

The U.S. Policy of Extended Deterrence in East Asia: History, Current Views, and Implications

The U.S. Policy of Extended Deterrence in East Asia: History, Current Views, and Implications

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

THE AUTHOR WISHES TO ACKNOWLEDGE the collegial assistance of the other participants in Brookings's project on extended deterrence, and particularly the leadership of Steven Pifer. He also is grateful for the support of MacArthur Foundation and Ploughshares Fund.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ii
1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
2. THE HISTORICAL RECORD	2
3. THE SECURITY ENVIRONMENT TODAY	5
4. WHAT TO DO?	13
5. THE REAL CHALLENGES FOR EXTENDED DETERRENCE IN ASIA	18
6. RECOMMENDATIONS	21
ENDNOTES	23
ABOUT THE AUTHOR	26

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

EXTENDED NUCLEAR DETERRENCE has been one element of the broader United States security policy towards East Asia. Because Washington has been willing to threaten the use of nuclear weapons against adversaries of its allies, those allies have felt less compelled to pursue a nuclear option. Taiwan and South Korea did try during the Cold War, only to be dissuaded by the United States. Japan and Australia have occasionally considered the option, only to remain under the shelter of the U.S. nuclear umbrella.

The end of the Cold War, the region's rise on the global economic and security agendas, and recent shifts in U.S. nuclear policy have modified the extended deterrence dilemma but have not negated it. Conservative and progressive observers in Australia, Japan, and South Korea have conflicting views on the implications of that dilemma for their security. They and their respective governments view documents like the 2010 U.S. Nuclear Posture Review through the prism of long-standing expectations and anxieties about American credibility and resolve regarding a resurgent China and an unpredictable North Korea.

Given the uncertainty about Chinese, North Korean, and U.S. intentions, some American allies proposed the creation of a mechanism akin to the nuclear planning group in NATO, a body where the

alliance's nuclear and non-nuclear powers discuss how nuclear weapons might be used in a conflict. This proposal ignores the fact that the geopolitics and power asymmetries of Cold War Europe are different than those of contemporary East Asia and how conflict might occur. So any such mechanism created with Australia, South Korea, and Japan would have to be adapted to regional realities. In particular, it should be part of a larger multilateral effort to reassure China that it is not the object of containment and so reduce the salience of nuclear weapons in the PRC's security planning.

In the short term, the United States and its allies should both reaffirm their interest in a balanced settlement of the North Korea nuclear issue and stress the need to prepare for the possible collapse of North Korea. In the medium term, the United States should continue to pursue a dialogue with China on strategic weapons *and* consider establishing bilateral channels for consultations with the governments of Australia, South Korea, and Japan on the requirements and needs of effective extended deterrence, including considerations that would guide U.S. nuclear weapons use. And it should continue to encourage the process of reconciliation underway between the two sides of the Taiwan Strait, since that process reduces the possibility of conflict between the United States and China.

2. THE HISTORICAL RECORD

Michael Dobbs' *One Minute to Midnight* tells the riveting tale of how close the United States and the Soviet Union came to nuclear war, despite the efforts of American and Soviet policy-makers to avoid catastrophe. John Kennedy's job was hard enough: striking the right balance between the security of the homeland and the preservation of peace. But Nikita Khrushchev faced an even greater dilemma once the United States discovered his plot to make Cuba a nuclear base, thanks to Fidel Castro. Once *el Comandante* concluded that an American invasion was imminent, he demanded that Khrushchev consider launching a preemptive nuclear strike against the United States.¹ Khrushchev no doubt asked himself, "Why should I use nuclear weapons to defend my ally when it will likely bring an all-out nuclear attack on my country?" He had to balance the survival of his ally, the security of his homeland, and the preservation of peace.

This precisely captures the dilemma of extended deterrence, where a nuclear power expands the umbrella of nuclear protection to a friend or ally. Deterrence is based on a defending state's persuading a potential adversary that the risks and costs of his proposed action are far greater than any gains that he might hope to achieve. When the defending state threatens to use nuclear weapons to retaliate for an adversary's attack against its homeland, the credibility of that warning is high (but not absolute). But extended deterrence is far more difficult to make credible. Both the adversary state and the defended third party would have reason to question whether the defending state would actually risk its own security for the sake of that third party.

Two years after the Cuban missile crisis, in October 1964, China tested a nuclear device. Four of America's East Asian allies grew so concerned about the credibility of the U.S. pledge to come to their defense with nuclear weapons if necessary that they either pursued an independent nuclear deterrent or considered doing so.² Taiwan and South Korea actually tried. Australia took initial steps. And Japan periodically considered abandoning its aversion to nuclear weapons.

TAIWAN

Taiwan was the first to pursue a nuclear weapons program. A research program began in the late 1950s, and the prospect that China would soon become a nuclear power triggered the transition from research to development in 1964. Republic of China (ROC) President Chiang Kai-shek and his son Chiang Ching-kuo worried that a Chinese nuclear capability would render the island increasingly vulnerable and deter any effort to retake the Mainland. They rejected advice that the project would be too expensive.³

Reinforcing the Chiangs' choice was declining confidence in the support of the United States. The Kennedy and Johnson Administrations rejected Chiang's proposals for intervention in China and proposed a "two-Chinas" solution for the United Nations. The United States was increasingly bogged down in Vietnam and, under the Nixon Doctrine, sought to shift more of the defense burden to its allies. Adding panic to anxiety, Nixon in 1971 initiated a rapprochement with Beijing at Taiwan's expense.

To cope with this deteriorating security environment, the ROC government began to acquire the elements of a reprocessing-based weapons program in the late 1960s and accelerated the program in the 1970s. After the United States discovered the effort by 1974, both the Ford and Carter Administrations exerted pressure to end it. But Chiang Ching-kuo continued it surreptitiously until 1988, when Washington gained new intelligence and exerted sufficient diplomatic pressure to shut down the program for good.⁴

SOUTH KOREA

South Korea's nuclear trajectory was similar. Even after the Korean War, the Republic of Korea (ROK) had some doubts about American resolve to defend it against external attack, but the deepest anxiety occurred during the 1960s and 1970s.⁵ Prior to that time, South Korea was reassured by the mutual defense treaty and the deployment of, first, U.S. troops and then tactical nuclear weapons on to the peninsula. Thereafter, North Korea (or the Democratic People's Republic of Korea—DPRK) increased its armed provocations, for example, its capture of an ROK naval vessel in June 1970. Soon thereafter, the Nixon Administration decided to withdraw one division from the peninsula without consulting Seoul and in spite of President Park Chung Hee's strong, subsequent objections. He therefore undertook a program of "self-reliant national defense" but concluded that building a sufficient conventional deterrent would be expensive and time-consuming. In the early 1970s, therefore, a nuclear weapons program began. Thus, this initiative had two drivers: Seoul's increasingly dire threat perception concerning North Korea and an apparent weakening of the U.S. security commitment.

In response, Washington tried to leverage an end to the South Korean initiative, threatening in the mid-1970s to withdraw U.S. troops and ending military and financial assistance. Park parried by temporarily suspending some parts of the program and ratifying the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). Yet work continued on a covert basis. U.S.-ROK relations deteriorated generally under the Carter Administration until Washington abandoned its

troop withdrawal plan and Park Chung Hee was assassinated in October 1979. Thereafter, confidence in the U.S. security commitment grew in fits and starts while South Korea became increasingly relaxed about the threat from the weakening North. In effect, Seoul committed itself to a non-nuclear policy. The high point, at least on paper, was the North-South Joint Declaration of the Denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula, signed in February 1992, in which both sides pledged not to "test, manufacture, produce, receive, possess, store, deploy, or use nuclear weapons," and foreswore reprocessing and enrichment facilities.⁶ South Korea has kept up its side of the deal, while North Korea has violated it.

AUSTRALIA

During the 1950s and early 1960s, Australia's consistent strategy for surviving in a nuclear world was to bind its allies, first Great Britain and then the United States, as closely as possible. There were elements of the government that argued for a plutonium stockpile as early as the 1950s, but to no avail. China's nuclear test in 1964 increased the sense of vulnerability, but the binding strategy continued.

The selection of John Gorton as prime minister in 1968 brought the only deviation from Australia's non-nuclear policy. A nationalist, Gorton favored an independent nuclear capability to supplement reliance on the United States guarantee. After extended debate, Canberra chose to sign but not ratify the NPT. Gorton also initiated programs to accumulate both plutonium and enriched uranium. Yet he only remained in office until 1971, not long enough to place the programs on a sustainable basis, nor to build public support for them. When the Labor government of Gough Whitlam came into office, it continued the policy of security dependence on the United States and supplemented it with strong support for the nonproliferation regime. In effect, Australia no longer feared the ghost of nuclear vulnerability.⁷

JAPAN

Of all four U.S. allies, Japan was the most ambivalent regarding nuclear weapons. It faced the same

security environment as its neighbors, one that did not inspire complacency. Yet the searing experience of Hiroshima and Nagasaki had left an enduring impact. National security was a divisive political issue, with nuclear weapons and extended deterrence as important elements. Three schools of thought emerged on how to insure the country's survival. Pacifists believed that the best way was neutrality and strict adherence to the anti-war, anti-military provisions of the constitution (Article 9). On the other side were revisionists who argued that Japan should again be a "normal" nation and rely primarily on itself for its defense. In the middle was the mainstream, which believed that the best approach was to rebuild Japan's economic power and depend on the United States for security. This latter approach was dominant during the Cold War, but it gave something to pacifists as well: a small and over-regulated defense establishment. This center-left consensus marginalized the right.⁸

But each major shift in the East Asia security situation tested this consensus. And on several occasions, the nuclear option received at least some attention. China's test of a nuclear device in 1964 and the multilateral negotiations on the NPT was the first, to which there was a dual response. In September 1967, Prime Minister Eisaku Sato enunciated as a matter of policy that Japan would neither manufacture nor possess nuclear weapons, nor allow them into its territory, territorial waters, or airspace. (Revisionists had argued as a matter of law that Japan was not

precluded from possessing nuclear weapons if they were necessary to exercise the right of self defense.) At the same time, Tokyo quietly ignored the third of these restrictions to accommodate forward deployment of nuclear weapons by the United States. And it authorized a covert study of the nuclear option. It concluded that a nuclear program would be very expensive and entail significant domestic and external political costs. The best option was to continue to rely on American extended deterrence.

New studies were conducted in 1970, in the context of the Nixon doctrine, and in the early 1990s, after the end of the Cold War. The result was the same in each case, and became enshrined in Japan's key documents on defense policy. The prospect of Soviet deployment of intermediate-range nuclear missiles in Asia at the end of the 1970s prompted similar concerns, which the Reagan Administration forestalled by negotiating the 1987 Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty, which banned all U.S. and Soviet intermediate-range missiles with ranges between 500 and 5,500 kilometers. With each strategic shift, Japan ensured, subtly or otherwise, that Washington knew of its anxieties, in order to encourage American reaffirmation of extended deterrence. Michael Green and Katsuhisa Furukawa conclude: "The history of the development of the U.S.-Japan alliance demonstrates one consistent pattern: whenever Japan has debated new security arrangements at a time of strategic shift in the environment, it has consistently selected pragmatic arrangements."⁹

3. THE SECURITY ENVIRONMENT TODAY

THE END OF THE U.S. NUCLEAR PRESENCE AND THE NUCLEAR POSTURE REVIEW

The security environment in East Asia has evolved considerably since the time, four decades ago, when the region approached something of a nuclear tipping point. China embarked in 1979 on a systematic and sustained program of self-strengthening that started in the economic system but is now bearing fruit in the military realm. Steadily, the People's Liberation Army is both acquiring conventional power-projection capabilities and modernizing its nuclear arsenal. China's economic growth has benefitted the countries of East Asia enormously. Militarily, however, Beijing's growing power fosters new anxieties, particularly in the context of perceptions of American over-extension or decline. North Korea embarked on its own weapons program, and tested a nuclear device in 2006 and another in 2009, raising concerns in South Korea and Japan.

For America's East Asian allies, North Korea and/or China pose the most significant concerns (but not the only ones). It is important to remember, however, that the conventional balance in East Asia still favors the defenders. Japan, Taiwan, and Australia are protected by significant bodies of water, and the U.S. Seventh Fleet remains the strongest naval force in the Pacific. As for South Korea, North Korea's conventional capabilities, while certainly not trivial, are degrading.

It should be noted that the East Asian security environment differs from that in Europe in two key

respects. First of all, the U.S. nuclear deterrent in Europe is embedded in the American commitment to the NATO alliance, particularly Article V of the Washington Treaty. By contrast, the United States has no parallel multilateral alliance structure in East Asia. The U.S. extended deterrent there is based on bilateral relationships and agreements, so any nuclear debate there will be viewed mainly through a bilateral lens.

Second, the U.S. nuclear commitment to Europe is underpinned in part by the presence of U.S. nuclear weapons deployed on the territory of NATO allies, some of whom maintain dual-capable aircraft that are equipped to deliver U.S. nuclear weapons. The United States never maintained such relationships with its Asian allies, under which it would make nuclear weapons available to them in the most extreme circumstances. Moreover, the United States withdrew all tactical nuclear weapons from South Korea during the George H. W. Bush Administration. At about the same time, the U.S. Navy removed all nuclear weapons from its submarines and surface ships, except for those on Trident missiles on ballistic missile submarines. This included removal of nuclear-armed sea-launched cruise missiles (SLCMs), which some had seen as providing an in-theater nuclear presence. Thus, since the early 1990s, the U.S. extended nuclear deterrent for its East Asian allies has been provided by U.S. strategic nuclear forces, either deployed in the United States or aboard Trident ballistic missile submarines.

Given the fact that there are no U.S. nuclear weapons on East Asian territory, there is no debate there

about withdrawal of those weapons. It is difficult to imagine the circumstances under which U.S. tactical nuclear weapons might be returned to the region. So long as the United States maintained nuclear-armed SLCMs in storage, it had the option of redeploying them on general purpose submarines and surface ships in the Pacific to demonstrate a visible presence of the extended deterrent. That option will be eliminated when the nuclear-tipped Tomahawk SLCMs are retired, as announced in the April 2010 Nuclear Posture Review. The review did note that the United States would maintain heavy bombers and fighter-bombers with nuclear capability that could, if necessary, be forward deployed. And the U.S. Air Force regularly deploys B-2 and B-52 strategic bombers to Guam; however, although the United States once deployed a variety of tactical nuclear weapons on Guam, there are none there now.

As for nuclear policy, the Nuclear Posture Review stated that the United States would work to create the conditions under which it could adopt a policy in which the “sole purpose” of nuclear weapons would be to deter a nuclear attack on the United States, its allies, and partners. The Nuclear Posture Review also modified U.S. negative security assurances, stating that the United States would not use nuclear weapons if it was attacked by a country—even with chemical or biological weapons—that was a non-nuclear weapons state in full compliance with its NPT obligations.

The Obama Administration’s Nuclear Posture Review will be judged by America’s East Asian allies in this security context. They will assess the effectiveness of the U.S. extended deterrent in light of recent power shifts. Some might see the current situation—in which geography and conventional forces make conventional defense credible—as permitting this shift in U.S. declaratory policy, or even allowing for a more radical policy change (though the Administration rejected a “no first use” policy). The review, however, will be carefully, even obsessively, studied by governments and security analysts in the region. And whatever sensible reasons the Obama Administration might have for making the shift (e.g., to reduce the role of nuclear weapons in U.S.

strategy, the conventional threat to U.S. friends and allies is modest at best), the response in East Asia, at least initially, will be to see dark clouds as well as silver linings.

TAIWAN

There is no evidence that Taiwan has pursued a nuclear weapons capability since the United States shut down its program in 1988 (or even thought about pursuing one). That is ironic, as of all U.S. allies and friends in East Asia, it is probably Taiwan that has the biggest strategic reason to exercise the nuclear option. China is building the capability to project power steadily and systematically, in particular against Taiwan. The United States will not provide an explicit pledge to come to Taiwan’s defense with either conventional or nuclear forces, in part because Beijing explicitly claims the island as its own. Taiwan security planners certainly *hope* that the United States will come to its aid in a crisis, and from experience they know that the chances of that intervention shrink to a very low level if Taiwan were to pursue the nuclear option. Hence, the island’s leaders cannot afford to dwell on the intricacies of extended deterrence. Rather they must have faith in American support.

Security experts on Taiwan will study carefully the language of the Nuclear Posture Review. The negative security assurance language applies to non-nuclear weapons states in compliance with their obligations under the NPT and does not apply to China, a nuclear weapons state. But Taiwan strategists will weigh what the changes in U.S. policy mean more broadly for the possibility of the United States using nuclear weapons to respond to a conventional attack on the island, and whether those changes weaken deterrence—even though the United States has no formal commitment to Taiwan.¹⁰

AUSTRALIA

Australia would seem an unlikely candidate for a case of extended-deterrence anxiety. It is in the southern hemisphere, while matters of nuclear strategy are more common north of the equator. The

country's commitment to the non-proliferation regime is strong, and the Labour Party has a strong nuclear allergy. Yet there is something of a debate among Australian security specialists over extended deterrence. Some ask whether it remains possible. Others ask whether it is necessary.

The position of the Australian government is stated in its defense white paper. The 2009 version provides a clear formulation: “[F]or so long as nuclear weapons exist, we are able to rely on the nuclear forces of the United States to deter nuclear attack on Australia... That protection provides a stable and reliable sense of assurance and has over the years removed the need for Australia to consider more significant and expensive defence options.”¹¹

The logic chain behind this conclusion is straightforward: the *nuclear* threat to Australia is remote; if there is a threat, it comes from rogue states like North Korea and Iran; Australia may rely on the *nuclear* forces of the United States to deter a *nuclear* attack on Australia; that “sense of assurance” has negated the need to consider an independent nuclear option.

More conservative observers are alert to the possibility that the assumptions of this policy, which has guided Australia for most of the last six decades, may erode.¹² For them, the revival of China and India as great powers forms the broad strategic context. China, North Korea, India, and Pakistan already possess nuclear weapons, and many believe that Japan could acquire them quickly with a radical policy shift. Indonesia, faced with a strong India and China, might someday seek to acquire a modest nuclear capability. That in turn would render Australia less secure.

Another critical factor is declining confidence in the credibility of U.S. extended deterrence. Key here is China's growing relative power vis-à-vis the United States, which weakens its respect for American dominance and might lead Washington to “choose to defend a narrower set of vital interests.”¹³ And American and Australian interests regarding China might diverge, with the United States giving greater priority to security issues and Australia giving more to economic ones.

In light of these trends, Australians are weighing what to do. One conservative observer considers the option of an independent nuclear force and a robust ballistic missile defense, but finds that the long-standing obstacles to the former still remain and that the latter would be expensive and might be ineffective. In the end, he argues that Canberra should “emulate the Japanese model and adopt a multi-layered strategic approach, which at once hedges against future uncertainties [through BMD and a civilian nuclear power industry], but which preserves the proliferation status quo.”¹⁴ Extended deterrence would remain as one layer of this approach.

Although the Nuclear Posture Review rejected the option, Australian conservatives might have been prepared to regard a shift in U.S. declaratory policy in the direction of “no first use” as intellectually acceptable. Any country that might wish Australia ill is more likely to use nuclear weapons than a conventional attack, because Australia's rather robust conventional forces and geography would probably defeat any conventional attack. They would have seen outright adoption of a “sole purpose” U.S. policy (that the only purpose of nuclear weapons is to deter a nuclear attack on the United States, its allies, and partners) as preferable to a simple adoption of “no first use.” Psychologically, however, and absent U.S. efforts to reaffirm extended deterrence, even a shift to a “sole purpose” formula would have reinforced the doubts that conservatives have about the credibility of the American commitment.

For its part, the Australian government welcomed the release of the U.S. Nuclear Posture Review, and asserted that its goals of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation were consistent with its own, long-standing objectives. With respect to extended deterrence, Canberra said the following: “Australia encourages strengthened security assurances from nuclear-weapon to non-nuclear weapon states, with fewer caveats than the current negative security assurances.”¹⁵

The most cogent, progressive voice in Australia on extended deterrence is probably that of Gareth Evans, a former foreign minister. He is the co-chair and intellectual force behind the International Commission

on Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament, an Australian-Japanese collaborative project. The commission's report, issued in December 2009, took as its premise the conviction that "the risks associated with a nuclear world are unacceptable over the long-term, and that eliminating them requires eliminating nuclear arsenals."¹⁶ On extended deterrence, it reached the realistic conclusion that America's allies will rely on the U.S. nuclear umbrella for some time to come, but argues that Washington should be able to reassure them of its commitment as a transition towards a non-nuclear world occurs. It suggests that, when it comes to non-nuclear attacks on U.S. allies (e.g., with chemical or biological weapons), U.S. conventional capabilities provide a sufficiently robust deterrent. The report warns against U.S. allies increasing the emphasis on nuclear weapons at a time when the goal is to reduce their number.¹⁷ Regarding American declaratory policy, Evans and his colleagues propose that nuclear-weapons states commit to "no first use" by 2025 and in the interim "accept the principle that the 'sole purpose' of possessing nuclear weapons is to deter others from using such weapons against that state or its allies."¹⁸ There is much in the Nuclear Posture Review's conclusions for Evans to like.

SOUTH KOREA

At the July 2009 meeting of the U.S.-Republic of Korea Strategic Dialogue, sponsored by Pacific Forum CSIS, a group of South Korean officials and scholars talked at length about extended deterrence.¹⁹ Shaping their specific concerns were two more general and long-standing anxieties. On the one hand, South Korea is surrounded by larger and in some cases nuclear-armed neighbors. On the other, it doubts whether it can absolutely trust the United States to supplement, where necessary, its own efforts to ensure security. This combination of perceived relative weakness and fear of abandonment has fostered a strong desire for American reassurance in words and deeds, which could be affected by the change in U.S. declaratory nuclear policy in the Nuclear Posture Review.

For these Koreans, the starting point is U.S. policy toward North Korea's nuclear problem, both in

terms of substance and process. Before the Obama Administration took office there had been a palpable fear on the part of South Koreans that Washington would deal with Pyongyang on a bilateral basis and marginalize Seoul in the process (as it had during the mid-1990s). The Obama Administration effectively allayed those fears by responding to the DPRK's missile and nuclear tests in the spring of 2009 with firmness and close consultation with South Korea, but South Koreans worry that sooner or later the United States will abandon the goal of denuclearization of North Korea, be willing to tolerate its retention of nuclear weapons, and try to "manage" the proliferation problem. They argue that Washington should make absolutely clear that its stated goals are its real goals and that it will not tolerate a nuclear North Korea.

It was this mentality that infused the drafting of the security portions of the U.S.-ROK joint vision statement, which was promulgated at the time of the June 2009 summit between Presidents Obama and Lee Myung-bok. Reportedly at South Korean request, the statement specifically reaffirmed extended deterrence with a nuclear dimension. It said that the United States and the ROK "will maintain a robust defense posture, backed by allied capabilities which support both nations' security interests. The *continuing commitment* of extended deterrence, including the U.S. nuclear umbrella, reinforces this assurance. In advancing the bilateral plan for restructuring the alliance, the Republic of Korea will take the lead role in the combined defense of Korea, supported by an enduring and capable U.S. military force presence on the Korean Peninsula, in the region, and beyond."²⁰

There are some interesting wrinkles to this desire for Washington to reaffirm its commitment. First of all, some South Koreans see North Korea as the primary target of deterrence and by and large do not regard China as a nuclear problem. Japan, on the other hand, is not irrelevant because a failure to denuclearize or otherwise constrain North Korea might lead Tokyo to pursue a nuclear option. These South Koreans are not worried about the implications of deep cuts for the American extended-deterrence commitment.

Their principal concern is whether Washington has the will to use nuclear weapons if deterrence fails.²¹

These views reflect the more conservative part of the South Korean spectrum. Progressives accept the ideal of a nuclear-weapons-free Korean peninsula. As a practical matter, they by and large recognize that extended deterrence is widely regarded as legitimate, and thus see no grounds to argue as a matter of principle that it is unnecessary. (Only those who advocate the withdrawal of U.S. armed forces from the Korean peninsula would argue, in addition, that extended deterrence be abandoned.) On the other hand, the South Koreans see a downside to the U.S. commitment to defend South Korea with nuclear weapons if necessary: North Korea can use the U.S. pledge as a pretext to delay its denuclearization. In particular, they regard the oft-used term “nuclear umbrella” as unnecessarily provocative to Pyongyang and would prefer consistent use of the term “extended deterrence.” But progressive scholars have been reluctant to express their views on extended nuclear deterrence since North Korea carried out its first nuclear test in October 2006.²² The Nuclear Posture Review, which leaves North Korea outside of U.S. negative security assurances as long as it continues to violate its nuclear obligations, will not address this downside.

By excluding North Korea in this way, the United States *is not* renegeing upon the DPRK-specific negative security assurance it provided to Pyongyang during the six-party talks regarding the latter’s nuclear programs—even though the DPRK has accused the U.S. of doing just that.²³ In the joint declaration concluded by the six parties on September 19, 2005, Washington “affirmed that it has . . . no intention to attack or invade the DPRK with nuclear or conventional weapons.”²⁴ But the premise of that promise is that North Korea is in compliance with the NPT. Should North Korea resume compliance in a credible way, including giving up its nuclear weapons, the Nuclear Posture Review’s negative security assurance would apply to it.

Even if this commitment stands, it is not inconsistent with the reaffirmation of extended deterrence by

the United States and South Korea in the June 2009 summit cited above. Nor is that defensive U.S.-ROK approach to extended deterrence necessarily inconsistent with a broader sort of no first use pledge by the United States. Korean experts do not regard one as a problem. Progressives certainly would have responded positively to some sort of U.S. “no first use” policy or to a “sole purpose” statement. At the July 2009 dialogue cited above, more conservative Korean scholars expressed no anxiety about the possibility of Washington making a “no first use” pledge. (One of them, Dr. Taewoo Kim, wrote in a separate essay that “even if the U.S. were to come back to a no first use . . . and no first strike . . . policy, there may be no ripple effect for extended deterrence,” because the latter applies only to situations where North Korea strikes first.²⁵)

There was no official ROK response to the Nuclear Posture Review, but analysts from the Foreign Ministry’s think tank observed that less reliance on in-region tactical nuclear weapons and more on theater missile defense and advanced conventional forces “raises the concern that U.S. deterrence capability achieved *with nuclear weapons* could be weakened, including U.S. extended deterrence capabilities provided to South Korea.”²⁶ (Note that the review’s conclusion not to respond with nuclear weapons to a chemical weapons or biological weapons attack does not apply to North Korea, as it is out of compliance with its NPT obligations.) Possibly exacerbating these concerns were the projected change in wartime operational control of allied Peninsular forces and the uncertainty over the future level of deployed U.S. forces. Together, they could spell “a weaker defense capability of the ROK vis-à-vis North Korea” and “a weakening of defense capability to the Korean people.”²⁷ South Korean security planners understandably will evaluate the likely U.S. response to the full spectrum of possible North Korean actions (including, for example, a *conventional* attack) and the likely effects on North Korean risk calculations. Parsing the Nuclear Posture Review is only part of the larger evaluation. What is important, as Taewoo Kim concludes, is the broader context of American policy: that the United States has the capacity and resolve to respond to North Korean attacks.²⁸

JAPAN

Although concerns about the U.S. commitment led Japan on several occasions to give at least some abstract thought to the nuclear option, it never took action to begin a program, as did Taiwan, South Korea, and Australia. Because the United States agreed that it could create a complete nuclear fuel cycle and reprocess spent fuel, Japan has a substantial amount of plutonium (all under safeguards). There are a wide variety of estimates as to how long it could take Japan to create a nuclear weapon should it lose confidence in the U.S. nuclear umbrella, ranging from a year to a decade.²⁹

Yet Japan is also the country least likely to cross the nuclear Rubicon, in large part because the nuclear attacks on Hiroshima and Nagasaki left a significant segment of the public strongly opposed to a military establishment and offensive warfare of any kind, to say nothing of nuclear weapons. Being a non-nuclear weapons state is a part of the national identity. Hence, Japan has consistently supported disarmament. For example, the Democratic Party of Japan (DPJ), which assumed power in September 2009, endorsed President Obama's April 2009 Prague speech, in which he articulated the long-term goal of a world without nuclear weapons. Foreign Minister Okada Katsuya subsequently promised "Japan will take leadership to achieve a positive agreement in each field of nuclear disarmament, nuclear non-proliferation, and the peaceful use of nuclear energy."³⁰ Okada's predecessor, Nakasone Hirofumi of the rival Liberal Democratic Party (LDP), vigorously supported those same goals in an April 2009 speech, laying out eleven benchmarks for disarmament.³¹

Nuclear disarmament thus reflects an idealistic strain in Japanese foreign policy, one that is found in both progressive and conservative political coalitions. For idealists, extended deterrence gets no more than passing reference, if that.³² Indeed, the current DPJ government has placed far more emphasis on investigating whether prior LDP governments allowed U.S. ships with nuclear weapons to enter Japanese territorial waters, in violation of domestic law and policy principles. But there is certainly a realist strain

as well, one that is sensitive to changes in Japan's security environment, such as the growing capabilities of both North Korea and China. In this perspective, the need to reinforce the credibility of America's commitment to defend Japan, with nuclear weapons if necessary, is central. If cuts in the number of American warheads went too low, Japanese realists worry that there would not be enough to credibly maintain deterrence, but they have different views on where the lower limit is. One expert estimates that 1500 is about the lower limit; others say that anxiety would increase significantly if the U.S. nuclear force dropped beneath 1000 deployable weapons. Idealists would probably regard the extent of U.S. cuts as a non-issue.³³

On the far right are those who argue Japan should secure its own nuclear weapons.³⁴ Somewhat less extreme are Nakanishi Terumasa and other conservatives who advocate an expansion of Japan's conventional forces so that Japan could defend itself in case the United States chose not to do so. Discussion of acquiring a long-range precision strike capability to hit North Korean missile bases, which surfaced while North Korea was testing missiles and nuclear devices in 2006, is a case in point.³⁵

On the left, scholars have argued that North Korea is fundamentally insecure. If it were to attack Japan, they say, it would be from a sense of vulnerability rather than to seize an opportunity. Reassurance would be more likely to dissuade Pyongyang from provocation than threats and warning. While still in the opposition, the Democratic Party of Japan picked up on this suggestion, calling at various points for a non-preemptive use pledge and working to build a regional nuclear-weapons-free zone.³⁶ (Note that both the right and the left seek more independence from the United States but in very different ways.)

The mainstream view "has been continued reliance on the U.S. nuclear deterrent as an indispensable component of Japanese defense policy."³⁷ Japan has affirmed that approach in its most authoritative documents on defense policy, and the United States has reaffirmed (in May 2007, for example) "that the full

range of U.S. military capabilities—both nuclear and non-nuclear strike forces and defensive capabilities—form the core of extended deterrence and support U.S. commitments to the defense of Japan.”³⁸ Yet the anxieties remain.³⁹

Tokyo has used a couple of strategies to supplement its dependence on the U.S. deterrent. One is to increase cooperation with the United States on the latter’s own priorities in order to reduce any incentives Washington might have to ignore Japan’s interests. Another is to suggest that Japan might go its own way, not because there was a strong reason to do so but as a means of eliciting reaffirmation of the U.S. commitment. Tokyo’s periodic studies on the nuclear option exemplify this approach.⁴⁰ Third, Japan decided in the late 1990s to build its own deterrence capabilities, in the form of missile defense, in close cooperation with the United States.

The 2009 electoral victory of the Democratic Party of Japan raised the question of whether there will be a new mainstream and where it might be located. Although the party and its small coalition parties won primarily because the public lost confidence in the Liberal Democratic Party’s competence on domestic policy, it had staked out a different position on foreign and security policy from the LDP. The DPJ’s broader policy principles appear to foreshadow a shift. These include reinserting Japan as a “member of Asia”; pursuing an alliance with the United States in ways that reduce Japan’s dependence and deference; contributing to international peace and security through the United Nations rather than as an arm of U.S. security policy; modernizing the national security apparatus in ways that save taxpayers’ money; and working for nuclear disarmament through a variety of diplomatic efforts.⁴¹

As noted, the disarmament goal has been a hardy perennial of Japanese foreign policy, and not just for the leftist parties. But it was a particularly high priority for Okada Katsuya during the year that he served as foreign minister. He proposed three specific steps for the May 2010 NPT review conference: “no first use” of nuclear weapons; no use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear weapons states; and a treaty

establishing a nuclear-weapons-free zone in North-east Asia. One of Okada’s Diet colleagues made explicit what was implicit in the proposal: such an approach is how Japan can “escape from the [American] nuclear umbrella.”⁴²

The DPJ does not make clear how pursuit of a nuclear-weapons-free zone is feasible in a region where China has nuclear weapons and North Korea has devices. But the DPJ has sought to avoid discussion of the contradiction between its goals and hard reality.

The DPJ government is struggling to find the right balance concerning the U.S.-Japan alliance. Generally, it has focused on the problems that stem from the presence of American forces rather than the strategic realities that have made that presence necessary—and which, arguably, have not changed. Optimists hope that Japan’s new leaders will gradually reconcile campaign promises with the security vulnerabilities that persist. That the DPJ government abandoned its early effort to move a controversial U.S. Marine air station off of the island of Okinawa and aligned itself more closely to Washington after provocative actions by North Korea and a maritime spat with China confirms that optimism. Pessimists worry that if the DPJ persists in seeking an alliance where it has fewer obligations and more benefits and does not follow through on its commitments, it will foster a stalemate with Washington and squander the mutual benefit the alliance affords.

In this context, nuclear issues are not trivial, and there have been several straws in the wind. First of all, Prime Minister Hatoyama deleted the word “deterrence” from the section on the U.S.-Japan alliance in his January 2010 policy speech (reportedly at the insistence of a DPJ coalition partner, the more pacifist Social Democratic Party).⁴³ Second, early in 2010, Foreign Minister Okada disavowed efforts during the spring of 2009 by security-minded Japanese diplomats to persuade the Perry-Schlesinger Commission to keep nuclear-capable Tomahawk missiles operational, because they were “a key component of the U.S. nuclear umbrella.”⁴⁴ Third, as noted above, Okada proposed that the 2010 NPT review conference consider the principles of “no first

use” of nuclear weapons and no use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear weapons states—proposals that the prior government declined to make, even though it shares the DPJ’s views on disarmament.⁴⁵ And fourth, almost half the members of the Diet (parliament) sent a letter to President Obama urging that he “immediately adopt a declaratory policy stating that the sole purpose of U.S. nuclear weapons is to deter others from using such weapons against the United States or U.S. allies.”⁴⁶

On balance, the initial Japanese reaction to the Nuclear Posture Review was positive. DPJ leaders both praised it as “a step toward a world without

nuclear weapons” and reemphasized the importance of American extended deterrence. Predictably, more conservative newspapers had some doubts on the credibility of American resolve, but all papers praised the exclusion of North Korea from the new negative security assurance.⁴⁷ The “step toward” formulation may suggest some disappointment on the part of the government that the Obama administration did not go further toward a “no first use” or “sole purpose” declaratory policy. Where the DPJ government comes out will be the result of a protracted process.⁴⁸ And wherever the government comes out, the more conservative circles that shaped the mainstream view in the past may well have doubts.

4. WHAT TO DO?

ADDRESSING THE CONCERNS OF DIFFERENT COUNTRIES

Current views in Australia, South Korea, and Japan have similarities and differences. In each country, there is a spectrum of opinion. Conservatives take the world as it is and worry about the credibility of U.S. extended deterrence commitments. Progressives assert that the nuclear umbrella is part of the problem and would prefer to find a way to reduce the dangers they see of being aligned with the United States in a nuclear world. Conservatives are definitely in power in Korea; progressives are in power in Australia and Japan.

Second, in each country the community of people who worry about the specific issue of extended deterrence is rather small, and even they may operate at a rather high level of generality. In Japan, for example, there is “a relatively shallow understanding . . . about the current deterrence and nuclear policy debates in Washington.”⁴⁹

Third, some of those in Korea and Japan who do worry about the credibility of the American commitment call for a deeper dialogue with the United States on what extended deterrence might mean in practice (but not Australia). One Korean speaker at the Pacific Forum/CSIS discussion in mid-2009 proposed the creation of a nuclear planning group between the United States and the ROK. The purpose would be to ensure that there were no gaps on the meaning of extended deterrence, specifically, the circumstances under which each country believes that the U.S. would and should use nuclear weapons.⁵⁰

Kim Taewoo, a conservative scholar, has asserted that “South Korea will need to foremost start negotiations with the U.S. on supplementary follow-up measures to the concept of extended deterrence as expressed in the June 16 [2009] agreement of the ROK-U.S. summit.” He includes issues of war plans, targeting, and extending the nuclear umbrella to chemical and biological weapons.⁵¹

Before the DPJ’s ascension to power, two experts on Japan predicted that, as China’s capabilities grow and if the denuclearization of North Korea proves impossible, “Japan will expect more of the United States in terms of information about and management of the extended nuclear deterrent and will be less easily satisfied.”⁵² In fact, Japanese and American diplomats and defense officials undertook quiet discussion on changes in deterrence theory in 2008, but they were described as rudimentary.⁵³ The discussions continued into the Obama Administration.⁵⁴

The Korean proposal for a nuclear planning group is of course a reference to the body created within NATO in the late 1960s to create greater coordination among alliance members on NATO nuclear weapons policy, including how nuclear weapons might be used against the Warsaw Pact. Currently, it addresses issues such as “the status of NATO nuclear forces, the safety, security, and survivability of nuclear weapons, nuclear strategy and operational planning, deployment measures, consultation mechanisms for weapons use, as well as communications and information systems.”⁵⁵ During the Cold War, a key issue was how to assure non-nuclear-weapons states like West Germany, whose position then was

rather analogous to Japan's today, that it could remain confident about American resolve in spite of the dilemmas attendant to extended deterrence. Indeed, West Germany insisted that "nuclear weapons were central to its defense and that Bonn had a right to a strong, perhaps even decisive, voice in NATO's nuclear policies and wartime decisions."⁵⁶ Washington thus offered Bonn a graduated entry into NATO's nuclear councils: first, a role in NATO's Nuclear Committee and its working group on nuclear planning, and later permanent participation in the Nuclear Planning Group. As a result, West Germany would get greater access to policy-making and information on tactical nuclear forces deployed in Europe. German confidence that Washington would indeed use those weapons, if necessary, would grow. This was a process mechanism to address a political and psychological problem.⁵⁷

How might such a mechanism be applied in Asia? One Japanese security specialist has proposed an ambitious agenda for a Japanese version of a nuclear planning group:

- Sharing basic doctrine regarding nuclear operations and targeting plans against North Korea and China.
- Contingency planning by the two militaries, including nuclear warfare.
- Broadening the community of Japanese with which the United States consults, to include political leaders and experts.

The specialist also urged the United States to strengthen its conventional and strategic capabilities deployed in Asia.⁵⁸

THE ISSUE OF ADAPTABILITY

Proposals for such mechanisms for both Japan and Korea quickly run into obstacles. There is the problem of expectations. The Japanese agenda just cited goes well beyond how the United States engages NATO allies on nuclear issues, and might worry Japan's neighbors rather than restrain them.

And before a Western solution is adopted for East Asian problems, it is worth considering whether it is adaptable in the current circumstances. Some issues are practical issues, the main one being information security on the part of those on the receiving end of the dialogue. The Japanese government is notoriously "leaky," which creates a deterrent against sharing sensitive information. The Seoul government is more disciplined but is not problem-free. Whether either government has sufficient breadth and depth of expertise to pursue such a dialogue is another question.⁵⁹

Another issue is with whom American officials would interact. Should it be "security officials" who have at least some expertise in this area? Or is it preferable to speak to elected officials who have constitutional authority for matters of war and peace, even though their expertise is limited? Or should it be both? If it is political leaders, who would be in the room and who would not? The question is difficult to answer in Japan because, constitutionally, the cabinet acts as a collective unit as the head of the executive branch. The prime minister acts only as a representative of the cabinet. When it comes to "security officials," there are other wrinkles. In theory, three groups in Japan might be involved: Foreign Ministry diplomats; civilian officials in the Ministry of Defense; and senior uniformed officers. Yet these groups have been competing for influence regarding security policy for decades, and each would probably like to see the other two excluded.

In Korea, the contest is more between security officials in the office of the president and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade on the one hand and uniformed officers in the defense establishment (where even ministers of national defense tend to be retired officers). These internal turf contests would be an obstacle to fruitful exchanges even before the dialogue began, but no American government would wish to be in the position of having to adjudicate them (nor should it have to).

But there is a larger, more conceptual question. That is, are NATO mechanisms that were appropriate for the specific set of circumstances that prevailed

in Europe during the Cold War necessarily suitable for the very different context in East Asia today? For one thing, the source of the Cold War extended-deterrence problem was the fear of a massive and perhaps surprise Warsaw Pact conventional attack on NATO countries that together lacked the conventional ability to mount a defense. That was why the U.S. nuclear guarantee was necessary in the first place. Moreover, NATO had a dual problem. One was whether the United States would put itself at risk to defend Europe by employing its strategic nuclear weapons. The other concerned tactical nuclear weapons that were deployed in NATO countries in Europe and might be used in their defense in the event of a conflict. Both problems, but especially the latter, fostered questions of nuclear sharing, which in turn prompted consideration of the multilateral force, dual-key arrangements, and the Nuclear Planning Group.

Without belittling the potential danger that Japan faces from Chinese and North Korean nuclear weapons, neither's conventional forces pose the kind of material threat that the Soviet Union posed to Western Europe. China may some day have robust conventional forces that threaten the Japanese home islands, but that is a long-term problem. Moreover, Japan has the advantage of terrain that West Germany lacked: the Sea of Japan is not the North German plain. And Japan opposes the deployment of nuclear weapons on its territory. So, Japanese security specialists who tend to believe that their country is in the same structural position as West Germany in the Cold War have created a misplaced analogy.

Superficially, the Korean peninsula shares certain features of Cold War Europe. South Korea does face a conventional threat from North Korea, whose ground forces are forward deployed to the demilitarized zone. But those capabilities have been seriously degrading over the last two decades, while South Korea's armed forces are increasingly robust. A conventional war would no doubt wreak serious damage on the South, but there is no doubt which side would prevail. Here, the allied conventional deterrent supplements and reinforces the U.S. threat to use nuclear weapons.

Although it is too early to dismiss the possibility that North Korea's leaders might make a deliberate, governmental choice to attack the South, that contingency is declining in probability. In this regard, Seoul and Washington together have successfully deterred Pyongyang for several decades. The United States withdrew tactical weapons from the peninsula beginning in 1991, so nuclear sharing is less of an issue. There may be some value in discussing how American strategic weapons might be used in such a conventional war, but again the analogy to Cold War Europe is a weak one.

If a conventional attack against Japan and South Korea is unlikely, what are the specific circumstances under which they might be the target of a nuclear-weapons attack, and what are the implications for extended deterrence?⁶⁰ As far as North Korea is concerned, the speculation is somewhat theoretical since neither the weapon nor the delivery system is proven. But the most likely scenario is that Pyongyang might threaten to use nuclear weapons against either the continental United States or American bases in Japan to dissuade Washington from intervening in a conventional conflict on the Korean peninsula, and to use them if dissuasion failed. That would certainly be a high-risk gamble, one that Pyongyang would only make if it underestimated the capabilities of ROK armed forces, American resolve, and Chinese tolerance. There would indeed be value in a U.S.-ROK discussion of how the United States would respond to such an effort at dissuasion, because that response would affect the South Korean will to resist a conventional attack.

In this regard, the planned transfer of wartime operational command from the United States to the ROK in 2015 will require adjustments in how the two allies manage nuclear issues. When the transfer occurs, the combined forces command, with its high degree of integration between Korean and American forces, will transition to something else. In a conflict, an ROK general will conduct the defense of the peninsula, not an American four-star general, as is now the case, and U.S. forces would be in more of a supporting role. By implication, deliberations about the use of nuclear weapons would

take place less within the U.S. chain of command and more between the civilian leaderships of the two countries. War plans would have to be revised to take account of the new command arrangements.⁶¹ Working through the implications of these new arrangements for extended deterrence will be as important in affirming the credibility of American commitments as declaratory statements, or more so. For example, should it become clear that North Korea was ignoring general U.S. extended-deterrence warnings and was preparing for aggression, when and how should Washington and Seoul issue specific warnings and actions regarding the use of nuclear weapons?⁶²

When it comes to North Korea and Japan, the chances that Pyongyang would, pursuant to a deliberate, governmental decision, launch a nuclear warhead on Japan seem very slim. What national interest would be served? On the other hand, as suggested above, the DPRK's threatening to use nuclear weapons against U.S. bases on Okinawa and the Japanese home islands (or actually using them) *in the context of* a conventional war on the peninsula is more plausible, if still unlikely. In theory, it would be useful for Japanese and American security planners to discuss what would happen in the case of threats or use. But that is a dicey proposition in practice. Once Japanese focused on American bases as a magnet for a nuclear attack, at least some might call for re-visiting the entire defense bargain with the United States, of which bases are a key element.

As far as China is concerned, the possibilities of a direct, bilateral conflict with either Japan or South Korea seem so remote as to be not worth considering. As noted above, South Korean security specialists generally do not regard China as a nuclear problem. Conservative Japanese are more anxious, but that stems not so much from a fear of a "bolt from the red" but rather anticipation of a shift in the conventional balance of power between China on the one hand and the United States and Japan on the other. Japan's vulnerability then would be, we surmise, more political than military. And the arrival of conventional parity of capabilities is a long way off, and says nothing about intentions.

A focus on intentions highlights the real possibility that China and North Korea rely on nuclear weapons to cope with the vulnerability they face from a dominant United States.⁶³ Thus, China adopted a "no first use" position at the time it tested its first nuclear device and has regarded its nuclear arsenal as a "minimum deterrent," providing the assured ability to retaliate in some small measure, even after an American first strike, and has sized its force accordingly. If Pyongyang's and Beijing's acquisition of nuclear weapons stems more from fear than greed, then perhaps reassuring them should be as much a part of the allied tool kit as issuing threats. Both are necessary, of course, and striking the right balance is not always easy. Yet one can argue that for almost four decades, reassurance has been the dominant American and Japanese political approach to China: seeking to integrate it into the international system, expanding the areas of common interests, and managing its revival as a great power.

Regarding North Korea, the United States and others have offered the same fundamental bargain to Pyongyang for over a decade: give up your nuclear weapons and you will have true security. Granted, the execution of this offer has sometimes lacked skill, which probably enhanced Pyongyang's sense of vulnerability. Also, there is the strong possibility that North Korea never intended to take the offer, which then imposes a challenge on its neighbors and the United States: how to contain a nuclear North Korea. But meeting that challenge is possible if the countries concerned, particularly China, work together.

A focus on a fear factor behind China's and North Korea's nuclear programs also illuminates the need for the United States (and others) to calculate the impact of their own security-seeking actions, because Chinese and North Korean responses can affect the security of South Korea and Japan. For example, U.S. initiatives during the Bush Administration to improve command and control, missile defense, and advanced conventional strike weapons have likely spurred Beijing to increase its numbers of warheads and missiles, which would then ironically only increase Japanese fears. The big task for

the United States, Japan, and South Korea in their relations with China is to manage the various issues at play so that they do not lead the Chinese leadership to conclude that their fundamental intentions toward China are hostile. Under those circumstances, the role of nuclear weapons in China's security strategy will recede.⁶⁴

5. THE REAL CHALLENGES FOR EXTENDED DETERRENCE IN ASIA

If Cold War analogies seem misplaced, and if deterrence concerning China should emphasize reassurance over threats and is a long-term proposition anyway, then what are the true challenges for U.S. extended deterrence? Two come to mind.

The first is the Taiwan Strait issue, where the problem is more complicated than one of the United States warning China that it might retaliate with nuclear weapons should China launch a conventional attack against Taiwan. For Taiwan is not a passive element in the equation. Its own actions can create security concerns in Beijing, and an American security guarantee for Taiwan can only exacerbate Taiwan's willingness to take risks.⁶⁵

The United States has strong incentives to foster good relations with both Taiwan and the People's Republic of China. It is an economic partner of both and seeks China's contributions to managing a variety of global and regional issues. Taiwan and China developed complementary economic relations after 1985, as Taiwan companies moved production and assembly operations to the Mainland, employing large numbers of Chinese in the process. There was some hope of a political reconciliation after decades of hostility. Yet a corrosive political dynamic took over in the early 1990s that created the risk of conflict.⁶⁶

This process was complex, but it produced deepening mutual suspicion between Taiwan and China. Each feared that the other was preparing to challenge its fundamental interests. China, whose goal is to convince Taiwan to unify on the same terms as

Hong Kong, feared that Taiwan's leaders were going to take some action that would have the effect of frustrating that goal and permanently separate Taiwan from China—the functional equivalent of a declaration of independence. Beijing increased its military power to deter such an eventuality. Taiwan feared that China wished to use its military power and other means to intimidate it into submission to the point that it would give up what it claims as its sovereign character. Taiwan's deepening fears led it to strengthen and assert its sense of sovereignty. There was misunderstanding at work here, which aggravated the vicious circle of mutual fear and mutual defense mechanisms—military on the Chinese side and political on the Taiwan side—that continued and worsened.

To complicate matters even further, some Taiwan leaders saw a political advantage in waving the sovereignty flag. It was a useful tool for mobilizing their political base at election time and putting the competition at a disadvantage. And if such tactics provoked China in the process—but not too much—that was fine too. China, on the other hand, could never tell whether this was simply a political ploy or a tricky way to undermine its interests, but it prudently chose to interpret it as a major threat.

For example, in the Taiwan legislative and presidential elections of 2008, former President Chen Shui-bian sought to mobilize support for his Democratic Progressive Party by proposing that on election day there be a referendum on whether Taiwan should join the United Nations and do so under the name of Taiwan, rather than its official name, the Republic

of China. China regarded this as highly provocative, and as a way to creep towards legal independence. It declared that there was a “period of high danger.”

The United States came to play a special role in this deteriorating situation. China’s first line of defense when facing such “dangers” was to mobilize Washington, on the assumption that it had sufficient control over Taiwan to end the problem. Taiwan, on the other hand, assumed that the United States would take its side as China’s rhetoric became more threatening. Each was unhappy when Washington appeared to take the side of the other.

Actually, the U.S. role was not to take sides. Washington’s main goal has always been the preservation of peace and security in the Taiwan Strait. It worried that the two sides might inadvertently slip into a conflict through accident or miscalculation. The United States would then, unhappily, have to choose sides in that conflict. In a worst-case scenario, that conflict might escalate out of control and nuclear weapons come into play.⁶⁷

So, first the Clinton Administration and then the George W. Bush Administration employed an approach of “dual deterrence.” They warned Beijing not to use force against Taiwan, even as they offered reassurance that Washington did not support Taiwan independence. They warned Taipei not to take political actions that might provoke China to use force, even as they conveyed reassurance that they would not sell out its interests for the sake of the China relationship. In this way, Washington sought to lower the probability of any conflict.

The situation improved markedly after the election of Ma Ying-jeou, the leader of the more conservative Nationalist Party, created the possibility of reversing that spiral. Ma campaigned on the idea that Taiwan could better assure its prosperity, dignity, and security by engaging and reassuring China rather than provoking it—as his predecessor had done. Since Ma took office in May 2008, the two sides have undertaken a systematic effort to stabilize their relations and reduce the level of mutual fear. They have made significant progress on the economic side,

removing obstacles and facilitating broader cooperation. There has been less progress on the political and security side, but the two sides are correct to work from easy issues to hard ones and defer discussion on issues that remain sensitive. Beijing and Taipei understand that the necessary mutual trust and consensus on key conceptual issues is lacking. Still, why China continues to build up its military capabilities relevant to Taiwan even though it faces a smaller strategic challenge is puzzling. Ma’s project is welcome to the United States, reducing the chances of Washington being entrapped in a conflict it does not need. But it is politically controversial within Taiwan, and the “pro-independence party” could make a comeback if Ma cannot demonstrate that engagement with China has left Taiwan better off.

So China, Taiwan, and the United States dodged a bullet in the years before 2008. None would wish to repeat the experience, for it demonstrated the difficulties of preserving peace when each party is not wholly friend or foe vis-à-vis the other two.

The second real-world challenge to extended deterrence again concerns North Korea, but not North Korea as unitary-actor aggressor. No one can predict what political change will occur once the current strongman ruler, Kim Jong Il, passes from the scene. But there will be change, since Kim chose not to groom a successor over a long period, as his father did for him. What is known of Kim’s health (he suffered a stroke in August 2008) suggests that his demise will come in the short term. That was likely the reason for him to clarify matters during the latter part of 2010, by designating his third son, Kim Jong-eun, as his heir. Despite this move, and because of Kim Jong-eun’s relative youth and inexperience, the leadership arrangement will become something different from the system of one-man rule that has existed for sixty years. Some sort of collective arrangement is likely.

Unknown is how change will occur: whether it will be incremental and relatively stable or sudden and destabilizing. There could be regime continuity if the regime’s various institutions support a “regency” succession, where Kim Jong-eun reigns but established

regime leaders rule. That apparently is Kim's preferred arrangement. But another scenario is possible: that the regency solution will foster tensions among the military, the security services, the Korean Workers Party, and the administration. Heretofore, when these pillars of the regime have worked together, it is because either of the supreme leaders (and there have been only two, Kim *père et fils*) have required it. Kim Jong Il's passing could put severe strain on the regime; tensions could spin out of control and produce some kind of more profound regime change.

The probability of significant destabilization leading to collapse may be relatively low, but it is not trivial. The consequences, however, for the countries concerned—the United States, South Korea, Japan, and China—would be very serious. Among them is the possibility that, as the regime enters its death throes, one of the contending elements might choose to induce a grand conflagration. An “explosion” might accompany “implosion,” with nuclear weapons at play. Another possibility is that implosion occurs and the external parties (China on one side, the United States and South Korea on the other) get drawn in as each seeks to protect its interests, but then end up in conflict because each side feels threatened by the actions of the other and responds in kind.

At this point, Washington, Beijing, Seoul, and Tokyo are not prepared for a possible collapse of North Korea, particularly when it comes to programming their responses. It is therefore imperative that together they do the following: a) better understand the discontinuities that may occur; b) assess how various scenarios affect their converging and diverging interests; and c) explore how to jointly conduct crisis management should a crisis occur. These discussions should be addressed in very quiet dialogues between and among the countries concerned.

So East Asia presents a different, in some ways more complicated situation than the NATO-Warsaw Pact template. The post-Cold War environment makes it even more complex. The mechanisms that the United States and its European allies devised to address the anxieties surrounding extended deterrence do not necessarily apply to the different circumstances of East Asia. East Asian solutions are required for East Asian realities.

This discussion illustrates the potential value of engaging China on nuclear issues, even though it is the potential adversary that causes concern. If the political change that follows the death of Kim Jong Il is to be managed well (whatever that change is), then China will have to be part of the conversation, since the future of North Korea affects both its strategic interests and domestic stability. If the Taiwan Strait is to become more stable, China will have to be confident that Taiwan leaders will not challenge its fundamental interests. And it is also possible that America's Asian allies who worry about the revival of China as a great power can engage it on the future of its nuclear arsenal. The United States has sought such a dialogue from China. Beijing agreed in principle but so far has been reluctant to carry through.⁶⁸ The Nuclear Posture Review reiterated U.S. interest in a dialogue on strategic issues with Beijing. But because China is the current and future security concern of both Japan and South Korea, because neither has the offensive or defensive capability to counter the PRC's nuclear forces, and because China's conventional modernization is likely to move at a faster pace than their own, Beijing has the opportunity to reduce their sense of insecurity. There are probably ways that South Korea and Japan could reassure China about their long-term intentions. *Not* exchanging views fuels suspicions that are as corrosive as they are unnecessary.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

Even if East Asia is not Cold War Europe, this discussion has illuminated several areas bearing on U.S. extended deterrence where proactive measures are possible—or necessary.

In the short run:

- The United States, along with South Korea and Japan, should continue to stress to North Korea (and to China) that they remain committed to their long-standing approach to assure its security and entry into the international community as long as North Korea is willing to address their security concerns by abandoning its nuclear weapons in a complete and verifiable way. In the absence of such a decision on Pyongyang's part, and in the event of continued conventional provocations, Washington, Seoul, and Tokyo will have no choice but to undertake a policy of containment.
- The U.S. government should continue to press China at the highest levels to begin discussions on scenarios for change in North Korea, how those scenarios will affect the interests of other parties (especially South Korea), and what concerted or coordinated action may be required. The focus should be on how, in the context of North Korean state failure, to avoid hostilities between China on the one hand and the United States and the ROK on the other. But the security of North Korea's nuclear weapons, fissile material, and nuclear facilities is also a sensitive issue that deserves attention. The ROK and Japan should make their own entreaties to Beijing. If China is unwilling to engage on these matters, the United States and South Korea

should continue to undertake the closest possible planning effort, including the possibility of Chinese intervention, and because the transfer of wartime operational command will have implications for U.S. nuclear deterrence. A similar planning effort with Japan would also be worthwhile.

In the medium term:

- The U.S. government should consider establishing bilateral channels for consultations with the governments of Australia, South Korea, and Japan on the requirements and needs of effective extended deterrence, including considerations that would guide U.S. nuclear weapons use. This dialogue might also address the impact of the New START Treaty and possible future negotiations on the U.S. ability to extend a credible and effective deterrent. In order to avoid misplaced analogies, the dialogues should begin with an analytical effort to clarify the dynamics of Northeast Asian geopolitics and force-building trajectories, and to delineate the likely scenarios under which U.S. allies might come under a conventional or nuclear attack. Assuming proper levels of information security and expertise in Japan and South Korea, the dialogues might consider in more depth how extended deterrence would be operationalized. As appropriate, Washington and its allies should brief Chinese officials on the general nature of the dialogues.
- The U.S. government should continue to pursue a strategic dialogue with China that would aim, among other things, to establish greater mutual

transparency concerning future force plans and military doctrine, specifically with respect to nuclear forces. If the dialogue occurs, Washington should brief its allies as appropriate.

- This strategic dialogue should be part of a broader diplomatic effort, in which Japan, the ROK, and Australia would participate, to continue to reassure China that they do not intend to block or contain the revival of China as a great power and indeed welcome it as a significant and constructive leader of the international system. As tensions attendant to Beijing's growing power and influence emerge, they are prepared to ameliorate those through dialogue (and, hopefully, reduce the salience of nuclear weapons in China's own security planning).
- The United States should continue to encourage the process of reconciliation underway between

the two sides of the Taiwan Strait, since that process reduces the possibility of conflict between the United States and China. It should encourage China to take actions that meet the expectations of the Taiwan public, and in particular unilaterally moderate its military build-up relevant to Taiwan. As part of that moderation, a security dialogue between Beijing and Taipei would be appropriate so that China can clarify the intentions behind its acquisition of threatening capabilities. If political anxiety on Taiwan should make such a dialogue premature, the United States might consider to undertake intellectual facilitation on security issues between the two sides—in close consultation with Taipei.

- The United States should continue to maintain and periodically demonstrate the ability to deploy U.S.-based strategic and nuclear-capable tactical aircraft to Guam.

ENDNOTES

- ¹ Michael Dobbs, *One Minute to Midnight: Kennedy, Khrushchev, and Castro on the Brink of Nuclear War* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2008), pp. 203-205, 295.
- ² China's pursuit of nuclear weapons was driven, in part, by its doubts about the credibility of the Soviet Union's defense commitment; see Avery Goldstein, *Deterrence and Security in the 21st Century: China, Britain, France, and the Enduring Legacy of the Nuclear Revolution* (Stanford University Press, 2000).
- ³ Jay Taylor, *The Generalissimo: Chiang Kai-shek and the Struggle for Modern China* (Harvard University Press, Belknap Press, 2009), pp. 502, 528-529.
- ⁴ Vincent Wei-cheng Wang, "Taiwan: Conventional Deterrence, Soft Power, and the Nuclear Option," in *The Long Shadow: Nuclear Weapons and Security in 21st Century Asia*, edited by Muthiah Alagappa (Stanford University Press, 2008) p. 413; William Burr, "The Taiwanese Nuclear Case: Lessons for Today," Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Proliferation Analysis, August 9, 2007 (<<http://www.carnegieendowment.org/publications/index.cfm?fa=view&id=19491>> [March 18, 2010]).
- ⁵ This historical review draws on Kang Choi and Joon-sung Park, "South Korea: Fears of Abandonment and Entrapment," in *The Long Shadow*, edited by Alagappa, pp. 373-403; and Don Oberdorfer, *The Two Koreas: A Contemporary History*, 2nd edition, (New York: Basic Books, 2001), pp. 68-74.
- ⁶ Choi and Park, "South Korea," p. 379.
- ⁷ Jacques E.C. Hymans, *The Psychology of Nuclear Proliferation: Identity, Emotions, and Foreign Policy* (Cambridge University Press, 2006), pp. 114-140.
- ⁸ Richard J. Samuels, *Securing Japan: Tokyo's Grand Strategy and the Future of East Asia* (Cornell University Press, 2007).
- ⁹ Michael J. Green and Katsuhisa Furukawa, "Japan: New Nuclear Realism," in *The Long Shadow*, edited by Alagappa, pp. 349-368.
- ¹⁰ During the Cold War, the United States had to confront the possibility that the islands off shore of China, that Taiwan controlled, might be regarded as having such psychological value to the Republic of China government that it would be necessary to use nuclear weapons to prevent their falling to Beijing, even though they had no inherent strategic value.
- ¹¹ Australian Government, Department of Defence, "Defending Australia in the Asia Pacific Century: Force 2030, Defence White Paper 2009," <http://www.defence.gov.au/whitepaper/docs/defence_white_paper_2009.pdf> [January 17, 2010], pp. 39, 50; spelling as in the original.
- ¹² This discussion is based on Raoul E. Heinrichs, "Australia's Nuclear Dilemma: Dependence, Deterrence or Denial?" *Security Challenges*, vol. 4 (Autumn 2008), pp. 55-67. It was published before President Obama's Prague speech in April 2009 and so did not examine the implications of deep cuts in the U.S. nuclear arsenal for Australia's security.
- ¹³ Heinrichs, "Australia's Nuclear Dilemma," p. 61.
- ¹⁴ Heinrichs, "Australia's Nuclear Dilemma," p. 66.
- ¹⁵ "Release of the United States' Nuclear Posture Review," joint media release by Stephen Smith, Minister for Foreign Affairs, and John Faulkner, Minister for Defence, April 7, 2010 <www.foreignminister.gov.au/releases/2010/fa-s100407>.
- ¹⁶ "Eliminating Nuclear Threats: A Practical Agenda for Global Policymakers," Report of the International Commission on Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament, December 2009, <http://www.icnnd.org/reference/reports/ent/pdf/ICNND_Report-EliminatingNuclearThreats.pdf> [March 12, 2010], p. 60.
- ¹⁷ "Eliminating Nuclear Threats," pp. 65-67.
- ¹⁸ "Eliminating Nuclear Threats," p. xx. For another conservative view, see Richard Tanter, "Rethinking Extended Nuclear Deterrence in the Defence of Australia," *The Asia Pacific Journal: Japan Focus*, no. 3269 (Dec. 14, 2009), <<http://www.japanfocus.org/Richard-Tanter/3269>> [January 17, 2010].
- ¹⁹ "A Question of Confidence: The First U.S.-ROK Strategic Dialogue," *Issues and Insights*, vol. 9, no. 18 (September 2009), <http://csis.org/files/publication/issuesinsights_v09n18.pdf> [January 19, 2010].
- ²⁰ "Joint Vision for the Alliance of the United States of America and the Republic of Korea," June 16, 2009, Office of the White House Press Secretary, Washington, D.C., <http://www.whitehouse.gov/the_press_office/Joint-vision-for-the-alliance-of-the-United-States-of-America-and-the-Republic-of-Korea> [January 19, 2010].
- ²¹ For an extended discussion by a conservative scholar, see Taewoo Kim, "ROK-U.S. Defense Cooperation against the North Korean Nuclear Threat: Strengthening Extended Deterrence," KINU-CNAS Research Paper, 2009. Dr. Kim approved of the reaffirmation of extended deterrence at the Lee-Obama summit but argued that the two countries should reinforce it through exercises, through inclusion of chemical and biological weapons and missiles, and through integrating extended-deterrence issues into allied war plans. He urged Washington not to undermine extended deterrence in the way it wrote the Nuclear Posture Review.

- ²² Dr. Park Sunwon provided this explication of progressive views. For a Western approach to extended deterrence with which at least some South Korean progressives would be comfortable, see Peter Hayes, “Extended Deterrence, Global Ambition, and Korea,” *The Asia Pacific Journal: Japan Focus*, no. 3268, <http://www.japanfocus.org/articles/print_article/3268> [January 12, 2010]. Hayes argued that the policy of extended deterrence provoked the North Korean weapons program and has rendered South Korea less secure rather than more. He believes that a shift to a purely conventional defense of South Korea would facilitate North Korea’s denuclearization.
- ²³ “Spokesman for DPRK Foreign Ministry Dismisses U.S. ‘Nuclear Posture Review,’” Korea Central News Agency, April 9, 2010, Open Source Center (hereafter OSC), KPP20100409971120.
- ²⁴ “Joint Statement of the Fourth Round of the Six-Party Talks,” September 19, 2005, U.S. State Department website, <<http://www.state.gov/p/eap/regional/c15455.htm>> [February 26, 2010].
- ²⁵ Kim, “ROK-U.S. Defense Cooperation against the North Korean Nuclear Threat,” p. 20. North Korea has demanded that it be regarded and treated as a nuclear-weapons state, but the United States has refused to consider that demand as a matter of international law (even though North Korea is a state that possesses nuclear weapons). Nor does the United States believe that North Korea is in compliance with its obligations under the NPT treaty.
- ²⁶ Hyun-Wook Kim, “Nuclear Posture Review and Its Implications on the Korean Peninsula,” Center for U.S.-Korea Policy, vol. 2, no. 5 (May 2010): p. 2, <<http://asiafoundation.org/resources/pdfs/CUSKPNewsletter25.pdf>>.
- ²⁷ Kim, “Nuclear Posture Review and Its Implications on the Korean Peninsula,” p. 2. The transfer of wartime operational command to South Korea was delayed until 2015.
- ²⁸ Kim, “ROK-U.S. Defense Cooperation against the North Korean Nuclear Threat,” p. 20.
- ²⁹ James L. Schoff, *Realigning Priorities: The U.S.-Japan Alliance & the Future of Extended Deterrence*, March 2009, Project Report by the Institute for Foreign Policy Analysis, <<http://www.ifpa.org/pdf/RealignPriorities.pdf>> [February 7, 2010], p. 44. At pp. 44-49, Schoff details the advantages and constraints that Japan would face in creating nuclear weapons and the means to deliver them.
- ³⁰ “Full Text of Foreign Minister Okada’s Foreign Policy Speech to 174th Diet Session,” January 29, 2010, Ministry of Foreign Affairs website, <<http://www.mofa.go.jp/announce/fm/okada/speech1001.html>> [February 6, 2010].
- ³¹ See “Statement by Mr. Hirofumi Nakasone, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Japan: Conditions towards Zero – ‘11 Benchmarks for Global Nuclear Disarmament,’” April 27, 2009, Ministry of Foreign Affairs website <<http://www.mofa.go.jp/policy/un/disarmament/arms/state0904.html>> [February 6, 2010].
- ³² See “Statement by Mr. Hirofumi Nakasone.”
- ³³ “Expectations Out of Sync: The Second U.S.-Japan Strategic Dialogue,” *Issues and Insights*, vol. 9, no. 12 (June 2009), <http://csis.org/files/publication/issuesinsights_v09n12.pdf> [January 19, 2010], p. 13; Schoff, *Realigning Priorities*, p. 38. On Japan’s security dilemma, see Richard C. Bush, “China-Japan Tensions, 1995-2006: Why They Happened, What to Do,” Policy Paper No. 16, Foreign Policy at Brookings, June 2009, <http://www.brookings.edu/-/media/Files/rc/papers/2009/06_china_japan_bush/06_china_japan_bush.pdf> [February 7, 2010]. On the factors shaping different Japanese perspectives on nuclear weapons, see Mike M. Mochizuki, “Japan Tests the Nuclear Taboo,” *Nonproliferation Review*, vol. 14, no. 2 (July 2007), pp. 303-328.
- ³⁴ “Conservative Journals in Japan Revive Talk of Nuclear Armament,” OSC Analysis, April 7, 2006, JPF20060407367001 [February 7, 2010].
- ³⁵ Schoff, *Realigning Priorities*, p. 32.
- ³⁶ Schoff, *Realigning Priorities*, p. 32. Critics of such proposals argue that North Korea needs warning as well as reassurance, and that Japan needs assurance as well. For a discussion why a U.S. “sole purpose” policy would be in Japan’s interests, see Masa Takubo, “The Role of Nuclear Weapons: Japan, the U.S., and ‘Sole Purpose,’” Arms Control Association, November 2009, <http://www.armscontrol.org/act/2009_11/Takubo> [November 11, 2009].
- ³⁷ Schoff, *Realigning Priorities*, p. 32.
- ³⁸ On Japanese policy, see “National Defense Program Guidelines,” in Japan Defense Agency, *Defense of Japan*, September 2006, <http://www.mod.go.jp/e/d_policy/pdf/national_guideline.pdf> [February 8, 2010]. For the U.S. reaffirmation, see “Joint Statement of the Security Consultative Committee: Alliance Transformation: Advancing United States-Japan Security and Defense Cooperation,” May 1, 2007, Ministry of Foreign Affairs website, <<http://www.mofa.go.jp/region/n-america/us/security/scc/joint0705.html>> [September 27, 2009].
- ³⁹ For a statement of the problem by the Institute for International Policy Studies, a rather conservative think tank, see *A New Phase in the Japan-US Alliance: The Japan US Alliance toward 2020*, IIPS 2009 Project Report (Sept. 2009), p. 10, <<http://www.iips.org/jussec/J-US-SEC2009e.pdf>>.
- ⁴⁰ See Michael J. Green and Katsuhisa Furukawa, “Japan: New Nuclear Realism,” in *The Long Shadow*, edited by Alagappah.
- ⁴¹ Leif-Eric Easley, Tetsuo Kotani, and Aki Mori, “Electing a New Japanese Security Policy? Examining Foreign Policy Visions within the Democratic Party of Japan,” *Asia Policy*, no. 9 (January 2010), pp. 45-66.
- ⁴² Easley, Kotani, and Mori, “Electing a New Japanese Security Policy?” pp. 45-66.
- ⁴³ “Prime Minister: Term ‘Deterrence’ Deleted in Policy Speech; Social Democrats Oppose Over Japan-U.S. Alliance,” *Mainichi Shimbun*, January 30, 2010, OSC, JPP20100215164002 [February 11, 2010].
- ⁴⁴ “United States to Retire Nuclear-Armed Tomahawk Missiles: Japanese Legislators Urge Obama Administration to Restrict the Purpose of U.S. Nuclear Weapons to Deterrence,” Union of Concerned Scientists press release, February 23, 2010, <http://www.ucsusa.org/news/press_release/united-states-to-retire-tomahawk-missiles-0357.html> [February 26, 2010].

- ⁴⁵ “Statement by Mr. Hirofumi Nakasone.”
- ⁴⁶ “Kyodo: Lead: Lawmakers Submit Letter To Obama in Support of Nuke-free World,” Kyodo World Service, February 19, 2010, OSC, JPP20100219969059 [February 26, 2010].
- ⁴⁷ “Japan: Officials Hail NPR; Some Media Express Concern Over Weakened Deterrence,” OSC Report, April 9, 2010, JPP20100409321001.
- ⁴⁸ One litmus test will be what the new National Defense Program Guidelines (essentially Japan’s defense strategy statement, prepared every five years) will have to say about extended deterrence.
- ⁴⁹ Schoff, *Realigning Priorities*, p. 40.
- ⁵⁰ “A Question of Confidence,” p. 15.
- ⁵¹ Kim, “ROK-U.S. Defense Cooperation against the North Korean Nuclear Threat,” pp. 24-25.
- ⁵² Green and Furukawa, “Japan: New Nuclear Realism,” pp. 349-368, cited passage on p. 365. For a general survey of Japan’s assessment of its nuclear dilemma, see Mochizuki, “Japan Tests the Nuclear Taboo,” pp.303-328.
- ⁵³ Schoff, *Realigning Priorities*, p. 28.
- ⁵⁴ “Japan, U.S. Should Talk More on Nukes: State Dept Official,” Nikkei Telecom, July 17, 2009, OSC, JPP20090717969001 [December 4, 2009].
- ⁵⁵ Schoff, *Realigning Priorities*, p. 53.
- ⁵⁶ Jenifer Mackby and Walter B. Slocombe, “Germany: The Model Case, a Historical Imperative,” in *The Nuclear Tipping Point: Why States Reconsider Their Nuclear Choices*, edited by Kurt M. Campbell, Robert J. Einhorn, and Mitchell B. Reiss (Brookings, 2004), p. 183.
- ⁵⁷ Mackby and Slocombe, “Germany: The Model Case, a Historical Imperative,” p. 194; David N. Schwartz, *NATO’s Nuclear Dilemmas* (Brookings, 1983). The NPG was created as a process mechanism once NATO failed to realize the idea of a multilateral nuclear force, a technical or hardware approach.
- ⁵⁸ “Expectations Out of Sync,” pp. 11-12. James Schoff has also offered a fulsome proposal for a dialogue mechanism with Japan: a “Deterrence Policy Group.” The goal over the long term, he argues, should be to take abstract and symbolic concepts of deterrence and translate them into a set of complementary capabilities with a nuanced understanding of each other’s roles and responsibilities in various situations. See Schoff, *Realigning Priorities*, pp. 55-56; pp. 28-29.
- ⁵⁹ “Expectations Out of Sync,” pp. 12.
- ⁶⁰ Recall the Australian observation that its defensive conventional capabilities are so strong that the more conceivable vulnerability is from a nuclear attack.
- ⁶¹ Kim, “ROK-U.S. Defense Cooperation against the North Korean Nuclear Threat,” pp. 16-17.
- ⁶² On the distinction between general and immediate commitments, see Timothy W. Crawford, “The Endurance of Extended Deterrence: Continuity, Change, and Complexity in Theory and Policy,” in *Complex Deterrence: Strategy in the Global Age*, edited by T.V. Paul, Patrick M. Morgan, and James J. Wirtz (University of Chicago Press, 2009), pp. 283-284.
- ⁶³ On reassurance as an important part of deterrence, see Crawford, “The Endurance of Extended Deterrence,” pp. 289-290.
- ⁶⁴ Richard C. Bush, “The Revival of China as a Great Power and What It Means for the United States,” speech at Towson State University, November 17, 2008 (<http://www.brookings.edu/-/media/Files/rc/speeches/2008/1117_china_bush/1117_china_bush.pdf> [November 8, 2009]).
- ⁶⁵ On these dynamics, see Crawford, “The Endurance of Extended Deterrence,” pp. 290-294.
- ⁶⁶ See Richard C. Bush, *Untying the Knot: Making Peace in the Taiwan Strait* (Brookings, 2005).
- ⁶⁷ For an exploration of escalation dynamics under a conflict scenario, see Richard C. Bush and Michael J. O’Hanlon, *A War Like No Other: The Truth About China’s Challenge to America* (New York: Wyley Publishers, 2007).
- ⁶⁸ An initial meeting was held in Beijing in April 2008 but a second meeting had not yet been scheduled as of the end of 2009. Bonnie Glaser, “U.S.-China Relations: Chock-full of Dialogue: SED, Human Rights, and Security,” *Comparative Connections*, vol. 10, no. 2, July 2008 (<http://csis.org/files/media/isis/pubs/0802qus_china.pdf> [December 16, 2009]), n.p.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

RICHARD C. BUSH is a senior fellow at The Brookings Institution and director of its Center for Northeast Asian Policy Studies. Before coming to Brookings, he served for nineteen years in the U.S. government: on the staff of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, as National Intelligence Officer for East Asia, and as chairman and managing director of the American Institute in Taiwan, through which the United States conducts substantive relations with Taiwan. His most recent book is *Perils of Proximity: China-Japan Security Relations*, published in October 2010 by the Brookings Institution Press.



BROOKINGS

The Brookings Institution
1775 Massachusetts Ave., NW
Washington, D.C. 20036
brookings.edu