

Japan-China Military Confidence Building Measures (Part I)

—History, Politico-Economic Environment, and Evaluation—

Abstract

A rising and increasingly assertive China is posing a wide variety of challenges against the United States by changing the entire landscape of global political realities. A debt-stricken United States is currently under an extremely tight economic constraint despite its heavier responsibility to meet these challenges. For its part, Japan, amidst its domestic politico-economic chaos, has managed to maintain its amicable relations with the two countries—its most trustworthy ally, i.e., the United States, and its geographically closer and increasingly economically intertwined partner, i.e., China. This short essay provides a brief description about the little-known but 35-year uninterrupted history of confidence building measures (CBMs) between the Japanese and Chinese military forces.² The essay also examines the changing circumstances surrounding the CBMs and their significance from the perspectives of the Japan-U.S. alliance and Asia-Pacific regional security.

1. Introduction: The Significance of the Japan-China CBMs Weathering the Vicissitudes of the Relationship.

The year 2011 marked the 35th anniversary of the CBMs between Japanese and Chinese military forces.³ In June 2011, a Japanese delegation comprising retired generals and admirals of Japan Self-Defense Forces (JSDF) (自衛隊) visited China and discussed with the top brass of the People's Liberation Army (PLA) (Rénmín Jiěfàngjūn/人民解放军) over sensitive issues ranging from territorial disputes between the two countries to Chinese development of stealth fighters and aircraft carriers. This uninterrupted history of CBMs has recently elevated its significance by making a marked difference compared with Sino-U.S. CBMs that have experienced vicissitudes such as occasional disruptions caused by mounting political tensions during the Bush and Obama administrations as discussed in more detail in the next section. In stark contrast, the Japan-China CBM efforts have been kept intact even during politically hypersensitive periods including the time of the Koizumi/Xiǎoquán (小泉) administration (between 2001 and 2006)

¹ Toshimichi Nagaiwa (永岩俊道) is a Lieutenant General of Japan's Air Self-Defense Force (JASDF) (retired). He also serves as a Senior Guest Fellow of the Defense and Security Team, the Sojitz Research Institute. He was a Senior Fellow of Harvard's Asia Center (2007-2009), (Nagaiwa.Toshimichi@sojitz.com). Jun Kurihara (栗原潤) is a Senior Fellow of the Harvard Kennedy School (HKS). He also serves as a Research Director (U.S. information and networks) of CIGS and a Liaison Officer of RIETI, (Kurihara.Jun@gmail.com). The views expressed in this essay are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the JASDF, Sojitz Research Institute, RIETI, CIGS or the HKS.

² CBMs are agreements between two or more parties regarding exchanges of information and verification, especially with respect to the use of military forces and armaments. CBMs can be military, diplomatic, cultural, or political, though military and diplomatic measures are the most commonly used. The Japanese translations of CBM is "shinrai josei sochi (信頼醸成措置)," while the Chinese one is "jiànli xīnrèn cuòshī (建立信任措施)." For more information, see, for example, http://www.beyondintractability.org/essay/confidence_building_measures/. The Japanese government explicitly stated the importance of CBM in "Heisei 8-nendo iko ni kakawaru Boei-keikaku no Taiko ni tsuite [National Defense Program Guidelines for and Fiscal Year 1996 and beyond/「平成8年度以降に係る防衛計画の大綱について」],” November 28, 1995, <http://www.kantei.go.jp/jp/singi/ampoboue/sankou/951128taikou.html>. As for the latest official statement, see "National Defense Program Guidelines for FY2011 and beyond" December 17, 2010.

³ Without doubt, there are other formal and informal military CBMs between Japan and China, the most well-known among which is the Japanese Self-Defense Force and Chinese Liberation Army Exchange Program that started in 2000 and is principally funded and organized by the Nippon Foundation on the Japanese side. See, for example, http://www.nippon-foundation.or.jp/eng/current/Japan_China_Military_Exchange.html. In addition, Japan's National Institute for Defense Studies (NIDS) has organized the annual Asia-Pacific Security Seminar on Confidence-Building Measures since 1994 where Chinese officers have been invited.

over the Yasukuni Shrine/Jingguó Shénshè (靖国神社) disputes, and the last year's Senkaku (尖閣)/Diaoyutai/Diàoyútái (釣魚台) territorial dispute. This section discusses the beginning of the Japan-China CBMs and the changing circumstances surrounding them.⁴

1-1. A Brief History of the Japan-China CBMs with Its Conflicting Evaluations

In 1977, General (Retired) Kenjiro Mitsuoka (三岡健次郎) of Japan's Ground Self-Defense Force (JGSDF) established the *Chu-sei-kon* (中政懇) (short for the *Chugoku Seikei Kondankai* (中国政経懇談会), or the Council on Political and Economic Affairs of China) with a specific purpose to build an informal bridge for the Chief of Staff of the Joint Staff Office (JS) between the two countries. At the time of the establishment of the *Chu-sei-kon*, enthusiastic support came from the Friendship Association for the Japan-China War Veterans (the *Nitchu Moto Gunjin Yuko no Kai* 日中元軍人友好の会), whose members were repentant of the tragic and unnecessary belligerent relationship during the 1930s and 1940s. In October 1977, General Mitsuoka formed and led the first Japanese delegation, comprising six retired generals and admirals, to exchange views with top Chinese leaders including China's charismatic leader, Deng Xiaoping/Dèng Xiǎopíng (邓小平), and Liao Chengzhi/Liào Chéngzhì (廖承志) who was then President of the Sino-Japanese Friendship Society (ZhōngRì Yǒuhǎo Xiéhuì/中日友好协会). According to General Mitsuoka, the CBMs comprise four activities—(1) Every year, the *Chu-sei-kon* forms a Japanese delegation to visit China and holds a series of meetings with Chinese leaders; (2) the *Chu-sei-kon* organizes conference and workshops on China issues about three times a year; (3) it holds a briefing session after the delegation comes back to Japan; and (4) it organizes welcome ceremonies when Chinese missions visit Japan.⁵

In October 1995, General Mitsuoka unveiled his memories about Deng Xiaoping's remarks on October 7, 1977.⁶ Deng said: "The Sino-Japanese exchange can be traced back to the reign of Emperor Wu of Han (Hànwǔdì/汉武帝) (between 141 and 87 before common era (B.C.E.)). Out of the past 2,000 years, our exchanges have a long history of at least 1,500 years. Although the two countries experienced an unfortunate series of warring situations over the last 100 years, a 100-year length of belligerent period appears to be very short from the viewpoint of our 1,500-year history of exchange." Having experienced over 20 years, General Mitsuoka said that "Mutual understanding was still extremely insufficient. By establishing the *Chu-sei-kon* with my colleagues in 1977, we have made our efforts and will continue to do so to enhance mutual understanding and a two-way exchange of opinions between Japan and China."⁷

In 1998, however, the *Chu-sei-kon* decided to terminate the CBMs, partly because principal supporting members

⁴ Although the year 2011 marked the 35th anniversary of the Japan-China CBMs, the 2011 CBMs is regarded as the 34th annual event. Not because of a strained politico-economic relationship, but because of disagreement on time scheduling, the both sides missed the CBMs event one time in 1998.

⁵ Kenjiro Mitsuoka (三岡健次郎), "Chugoku tono Yuko koryu Niju-nen no Kanso [Impressions on the 20 Years of Friendship Activities with China/「中国との友好交流 20年の感想」], mimeo, June 30, 1995.

⁶ Kenjiro Mitsuoka (三岡健次郎), "Tai Chugoku Ibunki: Moto Jieitai Shokan no Koryu Ni-nen [Strange-but-true Tales in regard to China: A Retired General's Memories of a Twenty-year International Exchange No. 1/「对中国異聞記: 元自衛隊将官の交流 20年 (1)」], *Sekai Nippo* [World Times/『世界日報』], October 14, 1995.

⁷ Kenjiro Mitsuoka (三岡健次郎), "Tai Chugoku Ibunki: Moto Jieitai Shokan no Koryu Ni-nen [Strange-but-true Tales in regard to China: A Retired General's Memories of a Twenty-year International Exchange No. 2/「对中国異聞記: 元自衛隊将官の交流 20年 (2)」], *Sekai Nippo* [World Times/『世界日報』], October 15, 1995.

were World War II veterans and they became extremely advanced in age, and partly because the 20-year efforts seemed to have achieved its initial purpose of building an informal bridge for the top brass between the two countries. At that time, interestingly, it was the Chinese side that enthusiastically tried to continue the annual CBMs between the two countries. As for the Chinese efforts not to disrupt the history of the CBMs, there are various interpretations within the Japanese side; but no convincing and integrated conclusions have yet reached. Indeed, each interpretation contains a grain of truth and the level of the truth might be varied by the PLA's intention. One extreme view among these interpretations is that China wants to infiltrate into the JSDF and nurture its pro-China school and then develop conflicting views with regard to its China strategy.⁸ Another extreme view is that the PLA wants to keep the two-way exchange with the JSDF intact and trustworthy because the PLA still embraces its insecurity, facing with their U.S. counterparts. Irrespective of these speculations, in the future, the PLA's intention may change in accordance with the global politico-military environment. Someday, a stronger and more assertive PLA might lose its interest in continuing the relationship with the JSDF; alternately, an more assertive PLA, bracing itself for a more conflictual relationship with the United States, might try to bind the JSDF to balance against the U.S. forces. Irrespective of the PLA's intention, the *Chu-sei-kon* has a great advantage to handle the CBMs, if adroitly handled in an unpredictable and protean world.

1-2. The End of “Chimerica”⁹: Mounting Suspicions between the Rising Dragon and the Falling Eagle

In today's protean world, the Japan-China CBMs are undeniably important because of the intensified Sino-U.S. rivalry. Jun Kurihara and James L. Schoff argue in their short essay published last year the importance of building a mutually beneficial trilateral relationship among Japan, the United States and China.¹⁰ They state that:

[A]n aging and less populous Japan that desperately needs its economic revitalization should get access to buoyant foreign markets and stable material resources from abroad. For this reason, Japan should have both the United States and China as its dancing partners. China, embracing a risk of becoming gray before becoming rich, should keep stable access to world markets and state-of-the-art technologies in a peaceful world. Accordingly, China needs both the United States and Japan as indispensable dancing partners. Finally, an economically ailing United States that requires a balance sheet correction in every sector (i.e., households, the corporate and government sectors, and external transactions) should aggressively explore opportunities in the global marketplace with multiple partners. This situation will force the United States to have a delicate dance both with Japan and with China, and we could be entering an era when exclusive couple dancing gives way to coordinated group dancing. This is harder to choreograph, but it invites less suspicion and malicious gossip, and it can be a productive use of various talents.¹¹

⁸ See, for example, the Defense Procurement Structure Improvement Foundation (防衛調達基盤整備協会), “Wagakuni wo meguru Heiki gijutsu Johokanri no Shomondai [Problems of Information Control regarding Japan's Arms Technologies/わが国をめぐる兵器技術情報管理の諸問題],” March 2009.

⁹ *Chimerica* is a neologism coined by Harvard Professor Niall Ferguson in his book titled *The Ascent of Money*, New York: Penguin Press, 2008, pp. 335-339. The word denotes a relationship of economic interdependence between China and America. See also Niall Ferguson and Moritz Schularick, “Chimerica and the Global Asset Market Boom,” *International Finance*, Vol. 10, No. 3 (Winter 2007), pp. 215-239.

¹⁰ Jun Kurihara and James L. Schoff, “For Whom Japan's Last Dance Is Saved—China, the United States, or *Chimerica*?” *Cambridge Gazette*: Politico-Economic Commentaries No. 4, Tokyo: the Canon Institute for Global Studies (CIGS), March 29, 2010, http://www.canon-igs.org/en/column/network/20100329_580.html.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 17.

Despite the above argument developed by Kurihara and Schoff, a relentlessly rising China has provided an environment where various analysts on the both sides of the Pacific conclude that United States and China have raised their suspicions against each other, leading to a growing number of studies regarding this conflictual bilateral relationship.¹²

For instance, Michael S. Chase, Director of the Mahan Scholars Program at the United States Naval War College (USNWC), argues that Chinese strategists and scholars have harbored and strengthened deep suspicions about U.S. strategic intentions.¹³ Gregory Chin of York University and Ramesh Thakur of the University of Waterloo argue that the behavior of the United States appears in the eyes of China that America is willing to talk about only burden sharing setting aside the issue of power sharing, therefore leading to a China dragging its feet and circumventing global leadership.¹⁴ Henry Kissinger points out a lingering risk of conflict between the two countries that would exhaust their societies and undermine the prospects of world peace. He also looks to a sobering fact that neither side has much practice in cooperative relations unlike the European experience.¹⁵ Aaron L. Friedberg, a professor at Princeton University, warns that “Insecurity continues to be the defining feature of international life. Even if great-power war is a thing of the past, great-power rivalry certainly is not.” He continues to question an uncertain future after the retirement of the seasoned top brass in the Chinese leadership by saying that “Inexperienced political leaders may be more inclined to accept without question the judgment of their military advisors.”¹⁶

Not everybody, however, agrees to the aforementioned arguments; for example, Charles Glaser, a professor at the George Washington University (GWU), provides a more optimistic view that the danger of conflict can be avoided if the United States can successfully devise its policies so as not to make less-than-vital interests (such as Taiwan) invite China’s vitriolic responses or amplify the risks posed by China’s growing power and military capabilities.¹⁷ Richard Rosecrance, one of America’s leading scholars, and Wang Jisi/Wáng Jīsi (王缉思), Dean of the School of International Studies (SIS) at Peking University and Director of the Institute of International Strategic Studies at the Central Party School, argue that “Understanding of the situation and maintaining communication between nations are the first requirement, but though they are necessary they are not sufficient to produce good long-term relations.”; therefore they continue to state that “The second requirement, therefore, is adjustment of interests that leads to compromise.”¹⁸

The year 2008 witnessed the successful holding of the Beijing Olympic Games and the world financial crisis,

¹² In addition to articles and books to which the authors briefly refer afterwards, see, for example, Rosemary Foot and Andrew Walter, *China, the United States, and Global Order*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, December 2010.

¹³ Michael S. Chase, “Chinese Suspicion and US Intentions,” *Survival*, Vol. 53, No. 3 (June/July 2011), pp. 133-150.

¹⁴ Gregory Chin and Ramesh Thakur, “Will China Change the Rules of Global Order?” *Washington Quarterly*, Vol. 33, No. 4 (October 2010), pp. 119-138.

¹⁵ Henry A. Kissinger, “Power Shifts,” *Survival*, Vol. 52, No. 6 (December 2010/January 2011), pp. 205-212. See also Henry A. Kissinger, *On China*, New York: Penguin Press, 2011.

¹⁶ Aaron L. Friedberg, *A Contest for Supremacy: China, America, and the Struggle for Mastery in Asia*, New York: W.W. Norton, 2011, pp. 39 and 276. See also Aaron L. Friedberg, “Hegemony with Chinese Characteristics,” *National Interest*, No. 114 (July/August 2011), pp. 18-27.

¹⁷ Charles Glaser, “Will China’s Rise Lead to War?” *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 90, No. 2 (March/April 2011), pp. 80-91.

¹⁸ Richard Rosecrance and Wang Jisi/Wáng Jīsi (王缉思), “Conclusions: ‘The United States and China Together?’” in *Power and Restraint: A Shared Vision for the U.S.-China Relationship*, edited by Rosecrance and Gu Guoliang/Gù Guóliáng (顾国良), New York: PublicAffairs, 2009.

both of which bolstered China's self-esteem. At a conference held in Shanghai in the aftermath of the Olympics, Zhen Bijian/Zhèng Bìjiān (郑必坚), one of China's leading intellectuals and the author of the "peaceful rise (héping juéqǐ/和平崛起)" concept, told a Western reporter that China had at last overcome the legacy of the Opium War (Yāpiàn Zhànzhēng/鸦片战争) and China's century of struggles with foreign intrusion, and that it was now engaged in a historic process of national renewal.¹⁹ The financial crisis in the Western powers also enhanced China's self-confidence in economic policies with Chinese characteristics (Beijing Consensus (Běijīng Gòngshí/北京共识)).²⁰ By suggesting that China gained in politico-economic terms in the midst of the global financial crisis, Wu Xinbo/Wú Xīnbó (吴心伯), Deputy Director of the Center for American Studies (CAS) at Fudan University, proudly declares that "In the Post-Cold War era, the U.S. model used to be hailed as the only way to economic prosperity. Now the Chinese model seems to provide an alternative."²¹

Some experts has gone too far in saying that "state-monopoly capitalism (guójiā lǒngduàn zīběn zhǔyì/国家垄断资本主义)" had finally brought the world economy to the brink of disaster, just as Lenin predicted in his 1917 book titled *Imperialism as the Highest Stage of Capitalism* [«Dìguó zhǔyì shì Zīběn zhǔyì de Zuìgāo jìēduàn/帝国主义是资本主义的最高阶段» (*Империализм как высшая стадия капитализма*)].²² A Chinese expert has gone farther, arguing that China is about to supplant the United States as the world leader. Liu Mingfu/Liú Míngfú (刘明福), a PLA senior colonel and professor at China's National Defense University (NDU), published a book titled *Zhōngguó Mèng: Hòu Měiguó Shídài de Dàguó Sīwéi yǔ Zhànlüè Dìngwèi* [China's Dream: Major Power Thinking and Strategic Posture in a Post-American Era/«中国梦: 后美国时代的大国思维与战略定位»].²³ The book was among China's bestsellers in 2010, not because it represents official government policy (actually, it does not), but because the author's views crystallize certain impulses to which the government has felt itself obliged to respond. Like the case of the United States, of course, there are various views with regard to China's self-image. Wang Jisi, in his recent article, points out China's domestic confusion in shaping its foreign policy and China's frail naïveté toward whimsical responses of the international community. He argues that there are wide differences in views among Chinese government agencies and such differences confuse outsiders as well as the Chinese populace. He also suggests that the international community take on the responsibility of helping the world's largest member (China) support itself.²⁴

¹⁹ Nathan Gardels, "Post-Olympic Powershift: The Return of the Middle Kingdom in a Post-American World," *New Perspectives Quarterly*, Vol. 25, No. 4 (Fall 2008), pp. 7-8. See also Kissinger, *On China*, p. 502. However, the authors think an opinion that China has overcome a victim mentality of "one hundred years of shame and humiliation (Bǎinián Guóchǐ/百年国耻)" and now possesses a "great power mentality (Dàguó Xīntài/大国心态)" is still a matter of debate.

²⁰ As for 'Beijing Consensus,' see, for example, Joshua Cooper Ramo, "The Beijing Consensus," London: Foreign Policy Centre, May 2004.

²¹ Wu Xinbo/Wú Xīnbó (吴心伯), "Understanding the Geopolitical Implications of the Global Financial Crisis," *Washington, Quarterly*, Vol. 33, No. 4 (October, 2010), pp. 155-163.

²² David Shambaugh, "Coping with a Conflicted China," *Washington Quarterly*, Vol. 34, No. 1 (Winter 2011), p. 11.

²³ Liu Mingfu/Liú Míngfú (刘明福), *Zhōngguó Mèng: Hòu Měiguó Shídài de Dàguó Sīwéi yǔ Zhànlüè Dìngwèi* [China's Dream: Major Power Thinking and Strategic Posture in a Post-American Era/«中国梦: 后美国时代的大国思维与战略定位»], Beijing: Zhōngguó Yǒuyǐ Chūbǎn Gōngsī [中国友谊出版公司], 2010. As for those who echo the view of Professor Liu Mingfu, see, for example, Zhao Yandong/Zhào Yándōng (赵言东), "Tiāoluò Měiguó, Měi tóuhào qiángguó dìwèi zāoyù tiāozhàn [Declining America, America's Number One Superpower Status Challenged/挑落美国, 美头号强国地位遭遇挑战]," *Dāngdài Hǎijūn/Dāngdài Hǎijūn* [Modern Navy/«当代海军»], 2011, No. 6, pp. 26-29.

²⁴ Wang Jisi/Wáng Jīsī (王缉思), "China's Search for a Grand Strategy," *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 90, No. 2 (March/April 2011), pp. 68-79.

Indeed, from a certain historical perspective, the rise of China is undeniable, impressive, and, in some sense, inevitable.²⁵ Not a few observers forecast that China's economic might will surpass that of the United States.²⁶ Nonetheless, this extraordinarily hurried pace of China's rise has invited not only international and domestic kudos but also bewilderment both at home and abroad.²⁷ These kudos and bewilderment have generated a flood of opinions—some are well-informed and others ill-informed, and they are sometimes competing and contradictory. Of great consequence is an irritable “Pearl Harbor syndrome” that is pervasive within the Washington defense establishment.²⁸ This syndrome urges the U.S. intelligence community to monitor closely China's military capabilities and establish overwhelming U.S. military superiority over China. To make matters worse, the PLA's lack of transparency has exacerbated this syndrome and led to an ineradicable fear of underestimating China's military capabilities. In short, even in experts' eyes, the rising dragon (China) looks like mercilessly beating the falling eagle (the United States). For the very reason, divergent perspectives, some of which are staggeringly and vitriolically provocative ones, are cropping up regarding an intensified U.S.-China rivalry, in particular in the national security field.²⁹

Thus, *Chimerica* is about to metamorphose itself into a chimera by deteriorating the politico-economic relations between the two countries. As a matter of fact, Niall Ferguson who coined the word of *Chimerica* had presaged the current situation by stating that “the longer the world goes without a major conflict, the harder one becomes to imagine (and, perhaps, the easier one becomes to start).”³⁰ Now, Japan's major dance partners on the stage of global politics—the United States and China—are cogitating their future course; the United States is pondering how to live (or

²⁵ See, for example, Piers Brendon, “China Also Rises,” *National Interest*, No. 110 (November/December 2010), pp. 6-13.

²⁶ See, for example, G. John Ikenberry, “The Rise of China: Power, Institutions, and the Western Order,” in *China's Ascent: Power, Security, and the Future of International Politics*, edited by Robert S. Ross and ZHU Feng/Zhū Fēng (朱锋), Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2008, and Adam S. Posen, “National Security Risks from Accumulation of Foreign Debt,” in *The Long-Term International Economic Position of the United States*, edited by C. Fred Bergsten, Washington, D.C.: Peterson Institute for International Economics, 2009, pp. 68-71.

²⁷ As for bewilderment at home and abroad, see, for example, Jonathan Holslag, Jonathan, “China's Vulnerability Trap,” *Survival*, Vol. 53, No. 2 (April/May 2011), pp. 77-88 and Song Xiaojun/Sòng Xiǎojūn (宋晓军) et al., *Zhōngguó bù gāoxìng: Dàshídài, Dàmùbiāo jí Wǒmen de Nèiyōuwàihuàn* [Unhappy China: the Great Time, Grand Vision and Our Challenges/«中国不高兴：大时代、大目标及我们的内忧外患»], Jiāngsū Rénmín Chūbǎnshè [江苏人民出版社], 2009.

²⁸ Lyle J. Goldstein, “Resetting the US-China Security Relationship,” *Survival*, Vol. 53, No. 2 (April/May 2011), pp. 89-116.

²⁹ As for China's military challenges against the United States, see, for example, the Chinese Government, “China's National Defense in 2010,” http://www.china.org.cn/government/whitepaper/node_7114675.htm («2010年中国的国防»白皮书, <http://www.scio.gov.cn/zxbd/wz/201103/t883079.htm>), March 2011), the U.S. Department of Defense (DoD), “Annual Report to Congress: Military and Security Developments Involving the People's Republic of China 2011,” Washington, D.C.: DoD, August 2011, and the DoD, “The National Military Strategy of the United States of America: Redefining America's Military Leadership,” Washington, D.C.: DoD, February 2011. As for China's military and technological challenges, see, for example, U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission (USCC), “The National Security Implications of Investments and Products from the People's Republic of China in the Telecommunications Sector,” Washington, D.C.: USCC, January 2011. As for the PLA's Navy (PLAN), see, for example, Toshi Yoshihara and James R. Holmes, *Red Star over the Pacific: China's Rise and the Challenge to U.S. Maritime Strategy*, Annapolis, MD: Naval Institute Press, 2010 and Peng Guangqian/Péng Guāngqiān (彭光谦), “China's Maritime Rights and Interests,” *China Maritime Study*, No. 7 (December 2010), pp. 15-22, and Peter Dutton, “Three Disputes and Three Objectives: China and the South China Sea,” *Naval War College Review*, Vol. 64, No. 4 (Autumn 2011), pp. 42-67, and Ronald O'Rourke, “China Naval Modernization: Implications for U.S. Naval Capabilities—Background and Issues for Congress,” RL33153, Washington, D.C.: Congressional Research Service (CRS), July 2011. With a special emphasis on the building of the PLAN's aircraft carriers, see, for example, Yoji Koda (香田洋二), “A New Carrier Race? Strategy, Force Planning, and JS Hyuga,” *Naval War College Review*, Vol. 64, No. 3 (Summer 2011), pp. 31-60. As for China's military modernization, see, for example, Richard D. Fisher, Jr., *China's Military Modernization: Building for Regional and Global Reach*, Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2010, and Christina Lin, “The PLA's ‘Orient Express’: Militarization of the Iron Silk Road,” Berlin: Institut für Strategie-Politik-Sicherheits- und Wirtschaftsberatung (ISPSW), March 2011. As for the PLA's Air Force (PLAAF), see, for example, Roger Cliff et al., *Shaking the Heavens and Splitting the Earth: Chinese Air Force Employment Concepts in the 21st Century*, Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, February 2011, and David J. Kostecka, “From the Sea: PLA Doctrine and the Employment of Sea-Based Airpower,” *Naval War College Review*, Vol. 64, No. 3 (Summer 2011), pp. 11-30. As for the Sino-U.S. rivalry for space superiority, see, for example, James Clay Moltz, “China, the United States, and Prospects for Asian Space Cooperation,” *Journal of Contemporary China*, No. 68 (January 2011), pp. 69-87.

³⁰ Niall Ferguson, *The Ascent of Money: A Financial History of the World*, Penguin Press, 2008, p. 340. See also Niall Ferguson and Moritz Schularick, “The End of Chimerica,” Harvard Business School Working Paper 10-037, Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business School, October 2009.

compete or fight) with China; China is pondering how and when to abandon the status of the status quo power.³¹

Here, several representative opinions on the U.S. responses to the rise of China are briefly examined. First, John J. Mearsheimer, the leading offensive realist professor at the University of Chicago, has long warned the looming instability of world politics triggered by the rise of China. At the outset of a 2006 article titled “China’s Unpeaceful Rise,” Mearsheimer, in an unemotional manner states: “Can China rise peacefully? My answer is no,” and concludes that the United States should “go to great lengths to contain China and ultimately weaken it to the point where it is no longer capable of ruling the roost in Asia.”³²

Second, Paul K. MacDonald and Joseph M. Parent assert an isolationist United States by stating that “The United States should be able to reduce its foreign policy commitments in East Asia in the coming decades without inviting Chinese expansionism.”³³ At the same time, they assure their fellow Americans the current hyperpower status of the United States by stating that “Fallen hegemonies still have formidable capability, which threatens grave harm to any state that tries to cross them.” They continue to argue that even if China’s power becomes closer to that of the United States, there is a possibility of a peaceful hegemonic transition by referring to a historical fact that “the Anglo-American hegemonic transition took place around 1872 without any evident struggles.”³⁴ In a similar vein, Andrew F. Hart and Bruce D. Jones discuss that the United States will have a diminishing willingness to play a leadership role, facing the “rise of the rest” spearheaded by China. Unlike MacDonald and Parent, however, Hart and Jones warn a spreading danger of miscalculation in global politics.³⁵ This isolationist and ostrich-like American stance might create in the Asia-Pacific region a politico-economic vacuum about which smaller Asian countries feel dreadful.³⁶

Third, Joseph S. Nye, Jr. of Harvard University argues that the United States maintains predominant power in the world and that China is not likely to become a peer competitor to the United States because in the 21st century the characteristics of power change drastically and such changes bring about a politico-economic environment that favors the United States’ predominance.³⁷ Then, in his 2010 article titled “American and Chinese Power after the Financial Crisis,” Nye warns that “Extrapolating the wrong long-term projections from short-term cyclical events like the recent

³¹ See, for example, Shiping TANG/Shiping Tang (唐世平), Mingjiang LI/Mingjiang Li (李明江), and Amitav Acharya eds., *Living with China: Dynamic Interactions between China and Its Neighbors*, New York: Palgrave-Macmillan, 2009.

³² John J. Mearsheimer, “China’s Unpeaceful Rise,” *Current History*, Vol. 105, no. 690 (April 2006), pp. 160 and 162. See also his recent article titled “The Gathering Storm: China’s Challenge to US Power in Asia,” *The Chinese Journal of International Politics*, Vol. 3, No. 4 (Winter 2010), pp. 381-396 as well as his 2001 book titled *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*, New York: W.W. Norton.

³³ Paul K. MacDonald and Joseph M. Parent, “Graceful Decline?: The Surprising Success of Great Power Retrenchment,” *International Security*, Vol. 35, No. 4 (Spring 2011), p. 42. See also their forthcoming article titled “The Wisdom of Retrenchment,” *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 90, No. 6 (November/December 2011).

³⁴ Paul K. MacDonald and Joseph M. Parent, “Graceful Decline?” p. 41.

³⁵ Andrew F. Hart and Bruce D. Jones, “How Do Rising Powers Rise?” *Survival*, Vol. 52, No. 6 (December 2010/January 2011), pp. 63-88.

³⁶ See, for example, Simon S. Tay, *Asia Alone: The Dangerous Post-Crisis Divide from America*, Singapore: Wiley (Asia), 2010. See also Craig S. Cohen, ed., “Capacity and Resolve: Foreign Assessments of U.S. Power,” Washington, D.C.: Center for Strategic and International Studies, June 2011.

³⁷ Joseph S., Nye, Jr., “American and Chinese Power after the Financial Crisis,” *Washington Quarterly*, Vol. 33, No. 4 (October 2010), p. 151 and his book titled *The Future of Power*, New York: PublicAffairs, 2011.

financial crisis can lead to costly policy miscalculations.”³⁸ He also warns that “hubris and nationalism among some Chinese, as well as unnecessary fear of decline among some Americans, make it difficult to assure this future.” In the meantime, Nouriel Roubini, a noted economist, becomes pessimistic regarding China’s economic growth that is the paramount legitimacy of the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) (Zhōngguó Gòngchǎndǎng/中国共产党) on the ground that economic dynamism will shift from China to India in 10 years because of a huge difference in additional youth population increase.³⁹

Fourth, David Shambaugh, a prominent Sinologist at the George Washington University (GWU), explains his ideas for America’s China policy in his 2010 article titled “A New China Requires a New US Strategy.”⁴⁰ Acknowledging that the world has begun dealing with a different—and sometimes more difficult—China, Shambaugh proposes 7 revisions to America’s current China strategy, i.e., (1) discarding the U.S. long-standing paternalistic attitude and missionary illusions about China, (2) developing the U.S. domestic strategy for dealing with China—specifically, (a) reducing the national debt, (b) readjusting its inward foreign direct investment (FDI) regulations against China, and (c) enhancing national awareness of China and competence in the Chinese language, (3) devising effective strategies and tactics to deal with China’s state-led development juggernaut such as mercantilist industrial policies, (4) learning to live with China’s military modernization and reducing misperception between military forces, (5) instituting a moratorium on arms sales to Taiwan, (6) developing a sophisticated U.S. Asia policy rather than the traditional hub-and-spokes alliances, and finally (7) fashioning a strategy for interacting with China on a global basis.

2. Why Can the Japan-China CBMs Be So Important Now?

The first section has described a brief history of the Japan-China CBMs organized by the *Chu-sei-kon*, and examined the current Sino-U.S. rivalry surrounding the Japan-China CBMs. This section discusses the conundrum of identifying the direction and resolve of the Chinese leadership and argue a prospective role played by the Japan-China CBMs to seek clearer information about the Chinese leadership’s direction and resolve.

2.1. The China Conundrum: Difficulty of Identifying the Direction and Resolve of the Chinese Leadership.

David Shambaugh reports the difficulty of identifying the direction and resolve of the Chinese leadership by stating that China “has no single international identity today, but rather a series of competing identities,” and then says that China is “unprepared for its new international status.”⁴¹ Nonetheless, he provides a very useful clue to understand the seven strands of thought for China’s foreign policy strategy (see Table 1). Table 1 shows each strand of China’s strategic thinking by classifying in terms of (a) external relationship (either self-help or interdependent) and (b) specific preferences. Table 1 also exhibits additional information regarding (c) feelings towards the United States, (d) principal

³⁸ Nye, “American and Chinese Power after the Financial Crisis,” p. 151.

³⁹ See, for example, Bloomberg, “Roubini Says India Growth May Beat China’s in 10 Years,” December 3, 2010, <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2010-12-03/india-s-economic-growth-may-surpass-china-s-in-next-10-years-roubini-says.html>. As for China’s population forecasts, see, for example, Xizhe PENG/Xīzhé Péng (彭希哲), “China’s Demographic History and Future Challenges,” *Science*, Vol. 333, No. 6042 (July 29, 2011), pp. 581-587.

⁴⁰ David Shambaugh, “A New China Requires a New US Strategy,” *Current History*, Vol. 109, No. 728 (September 2010), pp. 219-226.

⁴¹ David Shambaugh, “Coping with a Conflicted China,” *Washington Quarterly*, Vol. 34, No. 1 (Winter 2011), p. 9.

constituency, (e) leading advocates of each school, and (f) the fortune of each school in today’s Chinese society. The following brief descriptions provide additional information regarding each school.

Table 1. China’s Seven Schools of Strategic Thought (Classified by David Shambaugh)

Classification	1. Nativist	2. Realist	3. Major Powers	4. Asia First	5. Global South	6. Selective Multilateralist	7. Globalist
a. External Relationship	Self-Help/Autarky		Acknowledge an Interdependent Relationship with Other States				
b. Specific Preferences	Sinocentric	Opportunist	Great Power-oriented	Asia-oriented	LDCs-oriented	Issue Specific	Universalist
c. Feelings towards the U.S.	Anti-U.S.	Anti-U.S.	Pro-U.S. (*)	Anti-U.S.	Anti-U.S.	Anti-U.S.	Amicable with U.S.
d. Principal Constituency	CCP, PLA, Masses	CCP, PLA, Elites	Bureaucrats	Asia-first Pragmatists	Bureaucrats	Strategic Realists	Idealist Chinese
e. Leading Advocates	Wáng Xiǎodōng Hè Xióngfēi Zhāng Wénmù Fāng Níng	Shěn Dīnglǐ Yán Xuétōng Zhāng Ruìzhuàng	Wáng Jǐsī Jīn Cǎnróng Wú Xīnbó Cūi Lírú	Wáng Yìzhōu Qín Yàqīng Wàijiāo Xuéyuán Zhāng Yùnlíng		Yáng Jiéché Chén Hǎnxī Yè Zìchéng Sòng Xīnníng	Mén Hónghuá
f. Fortune in China	Dominant, Rising	Dominant	Majority, Declining	Minority, Rising			Minority, Declining

Note (*): Within the “Major Powers” School, there are two anti-U.S. elements, i.e., the pro-Russia and pro-EU schools.

Source: Authors’ compilation and interpretations based on the paper of David Shambaugh, “Coping with a Conflicted China,” *Washington Quarterly*, Vol. 34, No. 1 (Winter 2011), pp. 7-27.

First, the “Nativist” School is a collection of populists, xenophobic nationalists, and Marxists, believing that the U.S.-led international community is unjust. Second, the “Realist with Chinese characteristics” School is the dominant group in the discourse on international relations. The School embraces deep suspicions against the United States. Third, the “Major Powers” School—being subdivided into three, i.e., U.S.-oriented, Russia-oriented, and EU-oriented subgroups with the first one being predominant—comprises regional specialists. During the Jiang Zemin/Jiāng Zémín (江泽民) presidency when the “America-first” policy was adopted, the “U.S.-oriented” School was dominant. Fourth, the “Asia First” School has emerged since the late 1990s “under the rubric of ‘establish good neighborliness, make neighbors prosperous, and make them feel secure (mùlín fùlín ānlín/睦邻富邻安邻).’” Fifth, the “Global South” School believes China’s longstanding self-identification as a “developing country (fāzhǎnzhōng guójiā/发展中国家).” Sixth, the “Selective Multilateralist” School believes that China should expand its global involvements gradually but selectively. The School believes that “U.S. and EU calls for China to be a “responsible power (fùzérènde dàguó/负责任的大国)” or a “responsible stakeholder (fùzérèn lìyì xiāngguānzhě/负责任利益相关者)” are just the latest ruse for retarding and undermining China’s power and that global governance is a Western concept that China can hardly accept. Accordingly, in the eyes of Western scholars, this School is not liberal institutionalist, but more an internationalist version of realists. Seventh, the “Globalist” School is an equivalent of the Western liberal institutionalist, believing that China must shoulder the responsibility for addressing a wide range of global governance issues commensurate with its size, power, and influence.

Shambaugh does not forget to warn that despite intellectual distinctiveness of each school, “it would be incorrect to see these schools as mutually exclusive” and that “individual international relations scholars and officials in China are often eclectic thinkers” by referring to the oft-quoted phrase “Dàguó shì guānjiàn, Zhōubiān shì shǒuyào, Fāzhǎnzhōng guójiā shì jīchǔ, Duōbiān shì zhòngyào wǔtái (Major powers are the key, surrounding areas are the first priority, developing countries are the foundation, and multilateral forums are the important stage/大国是关键 周边是

首要 发展中国家是基础 多边是重要舞台)。”⁴²

Shambaugh concludes that: “China remains a deeply conflicted rising power with a series of competing international identities. Many new voices and actors are now part of an unprecedentedly complex foreign-policy-making process,” and states: “China’s foreign policy often exhibits diverse and contradictory emphases.”⁴³ Although the authors have found Shambaugh’s analysis impressively informative, equally informative is a report published last year by Linda Jakobson and Dean Knox. The researchers stress the need to monitor carefully, continuously, and diversely by stating that merely “by persistently engaging a broad spectrum of Chinese foreign policy actors, recognizing the variations in their perspectives and concerns, and integrating them into engagement strategies can foreign policy makers succeed in securing China’s cooperation.”⁴⁴ Jakobson and Knox argue that “Three trends—fractured authority, varying views of the degree to which China should internationalize and the demands that China defend its core interests—are changing the nature of Chinese foreign policy formulation and the way China interacts with the outside world,” and that foreigners “need to recognize nuances in Chinese perspectives.”⁴⁵

At a SIPRI (Stockholm International Peace Research Institute) event on May 8, 2009, Jakobson and Knox was warned by a Renmin University professor Jin Canrong/Jīn Cànróng (金灿荣) of the importance of the PLA. The professor called them ‘guys in uniform,’ when he listed three types of new foreign policy actors—netizens (wǎngmín/网民), shareholders (gǔmín/股民), and the military (jūnmín/军民). In a follow-up interview in Beijing in September 2009, Jakobson and Knox confirmed that the PLA is a ‘new’ actor because the PLA has become a more professional military through the PLA’s increasing contacts and cooperation with the outside world. Although the PLA has always been an actor in foreign policy deliberations in China, it adopts new perceptions of Chinese national interests and views itself as the final guarantor of those national interests. In addition, the mindset of the military has begun developing along a dual-track trajectory with regard to national interests: one track that becomes more nationalistic and another that becomes more willing to engage in international cooperation and dialogue.”⁴⁶ Therefore, as Jakobson and Knox suggest, a series of frank and candid discussions with PLA officers could give foreigners important clues to the future course of China’s foreign policy.

2.2. The Importance of Direct Contact with PLA Officers and the Record of the 2011 CBMs

Analysts and scholars have echoed the aforementioned advice offered by Jakobson and Knox. For example, Gu Guoliang/Gù Guóliáng (顾国良), Director of the Institute of American Studies (IAS), the Chinese Academy of Social Science (CASS) and the late Steven E. Miller who was Director of the International Security Program, Harvard

⁴² *Ibid.*

⁴³ *Ibid.*, p. 7.

⁴⁴ Linda Jakobson and Dean Knox, “New Foreign Policy Actors in China,” Policy Paper, no. 26, Stockholm: Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI), September 2010, p. vi. The Japanese translation of this report is published from a Japanese publisher (Iwanami Shoten (岩波書店)). See also Kerry Brown and Loh Su Hsing/Lú Shūxīng (卢殊杏), “Trying to Read the New ‘Assertive’ China Right,” Asia Programme Paper ASP PP2011/02, London: Chatham House, January 2011.

⁴⁵ Jakobson and Knox, *op. cit.*, p. vi.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 17.

Kennedy School (HKS), in their 2009 article titled “Arms Control and the Spread of Weapons of Mass Destruction,” suggest that CBMs “such as dialogues at all levels including high-level talks, hotline contacts, and crisis management between the two countries should be take so as to avoid misjudgment or accidents, which may lead to military conflict neither side wants.”⁴⁷

The aforementioned arguments have confirmed the importance of the Japan-China CBMs organized by the *Chu-sei-kon*. The following is a brief account of the 2011 CBMs between the *Chu-sei-kon* and the PLA. The 2011 Delegation visited China between June 7 and June 16, 2011, by visiting Beijing/Běijīng (北京), Tianjin/Tiānjīn (天津), Qingdao/Qīngdǎo (青岛), Xi’an/Xī’ān (西安), and Dalian/Dàlián (大连) (see Table 2).

Table 2. The 34th *Chu-sei-kon* Delegation Schedule (June 2011, Only Major Events Described)

		Cities	Schedule
1	Tue., June 7	Tokyo, Běijīng	Japanese Embassy (Meeting with Japanese Ambassador Uichiro Niwa (丹羽宇一郎)) Diaoyutai State Guesthouse (Diàoyútái Guóbīnguǎn/钓鱼台国宾馆) (Dinner with former Foreign Minister Li Zhàoxīng (李肇星))
2	Wed., June 8	Běijīng	China Aviation Museum (Zhōngguó Hángkōng Bówùguǎn/中国航空博物馆) Beijing Military Region, the 6th Armored Division (Běijīng Jūnqū, Tǎnkè Liù-shí/北京军区坦克六师) Chinese People’s Anti-Japanese War Museum (Zhōngguó Rénmín KàngRì Zhànzhēng Jìniànguǎn/中国人民抗日战争纪念馆)
3	Thurs., June 9	Běijīng	Sino-Japan Security Forum for Northeast Asia 2011 (ZhōngRì Dōngběiyà Ānquán Lùntán 2011/中日东北亚安全论坛 2011)
4	Fri., June 10	Běijīng, Tiānjīn	August 1st Building (HQs of Central Military Committee (CMC)) (Meeting with Defense Minister Liáng Guāngliè (梁光烈)) the PLA Air Force (PLAAF) 24th Fighter Division (Hángkōngbīng Dì Èrshísi-shí/航空兵第二十四师)
5	Sat., June 11	Qīngdǎo	Luncheon Meeting with Consul General Norio Saito (齋藤法雄) Dinner Meeting organized by Qīngdǎo’s CAIFC (*)
6	Sun., June 12	Qīngdǎo, Xī’ān	Naval Museum (Hǎijūn Bówùguǎn/海军博物馆) Dinner Meeting organized by the Shǎnxī Government
7	Mon., June 13	Xī’ān	Xī’ān Aircraft International Corp. (Xī’ān Fēijī Guójì Hángkōng Zhìzào/西安飞机国际航空制造)
8	Tues., June 14	Xī’ān, Dàlián	
9	Wed., June 15	Dàlián	Lǚshùn (旅顺) (Higashi-Keikanzan Battery (Dōngjī Guānshān Bēibóléi/东鸡冠山北堡垒), Suishiei (Shuǐshīyīng/水师营), Hakugyokusan (Báiyùshān/白玉山), 203 Hill (203 Gāodi/203高地)) Dinner Meeting organized by Dàlián’s CAIFC (*)
10	Thurs., June 16	Dàlián, Tokyo	

Note (*): CAIFC: China Association for International Friendly Contact (Zhōngguó Guójì Yǒuhǎo Liánluòhuì/中国国际友好联络会)

Source: Chugoku Seiji Keizai Kondankai, Dai-34-ji Hochu-dan [The 34th Delegation, Council on Political and Economic Affairs of China/中国政治経済懇談会], “Hochu Hokokusho [Delegation Report/「訪中報告書」],” Tokyo: Chugoku Seiji Keizai Kondankai (*Chu-sei-kon*), August 2011, pp. 3-4.

On Day 1, the 34th Delegation visited the Japanese Embassy and exchanged views with the Japanese Ambassador Uichiro Niwa (丹羽宇一郎) on the latest information regarding the bilateral relationship from a broader perspective. In the evening, former foreign minister and Chairman of the China Association for International Friendly Contact (CAIFC) (Zhōngguó Guójì Yǒuhǎo Liánluòhuì/中国国际友好联络会), Li Zhaoxing/Lǐ Zhàoxīng (李肇星) and his wife invited the Delegation to the Diaoyutai State Guesthouse. At the dinner meeting, Minister Li expressed his gratitude toward Japan’s rescue effort at the time of the deadly 2008 Wenchuan Earthquake (Wèncuān Dàdìzhèn/汶川大地震) and his concerns about the safety of the members of former Delegations at the time of the Great East Japan Earthquake (東日本大震災) of March 2011. Minister Li’s wife, Tai Xiaomei/Tài Xiǎoméi (泰小梅) told her memories at the time of World War II that her elder brother, who was at Peking University, suggested the American forces avoid bombing of Nara (奈良) like the case of Kyoto (京都).⁴⁸ Although the Delegation has not yet confirmed the historical

⁴⁷ Gu Guoliang/Gù Guóliáng (顾国良) and Steven E. Miller, “Arms Control and the Spread of Weapons of Mass Destruction,” in *Power and Restraint: A Shared Vision for the U.S.-China Relationship*, edited by Richard Rosecrance and Gu Guoliang, 2009, p. 178.

⁴⁸ Nara is an ancient Japanese capital between 710 and 784, which was built by imitating then Chinese Tang (Táng/唐) Dynasty’s capital, Chang’an

evidence of the Nara bombing, the members of the Delegation were deeply impressed by Mrs. Tai's remarks.⁴⁹

On Day 2, the Delegation visited the Headquarters of the 6th Armored Division (Tǎnkè Liù-shī/坦克六师) of the Beijing Military Division (Běijīng Jūnqū/北京军区) and discussed with Senior Colonel Su Rong/Sū Róng (苏荣) over lunch. The Delegation also visited the PLA Air Force (PLAAF) 24th Fighter Division (Hángkōngbīng Dì Èrshísì-shī/航空兵第二十四师) in the afternoon, and discussed with Senior Colonel Chu Longcun/Chú Lóngcún (除龙存), the Chief of Staff of the Division and his colleagues.

On Day 3, the Delegation was present at an all-day gathering titled the “Sino-Japan Security Forum for Northeast Asia 2011 (ZhōngRì Dōngběiyà Ānquán Lùntán 2011/中日东北亚安全论坛 2011)” (as for the participants, see Table 3). This year's main theme was “the Military Strategies of Japan and China,” and the Forum comprised three sessions—(1) “The Current International and Regional Security Circumstances, and Japanese and Chinese Military Concerns,” (2) “The Military Strategies and Defense Policies of the Two Countries,” and (3) “Japanese and Chinese Cooperation in the Field of Non-traditional Military Operations.”

Table 3. List of Participants in the 2011 *Chu-sei-kon* Confidence Building Measures

the 34th Japanese Delegation (*)		
Head	Hiroshi Inoue (井上廣司)	Lieutenant General (Retired) JGSDF, Commanding General, North Eastern Army
Secretary	Yoshishige Hori (堀好成)	Lieutenant General (Retired) JASDF, Commander, Western Air Defense Force
Member	Masanori Takeda (武田正徳)	Lieutenant General (Retired) JGSDF, Commanding General, First Division
Member	Katsumi Sanda (三田克巳)	Lieutenant General (Retired) JGSDF, Commandant, Ground Staff College
Member	Toru Izumi (泉徹)	Admiral (Retired) JMSDF, Commander in Chief, Self Defense Fleet
Member	Tamotsu Katoh (加藤保)	Admiral (Retired) JMSDF, Commandant, Sasebo District
Member	Mitsumasa Ishii (石井光政)	Major General (Retired) JASDF, Commandant, Fourth Technical School
PLA Participants at the Sino-Japan Security Forum for Northeast Asia 2011 (**)		
	Zhōu Bóróng (周伯荣)	Former Deputy Chief of Staff of Navy, Rear Admiral (Retired)
	Yīn Zhuó (尹卓)	Navy Director, Information Technology Advisory Committee of Experts, Rear Admiral (Retired)
	Ōuyáng Wéi (欧阳维)	Director, Centre for Defense Mobilization Studies, National Defense University, Senior Colonel
	Yán Fēng (闫峰)	National Defense University
	Yuán Yáng (袁杨)	Section Chief, Section 2, Department of World Military Research, PLA Academy of Military Sciences, Senior Colonel
	Wáng Yíshèng (王宜胜)	Deputy Section Chief, Section 2, Department of World Military Research, PLA Academy of Military Sciences, Colonel
	Jiāng Kēfēng (姜克峰)	Staff Member, PLA Contingency Planning and Management, Lieutenant Colonel

Note (*): Although the *Chu-sei-kon* CBMs started in 1977, this year's CBMs is the 34th event, not the 35th; as for the reason, see footnote 4 in this essay.

Note (**): In addition to the PLA officers, from the China Association for International Friendly Contact (CAIFC) (Zhōngguó Guójì Yóuhào Liánluòhuì/中国国际友好联络会), several people attended the Forum, including Lǐ Xiǎohuá (李晓华), Deputy Chairman and Sòng Ēnlěi (宋恩垒), Chief Secretary.

Source: Chugoku Seiji Keizai Kondankai, Dai-34-ji Hochu-dan [The 34th Delegation, Council on Political and Economic Affairs of China/中国政治经济懇談会], “Hochu Hokokusho [Delegation Report/「訪中報告書」],” Tokyo: Chugoku Seiji Keizai Kondankai (*Chu-sei-kon*), August 2011, pp. 2-5.

At the beginning, Japanese General Hiroshi Inoue (井上廣司) began with words of Japan's heartfelt gratitude toward China's swift rescue responses at the time of the Great East Japan Earthquake and heart-warming messages from President Hu Jintao/Hú Jǐntāo (胡锦涛) as well as CAIFC Chairman Li Zhaoxing.⁵⁰ Then he briefly explained the new “National Defense Program Guideline (the new NDPG) for Fiscal Year 2011 and Beyond (Heisei 23-nendo

(Cháng'ān/长安) (present day's Xi'an).

⁴⁹ Chugoku Seiji Keizai Kondankai, Dai-34-ji Hochu-dan [The 34th Delegation, Council on Political and Economic Affairs of China/中国政治经济懇談会], “Hochu Hokokusho [Delegation Report/「訪中報告書」],” Tokyo: Chugoku Seiji Keizai Kondankai (*Chu-sei-kon*), August 2011, p. 32.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 7.

ikou ni kakawaru Boei Keikaku no Taiko ni tsuite/「平成 23 年度以降に係る防衛計画の大綱について」) approved on December 10, 2010 by the Security Council of Japan, and the “Basic Defense Force Concept” (Kibanteki Boeiryouku Koso/「基本的防衛力構想」) by touching upon the concept of “dynamic defense capability (doteki boei-ryoku/「動的防衛力」).”⁵¹ General Inoue also referred to Japan’s grave concerns about increasing cases of close contact between Japanese and Chinese military vessels and aircraft as China develops its blue-water capability and stressed an urgent imperative of the establishment of air-and-sea safety communications mechanisms. On the Chinese side, Admiral Zhou Borong/Zhōu Bóróng (周伯荣), former Deputy Chief of Staff of Navy (Hǎijūn Yuán Fùcānmóuzhǎng/海军原副参谋长), started with words of encouragement toward Japan’s efforts after the Great East Japan Earthquake and then explained the interdependent politico-economic climate and China’s defense policy. Admiral Zhou raised questions regarding the defense capability enhancement near the Nansei Archipelago (Nánxī Qúndǎo/南西群岛).⁵² He also pointed out an increased possibility of Sino-Japanese collaboration within the schemes of the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF) that started in 1994 and that ASEAN Defense Ministers’ Meeting - Plus (ADMM-Plus) that started in 2010.⁵³

Session I’s moderator was Colonel Yuan Yang/Yuán Yáng (袁杨), Director of Section II, Department of World Military Research, PLA Academy of Military Sciences (Jūnshì Kēxuéyuàn Shìjiē Jūnshì Yánjiūbù/军事科学院世界军事研究部). The both sides discussed the importance of SLOCs (sea lanes of communication/hǎishàng jiāotōngxiàn 海上交通线) and territorial disputes in the South China Sea (Nán Hǎi/南海). Admiral Yin Zhuo/Yīn Zhuó (尹卓), Navy Director of Information Technology Advisory Committee of Experts (Hǎijūn Xīnxihuà Zhuānjiā Zīxún Wēiyuánhui/海军信息化专家咨询委员会), explained China’s interpretations of the Sino-Vietnam territorial disputes in the South China Sea, and questioned the possibility of submitting the Sino-Vietnamese territorial disputes to the International Court of Justice.⁵⁴ Senior Colonel Ouyang Wei/Ōuyáng Wéi (欧阳维), Director of the Centre for Defense Mobilization Studies, National Defense University (NDU) (Guófáng Dàxué Guófáng Dòngyuán Jiàoyánsī/国防大学国防动员教研室) shared his impressions with the other participants at the Shangri-La Dialogue held in Singapore between June 3 and 5, just prior to the *Chu-sei-kon* CBMs, especially regarding the remarks of General Liang Guanglie/Liáng Guāngliè (梁光烈), Minister of National Defense, and those of Japan’s Defense Minister Toshimi Kitazawa (北澤俊美).⁵⁵

Session II’s moderator was General Yoshinari Hori (堀好成), former Commander of the JASDF’s Western Air Defense Force. They discussed the territorial disputes between the two countries. Senior Colonel Ouyang pointed out the importance of the establishment of crisis management.⁵⁶ He also suggested that negotiations on the Chinese side be

⁵¹ As for “dynamic defense capability,” see, for example, the Japanese Government, Ministry of Defense (MOD), “Structural Reform of Defense Capability,” August 2011, www.mod.go.jp/e/d_act/d_policy/pdf/structural_reform.pdf.

⁵² The Nansei Archipelago (南西諸島) comprises the Satsunan Archipelago (薩南諸島) close to Kyushu Island (九州) and the Ryukyu Islands (琉球諸島) with the largest island of Okinawa (沖縄).

⁵³ Chugoku Seiji Keizai Kondankai, Dai-34-ji Hochu-dan, *op. cit.*, p. 9.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 15.

⁵⁵ As for their remarks, see the Second Plenary Session (Defense Minister Toshimi Kitazawa): <http://www.iiss.org/conferences/the-shangri-la-dialogue/shangri-la-dialogue-2011/speeches/second-plenary-session/toshimi-kitazawa/>, and the Fourth Plenary Session (General Liang Guanglie, Chinese only): <http://www.iiss.org/conferences/the-shangri-la-dialogue/shangri-la-dialogue-2011/speeches/fourth-plenary-session/fourth-plenary-session-general-liang-guanglie>.

⁵⁶ This issue is also being discussed at the bi-annual WPNS (Western Pacific Naval Symposium (Xītàipíngyáng Hǎijūn Lùntán/西太平洋海军论坛).

in the hands of the three government agencies—State Oceanic Administration (SOA) (Guójiā Hǎiyángjú/国家海洋局), Ministry of Agriculture’s Fishery Bureau (Nóngyèbù Yúyèjú/农业部渔业局), and the Ministry of Transport (Jiāotōng Yùnshūbù/交通运输部), and the PLA avoid intervention.⁵⁷ The Japanese side called the attention of the Chinese side to a recent increase in the number of Yun-8J Skymaster Maritime Surveillance Aircraft (Y-8ASA) (Y-8 Hǎishàng Zhēncháji/Y-8 海上侦察机) flights over the East China Sea (Dōng Hǎi/东海).⁵⁸

Session III’s moderator was Senior Colonel Ouyang and they discussed Japan-China collaborations in the field of non-traditional military operations, or in other words, military operations other than war (MOOTW).⁵⁹ Lieutenant Colonel Jiang Kefeng/Jiāng Kèfēng (姜克峰) was Leader of the Chinese International Search and Rescue Team (CISAR) (Zhōngguó Guóji Jiùyuánduì/中国国际救援队) at the time of the Great East Japan Earthquake. The Chinese team was operating in Iwate (岩手) Prefecture. The Chinese participants reported their bewilderment at the fact that Japan denied the Chinese offers regarding the dispatch of a hospital ship and the introduction of rescue robots. The Japanese participants were surprised to learn that the CISAR included the PLA’s soldiers because the JSDF had been informed that only American and Australian soldiers were accepted by the Japanese government.⁶⁰ As for other topics, the Chinese side addressed the PLA’s concerns with the JSDF’s preparedness against cyber warfare.

On Day 4, the Delegation paid a visit to General Liang, China’s Defense Minister. General Liang told the Delegation that it was the third time for him to receive the visit of the present and past Delegations. The Minister continued to say that (1) the *Chu-sei-kon* CBMs have a long history—the Delegations visited China 34 times in the past 35 years, (2) all members of the Delegations are retired but experienced high-ranking officers, (3) the *Chu-sei-kon*, as a private entity, has consistently kept its friendly attitude toward China, and made a great contribution to in many fields, and (4) although China and Japan have sometimes experienced a strained relationship in the past, the *Chu-sei-kon* CBMs have not been disrupted for the past 35 years. Finally the General asked the Delegation about impressions on the Japanese side. In response, General Inoue, Head of the Delegation, told General Liang that they sometimes felt like turning our faces away from the exhibits at the Chinese People’s Anti-Japanese War Museum (Zhōngguó Rénmín KàngRì Zhànzhēng Jìniànguǎn/中国人民抗日战争纪念馆), and that all of the Delegation members came to learn the vital importance of dialogues after realizing the differences in opinion between Japan and China.⁶¹

Although the limited space of this paper forces the authors avoid detail descriptions of events between Day 5 through Day 10, the Delegation members were deeply impressed by the hospitalities they received from the Chinese side. Several members reported that they enjoyed the opportunity to have a direct look at the factory of Xī’ān Aircraft

⁵⁷ Chugoku Seiji Keizai Kondankai, Dai-34-ji Hochu-dan, *op. cit.*, p. 19.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 21.

⁵⁹ The Chinese government touched upon MOOTW in its *Defense White Papers* (“Zhōngguó de Guófáng” *Báipíshū*/«中国的国防»白皮书) in 2006 and 2008. Several American analysts have already pointed out China’s MOOTW. See, for example, Barnard D. Coke, *The Great Wall at Sea: China’s Navy in the Twenty-First Century*, 2nd ed., Annapolis, MD: Naval Institute Press, 2010, p. 158.

⁶⁰ Chugoku Seiji Keizai Kondankai, Dai-34-ji Hochu-dan, *op. cit.*, pp. 27-28.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 33-34.

International Corp. (Xi'an Fēijī Guójì Hángkōng Zhizào/西安飞机国际航空制造).⁶²

Generally speaking, the PLA has been collaborative and flexible to respond to the requests from the Japanese side, and provided a wise and judicious choice of the participants every year. For example, during the 2010 visit of the 33rd Delegation that was organized and led by General Tsutomu Mori (森勉), former Chief of Staff of JGSDF, and one of the authors, General Toshimichi Nagaiwa/永岩俊道), former Commander of the JASDF Air Support Command, the Japanese members were extremely satisfied with the calm, candid and sincere attitude on the Chinese side at the “Sino-Japan Security Forum for Northeast Asia 2010.” In particular, it should be noted that the Japanese side enjoyed listening to energetic and informative arguments made by prominent Chinese strategies spearheaded by General Zhu Chenghu/Zhū Chénghǔ (朱成虎) and Admiral Yang Yi/Yáng Yi (杨毅) (as for the participants, see Table 4).⁶³

Table 4. List of PLA Participants in the 2010 *Chu-sei-kon* Confidence Building Measures

Zhū Chénghǔ (朱成虎)	Director-General, Academic Department of Strategic Studies, National Defense University, Major General
Yáng Yi (杨毅)	Former Director, Institute for Strategic Studies, National Defense University, Rear Admiral
Ōuyáng Wéi (欧阳维)	Director, Centre for Defense Mobilization Studies, National Defense University, Senior Colonel
Mǎ Gāng (马刚)	Deputy Director, Institute for Strategic Studies, National Defense University, Senior Colonel
Chén Zhōu (陈舟)	Research Fellow, PLA Academy of Military Sciences, Senior Colonel
Jiāng Xīnfēng (江新风)	Research Fellow, Department of World Military Research, PLA Academy of Military Sciences, Senior Colonel
Wēn Bīng (温冰)	Research Fellow, PLA Academy of Military Sciences, Senior Colonel
Liú Fèngjiàn (刘凤健)	Professor at the National University of Defense Technology, Senior Colonel
Liú Shìgāng (刘世刚)	Research Fellow, PLA Academy of Military Science, Lieutenant Colonel
Wēi Bǎozhǎng (威保长)	Division Chief, Division for Korean Peninsula Studies, China Institutes Of Contemporary International Relations

Source: Chugoku Seiji Keizai Kondankai, Dai-33-ji Hochu-dan [The 33th Delegation, Council on Political and Economic Affairs of China/中国政治經濟懇談会], “Hochu Hokokusho [Delegation Report/「訪中報告書」],” Tokyo: Chugoku Seiji Keizai Kondankai (*Chu-sei-kon*), August 2010, p. 4.

Last year, the Japanese side requested the Chinese side’s explanations regarding very sensitive issues including (1) the Sino-North Korean relationship at the time of the sinking of the ROKS *Cheonan* («천안» (in Chinese, *Tian’an/Tiān’ān*«天安»)) on March 26, 2010, (2) the close encounter by a PLA Navy (PLAN) helicopter to the JS *Suzunami* (「すずなみ/(Liángbō Hào/凉波号)」) on April 8, 2010, (3) the passage of a PLAN *Han*-class submarine (‘Hàn-jí’ 091-xíng Héqióntǐng/‘汉级’091 型核潜艇) through the Ishigaki Strait (石垣海峡) on November 10, 2004,⁶⁴ and (4) the travelling of the 10-vessel Chinese flotilla from the East China Sea through the Okinawa Islands and Miyako Strait (宮古海峡) to waters off the Okinotori Islands (沖ノ鳥諸島) (Chōng zhī Niǎodǎo/冲之鸟岛)⁶⁵ on April 10, 2010 to name a few. Discussions at the Sino-Japan Security Forum are noticeably active, informative, and mutually respective. In Asian societies, discussions prone to remain forbiddingly formal in an extremely stifling atmosphere,

⁶² *Ibid.*, p. 41.

⁶³ General Zhu Chenghu is well known among Western experts because he referred in 2005 to the possibility of the use of nuclear weapons. See, for example, Alexandra Harney, “China ‘Ready to use N-weapons against US,’” *Financial Times*, July 14, 2005 (Accessed via Factiva on September 29, 2011). Admiral Yang recently expressed his views along with a Japanese officer (Katsuya Yamamoto (山本勝也), naval attaché of the Embassy of Japan in China and a captain in the Japan Maritime Self-Defense Force). See *Global Times*, “Quake Offers Fresh Chance for Naval Relations,” March 25, 2011, <http://www.globaltimes.cn/opinion/commentary/2011-03/637843.html>.

⁶⁴ The Japanese side took this passage seriously as a deliberate violation of Japanese territorial waters. See, for example, Richard C. Bush, *The Perils of Proximity: China-Japan Security Relations*, Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution, 2010, p. 421.

⁶⁵ The Okinotori Islands, referred sometimes to as “the southernmost islands of Japan,” is located middle between the “First Islands Chain (Diyī Dǎoliàn/第一岛链, in Japanese, 第一列島線)” and the “Second Island Chain (Dìèr Dǎoliàn/第二岛链, 第二列島線)” from the viewpoint of Chinese strategists. See, for example, Toshi Yoshihara and James R. Homes, *op. cit.*, p. 292.

without inspiring any novel ideas or maturing mutual trust. However, discussions at the Japan-China CBMs are transcendently Asiatic, though they remain calm and amicable in an Asian fashion. The majority of participants ascribe such transcendence to mutual trust that the uninterrupted history of the CBMs has generated.

2-3. A Tentative Evaluation of the Japan-China CBMs based on International Comparison

Section 2's final part tries to argue a tentative evaluation of the *Chu-sei-kon* Japan-China CBMs. After World War II, Japan had long been cautious about military CBMs. But in the post-Cold era, the demise of the Soviet Union and the spectacular rise of China have dramatically changed the security landscape in the Asia-Pacific region, leading to a sea change in Japan's foreign policy. Under these circumstances, in 1995, one year after the establishment of the ARF, Japan co-hosted with Indonesia the first Inter-Sessional Support Group on Confidence Building Measures (ISG on CBM).⁶⁶ At first, China circumvented participation in the ISG on CBM. However, in order to mitigate a "China Threat (Zhōngguó Wēixié/中国威胁)" pervasive in the Asia-Pacific region, China became interested in an ARF-led CBM and then decided to co-chair with the Philippines the 1996-1997 ISG on CBM. As for Japan's bilateral CBMs, Japanese-Russian CBMs have been "most conspicuous," according to a study of Reinhard Drifte, Emeritus Professor of Japanese Politics, University of Newcastle.⁶⁷

The Sino-U.S. CBMs have been disrupted by a series of tensions mounting between the two countries including the difficult periods of (a) the 1989-1993 Tiananmen Incident and its aftermath, (b) the 1995-1996 Taiwan Strait Crisis, (c) the 1999 mistaken NATO bombing a People's Republic of China (PRC) embassy in Belgrade, (d) the 2001 EP-3 Collision Incident near Hainan Island, and (e) the 2009 USNS *Impeccable* Incident to name a few.⁶⁸ Recently, the Sino-U.S. CBMs have been disturbed by other reasons. In November 2007, Washington and Beijing agreed to set up a hot line, but immediately after the agreement the PLA denied port calls at Hong Kong for U.S. minesweepers in distress and for the aircraft carrier USS *Kitty Hawk* and accompanying vessels for the Thanksgiving holiday and family reunions. In January 2010 when President Obama reported to Congress about the 2008 U.S. arms sales to Taiwan, the PLA suddenly denied then scheduled Sino-U.S. CBMs. Having observed the intermittently disrupted Sino-U.S. CBMs, the majority of experts lamentably remember Kurt Campbell's cogent arguments—Just prior to taking office as Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs, Campbell wrote a paper with Richard Weitz titled "The Limit of U.S.-China Military Cooperation: Lessons from 1995-1999." They concluded that "progress in military confidence building and related security ties will *follow, not lead*, improvements in the other facets of this very complex bilateral relationship (emphasis added)."⁶⁹ Thus, the overall Sino-U.S. relationship plays the vital role in promoting the Sino-U.S. CBMs. As for the Japan-China CBMs, the overall bilateral relationship does not necessarily plague the

⁶⁶ The ASEAN Secretariat, "ASEAN Regional Forum Document Series 1994-2006," Jakarta, March 2007, p. 9.

⁶⁷ Reinhard Drifte, *Japan's Security Relations with China since 1989: From Balancing to Bandwagoning?* London: RoutledgeCurzon, 2003, p. 108.

⁶⁸ See, for example, Shirley A. Kan, "U.S.-China Military Contacts: Issues for Congress," RL32496, Washington, D.C.: Congressional Research Service (CRS), December 2010 and July 2011. See also the U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission (USCC), "The Chinese People's Liberation Army Delegation Visit to the United States, May 11: A Summary of Key Actors and Issues," Staff Research Background, Washington, D.C.: USCC, June 2011.

⁶⁹ Kurt Campbell and Richard Weitz, "The Limits of U.S.-China Military Cooperation: Lessons from 1995-1999," *Washington Quarterly*, Vol. 29, No. 1 (Winter 2005), p. 180.

CBMs. In other words, as far as the *Chu-sei-kon* is concerned, the Japan-China CBMs do not follow the vagaries of the bilateral relationship, even if they cannot lead.

This astonishing difference in stability regarding the CBMs can be understood in various ways. First, China's archrival is the United States, not Japan.⁷⁰ Accordingly, China is preoccupied with comparing and competing with the United States while its concern with Japan is a secondary business. Second, China wants to drive a wedge between the Japan-U.S. alliance. Therefore, China tries to solicit Japan for a closer relationship as its binding strategy. Third, as part of periphery diplomacy (*Zhōubiān Wàijiāo*/周边外交), it would not be of wise for China to display ostensible saber-rattling in front of smaller Asian nations. The PLA understand that it should behave cautiously to prevent the prying eyes of smaller Asian nations some of which are claimants of the Spratly Islands. The 2010 Senkaku/Diaoyudai Incident warned all policymakers and academics that the East China Sea territorial issue is inseparably connected with the South China Sea issues that are now increasing their complexity.⁷¹ Fourth, China has recognized the importance of the soft power. The principal proponent of soft power, Joseph S. Nye, Jr. suggests that "A well-run military can be a source of attraction" and that "misuse of military resources can undercut soft power."⁷² As a matter of fact, China has a long history to cherish the value of soft power. China's ancient strategist Sunzi teaches: "Those skilled in warfare seek victory by cultivating the Way (of the Man of High Caliber) and strengthening the Rules and Regulations, and in so doing, gains the initiative over their enemy."⁷³ Fifth, the geographical vicinity of the technologically superior JSDF and the formidableness of the imperial Japanese Army and Navy require prudence and judicious attitudes on the PLA side.

Recently, the PLA has realized the importance of the CBM and developed CRM efforts on a global basis (see Table 5).⁷⁴ However, China's military CBMs are at a nascent stage and therefore involve failures as well as successes.

⁷⁰ Other Japan-China CBMs, however, have been severely affected by the vagaries of the difficult politico-economic bilateral relationship. For example, the top-level CBMs were suspended just after the Tiananmen Massacre in 1989. The Japan Foundation-organized CBMs were also disrupted in 2010 at the request of the Chinese side just after the Senkaku/Diaoyutai Incident. At the same time, it should be noted that during the 1990s when the Japan-China CBMs have not become matured, Yang Bojiang/Yáng Bójiāng (杨伯江) of the China Institute of Contemporary International Relations (CICIR) stated: "Sino-Japanese military relations cannot exceed their political and/or economic relations." See Bojiang Yang, "Sino-Japanese Relations and Measures to Enhance Mutual Trust," in "Chinese Perspectives on Confidence-Building Measures," edited by Michael Krepon, Washington, D.C.: Henry I. Stimson Center, Report No. 23, May 1997, p. 73. See also Drifte, *op. cit.* p. 116.

⁷¹ See, for example, Marvin C. Ott, "Deep Danger: Competing Claims in the South China Sea," *Current History*, Vol. 110, No. 737 (September 2011), pp. 236-241.

⁷² Joseph S. Nye, Jr., *The Future of Power*, New York: PublicAffairs, 2011, p. 86.

⁷³ Sunzi/Sūnzǐ (孙子), *Art of War*, "Shèngshànyòngbīngzhě, xiūdào ér bǎofǎ, gù néng wéi shèng zhī zhèng./胜善用兵者、修道而保法、故能为胜之政。" As for recent studies on China's "soft power," see, for example, Sheng DING/Shèng Dīng (丁胜), *The Dragon's Hidden Wings: How China Rises with Its Soft Power*, Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2008. However, there are many studies that cast doubt on China's "soft power." See, for example, Bates Gill and Yanzhong HUANG/Yánzhōng Huáng (黄严忠), "Sources and Limits of Chinese Soft Power," *Survival*, No. 48, No. 2 (Summer, 2006), pp. 17-36. Ingrid d'Hooghe, "The Limits of China's Soft Power in Europe: Beijing's Public Diplomacy Puzzle," *Diplomacy Papers* No. 25, The Hague: Netherlands Institute of International Relations Clingendael, 2010, and Martin Jacques, "How China Will Change the Way We Think: The Case of the State," Washington, D.C.: Transatlantic Academy, February 2011.

⁷⁴ As for China's CBMs with India, currently, the New Delhi-based think tank, Institute for Peace and Conflict Studies (IPCS) is working on a research project on how to strengthen military CBMs on land and maritime issues between India and China. Based on the study, the IPCS plans to publish a book next year. As for the recent problems surrounding the two countries, see, for example, Namrata Goswami, 2011, "China's 'Aggressive' Territorial Claim on India's Arunachal Pradesh: A Response to Changing Power Dynamics in Asia," *Strategic Analysis*, Vol. 35, No. 5 (August 2011), pp. 781-792.

As for CBMs in the entire Asian context, it should be noted that the Malaysian Defense Minister, Ahmad Zahid Hamidi, referred to the importance of CBMs in the region. See "Fifth Plenary Session: Responding to New Maritime Security Threats," The 10th IISS (International Institute for Strategic Studies) Asia Security Summit, the Shangri-La Dialogue, Singapore, 5 June 2011, <http://www.iiss.org/conferences/the-shangri-la-dialogue/shangri-la-dialogue-2011/speeches/fifth-plenary-session/dato-seri-dr-ahmad-zahid-hamidi/>. At the same time, it should be noted that a negative views regarding the role played by ASEAN, see, for example, Evelyn Goh, "Institutions and the Great Power Bargain in East Asia: ASEAN's Limited 'Brokerage' Role," *International Relations of the Asia-Pacific*, Vol. 11, No. 3 (September), pp. 373-401. As for Russia, a rapidly rising China is raising Russia's fear against China despite its

Therefore, Japan, along with the more experienced United States military forces, can play a substantial role in providing China with informative guidelines for more effective CBM.

Table 5. China's CBMs Efforts (Confined Strictly in the Form of the PLA Leaders' Visits^(*))

Countries	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Japan			Japan	Japan	Japan	
United States		United States	United States		United States	
Korea		North and South Korea	South Korea	South Korea	North and South Korea	North Korea
SCO ^(**) + Other Central Asia	Russia, Kazakhstan, Tajikistan	Russia, Tajikistan	Russia, Kyrgyzstan, Uzbekistan, Mongolia	Tajikistan	Russia	Kazakhstan, Mongolia, Russia, Turkmenistan
India, Pakistan, Bangladesh	India, Bangladesh	India, Pakistan		India	Pakistan	Pakistan
ASEAN	Philippines	Cambodia, Laos, Malaysia, Myanmar, Singapore, Thailand, Vietnam	Philippines, Thailand, Vietnam	Brunei, Indonesia, Singapore, Thailand	Myanmar, Singapore, Thailand, Vietnam	Indonesia, Singapore, Vietnam
Other Asia-Pacific		Australia, New Zealand		Nepal	Australia, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea	Australia, New Zealand
Middle East	Egypt, Turkey		Kuwait	Bahrain, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, UAE	Turkey	Egypt
Africa	Sudan, Tanzania					Angola, Congo, Kenya, Namibia, Tanzania
Latin America	Argentina, Cuba, Uruguay		Argentina, Chile, Cuba	Brazil, Chile, Venezuela		Brazil, Colombia, Mexico
Europe	Denmark, Germany, Netherlands	Denmark, France, Norway	Greece	Germany, Italy, Norway	Finland, Germany	Germany, United Kingdom
Former Communist Europe		Belarus, Hungary, Romania		Belarus, Hungary, Serbia-Montenegro	Bulgaria, Serbia-Montenegro, Slovakia	Macedonia, Romania, Serbia

Note (*): Here, the PLA leaders indicate that Vice Chairman of Central Military Commission, the Minister of National Defense, the Chief and/or Deputy Chief of the General Staff, and the Commanders of the PLA AF and PLAN.

Note (**): SCO: Shanghai Cooperation Organisation; Shànghǎi Hézuò Zǔzhī/上海合作组织; in Japanese 上海協力機構.

Source: Authors' rearrangement based on the table in the "Annual Report to Congress: Military and Security Developments Involving the People's Republic of China 2011," Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Defense (DoD), August 2011, p. 82.

At the same time, the PLA is expected to develop its own approaches along with China's foreign policy that attaches importance to the above discussed soft power.⁷⁵ Such expectations are high because China's soft power has much room to be improved especially in the Asian region.⁷⁶ Interestingly enough, irrespective of nationality, soft power is a common headache in the military community.⁷⁷ Therefore, through CBM activities among peers, the PLA can draw precious lessons from both of sweet and bitter experiences from its Japanese and U.S. counterparts. In this connection, Nye echoes this argument by stating that "military-to-military cooperation and training programs can

tie through the SCO (Shanghai Cooperation Organization; Shànghǎi Hézuò Zǔzhī/上海合作组织). See, for example, Stephen J. Blank, ed., "Russia's Prospects in Asia," Carlisle, PA: Strategic Studies Institute (SSI), U.S. Army War College (USAWC), December, 2010, Michael Auslin, "Russia Fears China, Not Japan: The Decades-long Dispute over the Kuril Islands May Well be Russia's Way of Focusing on its Real Long-term Adversary: China," *Wall Street Journal* (Online), March 4, 2011, <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703559604576175660916870214.html>, and Oxford Analytica Daily Brief Service, "Russia: Navy shifts strategic focus with China in Mind," February 07, 2011.

⁷⁵ See, for example, Joseph S. Nye, Jr. and Wang Jisi/Wáng Jīsī (王緝思), "The Rise of China's Soft Power and Its Implications for the United States," in *Power and Restraint: A Shared Vision for the U.S.-China Relationship*, 2009, and Shaum Breslin, "The Soft Notion of China's 'Soft Power,'" Asia Programme Paper ASP PP2011/03, London: Chatham House, February 2011.

⁷⁶ See, for example, Gregory G. Holyk, "Paper Tiger? Chinese Soft Power in East Asia," *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol. 126, No. 2 (Summer 2011), pp. 223-254.

⁷⁷ See, for example, Naoyuki Agawa (阿川直之), "Japan Does Soft Power," in *Soft Power Superpowers: Cultural and National Assets of Japan and the United States*, edited by Yasushi Watanabe (渡辺靖) and David L. McConnell, Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharp, 2008, p. 236, and Lieutenant Commander (LCDR) Pat Paterson, USN, "SOUTHCOM turns to Soft Power," *U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings* (July 2008), p. 57. (SOUTHCOM is a joint command comprising Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine elements and responsible for all U.S. military activities on the landmasses of Central and South America, the island nations of the Caribbean, and the surrounding waters south of Mexico.)

establish transnational networks that enhance a country's soft power.”⁷⁸

The JSDF's special role, compared with that of the U.S. forces, is an intermediary one, in particular, between China and the United States. As discussed above, the PLA's secretive nature and hostile feelings deepen its suspicion against the United States, leading to a poor performance history of their bilateral CBMs.⁷⁹ At the same time, the JSDF and the PLA, possessing a vague sense of shared identity with the centuries-old Asian community, have the same characteristics in *modus operandi* regarding the exchange of views—a taciturn attitude or a circumlocutory rather than forthright manner as described above (see 2.2).⁸⁰ Accordingly, the JSDF can play a substantial role not only in the realm of hard power but also in the field of soft power in the context of the Japan-U.S. alliance, as it demonstrated along with its U.S. counterpart within Japan at the time of the Great East Japan Earthquake.

3. Conclusion

This short essay has provided a brief account of the Japan-China CBMs and the evaluation of the CBMs from the perspectives of the Japan-U.S. alliance and Asia-Pacific regional security. In 2009 Yukio Okamoto (岡本行夫), Japan's prominent foreign policy analyst, states: “As China grows in affluence and its relations with other countries mature, tripartite cooperation among Beijing, Washington and Tokyo offers the best way to secure the future stability and prosperity of the Asia-Pacific region.”⁸¹

However, the future of the three countries, if they imprudently mishandled their relationship, will be catastrophic because diverging economic conditions between a rising China and economically ailing Japan and the United States might evoke mutual suspicions among them. In this sense, no one doubts the importance of the future tasks the Japan-China CBMs take on as well as their past achievements. Although divided by history, language, and national interests, Tokyo, Beijing, and Washington should devise *modus operandi* to “tolerate toward the presence of each other.” Therefore, political ideology aside, everybody on the earth should remember the words of Immanuel Kant:

A special beneficent agreement would be needed in order to give an outsider a right to become a fellow inhabitant for a certain length of time. It is only a right of temporary sojourn, a right to associate, which all men have. They have it by virtue of their common possession of the surface of the earth, where, as a globe, they cannot infinitely disperse and hence must finally tolerate the presence of each other. Originally, no one had more right than another to a particular part of the earth.⁸²

⁷⁸ Nye, *The Future of Power*, p. 86.

⁷⁹ As for the PLA's deep-rooted suspicion about the United States, see, for example, Wang Shuning/Wáng Shǔníng (王蜀宁), “‘Kōnghǎi Yitǐzhàn’—Měiguó Chónghǎn Yǎzhōude Yìjī Měngyào [‘Air-Sea Battle’—the United States Returns to Asia with an Extremely Strong Medicine/‘空海一体战’—美国重返亚洲的一剂猛药],” *Dāngdài Hǎijūn/Dāngdài Hǎijūn* [Modern Navy/《当代海军》], 2011, No. 5, pp. 36-39.

⁸⁰ Kissinger, in his recent book, refers to this difference in communication by stating that “Many cultures, and surely all Western ones, buttress the authority of the ruler by demonstrative contact of some kind with the ruled. This is why in Athens, Rome, and most Western pluralistic states, oratory was considered an asset in government. There is no general tradition of oratory in China (Mao was somewhat of an exception). Chinese leaders traditionally have not based their authority on rhetorical skills or physical contact with the masses. In the mandarin tradition, they operate essentially out of sight, legitimized by performance,” *On China*, p. 334.

⁸¹ Yukio Okamoto (岡本行夫), “Great-Power Relations in Asia: A Japanese Perspective,” *Survival*, Vol. No. 6 (December 2009/January 2010), p. 34.

⁸² Immanuel Kant, *Perpetual Peace*, 1795, see, for example, <http://www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/intrel/kant/kant1.htm>.

In the age of globalization and the Internet, the earth has dramatically shrunk; like it or not, and, for better or worse, not a single day can pass without thinking about other countries' behavior (e.g., the U.S. financial regulations and its public debt management) and events (e.g., Japan's earthquake and its nuclear accident). Japan has to widen its security concerns especially in the Asia-Pacific region while keeping the time-honored Japan-U.S. alliance as its cornerstone of Japan's foreign policy.⁸³ In this sense, the future Japan-China CBMs are expected to evolve in the multilateral context to keep the international environment serene.

However, the role of CBMs should not be exaggerated. The authors understand that the role of CBMs can be justifiably evaluated from a broader perspective of international security by putting them along with other politico-economic activities. Accordingly, the future of the *Chu-sei-kon* Japan-China CBMs will have a trial-and-error process in a protean world. In this connection, every student of China's modern history remembers that Deng Xiaoping stressed the importance of gradualism by referring to the oft-quoted idiom—"Mōzhe shítou guòhé (crossing the river by groping for the stones under the water/摸着石头过河)." Now, the authors echo the wisdom of Deng Xiaoping in order to further the sophistication of CBMs and to develop mutually beneficial schemes in the Asia-Pacific region with cool-headed people on the globe. Finally, the authors plan to write a series of short essays on the Japan-U.S. CBMs in coming months regarding (1) a detailed description of the past *Chu-sei-kon* Japan-China CBMs and (2) an international comparison and the evaluation of the *Chu-sei-kon* Japan-China CBMs.

Yosuke Matsuoka (松岡洋右), Japan's Minister for Foreign Affairs just prior to the Pearl Harbor attack, made a speech at a 1934 meeting and remarked:

If Japan and the United States were to resort to war, both would be imbeciles. However, men often become idiotic and there is no guarantee to prevent a man from becoming a fool. Under miserable circumstances, a nation becomes emotional and enraged, and in the end, it might lose a sense of proportion. Accordingly, the most important thing in international relations is to keep the international environment and the domestic mood serene."⁸⁴

Contrary to his 1934 remarks, in 1941, the self-appointed Japan's savior Matsuoka, as Foreign Minister, became one of the most influential rabble-rousers and plunged an emotionally wobbling Japan into the abyss of endless war. We should take to heart Matsuoka's unforgivable fiasco, because there will emerge a person possessing Matsuoka-like brash braggadocios in any country at any moment. For this very reason, the Japan-China CBMs can play an undeniably indispensable role in securing global peace.

⁸³ As for an Asia-Pacific regional institutional arrangement, see, for example, Amitav Acharya, "Asian Regional Institutions and the Possibilities for Socializing the Behavior of States," Regional Economic Integration Working Paper No. 82, Manila: Asian Development Bank (ADB), June 2011, Michael J. Green and Bates Gill, eds., *Asia's New Multilateralism: Cooperation, Competition, and the Search for Community*, New York, Columbia University Press, 2009, and Amitav Acharya and Alastair Iain Johnston, eds., *Crafting Cooperation: Regional International Institutions in Comparative Perspective*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007. See also Chien-Peng Chung (鍾健平), "Japan's Involvement in Asia-Centered Regional Forums in the Context of Relations with China and the United States," *Asian Survey*, No. 51, No. 3 (May/June 2011), pp. 407-428.

⁸⁴ Yosuke Matsuoka (松岡洋右), *Showa Ishin* [Showa Restoration/『昭和維新』], Tokyo: Daiichi Shuppansha [第一出版社], 1938, p. 61