the principal focus of Sino-U.S. tensions shifted to Taiwan, the

Hughes-2.Final 3/18/2004 3:17 PM Page 59

most likely theater for a direct Sino-U.S. military conflict. Nevertheless, Korea and Taiwan need to be seen as security issues that originated in the process of decolonization subsequently overlain by the process of bipolarization. Hence, Taiwan can be viewed as an interstate military security issue that is not so much a direct military power issue but rather the result of an unfinished civil war, drawing in the United States.

In contrast to Sino-U.S. relations, Sino-Soviet relations did give rise to direct interstate military conflict. The Sino-Soviet split, relating to issues of global communist ideology, combined with their rivalry to achieve regional influence in Indochina and their contiguous borders in Northeast Asia, led to the clash of Soviet Union and Chinese conventional military forces over the disputed islands in the Ussuri River on the Manchurian border in March 1966. Thereafter, the disposition by both sides of large military forces along the Sino-Soviet border produced a situation capable of triggering conflict at any time during the Cold War.

Superpower–major regional power–regional power interstate military conflict. Direct military nuclear and conventional war between the United States and China, and between the Soviet Union and China, was thus always a calamitous possibility during both the first and second phases of the Cold War. However, the most destructive forms of potential or actualized military conflict were those involving the two superpowers, China as a major regional power, and the smaller regional states, focused in and around the Korean Peninsula, Taiwan, Vietnam, and Cambodia.

Inter-Korean disputes coupled with bipolar and superpower pressures were to produce a situation in which the Korean Peninsula became one of the most heavily militarized areas in the world. On one side, South Korea embarked on an extensive buildup of conventional forces, backed by U.S. security pledges and the physical presence of U.S. troops in South Korea and close by in Okinawa and mainland Japan, as well as the U.S. tactical and extended nuclear deterrent. On the other side, North Korea, increasingly concerned with its existing security guarantees from the Soviet Union and China, devoted ever greater national resources to large conventional forces (the North's famed "1 million man" army), as well as the acquisition of biological and chemical weapons and ballistic missiles. North Korea's military assets provided it the capability to conduct various forms of high- and low-intensity warfare and to inflict significant physical damage and casualties on South Korea and the United States. In this way, a rough military balance was established on the Korean Peninsula for much of the Cold War; although this balance began to tilt toward the South in the later stages of the Cold War, leading to renewed instability.

Taiwan, Vietnam, and Cambodia were sites for potential or actual interstate war involving the superpowers, major regional powers, and smaller regional powers. Hence, Taiwan from the early 1950s onward had the

Hughes-2.Final 3/18/2004 3:17 PM Page 60

potential to involve China, Taiwan, and the United States in a military confrontation. China in 1954–1955 and again in 1958 shelled the islands in the Taiwan Strait to deter the government of Taiwan and its international supporters from attempting to separate Taiwan from the mainland. In turn, the United States deployed the U.S. Seventh Fleet in the Taiwan Strait to demonstrate its determination to defend those waters and to signal that it would not accept a military resolution to the Taiwan issue. This brought the United States and China relatively close to direct military conflict.

Superior U.S. military power ensured that China was unable to really challenge Taiwan's security. Moreover, Sino-U.S. rapprochement from the early 1970s onward, U.S. acceptance of the "one China" principle (Taiwan being an integral part of the February 1972 Shanghai communiqué), and the U.S. abrogation of its defense treaty with Taiwan (replaced in part by the Taiwan Relations Act of 1979, which committed the United States to retain the capacity to resist any force that jeopardized the security of the people of Taiwan), neutralized Taiwan as a bilateral security issue in the latter half of the Cold War. Nevertheless, Taiwan remains a latent and potentially explosive security issue, with the potential to draw in Taiwan, China, the United States, and Japan.

Finally, the Third Indochina War involving Cambodia also needs to be viewed within this framework. The guerrilla war of the Khmer Rouge in Cambodia following the Vietnamese invasion, and the group's expulsion from Phnom Penh, was in part intrastate in nature but was also a struggle backed by China, ASEAN, and the United States as a means to check Vietnamese and Soviet influence, giving it the character of a bipolar struggle.

Regional major power and regional power interstate military conflict and territorial disputes. Interstate conflicts between the major regional powers, or between the major regional powers and smaller regional powers, or between just the regional powers themselves, were few and far between during the Cold War. But it was not because bipolarization and decolonization failed to generate sufficient latent security issues in the North and Southeast Asian subregions.

In Northeast Asia, the process of decolonization generated a potential territorial dispute over the sovereignty of the Senkaku Islands between China and Japan. Japan had incorporated the Senkaku Islands in January 1895 as part of the Nansei Shotō after surveys confirmed that the islands were uninhabited and had not been under the control of China. The Senkaku Islands were not part of Taiwan or the Pescadores Islands that were ceded to Japan by China in accordance with the Treaty of Shimonoseki of May 1895, and so they were not included in the colonies and territories that Japan renounced under article 2 of the San Francisco Peace Treaty of 1951. Instead the islands were placed as part of the Nansei Shotō

Hughes-2.Final 3/18/2004 3:17 PM Page 61

under U.S. administrative control in accordance with article 3 of the peace treaty. Japan regained administrative rights over these islands, Okinawa, and the rest of the Nansei Shotō in accordance with the U.S. Japan agreement concerning the Ryūkyū Islands and Daito Islands signed in June 1971. In 1969 the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East reported the possibility of large oil and natural gas deposits in the seabed in the vicinity of the Senkaku Islands (Kamiya 2000: 236; Takubo 1999: 31). This was followed by the assertion of both Chinese and Taiwanese claims to the islands, the former putting forward the argument that its vessels had first charted the islands in 1534.

China and Japan agreed to set aside territorial claims during the normalization of relations in 1972 (Yahuda 1996: 271), and at the conclusion of the Sino-Japanese Treaty of Peace and Friendship in August 1978 Deng Xiaoping stated that territorial problems could be left to the "next generation" to resolve (Roy 1998: 167–170). However, the right-wing Japan Youth Federation (Seinenkai) had raised popular Chinese ire earlier in 1978 when it erected a lighthouse on one of the islands (Downs and Saunders 1998–1999: 126). The U.S. government indicated in October 1996 that under the U.S.-Japan security treaty it does possess some obligations in relation to the defense of the Senkakus, but it also stated officially that it supported the position of neither side on the issue of territorial sovereignty. That September, the U.S. ambassador to Japan, Walter Mondale, indicated that the U.S.-Japan security treaty would not apply to the Senkakus (Ebata 1999: 197–198). This statement was again countered by the U.S. Department of Defense, which stated that the security treaty *did* cover the Senkakus (Green 1999: 162).

In addition to the Senkaku Islands, Japan became engaged in another territorial dispute with South Korea generated by the effects of decolonization. Japan had incorporated the two tiny uninhabited Takeshima Islands (Tok-do in Korean, Liancourt Rocks on navigation charts), totaling just 23 square kilometers in the Sea of Japan, into Japanese territory in January 1905. During the Japanese occupation, the Supreme Command Allied Powers (SCAP) issued an order in January 1946 placing the Takeshima Islands outside operational limits for Japanese fishermen, although it noted that this order did not constitute a final ruling on the issue of sovereignty. No specific mention of sovereignty was made in the San Francisco Peace Treaty. However, President Syngman Rhee declared South Korean sovereignty over the Takeshima Islands in January 1952, basing his claim on the exclusion of the islands from Japanese jurisdiction in accordance with the SCAP order of 1946. South Korea, in accordance with the declaration of the so-called Rhee Line, also unilaterally extended its territorial sovereignty over the continental shelf surrounding the Korean Peninsula for up to 200 nautical miles in places. This reserved for South Korea the right to exploit the

Hughes-2.Final 3/18/2004 3:17 PM Page 62

rich fishing resources of this zone in the Sea of Japan and Yellow Sea. The Japanese government protested, and South Korea responded by occupying the Takeshima Islands with a small garrison in 1954. Japan proposed to bring the territorial dispute to the International Court of Justice in 1954, a move rejected by South Korea.

The 1965 Basic Treaty on normalization between Japan and South Korea and related economic agreements resolved to some degree the issue of fishing rights, with the abandonment of the Rhee Line and provisions for cooperation and arbitration of disputes in this area. The issue of sovereignty over Takeshima, though, was not resolved, with both Japan and South Korea accepting that the issue should be left to future negotiations. Although the Takeshima issue was not mentioned specifically, both sides agreed that remaining bilateral differences should be settled by diplomacy and third-party mediation. Nevertheless, the issue remained a thorn in Japan–South Korea relations, with periodic incidents in February 1977, May 1978, and August 1981 and clashes between the Japanese Maritime Safety Agency (the Japan Coast Guard since 2000) and South Korean fishing and Fishery Agency boats. Most of these incidents were fueled by periodic deterioration in bilateral relations over fishing rights and the colonial past (Mendl 1995: 69–70), as in the first "textbook controversy" of 1982 (Hook et al. 2001: 176).

In Southeast Asia, latent military conflicts among the major regional powers and smaller regional powers, in particular over territorial sovereignty, were considerable during the Cold War period. The most notable was over the Spratly Islands (Nansha in Chinese, Truong Sa in Vietnamese) among China, Taiwan, Vietnam, the Philippines, Malaysia, and Brunei, and the Paracel Islands between China and Vietnam. The Spratly Islands, a dispersed group of more than 400 tiny islands, reefs, shoals, and sandbanks in the South China Sea, are located some 1,300 kilometers south of the Chinese mainland, 500 kilometers southeast of Vietnam, 500 kilometers west of the Philippines, and close to offshore Malaysian Borneo. The islands have never supported continuous human settlement or been subject to the continuous sovereign jurisdiction of any single state (Leifer 1995: 221). Nevertheless, since the Cold War they have become of crucial importance in East Asia security for two reasons. First, rival claimants have sought to gain control of potentially large reserves of oil and natural gas, as well as rich fishing grounds, in and around the islands. The conclusion of the United Nations Convention of the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) in 1982 potentially provides territorial rights to establish Exclusive Economic Zones (EEZs) extending up to 200 nautical miles (approximately 370 kilometers) and thus exclusive access to sea and seabed resources. Second, the Spratly issue and the need for stability are also of concern to regional states such as Japan, as they are located across major sea lines of communication

Hughes-2.Final 3/18/2004 3:17 PM Page 63

(SLOCs) that link the Indian and Pacific Oceans. The Paracel Islands are a cluster of 130 barren islands located 165 miles southeast of China's Hainan Island and 225 miles west of Vietnam. They are of less resource and strategic importance than the Spratlys but are of considerable symbolic importance to China and Vietnam.

China, Taiwan, and Vietnam lay claim to all of the Spratly Islands, the Philippines to a concentration of islands west of Palawan, Malaysia to several islands off the coast of Borneo, and Brunei to Louisa Reef on the periphery of the island chain. China, Taiwan, and Vietnam's claims to the Spratlys originate from the process of decolonization (Lin 1997: 323–339). France, as the colonial power in Indochina, established domination over the Spratlys and Paracels from the late nineteenth century, then was displaced in part by Japan during the Pacific War for submarine bases. Following the end of the war, Nationalist China challenged France's attempt to reestablish colonial control over the Spratlys and the Paracels by occupying some of the islands, although the KMT lost control over all the Paracels when it withdrew from the mainland in 1949. China and Vietnam subsequently registered claims to the Spratlys and Paracels at the San Francisco Peace Conference, where Japan was forced to relinquish its own colonial control over the islands, but again without specifying to which country it renounced these territories. From the mid-1950s onward China and South Vietnam competed to occupy both island groups. South Vietnam's attempts to incorporate the Paracels into its territory in September 1973 resulted in China's forced expulsion of South Vietnam from the islands and its full occupation of them from January 1974 onward. Following North Vietnam's absorption of South Vietnam in 1975, the Vietnamese government reasserted its claim to the Paracels, also occupying twenty-one of the Spratly Islands. China again responded by establishing footholds on a number of islands, and in January and March 1988 a clash between Chinese and Vietnamese naval forces led to the former taking control of six islands (Valencia 1995: 13). Meanwhile, Malaysia and the Philippines occupied a number of the islands and have maintained a limited military presence there (Acahrya 1993: 33–34).

The slow unwinding of the process of decolonization also gave rise to a series of other territorial disputes with military implications. The most notable was the Konfrontasi produced by Indonesia's successful campaign to recover Irian Jaya from the Dutch between 1960 and 1962, then its failed attempts to prevent Britain from merging the Federation of Malaysia, Singapore, and the British colonies of Sarawak and North Borneo. The latter dispute produced armed incursions into northern Borneo and peninsular Malaysia, fended off by the Malaysians and British, with support from Australia and New Zealand under the terms of the Anglo-Malayan/Malaysian Defense Agreement.

Hughes-2.Final 3/18/2004 3:17 PM Page 64

The next dangerous bilateral territorial dispute centered on the rival claims of Malaysia and the Philippines to Sabah (North Borneo). Again this claim was generated by the process of decolonization and Britain's decision to transfer sovereignty to the Federation of Malaysia at the time of its formation in 1963, in the face of Philippine objections that they were traditionally part of the Sulu Archipelago. The rival claims to Sabah produced deep tensions in bilateral relations throughout the 1960s and 1970s, with Malaysia fearing the infiltration of Philippine-trained guerrillas into Sabah. President Corazón Aquino attempted unsuccessfully to persuade her country's legislature to revoke its claim to Sabah in 1987, and the dispute remained unresolved. Finally, Malaysia has been engaged in territorial disputes with Singapore over Pedra-Branca Island (Horsburgh Light) in the Singapore Strait (with an eventual agreement to refer the matter to the International Court of Justice), and with Indonesia (Sipadan and Ligtigan Islands) in the Sualwesi Sea near the Sabah-Kalimantan border (eventually resolved in 2002 in favor of Malaysia), again related to the demarcation of sovereign boundaries that took place during the periods of British and Dutch colonial rule.

Intrastate military conflicts. For many states in East Asia during this period the intrastate and domestic security agendas were more dominant. Given the importance of intrastate conflict as a force to feed interstate conflict, the following section examines the potential and actualized intrastate conflicts that occurred in East Asia during the Cold War, the dynamics behind them, and their continuity into the post–Cold War period. The bundling together of different ethnolinguistic and religious groups within the same sovereign territorial units, and the consequent lack of cohesion between the apparatus of the state and sections of its citizenry, created security problems with intra- and interstate implications.

The division and incorporation of ethnic groups across and within sovereign state territorial boundaries has produced both irredentist and separatist movements, often taking the form of armed guerrilla struggles. In the case of Indonesia, attempts by the Javanese majority to create a centralized nation-state have been resisted by separatist movements across the vast Indonesian archipelago. The population of the province of Aceh in northern Sumatra has long been resentful of the central government's exploitation of its local natural resources, leading to the growth of a separatist movement from the 1970s onward, which then drew the response of military repression from the central government (Sukma 2001: 379–380). The central government in Jakarta also faced separatist movements at various times in central and West Sumatra (the Pemerintahan Revolusioner Republik of Indonesia). Meanwhile, the central government's need to satisfy nationalist demands among the Javanese majority produced an irredentist impulse

Hughes-2.Final 3/18/2004 3:17 PM Page 65

to incorporate more territory into the Indonesian republic during the post-colonial and Cold War periods. However, this irredentism only served to fuel ethnic tensions and separatist movements. Indonesia's determination to acquire Irian Jaya during the Konfrontasi era satisfied irredentist demands but also produced the armed separatist Free Papua Movement by Melanese inhabitants. Likewise, Indonesia's irredentist urge, and its concern over the spread of communism, which led to its intervention in and eventual occupation of the former Dutch colony of East Timor between 1975 and 1976, also generated a separatist movement and intrastate military conflict. Indonesia's invasion and pacification of East Timor is believed to have accounted for up to 200,000 Timorese deaths (Candio and Bleiker 2001: 66) and met continued armed resistance from the Fretilin (Frente Revolucionária do Timor Leste Independente). For instance, a political protest in the East Timor capital of Dili in November 1991 was crushed by the Indonesian security forces with considerable loss of life.

Meanwhile, in the Philippines the central government faced an armed insurgency from the Moro National Liberation Front (MNLF), consisting of Muslims in the southern island of Mindanao resentful at domination by the Christian majority of the Filipino state (producing a conflict that cost an estimated 120,000 lives from 1972 to 1996 [*Financial Times*, 4 May 2000: 12]); in Thailand, the state was confronted by the militant Muslim group of the Pattani United Liberation Organization (PULO), which railed against Buddhist assimilation and conducted a number of bomb attacks; and in Burma the government was engaged for much of this period in separatist and autonomy struggles against the Chin, Kachin, Shan, and Karen minority groups, all of which formed individually and collectively significant military threats to the integrity of the Burmese state (Lintner 1999).

The process of decolonization also led to economic inequality and a general lack of political legitimacy in central governments. The combination of these factors could be explosive, as with the larger indigenous but relatively economically disadvantaged Muslim populations of Malaysia and Indonesia and the usually more prosperous overseas Chinese minorities, manifested most strongly in the interracial rioting directed against the Chinese in Malaysia in 1969.

In many cases the lack of political legitimacy within the states of Southeast Asia could be overlain by the process of bipolarization, giving rise to the challenge of armed communist insurgency. The Communist Party of Malaya (CPM) launched an armed struggle first against the British colonial government and then against the independent Malay government during the period of the Emergency from 1948 to 1960, and continued its struggle until 1989; in Thailand, the pro-Beijing Communist Party of Thailand comprised a guerrilla force of up to 10,000 in the mid-1970s before entering into a decline by the late 1980s; and in the Philippines, the New

Hughes-2.Final 3/18/2004 3:17 PM Page 66

People's Army (NPA) from the late 1960s onward recruited up to 22,500 guerrillas and posed a major threat to the enfeebled Marcos regime before declining in numbers during the Aquino presidency (Acharya 1993: 18).

In most instances, insurgency threats were met with fierce internal repression. Moreover, the overlapping of decolonization and bipolarization created another threat in terms of the lack of political legitimacy, the perceived threat of communism, and ethnic divisions. In these instances the internal security effects were explosive. Thus some states, such as Indonesia and Malaysia, perceived the Chinese ethnic minorities as synonymous with communism as sources of economic inequality for majority groups; this intensified violent crackdowns by authorities. This is evidenced by the bloody elimination of the PKI in Indonesia upon the fall of Sukarno in 1966, which accounted for the deaths of thousands of Chinese and Javanese suspected of being communist sympathizers (Vatikiotis 1998: 34).

Societal group and individual level military conflicts. Groups in East Asia can be the referent objects of and perpetrators of conflicts. Ethnic minorities in Southeast Asia were subject to repression by central governments yet inflicted considerable damage on states or other societal groups in irredentist and secessionist struggles. Hence, most of the ethnic groups listed above were engaged in low-intensity guerrilla struggles, and many practiced terrorist tactics, as in the case of the PULO in Thailand and NPA in the Philippines (Chalk 1999: 189–192). Some were also engaged in criminal activities, such as the Shan minority under the leadership of Khun Sa's Shan United Army (Mong Tai Army), which financed its insurgency movement against the Burmese state through the opium trade (Dupont 1999: 441–442; Stares 1996: 41; Lintner 1999: 297–337).

Finally, all the inter- and intrastate military conflicts elucidated so far had significant costs for the security of individuals. The citizens in East Asia bore the costs of all forms of nuclear and conventional high-intensity conflict, as well as low-intensity conflict in the form of guerrilla warfare, terrorism, and piracy. The doctrine of nuclear deterrence, in particular MAD, ensured that citizens of the United States, Soviet Union, and China, and those under the U.S. nuclear umbrella, were held hostage by these weapons and would have borne the brunt of casualties in any major nuclear conflict. High-intensity warfare during the Korean War and high- and low-intensity conflict during the three Indochina wars claimed millions of noncombatant casualties, including women and children; and intrastate conflicts, often marked by internal repression and pogroms, claimed a large number of casualties as well.

Moreover, all these conflicts produced refugees and displaced persons. The collapse of the South Vietnam regime in 1975 generated an outflow of Vietnamese boatpeople for more than a decade (Hitchcox 1994: 202); large

Hughes-2.Final 3/18/2004 3:17 PM Page 67

numbers of refugees sought sanctuary in Thailand from conflicts in Cambodia and Burma (Maley 2000: 151); and Indonesian military repression in Irian Jaya produced at least 10,000 refugees fleeing to Papua New Guinea in 1984–1985 (Anwar 2001: 358). Indeed, Indonesia has one of the largest populations of displaced people in East Asia.

Organizational group military conflicts. A range of other organizational actors are involved in conflicts. The most prominent terrorist organizations in East Asia originated in Japan. Driven by a complex mix of Marxist-Leninist and Maoist ideology—espousing anticolonialism and Marxism—Japanese terrorist organizations conducted bombing and shootings in Japan before heavy police pressure obliged one faction, the Japanese Red Army (JRA), to move to the Middle East in 1970. The terrorist activities conducted by groups in Japan were of limited destructive potential due to their inability to obtain modern weaponry (with the exception of the East Asian Anti-Japan Front's bomb attack against Mitsubishi Heavy Industries in August 1974, which claimed eight lives and wounded 376). However, the JRA, supported by the People's Front for the Liberation of Palestine, was able to engage in a number of highly destructive shootings, bombings, and hijackings in Europe, the Middle East, South Asia, and East Asia, including an attack on an oil refinery in Singapore in 1974, the seizure of the U.S. and Swedish consulates in Kuala Lumpur in 1975, and possible kidnappings and rocket attacks in the Philippines and Jakarta in 1986 (Hughes 1998: 41–43; Katzenstein and Tsujinaka 1991).

The other organizations also involved in crime were the transnational networks of ethnic Chinese located outside mainland China. These groups included Sino-Burmese and Sino-Thai growers, refiners, and distributors, and Triad groups in Macao, Hong Kong and Taiwan. In addition, the Japanese *bōryokudan,* or organized crime syndicates (also known as Yakuza), appear to have developed some links to these groups.

Military Security: Responses and Frameworks

Responses to interstate military conflict. During the Cold War, the principal response of East Asian states to the interstate conflicts described above was to deploy military power individually, bilaterally, or multilaterally, creating a balance of military power that both generated and suppressed potential or actualized military conflicts.

Following the outbreak of the Korean War, the United States constructed a chain, or "great crescent," of bilateral and trilateral security treaties across the region intended to stifle communist expansion. Japan served as the fulcrum of this alliance system (8 September 1951), which stretched across from South Korea (27 July 1953), and down to the Philip-

Hughes-2.Final 3/18/2004 3:17 PM Page 68

pines (30 August 1951) and Australia and New Zealand (1 September 1951). The United States displayed sporadic interest from the 1950s onward in the creation of a multilateral collective self-defense system modeled along the lines of NATO in Western Europe and involving Japan and other key East Asian allies. Its plans eventually foundered due to Japan's resistance to shouldering new defensive responsibilities in the postwar era and the lack of shared security interests and identity among the East Asian states (Hughes and Fukushima 2003). The United States did succeed in establishing the South East Asia Collective Defense Treaty (the Manila Pact) in September 1954, followed by the creation of the South East Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO) in February 1955, with the participation of itself, Britain, France, Australia, New Zealand, Pakistan, the Philippines, and Thailand. However, this multilateral security treaty failed to function effectively due to internal disputes among its members and was dissolved in June 1977, although the United States maintained a bilateral commitment to the defense of Thailand under the Manila Pact.

The installation in East Asia of a bilateral "hub and spokes" alliance system during the Cold War centered on the United States, confirmed U.S. military hegemony in Pacific East Asia, and provided essential bases for projecting power across to continental East Asia. The system of bilateral security treaties also provided the United States the ability to regulate the pace and scale of military buildups among its treaty partners. Hence, the United States facilitated Japan's rearmament following the Korean War through the provision of aid under Mutual Security Assistance provisions, followed by requests for more "burden-sharing" in the defense of the region. This was viewed as a restraint on the unbridled buildup of Japanese military strength, famously described by Lieutenant-General Henry Stackpole, commander of the U.S. Marines in Okinawa, in 1990 as the "cork in the bottle" of Japanese militarism (Hook et al. 2001: 125). Similarly, the United States regulated the buildup of South Korea's military forces and supplied military aid and technology to allies in Southeast Asia.

In opposition to the United States, the Soviet Union and China jointly, and then separately following the Sino-Soviet split, formed the other half of the bipolar balance of power. The Soviet Union and China's deployment of military power was also accompanied by a system of bilateral security treaties. The Soviet Union and China both signed Treaties of Friendship, Cooperation, and Mutual Assistance with North Korea in July 1961; and the Soviet Union signed the Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation, and Mutual Assistance with Mongolia in January 1966, and the Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation with Vietnam in November 1978. However, China's split from the Soviet Union in the mid-1960s meant that it was to advocate a multipolar world without alliance systems as the preferable model for East Asian security.

Hughes-2.Final 3/18/2004 3:17 PM Page 69

These contending superpowers and their respective alliance systems produced tensions during the Cold War that could spill over into highly destructive "hot wars," as in Korea, Vietnam, and Cambodia. Nevertheless, the fragile balance of power established by alliance systems also gave a measure of stability in most major military theaters in East Asia. In the Northeast Asia subregion, the Korean Peninsula retained a military flashpoint, shown by North Korea's agitation against the United States with the seizure of the USS *Pueblo* information-gathering ship in January 1968, and the tensions along the Demilitarized Zone (DMZ) following the axe-killing of a U.S. serviceman at Panmunjon in August 1976 (Oberdorfer 1997: 74–83). But at the same time, contentment with the status quo meant that the superpowers reined in the hostility of the two Koreas toward each other. The Soviet Union refused to supply the technologically advanced conventional weaponry that would tip the military balance in the North's favor, and the Soviet Union and China made it clear that they did not wish to see the North acquire nuclear weapons, and they pressed it to join the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) regime in 1985. Likewise, the United States continued to arm South Korea with conventional weapons but pressured Seoul to halt its nuclear program in the early 1970s and to accede to the NPT in 1974.

In regard to Taiwan, the superior U.S. military presence, and China's need to enlist U.S. support in the Sino-Soviet split, ensured that it was largely suppressed as a security issue. The U.S. military presence suppressed other potential problems arising from territorial disputes. The U.S. military presence in Japan ensured that neither the Soviet Union nor Japan would contemplate resolving the Northern Territories issue by force; and although the United States was noncommittal in the Senkaku Islands dispute, its administration of the islands until 1972, and then its continued military presence in Okinawa from that time onward, discouraged any Chinese attempt to utilize force to pursue its territorial claim. Similarly, the U.S. military presence in the Philippines and interest in the freedom of navigation of the South China Sea (although the United States never extended the U.S.-Philippines Mutual Defense Treaty to cover the Spratlys) also discouraged any power that would seek to upset through military force the status quo. And the U.S. commitment to the defense of Thailand restrained Vietnam's military ambitions beyond Indochina. In turn, the influence and presence of the Soviet Union in Vietnam restrained it from further military expansion.

Hence, the security architecture of East Asia during the Cold War was characterized by a near total lack of multilateral security institutions. Instead there was a bipolar balance of power, which did little to alleviate the causes of interstate conflict generated by decolonization and bipolarization and prolonged them to maintain the status quo. Nevertheless, the

Hughes-2.Final 3/18/2004 3:17 PM Page 70

superpower military presence and their alliance systems in effect neutralized these problems. They discouraged military rivalries and weapons proliferation among their client and satellite states, even without addressing the root dynamics of conflict. They were a source of continued, if fragile, stability.

In Southeast Asia, the superpower presence was supplemented by the conclusion of the Anglo-Malayan/Malaysian Defense Agreement, which was revised as the Five Power Defense Arrangements in November 1971, and committed Britain, Australia, and New Zealand to the external defense of Malaysia and Singapore. Although the arrangements were originally intended as transitional to overcome any power vacuum following Britain's military disengagement and the buildup of Malaysia's and Singapore's armed forces, and have been subject to tensions between these two powers, the defense treaty has persisted, and the Five Powers continue to hold joint military exercises.

Southeast Asian states value the external security links provided by the Five Powers' defense arrangements, and the presence of the United States, as a means to balance against external intervention by the Soviet Union and especially China. They themselves have limited ability to create subregional frameworks to prevent interstate regional power conflict among their own. The establishment of ASEAN in 1967 (originally comprising Indonesia, the Philippines, Thailand, Malaysia, and Singapore; then joined by Brunei in 1984) did lead to the proposal for the recognition of the subregion as a Zone of Peace, Friendship, and Neutrality (ZOPFAN), which would limit the influence of the Soviet Union, United States, and China and leave management of Southeast Asian security affairs to states in the subregion (Haacke 2003: 54–61). The divisions of opinion among ASEAN states about the strategic necessity of maintaining defense links with external powers ensured that the concept, although official ASEAN policy since 1976, has never fully functioned with practical effect. Moreover, ASEAN has consciously avoided the institutionalization of any form of bilateral or multilateral defense cooperation. Hence, following Vietnam's invasion of Cambodia in 1978, ASEAN formed a political and diplomatic counterweight to the expansion of Vietnamese influence in Southeast Asia, but its members remained dependent for military security upon their own individual military capabilities and guarantees of security from the external powers (Acharya 2001: 82–90).

Response to intrastate military conflicts. ASEAN's greatest security utility for its member states during the Cold War period, and indeed one of its most important founding motivations, was in enabling the management of those subregional military conflicts described above that fell between the inter- and intrastate categories. The experience of the Konfrontasi obliged Southeast Asian states to search for ways to contain and resolve territorial dis-

Hughes-2.Final 3/18/2004 3:17 PM Page 71

putes through the organizational structure of ASEAN. ASEAN was intended to provide a forum for discussion and conciliation of contentious intramural subregional issues, and this role was confirmed with the conclusion of the Treaty of Amity and Cooperation (TAC) in February 1976 (Acharya 1992: 150). This treaty stressed the principles of sovereignty, territorial integrity, and noninterference in the internal affairs of ASEAN members; thus disputes among them would be resolved through direct negotiations or by a high council (Henderson 1999: 16–17). Even though the provisions of the treaty were never invoked during the Cold War, and tested only by the Malaysia-Philippines dispute over Sabah, the TAC was a statement on how to conduct subregional affairs and indicated that members would not disturb the existing sovereign state system. Certain observers thus see ASEAN's development as leading to the establishment of a nascent Southeast Asian "security community" within which members rule out the use of force to solve disputes among themselves (Khong 1997: 320–321).

The principle of noninterference governing interaction among ASEAN members, known as the "ASEAN way," thus enabled them to manage and suppress intrastate ethnic conflicts without fear of intervention from neighboring states. The principle is not entirely satisfactory and could lead to clashes between the military and police authorities of different states as they accuse each other of harboring insurgency factions or as they attempt to engage in "hot pursuit" of groups across borders (Simon 1978: 416–426). Hence, in some instances the principle of noninterference was made more flexible, allowing for bilateral cooperation of security authorities across borders to suppress intrastate military threats, especially threats from communist insurgency groups on the Thai-Malaysia and Indonesia-Malaysia borders (Acharya 1993: 27–28).

Nevertheless, the principle of noninterference held fast in ASEAN during the Cold War. This principle enabled states to keep a lid on potentially explosive intrastate threats of ethnic and communist insurgency. In most cases in Southeast Asia, the principal actor responsible for the suppression of intrastate conflicts has been the military. In Indonesia, the military "dual function" (*dwi fungsi*; the protection of the state externally and the right to intervene in internal political affairs) has led to the suppression of insurgency movements against the Indonesian state. The Thai and Philippines military also fulfilled this function to some extent (Hernandez 1996: 67–71). Malaysia and Singapore have depended more on professional and nonpoliticized police forces (Khoo 1997: 47). Meanwhile, in addition to brute military force, governments used other means to integrate dissident ethnic groups, such as the transmigration of Javanese to Irian Jaya and Christian Filipinos to Mindanao, also attempting to prove their legitimacy by spreading the benefits of economic growth.

The ASEAN way also enabled members to tolerate neighbors dealing with other forms of internal political dissent. Again, the military and inter-

Hughes-2.Final 3/18/2004 3:17 PM Page 72

nal police forces were prominent in suppressing forces seeking to challenge the dominance of the governing elite, such as the prodemocracy movements in the Philippines during the period of the Marcos regime, in Thailand during much of the postcolonial and Cold War periods, and Burma from 1962 onward.

However, the governing elites in Southeast Asia have attempted to strengthen control over the state and its citizens through developmental policies. The ASEAN regimes in particular placed their faith in the trickle-down effect of rapid economic growth as a means to achieve political stability. Greater prosperity and equity, it was hoped, could eradicate socioeconomic and urban-rural divides, remove the conditions that made their societies prone to insurgency and subversion, and enhance the legitimacy of the authoritarian structures over which they presided (Acharya 1992: 153). This recipe for political and military intrastate stability was not unique to Southeast Asia: The governments of Taiwan and South Korea employed military-backed authoritarianism in tandem with economic growth as a means to promote stability, liberalization, and eventually democratization; and China also employed a combination of authoritarian rule, based on the principles of nonintervention from external powers, and economic growth as means to contain political instability from the latter stages of the Cold War onward.

These principles of managing internal political instability have become increasingly untenable in the post–Cold War period. The new security agenda has produced a range of issues that can no longer be contained by and that cut across sovereign territorial borders; they demand a transsovereign response. Moreover, the economic success of East Asia under globalization has also produced further demands for democratization, as well as a transformation in civil-military relations that removes the military's role from internal politics.

Economic Security

Despite the vital significance of military issues during the Cold War, economic security was of considerable concern to all levels of security actors.

Economic exclusion, disparity, rivalry, and dislocation. The division of East Asia into two spheres of interdependence and dependence was marked by economic inclusion that guaranteed economic security to states, societal groups, and individuals. Hence, in the sphere of interdependence, the extension outward from the United States, and then increasingly from Japan, of investment, trade, and aid links ensured that few states were excluded from the regional production system and were thus unable to reap the benefits of economic growth. Likewise, in the sphere of independence, the preferential access to trade and aid in the socialist sphere ensured that states such as Vietnam and North Korea remained economically secure to the extent that the stability of their regimes was unchallenged.

Hughes-2.Final 3/18/2004 3:17 PM Page 73

The greater inclusion than exclusion offered by the two spheres of political economy also provided grounds for attempts to minimize economic disparities. In the sphere of interdependency, the developmental orientation of the states of Northeast and Southeast Asia, and the dash for economic growth, produced considerable internal domestic disparities among socioeconomic groups and between rural and urban areas. Nevertheless, high-speed growth also produced some benefits in the equalization of incomes. Japan was the outstanding example of this, but in maintaining average growth rates of around 4–8 percent from 1970 to 1985, the NIES-4 and ASEAN-4 (with the exception of the Philippines) also managed to close the income gap on a par with many developed states (World Bank 1993: 31). In addition, Indonesia, Thailand, Malaysia, and Singapore managed to reduce the percentage of the population below the poverty line by around 20–40 percent and to raise life expectancy (World Bank 1993: 33–34), thus guaranteeing an enhanced degree of individual economic security. Still, these reductions in inequalities were insufficient to satisfy all sectors of the population in East Asia. For instance, in Malaysia and Indonesia the disparities in wealth and economic opportunity between the Malay and Javanese populations and the Chinese minority were a constant source of internal friction. As a result the Malaysian government, following the race riots of 1969, embarked upon the New Economic Policy in an attempt to redistribute wealth to the Malay community (Horii 1991; Khoo 1997: 52–59).

The sphere of independence also functioned to level income inequalities for the bulk of citizens in the states associated with it. China was able through central planning to redistribute economic resources from the wealthier coastal provinces to those on the periphery, as well as to provide a higher and more secure living standard for much of its population. Meanwhile, North Korea was also able to increase and secure standards of living, even if the pace was slow and bought at a high cost in labor suffering. In turn, this economic stability and regime security in both spheres helped alleviate internal political unrest and military conflict.

Economic rivalry over natural resources was also limited during the Cold War period. All states in the region were concerned to secure access to resources. Japan, feeling itself to be resource-poor, was constantly concerned to secure access to raw materials in Southeast Asia and the security of SLOCs for the import of oil from the Middle East. Furthermore, all the states were impacted by the oil shock of 1973, with Japan in particular embarking upon "resource diplomacy" in the Middle East and the diversification of energy to secure vital supplies. Nonetheless, the limited growth of the other East Asian states during the Cold War restricted their appetite for resources beyond their own established territorial borders and minimized potential conflict. For instance, China remained self-sufficient in oil throughout most of the Cold War (Salameh 1995–1996: 133).

Hughes-2.Final 3/18/2004 3:17 PM Page 74

Economic dislocation was another factor for conflict during the Cold War. The oil shock engendered a structural crisis in the economies of the sphere of interdependence in the mid-1970s, accompanied by the rise of potential social crises. However, the ability and choice of the states of this sphere to join the NIDL presented them with opportunities to restructure and resume economic growth while heading off worst-case scenarios of economic and political instability. In the meantime, the economies of the sphere of independence such as North Korea were affected by the fall in commodity prices that accompanied the oil shock and were obliged to experiment with a certain degree of unsuccessful restructuring, burdening the North with external debt and laying the grounds for its economic crisis in the post–Cold War period. But the North's continued access to aid and trade from the rest of the sphere also ensured that it was able to stave off economic and political crisis. In the same way, China's disastrous experiment at forced development during the Great Leap Forward induced a homegrown economic crisis, but for much of the Cold War period, due to its nonparticipation in the global economy, it was insulated from external economic shocks.

Migration. Refugee flows resulting from military conflict were relatively common in East Asia and a threat to individual security. Migration as the result of economic change was also commonplace within the sphere of interdependence as investment and trade links between its constituent states deepened throughout the Cold War. Japan's economic expansion into Southeast Asia also brought in a reverse flow of migrant workers, especially female workers from Thailand and the Philippines, many of whom faced exploitation in the Japanese sex industry. Illegal economic migration also occurred among ASEAN states, with a large inflow of Filipinos into the Malaysian province of Sabah—an estimated 400,000 of a total 1.4 million population—further fueling Malaysian concerns about separatism. However, on the whole, economic migration was limited during this period (Skeldon 1999: 3), and its motive force of economic growth and the provision of the demand for labor ensured that inter- and intrastate conflict was also limited.

Organized crime and narcotics. For much of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, the European colonial powers promoted the production, trade, and consumption of opium as an important cash crop in East Asia (Trocki 1999), creating up to 15 million addicts in China alone (Dupont 1999: 439). The movement toward the prohibition of the opium trade in the early twentieth century led to a drop in supply, although the KMT and Japan remained engaged in a deliberate attempt to promote opium consumption as a means to consolidate control over their respective portions of China.

Hughes-2.Final 3/18/2004 3:17 PM Page 75

The Pacific War, followed by the onset of the processes of decolonization and bipolarization, produced major changes in the narcotics trade in East Asia. The effect of the war was to reduce the supply of heroin. Then the removal of Japanese and KMT influence from mainland China and the assumption of power by the CCP ensured that the narcotics trade was virtually eliminated from this part of the sphere of independence (Stares 1996: 21). The barriers erected to the drug trade in China, coupled with the breakdown of the colonial economic system and resistance of many of the newly independent states to involvement in narcotics, produced a shift in the production of opium. It relocated to territories on the margins of the spheres of independence and interdependence, where state authority was weakest or restrictions on trading activity the most liberalized, thereby placing the trade out of the control of individual sovereign states and international authorities (Flynn 2000: 47).

Even though many of the traditional transnational networks for the overseas trade in narcotics centered on the Chinese diaspora remained in place, production moved to the "Golden Triangle" of Laos, Thailand, and Burma. The Shan tribesmen under the warlord Khun Sa used the narcotics trade to fund their insurgency struggle against the Burmese government (Dupont 1999: 441), as did remnants of the KMT army that fled from Yunan Province to Burma and the Burmese Communist Party (BCP). Opium production in the Golden Triangle was further boosted by the coincidence of decolonization and bipolarization processes, as the Vietnam War increased the demand for heroin from U.S. combat forces. Following the end of the war, opium producers and distributors began to seek other markets in the United States, Europe, and East Asia itself.

Piracy. Like the narcotics trade, the practice of piracy was not a new phenomenon in East Asia. Piracy had long been practiced around the Strait of Malacca and Singapore Strait from the sixteenth to nineteenth centuries, but it had been suppressed to a degree by colonial naval power. During the Cold War, piracy continued in limited form in the Strait of Malacca/Singapore Strait zone, concentrating at the central "choke point" of the Phillip Channel (often less than 5 kilometers wide and no more than 20 kilometers from land, offering hiding places to pirate groups), which formed the fastest transit point for shipping on the SLOC from East Asia to the Middle East and Europe. In most cases, pirate groups carried limited numbers of firearms and boarded ships, ranging up in size to supertankers, to seize cash and safe valuables, even to unload cargo. According to IMB figures, the number of attacks from 1981 to 1988 was no more than a dozen per year (Vagg 1995: 69). Piracy was an important problem during the Cold War, often practiced by corrupt local state authorities and economically poor islanders in Indonesia and Malaysia. Nevertheless, the growing prosperity of local com-

Hughes-2.Final 3/18/2004 3:17 PM Page 76

munities, and the projection of U.S. sea power from bases in the Philippines, acted as disincentives to engage in piracy.

Environmental Security

There are three broad categories of environmental security threats: depletion of renewable and nonrenewable resources; pollution of land, sea, and air; and the fundamental alteration of the ecosystem. Regarding the first category, the East Asian states had already embarked on considerable environmental destruction during the Cold War. Efforts at autonomous development in the sphere of independence produced considerable damage to agricultural land and forests. China, for instance, denuded around 40 million hectares of farmland since the 1950s; and North Korea's attempts at self-sufficiency in rice production led to an intensive program of deforestation to create stepped rice fields. The sphere of interdependence and its drive for economic growth also began the depletion of its agricultural and forestry resources, fueled in part by Japan's insatiable demand for natural resources. For example, the destruction of rainforests in Kalimantan, Sumatra, Irian Jaya, and Sulawesi began in earnest in the 1970s (Dupont 1998: 11). Moreover, the competition for territory and fish stocks was also initiated in this period.

East Asia began to increase its pollution of the natural environment during this period. Industrialization in the ASEAN states during the 1970s produced a significant decline in air quality. Policies of industrialization in the post-Mao period also initiated the same process in China (Breslin 1997: 499). Major oil tanker pollution occurred in the East Sea with the spillage of 6,400 tons of oil from the *Juliana* in November 1971 and the grounding of the *Shōwa-maru* in the Strait of Malacca in 1973. The Soviet Union also began dumping of 13,150 containers of radioactive waste from eighteen decommissioned nuclear submarines in the Sea of Japan from 1978 onward (Valencia 1997: 100–101). Russian nuclear dumping was to draw Japanese objections, but its own environmental record was questionable. From the 1970s onward, Japan shifted much of its heavy-polluting industry offshore to Southeast Asia, causing environmental damage through the dispersal of chemicals and heavy metals. Meanwhile, in the sphere of independence, Chinese and North Korean industries continued to pollute unchecked by environmental concerns.

The cumulative effect was to set much of East Asia on the path toward the third environmental security threat: the destabilization of ecosystems. However, the limited economic development of states within the spheres of interdependence and independence restricted their ability to bring environmental threats to their own citizens and those of their neighbors. The onset of globalization has fully realized these environmental threats in the post–Cold War period.

Hughes-2.Final 3/18/2004 3:17 PM Page 77

Conclusion: East Asia and Japan's Emerging Comprehensive Security Agenda

This chapter has demonstrated that East Asia's security agenda in the Cold War period was shaped by the overlapping forces of decolonization, bipolarization, and nascent globalization. This produced an agenda that was highly complex, ranging across the military, economic, and environmental dimensions, and affecting the security of states, individuals, societal groups, and organizations. In turn, this understanding of the complexities of the East Asian regional security agenda provides a context for the evolution and current status of Japan's security policy during the Cold War and post–Cold War periods. These complexities and the emerging comprehensive nature of the regional security agenda explain how Japan was forced to respond with a comprehensive security policy during the Cold War, involving the use of military and economic power across all dimensions of security. The fact that the roots of these complex security dynamics were also implanted during the Cold War, and continue to dominate into the post–Cold War period, also explains Japan's continued attachment to notions of comprehensive security in the contemporary post–Cold War era.