Robert Schuman

European Security Integration:
Lessons for East Asia?

Katja Weber

The Jean Monnet/Robert Schuman Paper Series

The Jean Monnet/Robert Schuman Paper Series is produced by the Jean Monnet Chair of the University of Miami, in cooperation with the Miami-Florida European Union Center of Excellence, a partnership with Florida International University (FIU).

These monographic papers analyze ongoing developments within the European Union as well as recent trends which influence the EU's relationship with the rest of the world. Broad themes include, but are not limited to:

♦ EU Enlargement

♦ The Evolution of the Constitutional Process

♦ The EU as a Global Player

♦ Comparative Regionalisms

♦ The Trans-Atlantic Agenda

♦ EU-Latin American Relations

♦ Economic issues

♦ Governance

♦ The EU and its Citizens

♦ EU Law

As the process of European integration evolves further, the Jean Monnet/Robert Schuman Papers is intended to provide current analyses on a wide range of issues relevant to the EU. The overall purpose of the monographic papers is to contribute to a better understanding of the unique nature of the EU and the significance of its role in the world.

EUROPEAN SECURITY INTEGRATION:
LESSONS FOR EAST ASIA?♣

Katja Weber ♦

Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to analyze the relevance of the European integration experience for East Asia's future security architecture. Or, put differently, the study asks what the European experience can tell us about future East Asian security institutions. Tracing European cooperative efforts from the early post-World War II days to recent attempts of stabilizing the neighborhood via a European Neighborhood Policy, the paper argues that the process of European security integration provides useful lessons that can inform a similar process in East Asia.

Given that there are significant differences between post-1945 Europe and 21st century East Asia--including the U.S.'s promotion of regional institutions in Europe versus bilateral alliances in East Asia (Hemmer and Katzenstein 2002); more or less equal power capabilities in Europe versus the huge power asymmetry with respect to China in Asia; a fairly homogeneous European culture versus a heterogeneous Asian culture; largely traditional security threats in Cold War Europe versus a whole range of non-traditional security threats in East Asia, etc.--the East Asians are unlikely to copy the exact same steps taken by the Europeans to improve their security, i.e., one model does not fit all. Nor does the promotion of stability/peace-building have to be unidirectional--economic cooperation, for instance, does not necessarily have to precede security cooperation.

Since history--due to Japan's troubled past with its neighbors, and the creation of two Koreas and two Chinas--is still a "neuralgic point in East Asia" (Berger, 2006: 3), it is argued that Japanese, Koreans and Chinese can be expected to develop a distinct path to stabilize the region. And yet, considering the multi-faceted nature of security threats, the main ingredient of the European success strategy, namely the institutionalization of trust on multiple levels, and hence the creation of a complex web of governance (Hooghe and Marks 2003), is likely to be emulated in the long run.

Although many Taiwanese, as well as some Japanese and Koreans, would disagree, the paper assumes that the main enemy is strategic instability, and that institutional structures therefore are not created against anyone, but to reduce the high uncertainty East Asians confront regarding each others' actions and intensions.   Institutions are to provide fora to air opinions, establish rules (non-intervention in others' domestic affairs), access information, and reduce transaction costs. Moreover, it is understood that institution-building on multiple levels (local, national, sub-regional, regional) and across issue areas (economy, environment, security, energy, etc.) takes time and various forms (bottom-up versus top-down).

♣ Prepared for a presentation at "The European Union, Fifty Years After the Treaty of Rome (March 25, 1957): The EU Model in the Americas, Asia and Africa" workshop, University of Miami, Miami, FL, March 26, 2007.

♦ Katja Weber (PhD, University of California, Los Angeles) is Associate Professor in the Sam Nunn School of International Affairs at Georgia Tech and Co-Director of the European Union Center of the University System of Georgia. Her research interests center around theories of integration, prospects for international cooperation in the post-Cold War environment, as well as ideational approaches to shifts in foreign policy. She is the author *of Hierarchy Amidst Anarchy: Transaction Costs and Institutional Choice* (SUNY Press, 2000), co-author (with Paul Kowert) of *Cultures of Order: Leadership. Language, and Social Reconstruction in Germany and Japan*, (SUNY Press), forthcoming summer 2007, and co-editor (with Michael Baun and Michael Smith) of *Governing Europe's Neighborhood: Partners or Periphery?* (Manchester University Press), forthcoming summer 2007. She has also published a number of articles in the *Journal of European Integration, Journal of European Public Policy, International Studies Quarterly*, *Journal of Politics* and *Southeastern Political Review*.

While institutions are being created to enhance transparency, efficiency and trust, the paper argues, the East Asians need to address their historical legacies to promote security. Japan, in particular, more effectively and credibly needs to deal with its war guilt, while Chinese and Koreans are receptive to apologies from Japan. As Berger (2006) and Kaiser (2006) convincingly demonstrate in the German case, the dynamics of historical memory are quite complex. Germany has spent decades trying to come to terms with its war guilt by engaging in reeducation efforts, begging forgiveness, providing monetary compensation, building museums, etc. It is conceivable that this European experience may inform East Asia, i.e., that Japan may emulate the German model--rewrite its text books, extend heartfelt apologies to its neighbors (which some argue it has already done), stop its visits to the Yasukuni shrine, etc. However, it is also plausible that Japan may prefer to take a different path and rely on different types of restitution. In any event, it is hypothesized that, addressing this divisive issue, at a minimum, will help bring about greater cooperation, but may in fact be a necessary condition for the creation of a structurally sophisticated security arrangement.

Here the literature on reconciliation is pertinent. As Long and Brecke (2003: 124), for instance, make clear, "[e]motions and reason are not generally antagonistic; they are complementary. … Emotions recognize challenges and opportunities in our environment, and they identify our preferences." This then suggests that governance structures may be determined by much more than cost/benefit analyses of rational actors, namely also actors' emotions. Since Japan's apologies thus far have appeared "ad hoc and made grudgingly under international/regional pressure" (Suzuki 2007: 9), it can be hypothesized that resurfacing history problems, and emotional needs stemming from them, may have to be taken care of before institutional structures requiring a significant degree of commitment can be built. Or, put differently, the settlement of historical disputes may be a necessary prerequisite before further security cooperation can be achieved, but is unlikely to be sufficient.

In sum, the paper argues for a two-pronged strategy to enhance East Asian security: (1) dealing with historical legacies and war guilt; and (2) building trust via institutions. Since confidence-building, as the European case makes abundantly clear, does not happen over night, the goal is to remove outstanding obstacles to cooperation and create institutional structures that promote mutual respect, trust and tolerance. Over time, and commensurate with their threat perception(s), East Asians may graduate to more sophisticated security arrangements to dilute, absorb and/or contain conflict and to reduce the likelihood of opportunistic behavior. Thus, in the long run, East Asia may also end up with a complex web of governance and "thick alphabet soup of international agencies" (Ullman 1991: 145) to promote peace, but, due to the differences between post-1945 Europe and 21st century East Asia mentioned above, unique indigenous developments, and significant changes in the international environment since the Europeans began their institution-building, this web/soup is unlikely to be a carbon copy of the European one.

Conceptual Frameworks on East Asian Security

Examining East Asian security provisions from the perspective of a Europeanist, one is struck by the fact that there are much fewer theoretical writings on the subject. What one mainly finds are assessments of the likelihood of stability in the region with prognoses ranging from severe pessimism to cautious optimism.

(Neo)realists, as expected, focus on the security dilemma, the zero-sum international environment, power politics, and relative capabilities and, consequently, are pessimistic about the prospects of peace. Due to the anarchic nature of international politics, a regional arms race (Glaser 1993: 6), great power conflict (Betts 1993/94: 9), strategic rivalries (Hwang 2006: 5), and nuclear proliferation (Friedberg 1993/94: 29) seem to be where China, Japan and the two Koreas are headed.

Hegemonic stability theorists, similarly, predict a bleak future for the region. A rising China, Roy (1994: 149-150) for instance argues, will be able to challenge Japan which in turn will feel threatened and remilitarize. Or, in other words, dissatisfied with the status quo, China will become increasingly assertive (Jansen 2002: 763) and plunge the region into a hegemonic war (Roy 1994: 165). Alternatively, Japan may revise its Peace Constitution, and once this "demarcation line is broken through," there will be concern about a rising, remilitarized Japan (Garrett and Glaser 1997: 391). In this scenario, China and, very likely, South Korea are expected to increase their capabilities to deal with this Japanese challenge.

Neoliberals/institutionalists are more upbeat about the prospects of cooperation in East Asia. Shambaugh (2004/05: 64), for example, points out that "most nations in the region now see China as a good neighbor," rather than a threatening regional power. Absent imminent threat, yet still concerned about "the lack of transparency in the intentions and strategic thinking of Beijing" (Lee 1997: 252), Funabashi (1993), McVadon (1999), Wu (2000), Acharya (2003), to name but a few scholars, suggest to engage China in a variety of institutions. Similarly, Vaeyrynen (2001), Cha (2003), Katzenstein (2004), and many others, advocate incorporating Japan in a host of institutional arrangements ranging from bi- to multilateral. Although not a "cure-all," cooperative security arrangements, these scholars argue, are a step in the right direction in that they reduce uncertainty, lower transaction costs, and promote trust.

In addition to regional stability assessments, with few exceptions (Acharya 2003; Buzan and Waever 2003; Suh et.al. 2004; Katzenstein 2005) one largely finds descriptive accounts of East Asian security arrangements where scholars compare countries' GDP, military hardware, military strategies, etc., to calculate who is likely to win a war in which scenarios.[1]

Conceptual Frameworks on European Security

Aside from studies investigating security threats and the prospects for peace both during and since the end of the Cold War (Deutsch and Singer 1969; Waltz 1979; Mearsheimer 1991; Grieco 1993; Kupchan 1994; Lebow and Risse-Kappen 1995; Van Evera 1996), there is a sizeable literature on alternative modes of organizing cooperation among states that ranges from public goods discussions, strategic interaction and quid pro quo bargaining (Axelrod 1984; Oye 1986; Stein 1990), to regime theory (Krasner, ed. 1983; Keohane 1984) and studies of global norm-creation, diffusion and internalization (Axelrod 1986; Kratochwil 1989; Nadelmann 1990; Klotz 1995; Katzenstein, ed. 1996; Cortell and Davis 1996).

Particularly useful in the context of European integration, however, has been the large literature on multi-level governance. Spanning several disciplines,[2] this literature identifies a host of factors that are important to understand why the Europeans chose the types of cooperative arrangements they did. Adopting a governance approach,[3] one, for instance, learns that governance does not always entail one-way control. Two-way or multi-dimensional designs are found frequently and there is a vast literature on increasingly complex types of organization. One common feature of these frameworks involves the relationship between vertical and horizontal loci of activity: "multilevels" and "networks." For example, according to Marks et al (1998: 273), "EU policy is produced by a complex web of interconnected institutions at the supranational, national, and subnational levels of government comprising a system of 'multi-level governance.'" Sweet and Sandholtz (1998) also differentiate levels of jurisdiction spanning from

---

[1] See Bracken (2001: 71) who refers to this type of scholarship as a "cottage industry."

[2] For a recent review of this literature see Hooghe and Marks 2003.

[3] For a recent example, see Katja Weber, Michael E. Smith, and Michael Baun, eds. *Governing Europe's Neighborhood: Partners or Periphery?* Manchester: Manchester University Press, forthcoming. The following section draws on chapter 1 of this edited volume co-authored by Michael E. Smith and Katja Weber, "Governance Theories, Regional Integration, and European Foreign Policy."

the local to the supranational level, while Scharpf (2001) distinguishes between intergovernmental, joint, and supranational decision-making. Similarly, Gstoehl (1995: 13) speaks of "variable geometry," Eising and Kohler-Koch (1999) of "overlapping policy networks," Johannson-Nogués (2003) of "network governance," Lavanex (2004) of "external governance," and Emerson (2003: 4) of "hub-and-spoke, cobweb, matrix and Rubik cube arrangements."

Other scholars highlight factors such as the formality of rules and the inclusiveness or exclusiveness of the governance arrangements. Abbott and Snidal (2000) conceptualize institutional arrangements in terms of degree of legalization, i.e., hard versus soft law, while Dunsire (1993) differentiates between regulation and self-regulation. And more recently, Hooghe and Marks (2003: 236) proposed to differentiate two types of multi-level governance design: "Type I," they explain, entails "general-purpose jurisdictions, non-intersecting memberships, jurisdictions at a limited number of levels, and a system-wide architecture." Type II is characterized by "task-specific jurisdictions, intersecting memberships, no limit to the number of jurisdictional levels, and flexible design" (ibid).

Clearly, a great variety of institutional structures can be found in the international environment and actors who have decided to cooperate to promote security - rather than to rely on self-help - have some degree of choice between different governance structures that entail varying degrees of institutionalization.[4] Assuming that actors pursue governance to solve collective action problems, one might propose a classification scheme ranging from hierarchical to non-hierarchical modes of governance. Elsewhere (Weber 1997; 2000; and Weber and Hallerberg 2001) a continuum of different institutional arrangements ranging from relationships characterized by high autonomy to more structured relationships with significantly restricted autonomy has been discussed in some detail.

In the security realm, it has been shown, an (external) threat is instrumental in determining the nature and degree of a state's initial commitment to an alliance (Walt 1988). A related security motivation is the fear of exclusion from a cooperative security arrangement, even where a state faces no specific security threat. In other words, there are both "push" and "pull" factors – fears of attacks and abandonment - that might encourage states to join cooperative security arrangements (Christensen and Snyder 1990). If the level of threat is low and the actors are viable with respect to the competition they face, there is no need for a strong commitment, and, if the actors choose to cooperate, an informal rather than a structurally sophisticated arrangement might be chosen. Such arrangements have low exit costs, usually do not require ratification by state actors, and can be easily modified or discarded (Lipson 1991). On the other hand, if the level of threat is high, actors are likely to prefer an arrangement that gives them greater assurance (i.e. one that is more binding, thereby reducing the risk of defection). These incentives for security cooperation might be measured in terms of relative military capability and geographic proximity. Other factors such as uncertainty, high asset specificity, and a need for regular transactions may increase the desire of actors to institutionalize their commitments (Williamson 1979, Williamson 1985, and Weber 1997).

In sum it has been argued that, both a high level of threat and high transaction costs are often *necessary* to bring about a structurally sophisticated institutional arrangement (they are separately necessary), but neither is *sufficient*. One therefore should be sensitive to governance arrangements that arise because of other factors in addition to (or even instead of) calculations about power or threats, such as normative concerns, collective identity, socialization processes, or even symbols, language, and rhetoric. This open-ended approach may allow one to shed light on cases where governance arrangements develop without a clear security threat or fail to emerge despite a clear threat.

---

[4] This focus on deliberate, conscious choice conforms to standard micro-foundational assumptions about individual rationality and as such provides a useful starting point. Other assumptions about rational motivations at the micro-level, of course, are also possible - rationales of hard power, social skill/inclusion, and appropriateness (see Smith 2003: Chapter 1).

In the following, this study reexamines the governance literature scholars draw on so heavily in the European context and evaluates its explanatory power in the Asian case. It, moreover, demonstrates that a better understanding of the complex security relations in East Asia is contingent on the "cross-fertilization" of multi-level governance approaches with ideational and psychological conceptual frameworks. In doing so, it affirms the need for "eclectic theorizing" (Katzenstein and Sil 2004) to make sense of East Asian security affairs or, as Buzan and Waever (2003: 14) put it, the need to "mix" materialist and constructivist approaches.

After addressing an important caveat, the paper investigates Europe's complex institutional history, where different cooperative arrangements with varying memberships coexist and work alongside each other. Next, a mini case study of Japan will be conducted. Specifically, the paper examines historical legacies that still stand in the way of closer cooperation and, comparing Japan's attempts at reconciliation with those of Germany, aims to make a number of policy recommendations. Then the paper scrutinizes presently existing security arrangements (bilateral relations between the US and Japan, US and China, US and South Korea, ASEAN Regional Forum, North-East Asia Cooperation Dialogue, etc.) and, assuming voluntary cooperation rather than coercion,[5] i.e., that the actors are free to choose the degree of institutionalization and commitment they desire, seeks to ascertain which European solutions to cooperation problems and which institutional structures, if any, may be copied or adapted. Based on previous research of European institutional developments (both by the author and others), the study postulates that there will be package deals on a case-by-case basis and that, in the long run, East Asians will "embed" existing institutions into regional, sub-regional, and maybe even trans-regional ones to avoid sole dependence on the "American hub and spokes network of bilateral alliances in Asia" (Cha 2003: 108). It is also conceivable that the U.S. might play the role of guarantor in a multilateral non-aggression structure, at least in the short to medium term.

Caveat: Asia is NOT Europe

As Friedberg (1993/94: 7) correctly emphasizes, "what is true of Europe may not be true for other parts of the world." In Europe, he insists, there are various factors (democratic governments; equality; dense web of institutions, etc.) that mitigate instability, whereas in Asia, "many of these same soothing forces are either absent or of dubious strength and permanence" (ibid). France and Germany used to care about Alsace/Lorraine but, we are told (Friedberg 1993/94: 16-18), have long since moved beyond these differences. Not so in East Asia. Rather than to "converg[e] on a single, shared interpretation of their recent past, the Asian powers show signs of divergence, each constructing a history that serves its own national purposes (ibid, p. 18). And, to make matters worse, there is the timing of institutionalization. In Europe this process occurred soon after World War II and continues to this day, whereas the East Asians got a much later start (ibid. p. 22).

Kang (2003) could not agree more with Friedberg's assessment. "Because Europe was so important for so long a period, in seeking to understand international relations," Kang (2003: 58) laments, "scholars have often simply deployed concepts, theories, and experiences derived from the European experience to project onto and explain Asia," a practice he finds "problematic at best." "Eurocentric ideas," in his mind seem to have obfuscated rather than aided our understanding of Asian alliance behavior in that they have "yielded several mistaken conclusions and predictions."

And yet, there are parallels between Europe and Asia. Case in point is the Franco/German versus the Sino/Japanese axis. Just because China and Japan have not "begun to deal with their poisoned historical relations" (Kaiser 2006: 90), this does not imply that they could not learn from France and Germany's behavior in the aftermath of World War II. In fact, it

---

[5] China, of course, has refused to rule out the use of force to subordinate Taiwan.

is nonsensical to assume that Asia would discount valuable insights to be gained from the European experience, begin from scratch when it comes to institution-building and, so to speak, "reinvent the wheel."

As Kaiser (2006: 90) makes clear, European history does provide important lessons for Sino-Japanese relations, particularly when it comes to "dealing with the past and the question of guilt, nationalism, integration and political leadership." He, for instance, explains that, although Japanese officials repeatedly have asked their neighbors for forgiveness for Japanese atrocities, these acts did not achieve the desired results, "because they were not fully internalized by Japanese society as a whole" (ibid, p. 91-2). Kaiser then outlines a number of steps (issuance of formal apology, monetary compensation, preservation of memory, creation of trust, etc.) that were essential in bringing about reconciliation between Germany and its neighbors and, in his mind, are applicable to Sino-Japanese relations. These steps, along with other literatures on reconciliation, will be scrutinized in greater detail below, following a brief discussion of European institution-building.

Europe's Institutional History in a Nutshell[6]

The defeat of Germany and Japan at the end of World War II left a tremendous vacuum to the west and east of the Soviet Union and the United Kingdom, France, and the United States were not at all sure how the USSR would react to this change. Would the Soviet Union cooperate with the United States and allow for free elections in Poland and the rest of Eastern Europe as indicated at Yalta, or would it pursue an expansionist policy and thereby pose a threat to the security of independent countries?

As history texts (Black et. al. 1992; Ray 1992; Keylor 1992; Kaplan 1999) make abundantly clear, due to the imposition of Soviet puppet governments in some of the East European countries, as well as the immense military imbalance between the Soviet Union and the western world, by 1946, the West Europeans already felt threatened by the Soviet Union and some, foremost among them France, additionally feared a resurgent Germany. To enhance their security these countries solicited U.S. support, promoted greater cooperation among themselves and, very importantly, sought to integrate Germany in international institutions to contain its power once and for all. Thus, over the course of more than half a century, the West Europeans gave rise to numerous cooperative arrangements with varying memberships and varying degrees of structural commitment which, since the end of the Cold War, many East European countries joined. Or, in other words, the Europeans, gradually, built a complex web of governance to enhance their security and promote stability and prosperity.

Perceiving a dual threat, the West Europeans had different security needs in the early post-1945 period than the U.S., which largely viewed the Soviet Union as posing a political threat to international peace. This explains why the former acted first to improve their security. In early 1947 British foreign minister Ernest Bevin took a decisive step to coordinate a West European defense system by offering a treaty to France. In his mind such a treaty should not only win French support by promising British assistance in the event of renewed German aggression, but also decrease the uncertainty regarding French behavior by pulling France away from the USSR. This two-fold objective required that the text of an Anglo-French alliance would be worded carefully so as not to antagonize the USSR any further (give it the impression that it could be directed against it) or seriously offend Germany (since the latter eventually might have to be included in a Western security system). After drawn-out deliberations, on March 4, 1947, a

_____

[6] Over the course of many centuries Europe experienced periods of great upheaval as well as prolonged peace. Throughout, institutions had been created some of which survived and others fell by the way side. For the purposes of this paper it suffices to begin the analysis of Europe's institutional developments in the post-1945 period. The following section draws on Weber (2000) chapters 5 and 6.

8

Treaty of Alliance and Mutual Assistance was finally signed at Dunkirk, in the form of an old-fashioned military alliance.

Only days after Dunkirk, the American position began to change. U.S. decision-makers started to attribute recent unrest in Greece and Turkey to Soviet infiltration attempts and therefore persuaded President Truman to take action to stop Soviet influence from spreading. On March 12, 1947, the American president (in what became known as the Truman Doctrine) asked Congress for direct financial aid to support free peoples who are susceptible to pressure from the Soviets or pressure from domestic Communist movements. And, as a further safeguard against Soviet infiltration, U.S. Secretary of State George Marshall, on June 5, 1947, introduced a plan (Marshall Plan) to aid European economic recovery via massive U.S. financial assistance.

Still viewing the Soviet threat as political in nature, however, the U.S. was determined to avoid "entangling alliances" and made clear to the West Europeans that they would have to demonstrate their willingness to engage in self-help before any further U.S. commitment would be discussed. Again, Bevin took the lead and, on January 22, 1948, called for the creation of a Western union. A series of worrisome incidents in early 1948 (the Communist takeover of the government in Prague; a telegram by General Clay from Berlin warning that war "could come with dramatic suddenness"; rumors about a Soviet-Norwegian nonaggression pact; talk that Denmark feared an armed invasion by the USSR) underlined the need for greater security cooperation and, on March 17, 1948, led to the signing of the Brussels Treaty in which the United Kingdom, France, and the Benelux countries vowed to build a common defense system and to strengthen economic and cultural ties.

Since the Europeans now had fulfilled their end of the bargain, Truman gave permission to start secret North Atlantic Treaty (NAT) talks with the UK and Canada. While the negotiating parties were discussing several versions of a pledge with varying degrees of commitment, the Soviets, feeling provoked by western occupation policies in Berlin, responded with a partial, and soon thereafter full, blockade of the city. The United Kingdom initiated an airlift (which the U.S. later joined) and, on September 27, the defense ministers of the Brussels Treaty powers decided to create a Western Union Defense Organization as a first step to a larger association that the United States should join. At the same time, NAT talks were progressing and, on April 4, 1949, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, the United Kingdom, and the U.S. signed the North Atlantic Treaty. Within a year of its creation, NATO became much superior to traditional military coalitions and, through a high level of integration, a unified command, joint planning, and combined military training, set itself apart from most previous military arrangements.

Although, on May 9, 1949, the USSR lifted its blockade on Berlin, improved East-West relations did not follow. On the contrary, on September 23, President Truman announced the detection of an atomic explosion in the Soviet Union and responded by signing a Mutual Defense Assistance Act to facilitate cooperation among the Western allies. Then, on June 25, 1950, North Korea attacked South Korea. Convinced that the Korean War was initiated by the USSR, and that it might even be a "dress-rehearsal" for Europe, the Western powers grew anxious about their serious military inferiority vis-à-vis the USSR and began to discuss German rearmament.

Terrified by the increase in Soviet belligerence and deeply troubled by the prospect of a remilitarized Germany, in the fall of 1950 France called for the founding of a European army in which the contingents of the members (including Germany) "would be incorporated…on the level of the smallest possible unit."[7] That is, fearing that Germany could become militant again and act opportunistically, France sought to contain Germany through integration and control. Initially opposed by other countries (the U.S., the UK, and the Benelux countries preferred to integrate Germany in NATO), the proposal for a European Army--also known as the European Defense Community (EDC)--was eventually accepted by them only to be rejected finally by the French

---

[7] C. G. D. Onslow, "West German Rearmament," p. 467.

themselves. Following Stalin's death on March 5, 1953, and the signing of the Korean armistice on July 23, 1953, many French perceived a reduction in Soviet threat and thus, on August 29, 1954, the French National Assembly voted against the ratification of the EDC and made its demise official. The result of four years of security debates was a strengthened NATO, i.e., agreement was reached that the Western European Union (WEU) would be restored within NATO, that Germany would join the WEU and hence, become a member of NATO.

At about the same time an EDC was being discussed, two Frenchmen, Jean Monnet (a businessman) and Robert Schuman (foreign minister), in consultation with West German Chancellor Konrad Adenauer, proposed to bring the coal and steel industries of France and Germany under one interstate organization with significant supranational characteristics. Other countries were invited to join and on April 18, 1951, France, West-Germany, the Benelux countries, and Italy signed the Treaty of Paris, creating the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC). Although bringing about a Free Trade Area for basic materials such as coal, coke, iron, ore and steel would yield economic benefits, the main purpose of the ECSC was to tackle the French-German problem and "make war between France and Germany 'not merely unthinkable, but materially impossible'" (McCormick 1999: 66).

By ratifying the ECSC Treaty in August 1952 each member state declared its willingness to curtail its sovereignty voluntarily by delegating some aspects of its autonomy to a "High Authority" and, thus, started a long process of institution-building that led to the creation of a sophisticated structural arrangement which, with the signing of the Maastricht Treaty in 1992, became known as the European Union (EU). Without a doubt, the EU represents one of the most complex experiments in regional integration since the advent of the modern nation state in the 17th century and, over five decades, not only increased its competencies significantly, but also expanded its membership from six to 27 member states. Since this process is well documented (Lewis 1993; Dinan 1994; McCormick 1999; Nugent 1999), it here suffices to draw attention to the main developments on the road toward greater integration.

As has already been seen in the case of the European Army, integration efforts suffered setbacks but, each time, proponents of a united Europe "relaunched" the European idea (McCormick 1999: 68). When the failure of the EDC, for instance, made clear that greater integration in the security realm could not be achieved at the time, the foreign ministers of the ECSC countries met at Messina in June 1955 to discuss further economic cooperation. These negotiations culminated in the signing of the Treaties of Rome on March 25, 1957, in which the ECSC countries brought about a European Economic Community (EEC) and a European Atomic Energy Community (Euratom). In the coming years the signatories of the EEC sought to bring about a Common Market and to harmonize their economic policies. By 1973 they achieved a Customs Union, i.e., removed internal tariffs and set common external tariffs. Since non-tariff barriers continued to exist, in April 1985, the Commission produced a White Paper identifying roughly 300 measures that would have to be taken to get rid off the remaining obstacles to trade. Moreover, a European Council meeting in December 1991 called for economic and monetary union, a common foreign and security policy, the abolition of frontier controls, and a common immigration policy. As these Maastricht objectives (so called since they were signed by the member states at Maastricht on February 7, 1992), are being implemented (adoption of the Euro; creation of a European Rapid Reaction Force; signing of the Schengen Agreement, etc.), the EU is moving closer toward a "United States of Europe."

It is therefore fair to suggest that, since the signing of the Treaty of Paris that gave rise to the ECSC, the Europeans have come a long ways with their deepening process. In a little more than 50 years they have moved from a free trade area to a customs union to a common market with a common currency, and have discussed the further curtailment of their freedom of action in the context of a Common Foreign and Security Policy, a European Security and Defense Policy, Europol, etc. It furthermore needs to be stressed that integration took place at varying speeds

where those EU member states that were ready to move forward did so, while allowing others to exempt themselves from policies that they were not yet ready to adopt.[8]

At the same time, through a host of accession treaties, the Europe of Six has now grown to an EU of 27. Since membership is unlikely to be extended much further (Turkey and some of the former Yugoslav Republics may join some time in the future) the EU is now also in the process of figuring out what institutional arrangements it should seek with its new neighbors—countries like Ukraine, Moldova, Armenia, Azerbaijan, and Georgia, but also Southern Mediterranean countries like Algeria, Egypt, Israel, Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, Morocco, Palestine Authority, Syria, and Tunisia.[9]

Finally, one needs to keep in mind that the EU does not operate in a vacuum. In the security realm, ever since its founding in 1949, NATO has played an important role in stabilizing the European continent and continues to do so.   Like the EU, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization has experienced its ups (new members; various partnerships) and downs (France pulling out of SHAPE in the 1960s; the failure of the Multilateral Force) and has come a long ways in institutionalizing both cooperation among its members and with its partners (PfP; EAPC; NATO-Russia Founding Act; NATO-Ukraine Charter; Mediterranean Dialogue, etc).   One further international organization that helps promote peace in Europe is the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE—formerly known as the CSCE) which, since the signing of the Helsinki Accord in 1973, has taken a particular interest in human rights issues. Then there is also the Council of Europe (where Heads of State exchange ideas), the United Nations (UN), and, until recently, when it became absorbed by the EU, there was the Western European Union (WEU).   Thus, what we see in Europe are multiple institutional arrangements with varying memberships alongside each other and varying degrees of structural commitment collectively comprising a complex web of governance to promote stability and prosperity.

Mini Case Study: Japan

Historical Legacies

As Jansen (2002: 512) makes clear, "[t]hroughout history Japan's stability had been related to that of China." The problem of China, specifically "China-centrism," was of utmost importance. Since China viewed itself as "the cultural center of the universe and …all non-Chinese [as] 'uncivilized' barbarians," and insisted on the "preeminence of the Middle Kingdom and a tributary system of foreign relations" (Vohra 2000: 24), Japan-China relations for centuries were characterized by the threat of invasion and warfare.

Particularly damaging for Asian relations was the Sino-Japanese war in 1895. For China, according to Vohra (2000: 66), this war meant "[a] crippling defeat at the hands of the 'dwarf' Asian barbarians, who had historically been looked down on as vastly inferior to the [Chinese]." Not surprisingly, therefore, China a year later signed a secret defense treaty with Russia but, ultimately, could not prevent its territory from becoming divided into "spheres of influence" by foreign powers (Vohra 2000: 81).

The image of Japan by its neighbors suffered further and, as Jansen (2002: 515) argues, "lasting damage" as a result of Japan's actions during World War I (which Japan was committed to join to make good on its alliance with the United Kingdom) and its aftermath. Rather than to return bases it had seized from Germany to China at the end of the war, Japan elected to keep these holdings in its possession for a number of years. And although the Kellogg-Briand Pact (of which Japan was one of the original 15 signatories), by "renounc[ing] war as an instrument of

---

[8] See the UK and Denmark who exempted themselves from the Euro zone.
[9] For a closer look at the EU's relations with its "New Neighborhood," see Weber, Smith, and Baun, eds. (forthcoming).

national policy," may have given Japan's neighbors some hope that the country may be turning over a new leaf, all hope was shattered in the early 1930s when Japan decided to conquer Manchuria to develop a resource base to prepare for war with the USSR (Jansen 2002: 527, 580). Fearing the Soviet Union and communism, in November 1936 Japan signed the Anti-Comintern Pact with Germany. Shortly thereafter, Japan began to encroach on China's northern provinces and, in July 1937, was at war with China that lasted until the US defeated Japan in 1945. Korea, which had come under Japanese rule in 1894 when the Chinese lost their influence over Seoul, likewise, was not liberated until 1945.

What needs to be understood is that the atrocities committed by the Japanese against the Koreans (discussed elsewhere) and the Chinese, to this day, cause hatred and suspicion. Particularly gruesome—and thus still an issue in Sino-Japanese relations today--was the fall of Nanking (Nanjing) to Japanese armies in December 1937. In what came to be known as the "Rape of Nanjing," victorious troops committed unspeakable crimes "against a totally unarmed and helpless civilian population and disarmed prisoners-of-war."…[A]t least "20,000 women were raped once or repeatedly…and many thousands of men, women and children, and POWs were ruthlessly butchered."…"Within only six weeks after the fall of Nanjing the Japanese military apparatus ha[d] slaughtered more than 340,000 Chinese POWs and civilians" (Vohra 2000: 164). Prisoners were systematically mistreated and the disclosure by Korean and Chinese "comfort women" demanding restitution became a big problem for Japan in the 1990s (Jansen 2002: 656) and continues to this day.

Contrary to what happened in Europe where shared history helped to promote reconciliation, the steps taken thus far by China and Japan (war crimes trials, postwar reparations, peace treaty) have been "flawed and incomplete" (Rose 2005, 11). Hence the history problem resurfaces and, as Vohra (2000: 299) points out, in practically every top-level meeting the Chinese admonish their Japanese counterparts never to forget Japan's wartime record. Although some Chinese believe that Japan has apologized enough (Rose 2005, 108), most Chinese feel strongly that Japan has to come to terms with its past and "face up to history" to aid in the normalization of relations between the two countries. As long as "a sizeable segment of the population feels little remorse and vehemently opposes any apology" (Kristof 1998: 39), "conservative elements in Japan…ma[ke] frequent efforts to deny the history of Japanese aggression" (Wu 2000: 297), numerous Japanese continue to believe that their country's "purpose for invading its neighbors was…entirely noble" (freeing them from Western colonizers), and "cabinet ministers march to the Yasukuni Shrine" (Kristof 1998: 40), China's resentment and mistrust of Japan is unlikely to diminish. Until serious change comes about, the Chinese can be expected to maximize their political utility by playing the "history card."[10]

Does this mean that the prospects for improved Sino-Japanese relations are slim? Not necessarily. A significant number of Japanese and Chinese people appear to be ready to move on, confront and transcend the past, and work toward a better, more cooperative future. Assuming that the time has come to tackle the vexing problem of war guilt before further "apology fatigue" on the part of Japan (Green 1999: 158) creates additional obstacles, what concrete steps should East Asia take to transcend this significant hurdle that stands in the way of greater cooperation?

Here, the paper argues, European history can provide useful lessons for East Asia. Clearly, Europeans have come a long way from the dark days of World War II. They managed to deal with the past, make amends, and reestablish trust by giving rise to supranational institutions, thereby "forging new identities that extend beyond traditional ethnic and national boundaries" (Lebow 2006: 4). As will be discussed below, over the course of several decades, the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG) and, since 1990, a unified Germany, undertook a variety of steps to

---

[10] Note that there is a large literature that argues that China uses Japan's historical legacy to enhance its own domestic legitimacy. See, for instance, Shambaugh 1996, Rose 1998, and Zhao 2000.

confront its past, reach out to those who were harmed so gravely during the Nazi regime, and pledged never to commit such crimes again. As members of the nation in whose name atrocities were committed most Germans understand their responsibility to guard against the possibility of repetition and, no longer being the actual perpetrators of these crimes, they also appear to be reformulating their identity (Barkan and Karn 2006: 10).

In the following section the paper examines three crucial elements of reconciliation: (1) remembrance/truth seeking; (2) restitution/justice; and (3) apology/settling the past.[11] Comparing various steps taken by Germany and Japan in settling their historical legacies, the paper makes clear why the latter thus far has been unable to successfully transcend its past.

Remembrance/Truth Seeking

As Rose (2005: 2) points out, there have been very different interpretations of the events of 1931-1945 in China and Japan (as well as within Japan) and Japanese national memory, for several decades, has been a significant stumbling block for improved relations with Japan's neighbors. World War II from Japan's perspective (also known as the "Great East Asian War" or the "Pacific War") was viewed as "freeing Asia from the oppressive domination of the West" (Jansen 2002: 626). Since the Chinese were weak and had allowed themselves to become enslaved by the West, Japan, thinking of East Asia in terms of a "single house," had the duty to "liberate" China (Vohra 2000: 161). At the same time, Japan portrayed itself as the victim of nuclear attacks, rather than aggressor.

During the Tokyo trials the suffering of Chinese and other Asian victims. ('comfort women,' forced laborers, victims of biological experiments) was completely ignored (Rose 2005: 36). The trials not only failed to bring about justice, but led to what many scholars have termed Japan's "collective amnesia" for 40 years (Rose 2005: 37).

To make matters worse, the content of Japanese history textbooks ever since the Ministry of Education obtained the authority to screen them in 1953 has been highly controversial. Encouraged to adopt a "patriotic tone," and to "soften…Japan's excesses during World War II," authors speak of "self-defense," "liberation," and label the Nanjing massacre a "fabrication" (Ienaga 1996: 332). The most recent revision of high school textbooks that caused a stir centers around the Imperial Army's responsibility in the Battle of Okinawa. Instead of acknowledging the Army's role in ordering civilians to commit mass suicide in the final weeks of WW II, the textbooks now merely state that "mass killings and suicides took place among the residents" (Financial Times April 2, 2007: 6). This "biased historiography," time and again has led to calls by Chinese and other Asian victims for factual accuracy (Ienaga 1996: 348).[12]

In Germany there were the Nuremberg trials (1945-46), followed later by the Eichmann (1961) and Auschwitz (1963-65) trials, but Germans, for the most part, tried to come to terms with their past in post-war debates about the Nazi period and the Holocaust (*Vergangenheitsbewaeltigung*) which occurred in distinct stages. As Kansteiner (2006: 108) explains, in the 1950s the FRG experienced a period of "communicative silence" about the burden of the past. More concretely, "the consequences of war and 'war crimes' were acknowledged by the new political elites[13] in their dealings with their Allied supervisors, but not

---

[11] For an in depth study on Sino-Japanese relations which uses these three elements of reconciliation, see Rose 2005.

[12] For a detailed discussion of the textbook issue see Rose 2005 chapter 3.

[13] Katzenstein (2005: 86-7) explains that the political class in Germany after 1945 was recruited from democratic parties during the Weimar Republic and therefore largely consisted of people who had been imprisoned or in exile during the Nazi dictatorship. These people had an interest in talking about Germany's "problematic past" and wanted the history books to reflect adequately what had happened during the Nazi period. In Japan, on the other hand, the political class remained largely unchanged after the war, "except for the very top leadership," and the government therefore favored "textbooks that expressed a strong, nationalist historiography."

necessarily in communications with the German population" (ibid). In 1959 the appearance of anti-Semitic graffiti caused the German government to introduce educational reforms and, in the 1960s, a group of Germans who had belonged to the Hitler Youth—but who had been too young to have been involved in any crimes—became more vocal and sought to bring about further changes in the educational system (Kansteiner 2006: 112).

Moreover, German historians wrote "world-renowned" histories on the Holocaust and, aside from unearthing the historical facts, encouraged Germany to confront its past (Bindenagel 2006: 306). Since Germany cannot escape its historical legacy, German politicians reminded German citizens time and again, they have to deal with it squarely. In a speech on May 8, 1985, the 40th anniversary of the end of World War II, German President Richard von Weizsaecker stressed: "All of us, whether guilty or not, whether old or young, must accept the past. We are all affected by its consequences and held responsible for it" (Bindenagel 2006: 290).

In the 1970s, the student movement assured that discussions of personal guilt would not be dodged. It was important that a "clear distinction be made between those who committed crimes and the nation they came from" (Kaiser 2006: 92). Since guilt is individual rather than collective, one needs to differentiate guilty perpetrators and their descendants. Although the latter hold responsibility for the future, Kaiser (2006: 93) makes clear, they are absolved from responsibility for the past. To guard against the possibility of repetition, the German government decreed that it is a crime to deny the Holocaust, endorses full archival openness to make sure information relating to Germany's dark past will not be distorted, and continues to work hard to create new relationships of trust. Projects on common history textbooks are on-going, and town partnerships, youth and teacher exchange programs--created decades ago to combat the revival of nationalism--are still going strong.

Restitution/Justice

Under the Potsdam declaration, the Allied powers decided that Japan would have to hand over assets and capital which would then be dispersed as reparations. Between January 1948 and September 1949 China received $22.5 million worth of machinery and equipment and $18.1 million-worth of stolen goods were returned to China (Rose 2005: 42). As Cold War tensions began to intensify, however, the U.S. government recommended to forgive reparations for fear of weakening Japan. In a Peace Treaty with Japan in 1952 Taiwan agreed to waive reparations and, in 1972, the People's Republic of China followed suit in a Joint Statement signed with Japan.

Although, as Rose (2005: 5) demonstrates, this left the door open for civil compensation, to this day, only a small number of Chinese victims have received compensation. In general, the success rate appears to be better if a complaint is directed against a company, rather than a government, but even then a variety of criteria need to be met (claims must be in the hands of legislators rather than the judiciary; claims must be supported by a large group; claims must have merit, etc.) "for civil redress to be successful" (Brooks 1999 quoted in Rose 2005: 77-78). Most cases are dismissed and, typically, judges either argue "that compensation claims were settled under international law, … that under the Meiji constitution the Japanese state cannot be held liable, or that the twenty-year statute of limitations makes the claims invalid" (ibid 96).

Whereas victims of Japanese atrocities have not fared very well when it comes to restitution, victims of the Nazi regime, comparatively, have done much better in their search for justice. In 1947 U.S. occupation authorities launched the first German restitution and compensation programs and some of these are aiding Holocaust survivors to this day. According to Bindenagel (2006: 294) the compensation programs provided by the FRG "were quite extensive" with the government paying "over $70 billion … directly to victims." Also, in the 1990s, Germany launched a "$700 million humanitarian effort" to aid victims of Nazi atrocities in Eastern Europe. Negotiations among German business leaders, politicians, and victims of Nazi slave labor conducted between 1999 and 2000 led to a $5 billion settlement (Bindenagel 2006:

301) which was widely perceived as just. And, just this March, KarstadtQuelle agreed to pay $117 million to the Conference on Jewish Material Claims Against Germany which had filed suit on behalf of the Wertheim family who—being Jewish--had lost its property in the late 1930s to the Nazis (New York Times March 31st, 2007, B3).

Apology/Settling the Past

Clearly, since the end of World War II, the Japanese government has issued numerous apologies for its conduct during the war, but, to this day, these apologies have not achieved the desired effect, i.e., improved Japan's relations with its neighbors considerably. Why is this the case?

As Rose (2005: 19) suggests, for an apology to be effective certain criteria must be met: "it must be offered with the backing and authority of the collective so that the apology is official and binding; it must be made publicly and on the record; and it should acknowledge the violation, accept responsibility, and indicate that there will be no repetition of such acts in future." Moreover, reciprocity may be a must since each time an outstretched hand is not seized a further opportunity is lost (Kaiser 2006: 92).[14]

In any event, an apology must be "meaningful" (Kristof 1998: 38), "genuine," "sincere," and "backed by actions" (Rose 2005: 100). Over the course of several decades, Japan repeatedly has expressed "regret," "keen responsibility for the suffering it has caused," "remorse," "sincere remorse," "genuine contrition and deepest apologies" (Rose 2005: 101), but none of the apologies issued to date has been accepted by the majority of Chinese people. During a visit to Tokyo at the end of 1998, for instance,
Jiang Zemin "pressed for a formal 'apology' (owabi) and 'remorse' (hansei)," but, as Green (1999: 158-9) explains, only got hansei.[15] Similarly, apologizing to former 'comfort women' in Korea in 1993, the Japanese government acknowledged "moral" but not "legal" responsibility (Rose 2005: 71).

To make matters worse, many Japanese Prime Ministers have insisted on visiting the Yasukuni Shrine. Obviously, Japanese citizens should be allowed to honor their war dead. Ever since Class A (leading) war criminals were enshrined at Yasukuni in 1978, however, any visit there by a Japanese Prime Minister represents a "political act of state recognition of the[se] souls" (Takahashi 2006: 156). The crux of the matter, as Takahashi (2006: 175) explains, is that tens of thousands of Taiwanese and Koreans, who had been drafted into the Japanese military during the Asia-Pacific War, are also enshrined at Yasukuni. These "victims of colonial rule by Japan [were enshrined] in precisely the same way as Japanese people who died perpetrating the colonial rule…as 'gods who defended the nation.' For the bereaved families…who suffered colonial rule, this is an insult" (ibid), and they therefore undertook legal proceedings to remove their relatives from enshrinement, but to no avail.[16]

There are at least two ways in which the Japanese government could defuse this politically charged situation. On the one hand, it could decide to create a politically "neutral" war memorial that would make no reference to Japan's war criminals (Rose 2005: 125). Alternatively, Japanese Prime Ministers could "leave the commemoration and mourning of the

---

[14] For studies that argue that an apology does not require reciprocity, in fact, may be more effective unilaterally, see Long and Brecke 2003:26; and Suzuki 2007: 6.

[15] It is important to understand that there are different levels of apology in the Japanese language and that the exact wording chosen is crucial.

[16] Priest Ikeda rationalizes the refusal to remove the souls by arguing that "at the time when they died they were Japanese, so it is not possible for them to stop being Japanese after they died" (Takahashi 2006: 176). As Takahashi is quick to point out, however, this completely ignores the fact that "the[se] people were semi-forcibly drafted into the war."

souls enshrined at Yasukuni up to the priests at the shrine," even if that would mean jeopardizing some domestic votes (Takahashi 2006: 157).

An analysis of apologies made by the German government to come to terms with the Nazi past shows that Germany has been much more successful in moving beyond this dark chapter in its history. This, as Kaiser (2006: 91) makes clear, in large part, is due to the fact that the Germans recognized that "the acceptance of guilt in the past must not only be open and public, but, in order to be truly meaningful and effective, it must generate a formal apology." Case in point, former German Chancellor Willy Brandt's reconciliation with the East. While visiting the Warsaw Ghetto Monument in 1970, Brandt spontaneously fell to his knees, "[doing]", as he later explained in his memoirs, "what human beings do when speech fails them" (cited in Teitel 2006: 105). This "executive apology" was then followed by the signing of the Warsaw Treaty.

As part of the 1999-2000 settlement among German business leaders, politicians, and victims of Nazi slave labor mentioned above, German President Johannes Rau offered a similar apology, "emphasizing acknowledgement and repentance rather than money" (Barkan and Karn 2006: 23). Rau told his audience, which included Holocaust survivors: "I know that for many it is not really the money that matters. What they want is for their suffering to be recognized as suffering and for the injustice done to them to be named injustice. I pay tribute to all those who were subjected to slave and forced labor under German rule, and, in the name of the German people, beg forgiveness. We will not forget their suffering" (reprinted in Barkan and Karn 2006: 24).[17]

So then what lessons can Japan draw from the European experience? "In the best cases," as Barkan and Karn (2006:7) stress, "the negotiation of apology works to promote dialogue, tolerance, and cooperation between groups knitted together uncomfortably (or ripped asunder) by some past injustice. … [An] apology can create a new framework in which groups may rehearse their past(s) and reconsider the present." To the extent that apologies can "amend the past" (ibid. 8), their psychological value is immense. Germany seems to fit this "best case" scenario. Having addressed its historical legacies and "by building a new, shared identity with former enemies," Germany, in Lebow's mind, has been able to "transcend, at least in part, [its] Germanness" (2006: 30). Moreover, given that an "apology becomes an act of rehabilitation for the perpetrators and their descendants" (Barkan and Karn 2006: 17), "atoning for the war," as Kristof (1998: 44) points out, "would not only liberate Japan's neighbors; it would also free Japan itself."[18] Both of these developments, it seems, should enhance the prospects of future Sino-Japanese cooperation.

Japan's Threat Assessment

North Korea, as Saunders (2004: 150) makes clear, is the most immediate threat to Japan. "[F]ollowing years of provocative probing of Japanese sea and air defense perimeters by North Korean gunboats and fighter aircraft, admitted development of nuclear weapons, kidnappings of Japanese citizens, relentless espionage, …the 1998 launch of a ballistic missile over Japan" (ibid.), and the most recent atomic test by North Korea, it is not surprising that Japan seeks ballistic missile defense (BMD) (Kliman 2006: 2).

Aside from North Korea, the problem of China persists. "[T]hroughout the post-war period, Japan…[has] maintained a policy of constructive engagement toward Beijing" (Green 1999: 152), but continues to remain troubled by the uncertainty regarding China's future

---

[17] To live up to this pledge, the German government regularly provides money to education programs and memorials (Bindenagel 2006: 294).

[18] For an interesting study that advocates an apology as a new strategy, see Suzuki (2007: 5-7). He argues that Japan, as a democracy, has "greater political space…to debate and forward alternative interpretations of history." With time, an apology may lead to "collective identity transformations," and help to "de-securitise" China's identity.

behavior. It is thus strategic instability that is believed to be the main enemy—"the lack of transparency in the intentions and strategic thinking of Beijing" (Lee 1997: 252)—rather than the fear of an imminent attack.

Japan is well aware of the fact that "China has from time to time behaved in ways offensive to the rest of the world…[and] shown its willingness to use force to settle disputes, even when its own territory [was] not under attack" (China's incursion into Vietnam in 1979, or its entering the Korean War) (Roy 1994: 156). And, most recently, China stunned the world by shooting down a satellite in outer space.

By and large, however, Japan, like many of its neighbors, is cautiously optimistic when it comes to China. Unlike "a few years ago, [when] many of China's neighbors voiced growing concerns about the possibility of China becoming a domineering regional hegemon and powerful military threat," Shambaugh (2004/05: 64) explains, "most nations in the region now see China as a good neighbor…and a non-threatening regional power."

This is not to say that "Japan does [not] harbor concerns over improvements to China's military capabilities, especially its nuclear and missile prowess" (Wu 2000: 305). It does worry about developments such as China's nuclear weapons test in 1995, or the Taiwan Strait crisis in 1996, and therefore pursues the development of theater missile defense (TMD)--which it may also need to protect itself against North Korean ballistic missiles (Garrett and Glaser 1997: 393). Particularly vexing to Japan are the many ways in which the People's Liberation Army (PLA) has sought to shore up its military capabilities vis-à-vis Taiwan: the "deployment of approximately 600 short-range ballistic missiles opposite Taiwan…; the deployment of large numbers of attack fighters opposite Taiwan; the buildup of surface ships, submarines, and amphibious landing craft within range of Taiwan; periodic large-scale military exercises around Taiwan; and the refusal to forswear the possible use of force against Taiwan" (Shambaugh 2004: 86). "If the PRC [People's Republic of China] chose to blockade Taiwan or a military conflict across the Strait turned out to be a protracted one," Wu (2000: 305) claims, "Japan's lines of communication through the channel would be jeopardized." And yet it deserves to be stressed again that it is not the large military expenditures that make China's neighbors uneasy but the anxiety stemming from the significant uncertainty concerning Chinese intentions.

But there are also outright pessimists. Roy (1994: 149), for instance, argues that "a prosperous Chinese economy…would give China the capability to challenge Japan for domination of East Asia." "If China's economic power continues to grow rapidly relative to Japan's," he insists (1994: 165), "serious political tensions between China and Japan are certain, and military conflict is likely." Or, put differently, power politics pretty much would dictate an economically stronger China to start acting like a major power—"bolder, more demanding, and less inclined to cooperate with the other major powers in the region" (ibid. 160). Solomon and Drennan (2001: 231), paint an equally bleak picture suggesting that, "[a]s we enter the twenty-first century, Asia's security environment seems likely to be shaped by the distrust, if not rivalry, between China and Japan."

To make things worse, China with an "authoritarian and unstable government…is more likely to use force in pursuit of its goals" (Roy 1994: 160), and "fac[ing] less resistance than Japan to building a superpower-sized military…may provoke a military buildup by Japan, plunging Asia into a new cold war" (ibid. 150). Glaser (1993: 271), similarly, discusses the possibility of an increasingly powerful China causing a regional arms race due to the security dilemma. It is therefore imperative, according to Solomon and Drennan (2001: 232), to keep the US involved in East Asian politics. "Without the forward US military presence (i.e., the stationing of US military personnel in South Korea and Japan), these scholars suggest, "a resurgent rivalry between China and Japan" may not be avoidable and could easily lead to Japan's remilitarization.

At the same time it is understood that a fragile China, one that might experience significant domestic conflict and even disintegrate, also is not in East Asia's best interest. On the

contrary, an impoverished and unstable China would also be worrisome, since in this scenario Japan would have to deal with millions of refugees (Wu 2000: 307).

Institution-Building in East Asia

Given the history of the region, East Asians are sensitive to infringements on their sovereignty and reluctant to curtail their freedom of action. When they do agree to cooperate in the context of international organizations, they insist on consensus decision- making--as in ASEAN and the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF) which will be discussed in more detail below-- to protect their sovereignty (Simon 2001: 3).

To the extent possible, East Asian countries, much like others, and as predicted by neorealists, seek to engage in self-help. Since cooperation leaves a country vulnerable to opportunistic behavior on the part of its allies, the country can be expected to do everything in its power to enhance its security before relying on others. Japan, for instance, although its autonomy for a number of years was significantly constrained by systemic forces as a result of World War II, gradually improved its capabilities by modifying Article 9 and allowing its Self-Defense Forces to evolve. According to Kliman (2006: 67) this trend is likely to continue "as normative constraints on Japan's defense policy weaken."

Yet, "[i]n light of Japan's traditional problems with China, Korea and Russia, … possible repercussions for the security of sea lanes as a result of China's territorial claims in the South China Sea and the East China Sea" (Lee 1997: 257), and continuing military constraints (no nuclear weapons; military export restrictions), self-help is clearly insufficient to assure Japan's security. Instead it is essential for Japan to retain close ties with the US, to share the defense burden and thereby enhance the chances of US troops remaining stationed in the country, and prolong the security alliance with the US indefinitely. As Cha (2003: 108) demonstrates, ever since the end of World War II it was bilateralism that helped promote peace in the region. Specifically, the American "hub and spokes network of bilateral alliances" (ibid.) deserves credit for bringing stability to East Asia.[19]

Presently, the "hub and spokes model" consisting of five bilateral alliances between the US and Australia, Japan, South Korea, the Philippines, and Thailand predominates. But is it wise to put all of one's eggs in one basket, that is, solely rely on bilateralism? Cha (2003: 111) seems to think so, arguing that multilateral arrangements offer little security beyond what the existing alliances already provide, would only restrict maneuverability and thus add little value. Betts (1993/94), on the other hand, considers too heavy a reliance on the US dangerous. Even though "[t]he United States remains formally committed to a strategic role in the Pacific," he explains (1993/94: 51), "its military presence has…been attenuated as the flag has come down from Philippine bases, land- and sea-based tactical nuclear weapons have been removed, and defense budgets cuts trim the number of forces regularly on station elsewhere in the neighborhood."

Shambaugh (2004/05:95), much like Cha, acknowledges the importance of bilateralism and the crucial role of the US in shoring up East Asian security, yet advocates for Japan to develop broader security ties and predicts the emergence of a "multitextured and multilayered regional system." As has become apparent in the European case, there are numerous forms of institutions with varying memberships, levels of commitment, etc., to choose from. Thus, in the following, several institutional arrangements that have been discussed in the European context, and/or have been put in place there, will be considered for East Asia alongside already existing security structures.

If one continues the above discussion of security arrangements and, gradually, increases the number of countries involved, trilateralism logically follows bilateralism. And there are a few

---

[19] This fact, obviously, has not gone unnoticed and explains, at least in part, why former Japanese Prime Minister Koizumi agreed to aid the US in Iraq (see Kliman 2006: 139).

scholars who have given trilateral security structures some thought. Lee (1997), for example, leaves no doubt that it is imperative to engage China. "As the future of Asia-Pacific security will to a large extent be determined by China, the United States and Japan," he argues, "a stable triangular relationship involving Sino-Japanese relations, Sino-American relations and US-Japan relations would be of paramount importance for the maintenance of stability and prosperity of the region" (ibid. 258). The key here, obviously, is a *stable* triangle and it is not clear whether the US, Japan and China can cooperate giving equal consideration to each partner. Funabashi (1993: 83) is skeptical, reminding us that "[t]riangular relationships, by their nature, reduce international relations to a zero-sum game: any of the three powers is apt to suspect the other two of colluding to augment their bargaining power. A triangle made up of China, with its despotic government and closed economy, Japan, with its ambiguous policy decision-making process, and the United States, with its tradition of playing China and Japan against each other," he concludes, "could be a dangerous one."

Given the risks associated with trilateralism, it may make sense to add additional members to the security structure to reduce the likelihood of two countries ganging up against one. Minilateral arrangements consisting of a small number of participants (3-4)[20] may be considered. By virtue of their relatively small size it may be possible to give rise to such arrangements fairly quickly, deal with real security issues (like the cooperation on North Korean nuclear proliferation by the US, Japan, and South Korea), keep the arrangements focused and, once they have served their purpose, disband them (Cha 2003: 116-7).

Minilaterals whose members are great powers are referred to as *concerts*. In this form of collective security a small group of major powers cooperates to resist aggression, monitors events, and reaches decisions via consensus.[21] The most well-known concert is the Concert of Europe where Britain, Austria, Russia and Prussia managed to uphold the status quo on the European continent from the end of the Napoleonic Wars (1815) until the Crimean War (1854-56). Based on the stability the cooperation of the great four European powers brought,[22] Betts (1993/94: 75) suggests that, "if a concert of great powers in East Asia is feasible, we should seek it." At the same time, however, he seems to doubt the effectiveness of such a security provision for East Asia advising that "no one should depend on [a concert] to solve more than modest disputes" (ibid. 71).

Adding additional members to minilateral security structures leads to multilateral arrangements[23] and, when one thinks of these in the context of Asia, the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) comes to mind. Founded in 1967 by Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore, and Thailand to "demonstrate solidarity against communist expansion in Vietnam and insurgency within their own borders,"[24] today ASEAN consist of 10 members (Brunei, Vietnam, Laos, Myanmar, and Cambodia were added over time) and mainly seeks to promote economic and cultural cooperation. As Acharya (2003: 206) makes clear, however, ASEAN also has developed a number of security goals: it seeks to deny any power to dominate the region; works toward the peaceful management of regional territorial disputes; seeks to prevent an arms race and to keep the US strategically engaged in the region. Moreover, it tries to engage China rather than to contain it (ibid. 219). To accomplish its goals ASEAN prefers informal over structured talks, searches for consensus--though not necessarily unanimity--and

---

[20] In situations where there is a great likelihood of two countries ganging up against the third, obviously, a minilateral arrangement consisting of three participants would defeat its purpose, that is, to enhance the security of *all* participants.

[21] For a more detailed discussion of concerts, see Kupchan 1994.

[22] France was successfully brought back into the European security arrangement at the Congress of Aix-la-Chapelle in 1818.

[23] The cut-off point between these two institutional arrangements seems somewhat arbitrary.

[24] See http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/ASEAN

"attempt[s] to reconcile national strategies with multilateral norms and principles" (Acharya 2003: 254-268).

Aside from ASEAN other multilateral structures exist in the region to promote stability. The Northeast Asia Cooperation Dialogue (NEACD) founded in 1993, for example, brings together diplomats and members of the Defense Departments of China, the US, Russia, Japan, and South Korea to engage in "track-two" security dialogues. Similarly, the Council on Security Cooperation in the Asia-Pacific (CSCAP) founded in 1994 promotes track-two discussions. Unlike NEACD, however, CSCAP is a non-governmental organization that was created by research institutes in the region and its participants are individuals (Jin 2002: 192-3).

The ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF), also launched in 1994, is an informal multilateral dialogue mechanism of 26 members[25] who seek to address security issues in the Asia-Pacific region. Drawing upon the chief normative framework for inter-state behavior developed by ASEAN, namely the "Treaty of Amity and Cooperation," Acharya (2003: 185-9) explains, the chief purpose of ARF is to build "security with others rather than against them." Hence, whereas confidence building, preventive diplomacy, non-discrimination and transparency are encouraged, the organization discourages the use of force by members to settle disputes, but "does not make any provision for common action to punish an act of aggression" (Acharya 2003: 190). Some of the measures proposed by ARF include a regional arms register, the exchange of defense white papers, observers during military exercises, etc. (ibid. 190). And, with respect to the rivalry between the two big East Asian countries, Buzan and Weaver (2003: 158) argue, ARF "binds both Japan and China into a regional institutional framework, allowing Japan to address its historical problem, China to address fears of its neighbors, and both to avoid conspicuous balancing behavior towards each other."

To sum up, a variety of cooperative security arrangements presently exist in East Asia and the hub and spokes model discussed above, clearly, is of utmost importance. Yet there is recognition that sole reliance on a bilateral relationship with the US is insufficient (even dangerous), and that arrangements on multiple levels of governance and with varying degrees of commitment are desirable. As Huang (2002: 260), borrowing from Vinod Aggarwal suggests, "bilateral security arrangements should be nested into transregional security regimes such as ARF and CSCAP, so that the norms, rules and practices of transregional security regimes can transplant to bilateral security arrangements." Similarly, Katzenstein (2004:103), focusing on Japan, explains that the country favors bilateralism, yet, seeks to complement it with "embryonic multilateralism" (track-two dialogues) to create trust. Vaeyrynen (2001: 166) could not agree more. In his mind, Japan also seeks a multifaceted approach to security, namely "to deepen regional economic integration, enhance subregional security integration and mutual reassurance, and rely on firm and predictable US-Japanese cooperation."

What is also clear is that East Asians prefer a "gradual, incremental approach to cooperation over legalistic and fast-track modalities of institution-building" (Acharya 2003: 15). In other words, it is preferable to begin by building mutual trust, respect, and tolerance through regular talks and then graduate to more ambitious goals. "[C]onfidence-building measures, preventive diplomacy and conflict resolution," according to Lee (1997: 262), are the bottom line, and multilateral institutions, by "redefin[ing] identities and acceptable standards of behavior" (Katzenstein 2004: 120), and promoting greater transparency, are a good way of getting there.

And yet, ARF and CSCAP are "talk shops," …they do not negotiate treaties or impose formal obligations" (Simon 2001: 4). In fact, ARF, as Katzenstein (2004: 115) explains, "has sidestepped the most pressing security issues in Asia: conflicts on the Korean Peninsula, across the Taiwan Strait, and in the South China Sea."

---

[25] The current members of ARF consist of ASEAN plus Australia, Bangladesh, Canada, the People's Republic of China, the European Union, India, Japan, North Korea, South Korea, Mongolia, New Zealand, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Russia, East Timor, and the United States.

Does this make them paper tigers? Hardly. These institutions fulfill an important role: the creation of trust and reciprocity (Simon 2001: 4). By virtue of "[c]onsensus decision making [they] also permit some states to abstain from an agreement without obstructing the will of the majority," and thereby allow for greater flexible than unanimity rule (ibid). These institutions are vital when it comes to community building and their members hope that by engaging each other they can promote understanding, avoid problems from spiraling out of control, and over time create more sophisticated security structures that can cope with bigger problems. The idea is to acquire information and then, gradually, change interests and preferences. Or, as Johnston and Evans (1999: 264) put it, "the most important function of dialogue fora is not the rules they create but the suspicions they allay and the norms they reinforce." In the case of ARF and CSCAP this translates into the non-use of force for settling disputes.

Much like in Europe, it is hoped that integration in one area (for instance the economic realm) will spill over into others and facilitate cooperation there (Betts 1993/94: 72). But as European developments also have shown, this does not happen over night, nor should one expect smooth sailing all the way. As the failure of the European Defense Community (EDC), for instance, makes clear, it is likely that there will be occasional setbacks. In fact, the present "rise in political tensions and nationalism" in East Asia may constitute just that (Kaiser 2006: 96).

Strategic instability does exist in East Asia and the countries in the region seem to understand that it is in their interest to include their most likely adversaries in cooperative security arrangements, rather than to ally against them. Along those lines it, for instance, makes sense to include Japanese troops in multilateral peacekeeping, especially "if the alternative were Japanese remilitarization outside such a framework" (Betts 1993/94:57).[26] It may also be beneficial to create confidence-building measures in the region that resemble the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) of the 1970s (Kaiser 2006: 97). To mention but one further possibility, a multilateral arrangement resembling the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) may be of great help in stabilizing the region by making it virtually impossible for the members to go to war with each other.

What specific form cooperative security arrangements in the region will take in the not too distant future is still to be determined. What is clear is that these institutions will be "a compliment to, rather than substitute for, existing bilateral arrangements" (Acharya 2003: 195). In the words of Acharya (2003: 325) the "best prospects for the regulation of Great Power competition in Asia are through cross-cutting bilateral channels, with occasional resort to ad hoc multilateral consultations." He even goes further and suggests that, depending on the issues, a "division of labor" between ARF and something resembling a "concert" of the Great Powers may be desirable (ibid. 326).

Japan these days seeks to "hedge against possible Chinese hegemony" and tries to integrate China into the region (Green 1999: 165). China, likewise, seeks to take steps to prevent Japan's remilitarization. It is clear to all parties involved in East Asian security matters that institutions are not a "cure-all" but, due to the benefits outlined above, a step in the right direction. The goal is to encourage positive behavior when feasible, but have cooperative structures to rely on when benevolence fails to accomplish the desired outcome.

In the end, those who caution that East Asia is NOT Europe are correct. Whereas the Europeans already curtailed their freedom of action significantly in the early post-1945 period, introduced multilateral structures, and progressed fairly rapidly toward greater integration, the East Asians for a number of years relied on bilateral security arrangements with the US and only fairly recently began to experiment with multilateral security structures. Despite this delayed start and more incremental approach to trust building, this paper has shown, there are important lessons East Asia can learn from Europe when it comes to the process of security integration.

---

[26] Obviously, the case of German rearmament within a European Army to exercise control over the German military is important here.

First, the European case makes clear that historical legacies not only need to be addressed, but dealt with in a particular manner, to remove the big stumbling block these issues still represent for East Asia. Specifically, studies of European reconciliation identify elements (remembrance, restitution, apology) essential in coming to terms with the past and thereby provide East Asia with a blueprint that it can follow and, where needed, modify to account for differences in timing, cultural heterogeneity, etc. Second, to achieve the remarkable stability the Europeans have enjoyed since the end of World War II it appears to be beneficial, if not imperative, to coordinate security provisions on multiple levels and, over time, give rise to a complex web of governance that can allay suspicions, reinforce rules, and promote trust. Third, European integration also demonstrates that spillover from one area of cooperation to another is likely, but, that it is also likely that there will be setbacks on the road to greater institutionalization.

As the above discussion has shown, East Asians are no longer solely relying on their bilateral security relations with the US, but also imbedding their security provisions in regional institutional structures. ARF is no NATO or OSCE, but it does represent a step in the right direction. Similarly, Japanese Prime Minister Shinzo Abe's recent conciliatory moves toward China are encouraging. It is about time both Japan and China take concrete steps to deal with their historical legacies, remove remaining obstacles to cooperation, and move beyond talking. If Europe is any indication, Action Plans will have to be next.

Finally, conceptually speaking, if there are any lessons to be learned it is that regional stability assessments, by themselves, do not suffice to shed light on East Asian security provisions. To understand why East Asian countries have given rise to the specific security structures in existence today it is essential to "cross-fertilize" governance approaches with ideational and psychological conceptual frameworks. Reason clearly mattered in these decisions, but an accurate understanding of why the actors behaved the way they did cannot be obtained without examining their ideas and emotions.

Bibliography

Abbott, Kenneth and Duncan Snidal, "Hard and Soft Law in International Governance." *International Organization* 54, (2000), pp. 421-456.

Acharya, Amitav, *Regionalism and Multilateralism. Essays on Cooperative Security in the Asia-Pacific*, (Singapore: Eastern University Press, 2003).

Axelrod, R., *The Evolution of Cooperation*, (New York: Basic Books, 1984).

Axelrod, R., "An Evolutionary Approach to Norms," *American Political Science Review* 80, (1986), pp. 1095-1111.

Babb, Joseph G. D., "China: The Rising Power in Asia and Its Relations with Preemptive America – Emerging Strategic Partnership, Temporary Tactical Accommodation, or Both?" in William M. Carpenter and David G. Wiencek, eds., *Asian Security Handbook. Terrorism and the New Security Environment*, (New York: An East gate Book, 2004), pp. 95-115.

Barkan, Elazar and Alexander Karn, "Group Apology as an Ethical Imperative," in Elazar Barkan and Alexander Karn, eds., *Taking Wrongs Seriously: Apologies and Reconciliation*, (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2006), pp. 3-30.

Berger, Thomas U., "From Sword to Chrysanthemum: Japan's Culture of Anti-Militarism," in Michael E. Brown, Sean M. Lynn-Jones and Steven E. Miller, eds., *East Asian Security*, (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1996), pp. 300-331.

Berger, Thomas, *A Model Penitent? German Historical Memory and Foreign Policy in Comparative Perspective*, (San Diego, CA: International Studies Association, 2006).

Betts, Richard K., "Wealth, Power, and Instability: East Asia and the United States after the Cold War," *International Security*, Vol. 18, No. 3 (Winter, 1993-1994), pp. 34-77.

Bindenagel, J.D., "Justice, Apology, Reconciliation, and the German Foundation: 'Remembrance, Responsibility, and the Future,'" in Elazar Barkan and Alexander Karn, eds., *Taking Wrongs Seriously: Apologies and Reconciliation*, (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2006), pp. 286-310.

Black, Cyril E. et al., *Rebirth: A History of Europe Since World War II*, (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1992).

Bracken, Paul, "Technology and the Military Face of Asian Security," in Sheldon Simon *The Many Faces of Asian Security*, ed., (New York: Rowman and Littlefield, 2001).

Buzan Barry and Ole Waever, *Regions and Powers. The Structure of International Security*, (London: Cambridge University Press, 2003).

Carlson, Allen and J. J. Suh, "The Value of Rethinking East Asian Security: Denaturalizing and Explaining a Complex Security Dynamic," in J.J. Suh, Peter Katzenstein, and Allen Carlson, eds., *Rethinking Security in East Asia. Identity, Power, and Efficiency*, (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2004), pp. 209-234.

Cha, Victor D., "Engaging China: the View from Korea," in Alastair Iain Johnston and Robert S. Ross, eds., *Engaging China. The Management of an Emerging Power*, (London: Routledge, 1999), pp. 32-56.

Cha, Victor D., "The Dilemma of Regional Security in East Asia: Multilateralism Versus Bilateralism," in Paul F. Diehl and Joseph Lepgold, eds., *Regional Conflict Management*, (Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2003), pp. 104-122.

Christensen, Thomas J., and Jack Snyder, "Chain Gangs and Passed Bucks: Predicting Alliance Patterns in Multipolarity," *International Organization* 44 (1990), pp. 137-68.

Chung, Jae Ho, "South Korea between Eagle and Dragon: Perceptual Ambivalence and Strategic Dilemma," *Asian Survey*, Vol. 41, No. 5 (September/October 2001), pp. 777-796.

Cortell, A. P. and J. W. Davis Jr., "How Do International Institutions Matter? The Domestic Impact of Rules and Norms", *International Studies Quarterly* 40 (1996), pp. 451-78.

Dent, Christopher M., "Introduction: Northeast Asia – A Region in Search of Regionalism?" in Christopher M. Dent and David Huang W. F., eds., *Northeast Asian Regionalism. Learning from the European Experience*, (London: RoutledgeCurzon, 2002), pp. 1-15.

Dent, Christopher M., "The International Political Economy of Northeast Asias Economic Integration," in Christopher M. Dent and David Huang W. F., eds., *Northeast Asian regionalism. Learning from the European Experience*, (London: RoutledgeCurzon, 2002), pp. 65-95.

Deutsch, Karl and J. David Singer, "Multipolar Power Systems and International Stability," in James Rosenau, ed., *International Politics and Foreign Policy: A Reader in Research and Theory*, revised ed. (New York: The Free Press, 1969).

Dinan, Desmond, *Ever Closer Union? An Introduction to the European Community*, (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1994).

Dreyer, June Teufel, "China's Military Strategy Regarding Japan," in James R. Lilley and David Shambaugh, eds., *China's Military Faces the Future*, (Washington: AEI, 1999), pp. 322-243.

Dunsire, Andrew, "Modes of Governance," in Jan Kooiman, ed., *Modern Governance: New Government-Society Interactions.* (London: Sage, 1993).

Eising, Rainer and Beate Kohler-Koch, "Introduction: Network Governance in the European Union," in Beate Kohler-Koch and Rainer Eising, eds., *The Transformation of Governance in the European Union*, (New York: Routledge, 1999).

Emerson, Michael, *Institutionalising the Wider Europe Policy Brief 42*, (Brussels: Centre for European Policy Studies, 2003).

Friedberg, Aaron L., "Ripe for Rivalry: Prospects for Peace in a Multipolar Asia, *International Security*, Vol. 18, No. 3 (Winter, 1993-1994), pp. 5-33.

Funabashi, Yoichi, "The Asianization of Asia," *Foreign Affairs*, Vol.72, No. 5, (November/December 1993), pp. 75-85.

Gallagher, Michael G., "China's Illusory Threat to the South China Sea," *International Security*, Vol. 19, No.1 (Summer, 1994), pp. 169-194.

Garrett, Banning and Bonnie Glaser, "Chinese Apprehensions about Revitalization of the U.S.-Japan Alliance," *Asian Survey*, Vol. 37, No. 4 (April 1997), pp. 383-402.

Glaser, Bonnie S., "China's Security Perceptions: Interests and Ambitions," *Asian Survey*, Vol. 33, No. 3 (March 1993), pp. 252-271.

Green, Michael Jonathan, "Managing Chinese Power: the View from Japan," in Alastair Iain Johnston and Robert S. Ross, eds., *Engaging China. The Management of an Emerging Power*, (London: Routledge, 1999), pp. 152-175.

Grieco, Joseph, "Anarchy and the Limits of Cooperation: A Realist Critique of the Newest Liberal Institutionalism," in Baldwin David ed., *Neorealism and Neoliberalism,* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1993).

Gstoehl, Sieglinde, *Patchwork Europe? Towards a Continent of Variable Cooperation,* (Charleston, S.C.: European Community Studies Association, 1995).

Hemmer, Christopher, and Peter Katzenstein, "Why is There No NATO in Asia? Collective Identity, and the Origins of Multilateralism," *International Organization* Vol. 56, No. 3 (2002): 575-607.

Hettne, Bjorn, "Regionalism, Security and Development: A Comparative Perspective," in Bjorn Hettne, Andras Inotai, and Osvaldo Sunkel, eds., *Comparing Regionalism. Implications for Global Development*, (Great Britain: Palgrave, 2001), pp. 1-53.

Hoare James and Susan Pares, *Korea. An Introduction*, (London: Kegan Paul International, 1988).

Hooghe, Liesbet, and Gary Marks, "Unraveling the Central State, But How? Types of Multi-Level Governance," *American Political Science Review* Vol. 97 (2003), pp. 233-243.

Huang, David W. F., "Comparing Regionalism in Europe and Northeast Asia: Perspectives from the Epistemic Communities Approach," in Christopher M. Dent and David Huang W. F., eds., *Northeast Asian regionalism. Learning from the European Experience*, (London: RoutledgeCurzon, 2002), pp. 96-140.

Huang, David W. F., "Conclusion: Toward a Multi-Layered Issue Linkage Regionalism in Northeast Asia," in Christopher M. Dent and David Huang W. F., eds., *Northeast Asian regionalism. Learning from the European Experience*, (London: RoutledgeCurzon, 2002), pp. 243-264.

Hurtzig, Julia and Eberhard Sandschneider, "National Interest and Multilateral Cooperation. The PRC and its Policies towards APEC and ARF," in Jorn Dosch and Manfred Mols, eds., *International Relations in the Asia-Pacific. New Patterns of Power, Interest, and Cooperation*, (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2000), pp 215-242.

Hwang, Balbina Y., "The US-Korea Alliance on the Rocks: Shaken, Not Stirred," *Heritage Lectures* No. 970, (October 2006), pp. 1-6.

Ienaga, Saburo, "The Glorification of War in Japanese Education," in Michael E. Brown, Sean M. Lynn-Jones and Steven E. Miller, eds., *East Asian Security*, (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1996), pp. 332-351.

Jansen, Marius B., *The Making of Modern Japan*, (London: Cambridge University Press, 2002).

Jin, Guangyao, "The Security Situation and Co-operative Security in Northeast Asia," in Christopher M. Dent and David Huang W. F., eds., *Northeast Asian Regionalism. Learning from the European Experience*, (London: RoutledgeCurzon, 2002), pp. 187-205.

Johansson-Nogues, Elisabeth, *Network Governance and EU's Near Neighborhood*, (Mannheimer Zentrum fuer Europaeische Sozialforschung, 2003).

Johnston, Alastair Iain and Paul Evans, "China's Engagement with Multilateral Security Institutions," in Alastair Iain Johnston and Robert S. Ross, eds., *Engaging China. The Management of an Emerging Power*, (London: Routledge, 1999), pp. 235-272.

Kaiser, Karl, "European History 101 for Japan and China," *Internationale Politik* (Transatlantic Edition), Vol.7, No.3 (Summer 2006), pp. 90-97.

Kang, David C., "Getting Asia Wrong. The Need for New Analytical Frameworks," *International Security*, Vol. 27, No. 4 (Spring 2003), pp. 57-85.

Kansteiner, Wulf, "Losing the War, Winning the Memory Battle: The Legacy of Nazism, World War II, and the Holocaust in the Federal Republic of Germany," in Richard Ned Lebow, Wulf Kansteiner, and Claudio Fogu, eds., *The Politics of Memory in Postwar Europe*. (Durham: Duke University Press, 2006), pp. 102-146.

Kaplan, Lawrence S., *The Long Entanglement: Nato's First Fifty Years*, (Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers, 1999).

Katzenstein, J. Peter, ed., *The Culture of National Security*, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1996).

Katzenstein, J. Peter and Nobuo Okawara, "Japan's National Security: Structures, Norms, and Policies," in Michael E. Brown, Sean M. Lynn-Jones and Steven E. Miller, eds., *East Asian Security*, (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1996), pp. 265-299.

Katzenstein, J. Peter and Rudra Sil, "Rethinking Asian Security: A Case for Analytical Eclecticism," in J. J. Suh, Peter J. Katzenstein, and Allen Carlson, eds., *Rethinking Security in East Asia. Identity, Power, and Efficiency*, (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2004), pp. 1-33.

Katzenstein, J. Peter and Nobuo Okawara, "Japan and Asian-Pacific Security," in J. J. Suh, Peter J. Katzenstein, and Allen Carlson, eds., *Rethinking Security in East Asia. Identity, Power, and Efficiency*, (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2004), pp. 97-130.

Katzenstein, Peter, *A World of Regions: Asia and Europe in the American Imperium*, (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2005).

Keohane, Robert O., *After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984).

Keylor, William R., *The Twentieth Century World*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992).

Kim, Taeho, "Strategic Relations Between Beijing and Pyongyang. Growing Strains amid Lingering Ties," in James R. Lilley and David Shambaugh, eds., *China's Military Faces the Future*, (Washington: AEI, 1999), pp. 295-321.

Kliman, Daniel M., *Japan's Security Strategy in the Post-9/11 World*, (Washington: CSIS, 2006).

Klotz, Audie, "Norms Reconstituting Interests: Global Racial Equality and U.S. Sanctions Against South Africa," *International Organization* Vol. 49 No. 3 (1995), pp. 451-478.

Krasner, Stephen D., *International Regimes*, (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1983).

Kratochwil, Friedrich V., *Rules, Norms, and Decision: On the Contradictions of Practical and Legal Reasoning in International Relations and Domestic Affairs*, (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1989).

Krause, Joachim, "Overview," in A CAEC Task Force, ed., *Strengthening International Order. The Role of Asia-Europe Co-operation*. (London: CAEC, 2000), pp. 1-29.

Kristof, Nicholas D., "The Problem of Memory," *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 77, No. 6 (November/December 1998), pp. 37-49.

Kupchan, Charles, "The Case of Collective Security," in George Downs ed., *Collective Security Beyond the Cold War*, (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1994).

Lavanex, S., "EU External Governance in "Wider Europe"', *Journal of European Public Policy* 11 (2004), pp. 680-700.

Lebow, Richard Ned and Thomas Risse-Kappen eds., *International Relations Theory and the End of the Cold War*, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1995).

Lebow, Richard Ned, "The Memory of Politics in Postwar Europe," in Richard Ned Lebow, Wulf Kansteiner, and Claudio Fogu, eds., *The Politics of Memory in Postwar Europe*. (Durham: Duke University Press, 2006), pp. 1-39.

Lee, Lai To, "East Asia Assessments of China's Security Policy," *International Affairs*, Vol. 73, No. 2, (April 1997), pp. 251-262.

Lehmann, Jean-Pierre, "Peace and Prosperity Versus Protectionism and Conflict," in A CAEC Task Force, ed., *Strengthening International Order. The Role of Asia-Europe Co-operation*. (London: CAEC, 2000), pp. 108-134.

Lewis, David W. *The Road to Europe: History, Institutions and Prospects of European Integration 1945-1993*, (New York: Peter Lang, 1993).

Lipson, Charles, "Why Are Some International Agreements Informal?" *International Organization* 45 (1991), pp. 495-538.

Long, William, and Peter Brecke, *War and Reconciliation: Reason and Emotion in Conflict Resolution,* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2003).

Marks, Gary, Liesbet Hooghe, and Kermit Blank, "European Integration From the 1980s: State-Centric versus Multi-Level Governance," in Brent Nelsen and Alexander Stubb, eds., *The European Union: Readings on the Theory and Practice of European Integration*, (Boulder: Lynne Rienner, 1998).

McCormick, John, *Understanding The European Union: A Concise Introduction*, (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 1999).

McVadon, Eric A., "Chinese Military Strategy for the Korean Peninsula," in James R. Lilley and David Shambaugh, eds., *China's Military Faces the Future*, (Washington: AEI, 1999), pp. 271-294.

Mearsheimer, John, "Back to the Future: Instability in Europe After the Cold War," in Lynn-Jones and Steven E. Miller, eds., *East Asian Security*, (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1996).

Nadelmann, E. A., "Global Prohibition Regimes: The Evolution of Norms in International Society", *International Organization* Vol. 44 (1990), pp. 479-526.

Nugent, Neill, *The Government and Politics of the European Union*, (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan and Raleigh, NC: Duke University Press, 1999).

Onslow, C. G. D., "West German Rearmament," *World Politics*, Vol. 3 No. 4 (1951), pp. 450-485.

Oye, K., ed., *Cooperation under Anarchy*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986).

Ray, James Lee, *Global Politics*, (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1992).

Rose, Caroline, *Interpreting History in Sino-Japanese Relations: A Case Study in Political Decision-Making*, (London: Routledge, 1998).

Rose, Caroline, *Sino-Japanese Relations: Facing the Past, Looking to the Future?* (New York: RoutledgeCurzon, 2005).

Roy, Denny, "Hegemon on the Horizon? China's Threat to East Asian Security," *International Security*, Vol. 19, No. 1 (Summer 1994), pp. 149-168.

Saunders, R. Steven, "Japan: Untangling the Contradictions," in William M. Carpenter and David G. Wiencek, eds., *Asian Security Handbook. Terrorism and the New Security Environment*, (New York: An East gate Book, 2004), pp. 143-159.

Scharpf, Fritz, "What Have We Learned? Problem-Solving Capacity of the Multi-Level European Polity," *Max Planck Institute for the Study of Societies Working Paper* (July, 2001).

Schulz, Michael, Fredrik Soderbaum and Joakim Ojendal, "Key Issues in the New Regionalism: Comparisons from Asia, Africa, and the Middle East," in Bjorn Hettne, Andras Inotai, and Osvaldo Sunkel, eds., *Comparing Regionalism. Implications for Global Development*, (Great Britain: Palgrave, 2001), pp. 234-276.

Shambaugh, David, "China and Japan towards the Twenty-First Century: Rivals for Pre-eminence or Complex Interdependence?" in Christopher Howe, ed., *China and Japan: History, Trends, and Prospects*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), pp. 90-01.

Shambaugh, David, "China Engages Asia. Reshaping the Regional Order," *International Security* Vol. 29, No. 3 (Winter 2004/2005), pp. 64-99.

Simon, Sheldon W., "Introduction," in Sheldon W. Simon, ed., *The Many Faces of Asian Security*, (Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2001), pp. 1-11.

Smith, Michael E., *Europe's Foreign and Security Policy: The Institutionalization of Cooperation*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).

Solomon, Richard H. and William M. Drennan, "Conclusion: Forward to the Past?" in Sheldon W. Simon, ed., *The Many Faces of Asian Security*, (Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2001), pp. 231-242.

Stein, A.A., *Why Nations Cooperate: Circumstance and Choice in International Relations*, (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990).

Suzuki, Shogo, "Responsible Scholarship in Sino-Japanese Relations." Paper presented at the International Studies Association conference, Chicago, IL, March 2, 2007.

Sweet, Alec Stone, and Wayne Sandholtz, eds., *Supranational Governance: The Institutionalization of the European Union*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998).

Takahashi, Tetsuya, "The National Politics of the Yasukuni Shrine," (translated by Philip Seaton) in Naoko Shimazu, ed., *Nationalism in Japan*, (New York: Routledge, 2006), pp. 155-180.

Tan, See Seng and Ralph A. Costa, "Rescuing Realism from the Realists: A Theoretical Note on the East Asian Security, in Sheldon W. Simon, ed., *The Many Faces of Asian Security*, (Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2001), pp. 15-48.

Teitel, Ruti, "The Transitional Apology," in Elazar Barkan and Alexander Karn, eds., *Taking Wrongs Seriously: Apologies and Reconciliation*, (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2006), pp. 101-114.

Ullman, Richard H., *Securing Europe*, (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1991).

Vaeyrynen, Raimo, "Post-Hegemonic and Post-Socialist Regionalism: A Comparison of East Asia and Central Europe, in Bjorn Hettne, Andras Inotai, and Osvaldo Sunkel, eds.,

Comparing Regionalism. Implications for Global Development, (Great Britain: Palgrave, 2001), pp. 132-186.

Van Evera, Stephen, "Primed for Peace: Europe After the Cold War," in Lynn-Jones and Steven E. Miller, eds., *East Asian Security*, (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1996).

Van Vranken Hickey, Dennis, "South Korea: An Emerging Power in the Pacific," in William M. Carpenter and David G. Wiencek, eds., *Asian Security Handbook. Terrorism and the New Security Environment*, (New York: An East gate Book, 2004), pp. 264-272.

Vohra, Ranbir, *China's Path to Modernization. A Historical Review from 1800 to the Present*, (New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 2000).

Walt, Stephen M., *The Origins of Alliances*, (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1988).

Waltz, Kenneth, *Theory of International Politics*, (New York: Random House, 1979).

Wang Fei-Ling, "Stability with Uncertainties: US-China Relations and the Korean Peninsula," in Tae-Hwan Kwak and Seung-Hoo Joo, eds., *The United States and the Korean Peninsula in the 21st Century*, (Ashgate, 2006), chap. 9.

Weber, Katja, "Hierarchy Amidst Anarchy: A Transaction Costs Approach to International Security Cooperation*," International Studies Quarterly* (1997), pp. 321-340.

Weber, Katja, *Hierarchy Amidst Anarchy: Transaction Costs and Institutional Choice,* (New York: SUNY Press, 2000).

Weber, Katja and Mark Hallerberg, "Explaining Variation in Institutional Integration in the European Union: Why Firms May Prefer European Solutions?" *Journal of European Public Policy* 8/2: (2001), pp. 171-191.

Weber, Katja, Michael E. Smith, and Michael Baun, eds., (forthcoming), *Governing Europe's Neighborhood: Partners or Periphery?* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007).

Weber, Katja, and Michael E. Smith, "Governance Theories, Regional Integration, and EU Foreign Policy," in Katja Weber, Michael E. Smith, and Michael Baun, eds., (forthcoming), *Governing Europe's New Neighborhood: Partners or Periphery?* (Manchester: Manchester University Press: 2007).

Williamson, Olliver, "Transaction-Cost Economics: The Governance of Contractual Relations," *Journal of Law and Economics* 22 (1979), pp. 233-261.

Williamson, Olliver, *The Economic Institutions of Capitalism: Firms, Markets and Relational Contracting*, (New York: Free Press, 1985).

Wu, Xinbo, "The Security Dimension of Sino-Japanese Relations: Warily Watching One Another," *Asian Survey*, Vol. 40, No. 2 (March/April 2000), pp. 296-310.

Zhao, Suisheng, "Chinese Nationalism and Its International Orientations," *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol. 115, No. 1 (2000), pp. 1-33.