# THE POLITICS OF IDENTITY: HISTORY, NATIONALISM, AND THE PROSPECT FOR PEACE IN POST-COLD WAR EAST ASIA

**Sheila Miyoshi Jager**

**April 2007**

*****



*****

Comments pertaining to this report are invited and should be forwarded to: Director, Strategic Studies Institute, U.S. Army War College, 122 Forbes Ave, Carlisle, PA 17013-5244.

*****

All Strategic Studies Institute (SSI) publications are available on the SSI homepage for electronic dissemination. Hard copies of this report also may be ordered from our homepage. SSI's homepage address is: *www.StrategicStudiesInstitute.army.mil*.

*****

The Strategic Studies Institute publishes a monthly e-mail newsletter to update the national security community on the research of our analysts, recent and forthcoming publications, and upcoming conferences sponsored by the Institute. Each newsletter also provides a strategic commentary by one of our research analysts. If you are interested in receiving this newsletter, please subscribe on our homepage at *www.StrategicStudiesInstitute.army.mil/newsletter/*.

ISBN 1-58487-289-6

## FOREWORD

Both the Taiwan Strait and the Korean peninsula harbor real dangers for the Northeast Asian region. The clash between an increasingly divergent nationalist identity in China and in Taiwan represents a new challenge for U.S. policy in the region. Similarly, the rise of pan-Korean nationalism in South Korea, and an unpredictable North Korean regime that has succeeded in driving a wedge between Seoul and Washington, has created another highly combustible zone of potential conflict.

This monograph, by Dr. Sheila Miyoshi Jager, explores how the United States might respond to the emerging new nationalism in the region in order to promote stability and peace. Offering a constructivist approach which highlights the central role that memory, history, and identity play in international relations, the monograph has wide-ranging implications for U.S. foreign policy.

DOUGLAS C. LOVELACE, JR.
Director
Strategic Studies Institute

## BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF THE AUTHOR

SHEILA MIYOSHI JAGER, an Associate Professor of East Asian Studies at Oberlin College, is currently a Visiting Research Professor of National Security Affairs at the Strategic Studies Institute. She is the author of *Narratives of Nation-Building in Korea: A Genealogy of Patriotism* (M. E. Sharpe, 2003) and (with Rana Mitter) *Ruptured Histories: War, Memory, and the Post-Cold War in Asia* (Harvard University Press, 2007). She has published in numerous journals including *Journal of Asian Studies*, *New Literary History*, *Public Culture, Positions: East Asia Cultures Critique*, and *Japan Focus*. Dr. Jager received her Ph.D. in anthropology from the University of Chicago.

## SUMMARY

The main source of regional instability and potential conflict in Northeast Asia consists of those factors to which most international relations theorists have paid the least attention, namely, issues of memory, identity, and nationalism. The potential for violent military clashes in the Taiwan Strait and the Korean peninsula largely involve disputes over history and territory, linked as they are to the unresolved legacies of the Cold War: a divided Korean peninsula and a divided China. The "history disputes" that surround these divisions continue to be a source of instability for the region. The clash between an increasingly divergent national identity in China and in Taiwan represents a new challenge for U.S. policy on China. Moreover, it is reshaping the security environment in the Taiwan Strait in potentially destabilizing ways.

Similarly, the rise of pan-Korean nationalism in South Korea is problematic. Motivated by the desire of South Korea's younger generation to seek reconciliation rather than confrontation with North Korea, it has led to severe strains in U.S.-South Korean relations as both Washington and Seoul attempt to resolve the ongoing North Korean nuclear crisis. Linked to the rise of new and competing nationalisms in the region is China's and South Korea's suspicion of Japan and the rise of neonationalism in that country. U.S. mishandling of these regional tensions involving questions of identity and interpretations of history could plunge the entire region inadvertently into war and conflict.

This monograph reflects on how the United States might respond to the emerging nationalisms in the region in order to promote stability and peace. Breaking

with both realist and liberal analysis, the monograph offers a constructivist approach which highlights the central role that memory, history, and identity play in the international relations of the area, with wide-ranging implications for U.S. foreign policy.

# THE POLITICS OF IDENTITY: HISTORY, NATIONALISM AND THE PROSPECT FOR PEACE IN POST-COLD WAR EAST ASIA

In an interview with Asian journalists on November 8, 2005, President George W. Bush urged Asian nationals to put their past behind them "in order to overcome the tensions standing in the way of an optimistic future."[1] He went on to say that "it is possible to forget the past . . . it's difficult, but it is possible." In a related speech about the role of history in contemporary U.S.-South Korean relations, Senator Hillary Rodham Clinton chided South Korea for what she claimed was a fog of "historical amnesia" that was clouding South Korea's relationship with Washington.[2] Warning that the U.S.-Republic of Korea (ROK) alliance was at a critical juncture, she reminded South Koreans of the U.S. role in bringing about their country's remarkable economic resurgence after the Korean War.

President Bush was referring to the recent anti-Japanese protests in China and South Korea, while Senator Clinton was speaking of rising anti-American sentiments in South Korea and strains in the U.S.-ROK alliance over the North Korean nuclear issue. In each case, America's policymakers are beginning to recognize the vital role of national memory in shaping contemporary events, although how memory is linked to the emergence of a new post-Cold War order in East Asia is less understood.

While current debates on the future of international relations in Northeast Asia have focused mostly on security dilemma, balance of power, and neoliberal cooperation theory in predicting the prospects for either regional tension or prolonged peace in the

region, the vital role of memory, national identity, and history in influencing Northeast Asia's new strategic alignments and emerging international tensions has not yet been seriously addressed by international relations scholars or the American policy community.[3] Academic analyses of the causes of conflict have looked to structural theories of international relations (balance of power, opportunities for trade, and so on) and largely discounted ideas and culture as causal variables. But as Thomas Berger has pointed out, "This gap in the academic analyses has practical consequences. In the absence of theoretically grounded models that can explain which particular factors are important and why, it is impossible to articulate a foreign policy that addresses them as issues."[4] At best, the history disputes that currently plague relations between China, South Korea, and Japan have been treated as mere epiphenomena, that is, as being reflective of other, underlying forces of the self-interested state.

Perhaps the most common manifestation of this debate, extending to the future of the Northeast Asian region in general, is the disagreement between so-called liberal optimists and realist pessimists.[5] By and large, liberals take the view that the future of Northeast Asian relations will be basically stable and peaceful, pointing to the leavening effects of the economic interdependence of the region, while realist pessimists expect confrontation and conflict due to the new power dynamic of a rising China. The implicit assumption underlying both these views about the current state of Northeast Asian relations, however, is that all units in global politics have the same a priori interests to further their material power, whether economic or military. As mere symbolic manifestations of these material interests, the emotional debates surrounding

the history of World War II and Japanese colonialism are treated as mere shibboleths of competing elites who seize on popular ideas to propagate and legitimize their own self-interests; the ideas themselves do not play a causal role in formulating policy. For realists, the recent showdown between Beijing and Tokyo over history is merely a symbolic manifestation of the new and emerging great power struggles between a rising China and a declining Japan, while for liberals, the history problem that currently plagues relations in Northeast Asia has been largely treated as an impediment that eventually will be resolved by the forces of economic cooperation and eventual regional integration.[6]

But as David Shambaugh has pointed out, the tendency to construct procrustean theories and the drive to establish the superiority of one school of thought over another have led to an approach that hinders efforts to understand the complexities of real world politics: "Unfortunately, there is no single conceptual metamodel sufficient to describe the evolving Asian system; one size does not fit all."[7] Moreover, if we concede that the history problem in contemporary Northeast Asian international relations is linked closely not only to questions of power and cooperation, but also to new notions of national identity and legitimacy, and that perceptions of the past are connected intimately with the meaning and cohesion that social groups confer upon themselves, then the way in which history currently is being debated in China, Japan, Taiwan, and South Korea has direct consequences for future political action and international relations. Questions of national identity and legitimacy cannot be understood deductively or theoretically, and to the extent that Asia's modern history of war has left an indelible imprint on these societies' views of the world

and of each other, the current history disputes will continue to play a significant role in shaping the future relations of states in Northeast Asia.

To a large extent, these disputed histories are products of the unfinished legacy of the Cold War era. The collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991 led to sustained efforts to rediscover and rewrite the past which, in East Asia, has included both the history of the Second Sino-Japanese War (1937-45), the Chinese Civil War (1945-49), and the Korean War (1950-53). Unlike in Europe, however, the Cold War has not ended in Asia. Rising nationalism in China is a symptom of a nation in need of a new identity in the wake of global communism's collapse, and what brings the history problem (particularly, the history of the Second Sino-Japanese War) to the fore diplomatically is precisely the search for new sources of Chinese "post-communist" identity. The rise of neonationalism in Japan is the result of new domestic pressures by "normal state" advocates to return to a pre-1945 world of statehood defined in terms of the right of belligerency.[8] Similarly, in South Korea, a new generation of leaders is seeking to heal the wounds of national division inflicted by the Korean War by reconciliation, rather than confrontation, with North Korea.

This search for a "post-communist" identity in China, a "post-1945 identity" in Japan, or a "post-division identity" in South Korea, however, is not solely the prerogative of government elites who seek to maintain their power. The use by elites of growing popular nationalism as a powerful propaganda tool to prop up state interests blinds us to the critical role that people and passions play in politics. For example, popular Chinese reactions to former Japanese Prime Minister Koizumi's visits to Yasukuni Shrine, which

honors Japan's war dead (including 14 World War II-era Class A war criminals), cannot be explained away by the machinations of Chinese state-party interests with complete power and control over the nationalist discourse. Similarly, the nationalist rhetoric emerging in contemporary South Korea, which seeks to include its old Cold War enemy North Korea in a new story of pan-Korean unity and identity, cannot be explained away by the persuasive skills of South Korea's new leftist government elites. These phenomena suggest the need for an explanation that recognizes the intrinsic power of the nationalist ideas themselves and how the substantive content of these ideas—about people's perceptions of their past and their future—really matter for policy.

A serious effort to study the impact of national identity on contemporary East Asian international relations also opens up the possibility of exploring the category of ideas and notions of identity as evolving entities amenable to change. Far from a static identity as embedded in an unchanging symbology of a strategic culture or as reflective of a particular East Asian historical pattern, national identities are mutable, with significant world events impacting and radically changing peoples' national self-conceptions and identities.[9] The changing balance of power in East Asia following the collapse of the Cold War geopolitical world order has created conditions for changes in the way in which the wartime past is being evaluated, and in forces shaping these countries' *new* nationalist self-conceptions.

As long "forgotten" war crimes are suddenly brought out into the open for public inspection (like the Korean comfort women issue in South Korea and the 1937 Nanjing Massacre in China), other war crimes

are being reburied in the name of reestablishing the bonds of community torn apart by the Cold War (a case in point being the two Koreas). These exhumations and reburials of the past play an important part in the story of Northeast Asia's post-Cold War political transformations. Challenges to U.S. policy in Northeast Asia that are linked to the current history disputes in the region include contested borders, shifting configurations of military power and diplomatic perceptions, and possible redefinitions of national security objectives among the East Asian countries.

The main sources of regional instability and potential conflict in Northeast Asia are thus those which, ironically, most international relations theorists have paid the least attention to, primarily because they are the kinds of variables that typically are downplayed in contemporary international relations theory, namely, issues of memory, identity, and nationalism. As Thomas Berger observes, "The chief source of instability in the region today lies in the peculiar construction of national identity and interest on the part of the chief actors in the region."[10] Relying on insights from the so-called constructivist approach to international relations, this monograph aims to examine the current history disputes in China, South Korea, Taiwan, and Japan in the context of post-Cold War Asian politics, including the consequences of these recent developments for U.S. policy in Northeast Asia.[11]

There are two areas of particular concern in this connection: the fundamentally irreconcilable nationalist movements in China and Taiwan, and the unresolved issue of national unification on the Korean peninsula. The potential for violent military clashes in the Taiwan Strait and the Korean peninsula, which could plunge the entire region into chaos, largely involves disputes

over history and territory linked to the unresolved legacies of the Cold War.[12]

The monograph is divided into two interrelated sections. The first section begins with a discussion of the rise of nationalisms in China and Taiwan, and how each is linked, on the one hand, to China's "new" memories of World War II (including the brutal role that Japan played in that conflict), and, on the other, to Taiwan's "new" memories of the Chinese Civil War (1945-49) and Guomindang (Chinese Nationalist Party, or GMD) oppression. Accompanying the rise of Chinese nationalism that is linked to the memory of China's historical victimization by Japan and the West has been the simultaneous emergence of Taiwanese nationalism as Taiwan's leaders attempt to balance their search for an autonomous political identity with the external constraints imposed on that identity. The clash between increasingly divergent national identities in China and Taiwan represents a new challenge for U.S. policy on China and is reshaping the security environment in the Taiwan Strait in potentially destabilizing ways.

The second section explores competing national memories and interests as they concern the division of the Korean peninsula, and regional efforts to resolve the ongoing North Korean nuclear crisis. Central to this issue is the rise of pan-Korean nationalism in South Korea, and how new memories of the Korean War, and of North Korea's role in this brutal conflict, have led to severe strains in Seoul's relationship with Washington as South Koreans seek reconciliation, not confrontation, with Pyongyang. In order to preserve the U.S.-South Korean alliance and find a resolution to the ongoing North Korean nuclear crisis, the United States will need to rethink its relationship with Pyongyang, including ways to finally end the Korean War. Recent new

developments toward these goals are encouraging. On February 13, 2007, a historic deal was struck in Beijing, commencing the process of the denuclearization of the Korean peninsula.[13] The monograph concludes with some reflections on how the United States might respond to the changing geopolitical dynamics and emerging new nationalisms in Northeast Asia, and on what they mean for U.S. future policy in the region.

## Overcoming a "Century of Humiliation": The Taiwan Problem.

Efforts to rewrite the past often occur during periods of momentous change.[14] This is particularly true of China, where the memory and meaning of World War II have undergone considerable reevaluations in recent years and have played a central role in the rise of popular nationalism in that country.

The role of historical memory in the configuration of a new Chinese post-Cold War identity becomes clear when one considers that the People's Republic of China (PRC) has taken little notice of the War of Resistance to Japan (*Kang-ri zhanzheng*), as the Second Sino-Japanese war (1937-45) war is known in China. Although stylized versions of the conflict were found in sources such as Cultural Revolution-era model operas, for the most part, Mao downplayed the memory of the war—and Chinese victimization—in order to focus on more positive aspects of China's past that would serve as a model for building its communist future.[15] As Rana Mitter has remarked, "In one sense, China's new awareness of its anti-Japanese conflict is part of a process by which its attitude toward its history is becoming more normal. For all other major powers involved in World War II, victorious or defeated,

engagement with their war experience was crucial for creating postwar identity."[16]

But to a large extent this engagement with the war did not happen in China. This was in large part due to the way in which China moved from the World War to the Cold War. By 1946, the Nationalists and the Communists were at war, and the eventual victory of the Communists in 1949 meant that a balanced treatment of the earlier conflict was impossible. The fact that Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalists had played a significant role in defeating the Japanese could not be discussed easily after the Communist victory in 1949. Moreover, Mao's policies often permitted the Japanese to destroy Nationalist forces and thus strengthen the Communists. While Japanese brutality in the conflict was not entirely forgotten, Chinese historical discussion of the war by and large regarded the Nationalists as a greater threat than the Japanese. Indeed, according to his personal physician, Mao even credited Japan with the Communist victory in the civil war.[17] When Japanese Premier Kakuei Tanaka came to China in 1972 and tried to apologize for his country's 1937 invasion of China, Mao assured him that it was the "help" of the Japanese invasion that made the Communist victory possible.[18] The signing of the Anhou-Tanaka Communiqué of 1972, especially with the signing of the Treaty of Peace and Friendship in 1978, has given credibility to the bitter accusation, long hurled from Taiwan, that Communist participation in the War of Resistance to Japan had been, at best, half-hearted and calculating.[19]

From the late 1980s onwards, however, China's portrayal of the war changed. The immediate context of the shift was the Chinese response to the issue of a Japanese textbook revision when it appeared in 1982.[20]

The event, however, that actually triggered Chinese protests was Prime Minister Nakasone's visit to the Yasukuni Shrine in 1985, marking the 40th anniversary of Japan's surrender on August 15, 1945. By linking the visit with the revival of Japanese militarism and recollecting the horrors of World War II, Chinese leaders were provided an occasion to stir up nationalist sentiments, thereby helping to unite the country in the common goal of economic development that had been initiated by Mao's successor, Deng Xiaoping. The decline of ideology that accompanied China's post-Mao reforms exposed the loss of faith in the communist system, and the search for some unifying system of belief intensified during this period. By 1985, there were already troubling signs that the post-Mao economic reforms were running into trouble, and whipping up nationalist sentiments provided an expedient for reinvigorating the struggle for development.[21]

It was also during the 1980s that officially-endorsed versions of the new history of World War II began to appear in China's news and information media, including films, books, and, perhaps most concretely, three massive museums that were built in Nanjing, Beijing, and Shenyang. These sites were chosen for their commemorative value in recalling to mind three major incidents during the war: the 1937 Nanjing massacre, the 1937 Marco Polo bridge incident, and the Japanese invasion of Manchuria in 1931. In addition, the desire for reunification with Taiwan encouraged a more positive attitude toward the former Nationalist government.[22] As Arif Dirlik notes, "Victory celebrations throughout the summer of 1985 recalled Chinese unity displayed during the war, including cooperation between the Communist Party and the GMD, which made victory possible."[23]

This revisionist historiography of World War II also became important to the Chinese contemporary self-image and new perceptions of national identity following Deng's post-Mao economic reforms. Not only did the new accounts of the war begin to emphasize both Communist and GMD cooperation in fighting the Japanese, which helped foster the myth of national unity among all Chinese; they also asserted China's new image as an assertive and confident power, now willing and able to stand up to its former foe, Japan. History became, again in the words of Arif Dirlik, "a means of providing symmetry to an asymmetrical relationship."[24] Throughout the 1980s, efforts to rewrite the history of World War II thus became bound with transformations of China's image of itself and of others.

By the 1990s, China's nationalistic discourse took on an entirely new turn, especially with regard to its relationship to the West. During the 1980s, China's intellectuals, by and large, were very pro-Western, even promoting Western democratic values against the Chinese state.[25]

By the Cold War's end, however, a great majority of these same pro-western Chinese intellectuals now submitted to the official party line. As many observers of China have noted, the rise of China's assertive nationalism in the 1990s displayed a new anti-Western bias which distinguished it from the pro-Western and democratic views of Chinese intellectuals of the previous decade.[26] At the socio-economic level, the reemergence of this assertive nationalism coincided with the end of the Cold War and the beginning of China's rapid economic growth in the past decade. While the West won the Cold War, many Chinese intellectuals began to express concurrence with the official view that the

post-Cold War transformation in Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union was not as positive as expected. Disillusionment with the concomitant reforms led many Chinese intellectuals who initially had supported the 1989 Tiananmen uprising to conclude that, if China were to initiate similar dramatic reforms promoted by the West, the nation could well share a fate similar to that of Russia and Eastern Europe. Moreover, the tragedy of Tiananmen and the sustained criticism that China was subjected to by the Western press were interpreted as yet another form of Western "bullying," which conjured patriotic themes linked to China's past humiliation by foreigners. With the government exploiting these themes, "the fanfare of patriotism remained a largely orchestrated show until it began to be echoed in academic circles in the mid-1990s with the emergence of the so-called '*China Can Say No* literature' that became accepted as mass-consumption goods rather than academic works." [27]

Amid the anti-Western backlash resulting from the West's post-Tiananmen sanctions against China, the regime was thus able to present itself as the defender of China's pride. It was also able to deflect Western criticism of China's lack of human rights in precisely the same terms. Associating these criticisms with the aggressive, humiliating, and degrading historical experiences of China's past relationship with an imperialist West, both official and populist nationalism portrayed this criticism of China's human rights record as an affront not only to the dignity of the Chinese nation, but to the personal dignity of all Chinese people. As Edward Friedman has pointed out, "Recent events have fostered a feeling among many educated Chinese that promoting democracy is virtually synonymous with treason, with splintering China, and with blocking

its rise and return to greatness. The favored metaphor for economic growth—that of stretching one's wings and flying up—is part of the idiom of national self-respect; it is not the people who fly aloft, but the Chinese nation."[28]

What is remarkable, however, is that most of the proponents of this nationalism were either trained in the West or had been visiting scholars in Western academic institutions.[29] These western-educated Chinese nationalists now play a pivotal role in the contest to define freedom, citizen's rights, and democracy in parochial terms, that is, by emphasizing Chinese values against Western values. Based on an anti-imperialist impulse, this assertive nationalism is thus "characterized by its vehement protest against neo-imperialism and the containment of China by the West, especially by the United States."[30] Memories of past suffering and humiliation inflicted by the Japanese and the West that have become a central part of the rhetoric of China's new populist nationalism therefore must be understood in relation to China's recent emergence as a global power: its ability to finally "stand up" to the West (a claim that also was made by Mao in 1949).[31]

Nevertheless, there are limits to how far the regime will go in the name of nationalist pride. While the regime has permitted, and often encouraged, populist nationalists to take their militant views to the streets, they are careful to call a halt to it when the threat to China's long-term economic interests are at stake. After anti-Japanese protests continued unabated for 3 consecutive days in cities across China in April 2005, Beijing censors, sensing that they had gotten out of hand, imposed the blackout in order to contain further damage to already strained Sino-Japanese relations. These protests were the largest China had seen since

1999, when angry crowds pelted the U.S. Embassy following the accidental U.S. bombing of the Chinese Embassy in Belgrade. At that time, then vice president Hu Jintao, perceiving a threat to Sino-American relations, went on national television to stop them. The Chinese state is thus faced with two seemingly contradictory goals: on the one hand, to integrate China into global capitalist modernity, and on the other to show China's continuing hostility to any forms of neo-imperialism that might remind of past weakness and national fragmentation.[32]

For its part, Japan has abetted China's anti-Japanese nationalism. Despite protests from both China and South Korea, former Japanese Prime Minister Junichiro Koizumi continued to visit the Yasukuni Shrine in Tokyo throughout his tenure in office. It was under Koizumi that observers of Japan first began to witness the emergence of a newer and more strident form of nationalism that made it permissible to recall the war in increasingly positive terms.[33] Concurrent with this narrative of the war, however, has been a growing vocal and aggressive call in some circles for revisions of history textbooks that deny the 1937 Nanjing massacre and the forced prostitution of Asian women.[34] For these neonationalists and "normal state" advocates, the real issue surrounding Japan's history problem is not about repentance (many Japanese people believe that they already have apologized sufficiently for their war crimes), but about confronting the post-1945 Japanese order which has left Japan, as Hisashi Owada put it, "bereft of a healthy nationalism."[35] Decrying the so-called "masochistic historiography" promoted by the pacific education of Japan's postwar educators, these nationalists have also questioned the wisdom of the self-imposed constitutional restrictions on the military

that have denied Japan a "normal" statehood. Japan's new security concerns in Asia, first brought to the fore by North Korea's 1998 *Taepodong* missile launching and its 2006 nuclear test, have led more and more Japanese to question the continuing validity of Article 9. Recent polls, including one conducted by the progressive *Asashi Shimbun* newspaper, show a clear majority of Japanese people and parliamentarians are now in favor of constitution revision.[36] For Japan's neonationalists and "normal" state advocates, the Yasukuni Shrine therefore has increasingly come to stand as a "symbol of Japan as a future warrior rather than . . . of a defeated nation clinging desperately to its martial past."[37]

Thus, whereas China's leaders interpreted Koizumi's continued visits to Yasukuni Shrine as a lack of remorse over the past and as ongoing affronts to Chinese dignity and self-respect, Japan's new nationalists have supported these visits for precisely the same reason: in order to shore up their nation's own diminished sense of national dignity associated with Japan's defeat and subsequent occupation.

But China's anti-Japanese nationalism also serves another purpose. Today, the threat of internal ethnic nationalism is the greatest source of anxiety in Beijing. The revival of the memory of Japanese war atrocities in China thus is aimed to create a common history of national suffering that serves to bind China's diverse ethnic population together by creating an undivided patriotism and loyalty to the Chinese state. While China's history of national humiliation plays a central role in this narrative of shared collective suffering, China's rise as an economic powerhouse is also offered up as a narrative of shared collective redemption.

The restoration of national pride lost during its century of humiliation hinges, ironically, upon China's

dealings with Japan and the West. The contradictions between a populist nationalism that vilifies Japan (and the West) historically, and a pragmatic nationalism that requires China to engage with Japan economically, thus turn on the notion of national redemption, that is, on the Chinese state's pursuit of great power status as antidote to China's historical experience of weakness and national fragmentation. War memory has been central to that realignment and the attempts to square the circle.

This search for an enduring national history that could serve to bind China's diverse populations in identifying with a strong Chinese state also explains why Beijing has encouraged a more positive attitude toward the former Nationalist government (including Nationalist leaders like Chiang Kai-shek) and their contributions to the anti-Japanese war effort. For their utility in creating a common history of shared victimization that could serve to bind Taiwan with the mainland, Nationalist contributions to China's anti-Japanese struggle, once written out of the CCP history of the war, are currently being written back in.[38] Moreover, the goal of reunification with Taiwan plays a central part in China's history of anti-imperialist national struggle. This narrative traces anti-Chinese policies back to Japan's 1870s incursion into Taiwan and Japan's take-over of the island after its victory in the first Sino-Japanese War in 1895. Reunification with Taiwan is thus an intrinsic part of the Party's narrative of national redemption and is linked to China's triumph over its historical victimization, representing the end at last of the age of national humiliation.

A problem, of course, is that native Taiwanese do not share China's historical antipathy toward Japan. Nor do they identify with China's history of anti-imperialist

struggle. Native Taiwanese did not share in China's formative national experiences, including the May 4th Movement, the war of the Northern Expedition, or the Second Sino-Japanese war. When Japan took the island in 1895 as a prize for its victory over China, Tokyo ruled Taiwan as a colony within the Japanese Empire for nearly half a century. This was a deeply formative experience which divided the fate of the island from the mainland. Whereas the Japanese colonization produced a relatively peaceful and orderly system of rule over the Taiwanese, Japanese imperialism, when launched against China, was a ruthlessly destructive and devastating force that led to the mass killings of millions of people.[39] Although the Taiwanese suffered acute hardships at the end of the war, they remain deeply ambivalent over this experience since many Taiwanese soldiers who volunteered and died in the war were regarded less as victims of Japan than as honorable and praiseworthy Japanese subjects.

The end of the Pacific war returned Taiwan by Allied agreement to China. However, the GMD occupation after Japan's surrender proved to be a far more traumatic experience than Japan's 50–year occupation of the island. It was not so much the Sino-Japanese war of 1937-45 that shapes memory in Taiwan, but rather the legacy of the Chinese Civil War and the ruthless suppression of the native Taiwanese population by the GMD that led to a spontaneous uprising against it in early 1947. The way in which this uprising, known as the "228 Incident," has come to be acknowledged in Taiwan during the democratizing era of the 1990s is central to understanding the gulf that separates native Taiwanese (*benshengren*) from the mainlander compatriots (*waisahengren*). This latter population migrated to the island after the civil war under the

duress of defeat. The massacre of native Taiwanese that took place on February 28, 1947, by the GMD and the period thereafter have become central to the *benshengren* opponents of GMD rule and a rallying cry for pro-democracy activists from the 1970s onwards. During the 1990s, the political meaning of the 228 Incident was transformed from one that had symbolized resistance to internal repression from GMD rule, to a symbol for resistance to external oppression by mainland China. The principal definition of national identity thus lies in the contrast between democracy on the island and dictatorship on the mainland. As Edward Vickers says, "The incident has come primarily to symbolize the importance of protecting independence and democracy for all of the island's inhabitants—both native Taiwanese and the 'new Taiwanese' of *waisahengren* extraction—from the threat of another mainland takeover."[40] This sense of Taiwan as a society fundamentally distinct from that of the PRC, and a determination to defend this distinctiveness from a new mainland threat, is the principal rationale for Taiwanese independence: its achievement of democracy that the mainland has failed to realize.

Yet, a peculiarity of Taiwan's claim to independence is that it wholly depends upon a foreign power to uphold its status. While Taiwan's achievement of democracy is praiseworthy, "the underlying reality is that the island remains a protectorate of U.S. imperial power."[41] The stalemate between Beijing and Taipei thus has consequences not just for cross-Strait relations, but for Sino-U.S. relations as well. U.S. support for Taiwan has been a major obstacle standing in the way of friendly Sino-American relations. In discerning long-term trends in the region, optimistic U.S. officials have a much harder time making the case for peaceful resolution of

the Taiwan problem, particularly as China's military buildup opposite Taiwan continues to grow. Ever since Taiwan's first directly-elected president Lee Teng-hui took office in 1996, the pace and scope of China's arms buildup have increased markedly, leading some U.S. policy analysts and military planners to suspect that China may resort to armed conflict to achieve its goal of national unification.[42] Lee became the first leader of Taiwan to promote publicly Taiwan's move away from the reunification goal. Although Chinese officials understand that military aggression against Taiwan risks conflict with the United States, they have repeatedly insisted that they will have no choice but to take military action if Taiwan declares independence. Beijing spelled out this threat with the passage of the controversial Anti-Secession Law in March 2005, which put on record in a binding legal code the threat of military action should Taiwan's leaders take steps toward independence.[43]

Washington's response to this threat has been to continue its policy of strategic ambiguity which, on the one hand, formally commits the United States to the principle of "One China" as proclaimed in the joint Shanghai communiqué of 1972, but on the other hand informally binds the United States to protect the island against any threat of invasion as stated in the Taiwan Relations Act of 1979. American policy thus continues to balance U.S. assurances to China of its support of a "One China policy" and of opposition to Taiwan independence with its assurances to Taiwan of continued support and protection.

This dual deterrence policy, however, is coming under increasing pressure by pro-independence moves by the current President Chen Shui Bian and his administration. Although the George W. Bush

administration has not taken extraordinary efforts to resolve the Taiwan problem, Washington has increasingly become, according to Perry Anderson, "a hostage to Taiwanese democracy." The surprise presidential win by Democratic Progressive Party (DPP) candidate Chen Shui Bian in 2000 and his reelection in 2004 have reaffirmed this growing separatist trend in Taiwan with worrying implications for Washington. Concerned that Beijing is losing its patience with the separatist movement in Taiwan that seeks to cultivate a Taiwanese identity distinct from China, Washington has shifted its policy emphasis toward reassuring Beijing.[44] However, it remains unclear how long the United States can continue to balance its ties with Taipei and Beijing, given the emergence of increasingly vocal Taiwanese voters who appear to be prepared to confront China over their pro-independence aspirations.

These pro-independence inclinations, amounting to more than a mere political movement, have also manifested themselves in the classroom. Along with the "new" recollections of the 228 Incident as the starting point of Taiwanese resistance against the GMD (and mainland China's) oppression, the Ministry of Education introduced in 2004 a new draft outline for 2006 history courses that removed GMD founder Sun Yat Sen and the Chinese Revolution of 1911 from Taiwan's domestic history. These events were moved into the "foreign history" course on China.[45]

The decision to consider treating the 1911 Revolution officially as a "foreign" event received widespread and scandalous coverage in China, which regarded it as a clear symbol of just how far the DPP administration has shifted Taiwan's official political identity.[46] Taiwanese politics no longer revolves around the opposition between islanders and mainlanders, but between

Taiwan and the CCP in Beijing. Increasingly organized around identity politics with little distinction in social and economic policy between the Green (DPP) and Blue (GMD) camps, the popular embrace of nationalism by Taiwan's new politicians threatens to upset the provisional nature of the status quo that has served as the basis for stability in the region for more than 4 decades.

For Beijing leaders, such nationalist trends across the Strait have signaled dangerous adventurism with worrying implications for the Chinese state. What concerns China's leaders most is the fear of repeating their own history. In the wake of the Opium War and other encounters with the West, as well as the disastrous defeat in the Sino-Japanese War of 1894-95, it was the search for national renewal by nationalists like Sun Yat Sen and other leaders of the ethnic Han majority that led to the 1911 overthrow of the Manchu dynasty, which they had stigmatized as "foreign." What followed was the fragmentation of the country into various fiefdoms and decades of civil war. Beijing leaders also have learned the lessons from the former Soviet Union's collapse and the breakup of Eastern Europe. Fearful of repeating this history, and the history of the Soviet empire, Beijing's leaders have eagerly sought to revive the shared memory of China's victimization by Japan, which entails both downplaying the period of the Chinese civil war and overlooking instances of conflict between Han Chinese and China's minority nationalisms.

Although the PRC acknowledges the existence of multiple nationalities within its territory and concedes to them autonomous jurisdictions, China nevertheless remains a unitary, not a federal, state.[47] Three large areas—Tibet, Xinjiang, and Inner Mongolia—constitute

separate linguistic and ethnic communities within the Chinese state which are distinct from the ethnic Han majority who make up 92 percent of the population. Taiwan, like Tibet, Xinjiang, and Inner Mongolia, is a historical holdover from the time of the vast Qing empire. However, it distinguishes itself from these other areas by the fact that the vast majority of its population is ethnically Han. About 85 percent are descendents of migrants who arrived on the island from Fujian and Guangdong Provinces between the 17th and late 19th centuries. Another 12 percent are mainlander Chinese who came to the island at the end of the civil war in 1949, while the remaining 2 percent are native Taiwanese aborigines.

A declaration of *de jure* independence by Taiwan would thus constitute a real threat to the territorial integrity of China, since it could invite a dynamic of national disintegration like the one that brought an end to the Qing empire and the former Soviet Union. After all, provinces like Tibet and Xinjiang, with their own distinct ethnicity, language, and culture, have much stronger claims to separate national identity than Taiwan with its majority Han population. Moreover, a declaration of independence would pose a serious threat to the very existence of the CCP regime. This is so because the Party's legitimacy rests on its repeated pledge to defend China's integrity, pride, and national interests. Taiwan's successful secession from the mainland would evoke the selfsame sense of shame that many Chinese associate with the memory of the island's annexation by Japan and the beginning of China's century of humiliation. China's anti-Japanese nationalism demands the return of Taiwan, a former colony of Japan, in order to redeem China from its humiliating history of subordination to foreign powers.

Chinese scholar Liu Ji put these views more starkly: "Chinese history is a history of fighting disunity and reinforcing unity. Any person or political group who maintains Chinese unity and territorial integrity wins the people's support and the appreciation of historians. Any persons or political group who tries to divide China, to surrender the territory of our motherland to others, and thus to harm the integrity of our motherland, will be cast aside by the people and condemned from generation to generation."[48]

Taiwan's creep toward independence as well as the pressure by China's new populist nationalism for the regime in Beijing to prove itself by acting in an assertive way against Japan (and other foreign powers), has thus created a number of new challenges for American Taiwan policy. For one thing, the policy of strategic ambiguity that has served the United States for over a quarter of a century was premised on a goal of peaceful national reunification shared by both China and Taiwan. During the rule of Chiang Kai-shek and the GMD, there was no risk that Taiwan would declare independence from China, nor did it threaten to. The GMD's reunification goal, while never credible, had reinforced Taiwan's political and cultural identification with China. That goal was based on the claim that Taiwan was the true political and cultural representative of the Chinese state as forged by Sun Yat Sen and the 1911 Revolution. Even after Nixon's 1972 visit to Beijing, which eventually led Washington to transfer its official recognition from Taiwan to China under the Taiwan Relations Act in 1979, both CCP and GMD leaders nevertheless continued to acknowledge the One-China principle.

Taiwan's democratization and the rise of identity politics in the 1990s, however, has undermined this

traditional support for reunification in Taiwan. As Malcolm Cook has observed, "Reunification is now a minority political position of the opposition, with little or no institutional base in the Taiwan state."[49] Whether Taiwan's search for an autonomous identity will ever lead its leaders to formally declare independence is unclear. What is clear, however, is that Taiwan's increasingly assertive nationalism threatens the status quo. The last five U.S. presidential administrations have worked to preserve this status quo through adherence to a flexible approach that allowed Washington both to have a One-China policy and to assist in the defense of Taiwan. However, Taiwanese democratization and the rise of nationalism in that country have threatened the ability of the United States to maintain the status quo, with frightening implications for both the United States and the region.

After President Bush's 2001 announcement that the United States would do "whatever it takes" to defend Taiwan, fears that such a mixed message "had encouraged rash behavior in Taipei has since led Washington to try to rein in DPP exuberance."[50] But it is not at all clear how effective Washington's efforts to restrain Taipei will continue to be. As Andrew Peterson has put it, "Whether the United States encourages it or not, the movement for Taiwanese independence is growing."[51] Although the United States continues to advocate a peaceful resolution while deterring aggression through strategic ambiguity, this policy is increasingly viewed as problematic by those who fear that domestic political forces in Taiwan have undermined the basis of America's long-standing cross-Straits status quo. If Taipei finally decides to plunge ahead, the United States would be forced to pick sides in an escalating game of brinkmanship.

What makes this scenario all the more frightening is that the issues at stake are more symbolic than substantive: they have more to do with patriotic posturing than with achieving the actual conditions of independence, since Taiwan is already a de facto independent state, albeit one without international recognition. Although Taiwan leaders believe that their country is entitled to legitimate standing in the international community, the fact remains, as Perry Anderson has explained succinctly, "that the nation claiming independence is itself completely dependent on a foreign power to safeguard and insure it."[52] Trevor Corson is even blunter: "Is the United States willing to sacrifice American lives and regional stability just so Taiwan could add a word in parentheses to its name?"[53] Furthermore, it is not clear whether Taiwan's declaration of *de jure* independence in fact would change its international standing, since few countries would actually risk their relationship with Beijing to recognize Taiwan.

For the CCP, the issue of Taiwanese separation is linked to issues of history, nationalism, and domestic political considerations by the Party. It worries that humiliation on this issue "could provide the rallying point for people frustrated with the Party for other reasons."[54] Few observers of the Taiwan problem actually believe that China wants to occupy Taiwan physically. China has everything to lose and very little to gain from a conflict with Taiwan, or with the United States for that matter. As Thomas Christensen notes, "The conflict isn't about territorial acquisition, it's about political identity."[55] What China wants is simply to prevent Taiwan from securing legal independence that would foreclose the possibility of eventual reunification. This was the basis for the "one country,

two systems approach" proposed in 1979 by Deng Xiaoping stipulating that Taiwan could keep its own administration and even its own military intact. Beijing is also increasing China's economic integration with Taiwan in the hopes of deterring pro-independence forces from pushing their cause too far.[56] But the reality is that increasing economic integration has not led to a decrease of nationalist posturing in Taiwan. In much the same way that pragmatic and populist nationalism has often pulled Beijing in contradictory directions, Taiwan's increasing economic dependence on the mainland has not deterred significantly the rising nationalist forces on the island.

In light of recent trends in the region, which has witnessed a surge of nationalism in China, South Korea, and Japan, it appears doubtful that Taiwanese nationalism will fade away any time soon, despite the recent setbacks for the DPP. Maintaining the "one China" framework in the face of these nationalist trends will require Washington to take on more assertive and intrusive actions to resist efforts by either Chinese or Taiwanese nationalists to alter the status quo.[57] Short of withdrawing from its pledge to protect the island, thereby forcing Taiwan alone to face the consequences of upsetting the status quo—but also undermining U.S. credibility, long-term security, and moral interests in the political liberalization of the mainland in the process—the United States should simply *clarify* that pledge. Thomas Christensen, for example, has proposed that the United States declare its commitment to defending Taiwan's freedom and democracy, not its sovereignty: "The goal of such pro-democracy assurance strategy is not to oppose the independence of Taiwan actively, but to make a credible public commitment that the United States has no interest in fighting for this outcome, were

it to occur."[58] The immediate result would be a dramatic reduction in China's fears, but, more constructively, it would link the prospect of China's unification with Taiwan to the achievement of certain democratic conditions which, as Christensen notes, "can be a powerful force for liberalization on the mainland."[59] By linking unification with democracy, the United States could continue to maintain its traditional commitment to the "One-China policy" without risking political entanglement in Taiwanese nationalism.

Yet, such a policy prescription is not without its inherent contradictions. How can the United States defend Taiwan's freedom while at the same time deny the Taiwanese people the right to exercise that freedom? Since the cause of Taiwanese nationalism rests politically on the national right of self-determination, a conditional promise to defend Taiwan's democracy, but not its sovereignty, would appear to be a contradiction in terms.

However, the right to self-determination always has been situational. As Perry Anderson put it, "Where a nation-state was already constituted, rather than still to be created, self-determination [by a part] has been systematically rejected."[60] In such cases, this "right" disappears, and "the standard means of preventing or crushing secession is war."[61] Ideologically speaking, then, what is at stake in Taiwan is not self-determination per se, but secession. Today's PRC largely resembles the territorial holdover from the Qing empire which contained distinct ethnic and linguistic communities within the largely Han-dominated majority that make up nearly 90 percent of the total population. To the historical Han core of the country, the Manchus added Manchuria, Tibet, and Mongolia, as well as Xinjiang and an additional 600,000 square miles of new territories in the far northwest.[62]

Although Beijing acknowledges the existence of these communities as distinct nationalities and accords them autonomous jurisdiction, their place within "greater China" is legitimized by the fact that they are historical holdovers of the Manchu empire. From this standpoint, Taiwan, which is ethnically Han and historically falls within the national core rather than imperial periphery of this hybrid structure, is part of China. Its independence from mainland China therefore would be, in terms comparable with other political entities that have sought separation from the nation-state, a secession.

The historical precedents for defection from the nation-state reveal that secessionist movements have rarely been successful. "No standard nation-state has so far ever allowed the detachment from its territory of a breakaway community," Perry Anderson noted.[63] Nor are democracies more tolerant of separatist leanings than dictatorships, as the American Civil War, with its 600,000 dead, has aptly demonstrated. It is therefore highly unlikely that the attitude of any future Chinese democracy toward the secession of Taiwan would differ significantly on this issue from China's present dictatorship.[64]

Although the United States has made clear its opposition to any formal declaration of Taiwanese independence, it continues to treat Taiwanese nationalism as a legitimate expression of a vibrant democracy and the culmination of a popular mandate in need of U.S. protection and support. But Washington's commitment to Taiwan's democracy cannot mean respect for all the choices made by the Taiwanese people, particularly since the cause of Taiwanese independence completely depends upon the United States to secure it. By treating Taiwanese nationalism as an expression

of the right of self-determination rather than secession, Washington has boxed itself into a dangerous corner leaving it highly vulnerable to the machinations of both Taiwanese and Chinese nationalism that could force the United States to become involved in a costly war it has no desire to fight. Washington is caught in a bind, where two key values—self-determination and unification—no longer mesh.

When the United States withdrew official recognition of Taiwan and agreed to acknowledge Beijing's One-China principle as proclaimed in the joint Shanghai communiqué of 1972, Washington implicitly agreed that Taiwan was part of China, and that peaceful resolution of the conflict remained the ultimate goal of U.S. policy. A clear but conditional commitment to Taiwan's democracy, but not to its sovereignty, merely reaffirms Washington's long-standing commitment to abide by the terms set forth in this original agreement. Such a commitment must entail an unambiguous rejection of Taiwanese independence, and equally unambiguous support of Taiwan's freedom and peaceful unification.

In this way, the United States can make a credible public commitment to both the principle of unification and democracy, thereby fulfilling its pledge to abide by the "One-China" principle while also ensuring that unification be achieved through peaceful and democratic means. Taipei will not like this pro-democratic reasoning that undermines its basis for achieving national autonomy, however symbolic. Yet, the fact remains that the island claiming independence remains a protectorate of U.S. power and as such, the United States cannot allow Taiwanese nationalism to dictate a politics of conflict that might involve America in a war between Taiwan and China. As for Beijing,

precisely because it has both military and economic reasons for avoiding war, assurances that the United States will not support Taiwan's permanent separation from the mainland would go a long way in improving relations between the United States and China.

While managing the competing nationalisms in both Taiwan and China represents a major challenge for U.S. policy on China and the key to maintaining peace in East Asia, the highly unpredictable nature of the North Korean regime and the rise of emotive nationalism in South Korea are other potential sources of instability for the region. Like the Taiwan Strait, the Korean peninsula represents a highly combustible zone of potential crisis that, if not managed properly, can plunge the region into violent military conflict that would have far-reaching implication for international relations in Asia and beyond. At issue is North Korea's emergence as a new nuclear power, and South Korea's response to the ongoing crisis as it works to end the seemingly interminable Korean War and promote the reunification of the Korean peninsula. How Washington responds to the rise of pan-Korean nationalism in South Korea will have implications not only for the future of the U.S.-South Korean alliance, but also for the peaceful resolution of the ongoing North Korean nuclear crisis. Like the Taiwanese dilemma, the North Korean crisis is manageable only if the United States recognizes that the major sources of conflict in contemporary East Asia, far from structurally driven, have arisen from new historical controversies linked to emerging nationalisms in the region. Resolving these conflicts requires understanding the complex permutations of these historical debates and their implications for conflict and peace in Northeast Asia.

**Ending the Korean War: The North Korean Nuclear Crisis in an Age of Unification.**

Unification of the Korean peninsula is the shared desire of all Koreans north and south of the demilitarized zone (DMZ). Unlike Taiwan, which has drifted away from its goal of unification with democratization, a new generation of South Koreans has worked hard to rejoin the bonds between the two Koreas that were severed during the Cold War. These efforts have resulted in new policy initiatives towards North Korea, including economic cooperation and cultural exchanges. With the ascendancy of the first president from the opposition in 1998, Kim Dae Jung fundamentally reoriented his country's relationship to its former Cold War enemy. Rejecting the premise of previous South Korean presidents that only a hardline approach would make North Korea more conciliatory, Kim initiated his "sunshine policy," which essentially separated politics from economics, in order to permit South Korean companies to do business with North Korea without regard to political differences. The impact of this approach, according to Kim, would be felt gradually, as North Korea was penetrated and assuaged by the liberalizing influence of an economy already integrated with the global economy. In time, it was hoped, North Korea would have liberalized enough to make a more open relationship or even unification with South Korea possible.[65]

The new engagement policy has continued to inform Seoul's relationship with Pyongyang under the current Roh Mu-hyun administration.[66] In sum, the end of military rule in South Korea, the dynamics of democratization, and the normalization of relations between South Korea and its former Cold War enemies,

China and the former Soviet Union, have induced the South Korean government and the public to rethink their brutal struggle with North Korea in light of the changing global and domestic climate of a new post-Cold War era.

The politics of transition has also fueled a close reexamination of the U.S.-South Korean alliance, which accordingly is facing a profound transitional period.[67] The emergence of the so-called "386 generation," which came to power in 2002 with the election of Roh Mu-hyun, was the precipitating step in this transition. Rejecting the previous political paradigm that had prevailed under the Cold War regime, the new generation of leaders in South Korea, capitalizing on intimate ties to the United States, instead have begun to seek realization of the long-held dream of Korean reunification.

Linked to this new focus on inter-Korean reconciliation in South Korean politics has been a renewed interest in the country's wartime past. During the Cold War, the nationalist struggle against communism and the North Korean threat had shaped South Korea's self-image as a developing state under siege. In the era of reform, and particularly with the collapse of European communism after 1989, South Korean leaders have turned their attention outward to the world stage, confident in their nation's new status as a global economic powerhouse. The result of these developments is that South Koreans, freed from the imperatives of the anti-communist line, have begun to think very differently about their former Cold War enemy. These new post-Cold War political revaluations of North Korea are predicated (1) on recognition of the enormous human cost in the event of a North Korean collapse or resumption of the Korean War; and (2) on

a developing perception of North Korea as a blighted but basically benign enemy in need of prodding and support. These views are shared by many younger South Koreans, who came of age during South Korea's transition toward democracy in the late 1980s. Their views have had enormous repercussions not only on the way South Koreans now perceive their wartime past, but their future as well.

Whereas North Korean brutality was central to the official story of the Korean War until the 1990s, the focus has now shifted to reexamining American culpability and misdeeds during the conflict.[68] In this rewriting of the war, North Korea's divisive role in the Korean War is tacitly papered over, while America's alleged culpabilities have moved to the fore. The new war memory that has emerged in the post-Cold War context thus reflects a drastically changing relative view of North Korea and the United States and the latter's role in the U.S.-South Korean security alliance (from savior from communism to perpetrator of war crimes). The active "remembering" of such alleged U.S. atrocities as the massacre of civilians at No Gun Ri and the concurrent erasure of North Korean culpability, all in the name of the peaceful reunification of the peninsula and ending the Cold War/Korean War, reveals how war memory is linked directly to the politics of reunification.

The need to revise Korea's wartime history has many causes, not the least of which was the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991, and with it the loss of North Korea's most powerful ally. After 1991, the communist threat vanished and in its wake stood a shell of a nation, abandoned by history, seeking some way to survive. Suddenly North Korea no longer appeared so threatening; with the military junta out of power,

South Koreans found themselves able to say things about their northern neighbor that they could not say before. The result of such ferment was that South Koreans, freed from the shackling imperatives of the anti-communist line, began to think very differently about their former Cold War enemy.[69] President Roh Mu-hyun's "Policy of Peace and Prosperity" toward North Korea, building on the approach of the earlier Kim Dae Jung administration, interprets Pyongyang's pursuit of nuclear weapons primarily as a defensive strategy, and advocates a policy of engagement with the North to ease the tensions between the two countries.

South Korean efforts to build warmer relations with North Korea thus must be broadly understood not only to move beyond the Korean War and the old Cold War framework that had sustained it, but also to return to a prewar consensus based upon such elusive emotional ties as ethnic identity, nationalism, and shared cultural affinities. Such novel reformulations of pan-Korean nationalism and identity have inevitably put South Korea on a path of confrontation with the United States over the best approach for resolving the North Korean nuclear crisis. South Korea's overriding concern is how to resolve the issue of Korean reunification and to peacefully integrate North Korea back into the world's most dynamic economic region, whether or not there are nuclear weapons.[70] The intensification of memory and identity struggles in South Korea in recent years is therefore part of a growing search for an alternative view of the war years, including new interpretations of U.S.-ROK relations. Attempts to rewrite North Korea back into a shared and ongoing history of national struggle and triumph over adversity—a familiar theme in Korean history—reveal the growing desire for normalization of relations between the two Koreas.

This shift has also brought a fundamental reevaluation in South Korea of U.S.-South Korean relations, as well as the legacy of the unfinished war that the United States is seen now as perpetuating.

This trend has also contributed to the rise of popular anti-American sentiments, producing strains in the U.S.-South Korean alliance that, in turn, have fueled tensions between the Roh and Bush administrations as they seek to find resolution to the ongoing North Korean nuclear crisis.

Today, more South Koreans view the United States as a greater threat to their national security than North Korea. In a recent KBS poll, 43 percent of those surveyed blamed the United States for North Korea's nuclear test as opposed to 37 percent who blamed North Korea, and 13.9 percent who blamed the Roh administration.[71] Meanwhile antipathy towards the United States has continued to grow in South Korea, particularly among the younger generation. A recent public opinion poll sponsored by the *Choson Ilbo* revealed that 65.9 percent of Koreans born in the 1980s (ages 16-25) said they would side with North Korea in the event of a war between North Korea and the United States.[72]

When North Korea went ahead with its nuclear test on October 9, 2006, the Bush administration had hoped that Pyongyang's brazen act would finally create the necessary momentum to precipitate a strategic shift in South Korea's relationship to North Korea and help bridge the widening gap between the two allies. Even North Korea's longtime protector, China, issued suitably harsh-worded statements so that many in Washington believed that the solidarity of the outraged world at last would press the North Koreans to giving up their nuclear weapons.

Yet, despite the initial optimism by the Bush administration that a unified policy on North Korea would be reached on the basis of a full implementation of the final United Nations (UN) Security Council Resolution 1718, both China and South Korea have continued their economic cooperation with the condemned nation. Despite Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice's visit to Asia that was aimed to "rally the support of our friends and allies in Northeast Asia for a comprehensive strategy,"[73] there was no world or even regional outcry to impose full economic sanction against the North.

Determined to pursue his country's engagement policy with the North, President Roh Mu-Hyun widened the gap between Seoul and Washington still further by refusing to go along with the U.S. request at the November 2006 Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) meetings in Hanoi for Seoul to join the Proliferation Strategic Initiative (PSI). Seoul has also refused to discontinue the inter-Korean reconciliation projects in Kaesong and Mt. Kumgang. As one commentator of the summit meetings put it, "What people may remember most about this APEC meeting is that it became painfully obvious just how successful Kim Jong Il—the charter member of the "axis of evil"—has been at driving a wedge between the United States and its ostensible ally in Seoul."[74]

At its core, then, the marked difference in the perception and treatment of the North Korean crisis by the Bush and Roh administrations can be attributed to two profoundly different views and interpretations of the Cold War and the Korean War. Whereas the Bush administration continues to view the Cold War in light of the U.S. "victory" over communism and its role in the Korean War as South Korea's "savior" from

a menacing and aggressive regime that continues to threaten the peace and stability of the world, the Roh administration has adamantly rejected this narrative, in an effort to finally end the Cold War on the Korean peninsula and bring about the peaceful reunification of the two Koreas. Indeed, there is a shared elite and public consensus that the Cold War ideological opposition between communism and liberal democracy is now being supplanted by differences emanating from tradition, values, and social realities among nations. The search for a post-division identity in contemporary South Korea plays an important part in the shift away from confrontation with North Korea toward repairing the bonds of community that were torn by the Cold War. It is this reasoning that has led the Roh administration to vigorously oppose U.S. pressure to participate in the PSI, claiming that it could lead South Korea to unwanted armed conflict with Pyongyang.[75]

What all this means is that Washington must come to terms with the emergence of pan-Korean nationalism in South Korea in which ending the Korean War is the main goal. In practical terms, this will require that the United States engage North Korea in bilateral talks aimed at finally settling the hostile relations between the two countries with the ultimate goal of concluding a peace treaty. Recent developments toward these ends are promising. The setbacks in Iraq, the recent congressional election defeats, and the 3-year deadlock on the Six Party talks have finally pushed the Bush administration to reverse its hardline stance and make the concessions necessary to extract North Korean concessions. The historical deal that was struck on February 13, 2007, in Beijing will hopefully commence the process of denuclearization of the peninsula. Indeed, if anything good has come out of the continuing

debacle in Iraq, it has been the stabilization of East Asia. To the extent that the degeneration of the Middle East has inclined the United States toward a more conciliatory attitude toward North Korea, including an accommodation with China over the boundaries of influence in East Asia, the war in Iraq has had an overall beneficial effect for the region. For the first time since the end of the Cold War, there is a real prospect of peace treaties (U.S-North Korea, Japan-North Korea) and normalization on all sides.

The future of the Korean peninsula hinges on ending the Korean War by helping all Koreans realize the goal of national reunification. Pressing Seoul to adopt measures that conflict with these national interests as a way of dealing with nuclear North Korea denies this post-Cold War reality and the desires of a new generation of South Koreans who seek reconciliation, not confrontation, with North Korea. This denial, and the pursuit of a policy that ignores these new post-Cold War/post-Korean War realities and desires, will likely result in further strains in the relations between the United States and South Korea and a deterioration of Northeast Asia's security environment.

Fortunately, the February 13, 2007, agreement may offer a new path to reverse this trend. Still, there is incompleteness to the agreement, and so how this landmark deal will be implemented will require good faith efforts from all parties involved. The United States, in particular, must make every effort to start normalization relations with North Korea, since it has the most to lose if the deal falls through. Washington cannot afford to repeat the history of the failed 1994 Agreed Framework. While no country in the region has welcomed the emergence of a nuclear North Korea, none of them has pursued regional stability

by subordinating their own national concerns to the global concerns of nonproliferation. China's primary interest is to maintain the status quo of national regimes. Beijing fears a North Korean collapse as much as it fears a unified Korea friendly to Washington. China's leaders are willing to live with the status quo of a divided peninsula and a dependent North Korea. While Seoul also does not welcome Pyongyang's nuclear capabilities, its main long-term goal is to achieve national reconciliation, and it will continue to support engagement with North Korea, with or without Washington's blessing.

Washington's pursuit of a policy that attempts to divide the two Koreas against one another will not persuade Pyongyang to relinquish its nuclear and missile forces. Rather, the likely result will be continued inertia on the issue, as each power pursues its own interests regardless of any others, thereby ensuring preservation of the status quo, the continued fraying of the U.S.-South Korean alliance, and continued North Korean belligerence.

The test for both the United States and North Korea comes in the months ahead: Will they be able to put the accumulated half-century of hostility behind them in order to move forward with the February 13, 2007, agreements? An important barometer will be whether the United States removes North Korea from a list of terror-sponsoring countries and move forward with bilateral talks with the North for the normalization of diplomatic relations. For all the complaints that American neoconservatives have made about the deal—former United Nations Ambassador John Bolton denounced it as a "very bad deal" that made the Bush administration "look very weak"—Washington has little choice but to follow through on the agreements

if it wants a deal.[76] The ironic outcome of the Bush administration policy of pressuring and isolating North Korea is that Washington, not Pyongyang, has been isolated. Failure to craft a policy which reflects the new regional dynamics of post-Cold War Asia has led the Bush administration to pursue a policy resulting in the continued inertia of the past 6 years on the North Korean nuclear issue. This inertia has not been without serious cost to the U.S.-South Korean alliance. If Washington wants to improve its relationship with Seoul, it must work to fundamentally change its relationship with Pyongyang. Since Seoul and Beijing will continue to pursue engagement with North Korea (albeit for different reasons) and since Pyongyang has continued to call for the normalization of relations with Washington, the United States must work with, rather than against, Seoul's new nationalists to engage the North Korean regime directly. The United States can no longer afford to simply ignore the changes in the Korean situation initiated by Kim Dae Jung. These efforts, which were supported by the Clinton administration, represented the first genuine attempt to achieve peace and reconciliation between the two Koreas. Moreover, they had the virtue of accommodating the national interests of all parties concerned, especially those like China and South Korea, who wield the most influence over the North Korean regime.

The exercises in sanctions and isolation aimed to change Pyongyang's behavior have failed largely because Washington has refused to take notice of the new post-Cold War realities on the Korean peninsula. The February 13, 2007, agreement is thus a welcome development in that these new realities are at last being addressed by an administration that has finally come to terms with the limits of its power to change the world, by dealing with the world as it is.

**Conclusion.**

Both the Taiwan Strait and the Korean peninsula harbor very real dangers for the region. The combination of fundamentally irreconcilable nationalist movements in China and Taiwan, an unpredictable regime in North Korea that has succeeded in driving a wedge between Seoul and Washington, and lack of a unified strategy for dealing with a nuclear North Korea have created two highly combustible zones of potential conflict that could plunge the region into war. A nuclear North Korea may also prompt extensive new arms programs, possibly including nuclear weapons programs by Japan. It is hard to overstate the impact that Japan's remilitarization could have on U.S. interests in Asia, and nowhere would this impact be greater than in China.[77] A remilitarized Japan allied with the United States may well lead to an arms race in the region, setting the stage for dangerous confrontations. In supporting Japan's remilitarization, the United States ought to consider the short-term marginal benefits in the light of likely long-term damage to East Asian peace and stability.[78]

As products of the unfinished Cold War, a divided China and a divided Korean peninsula have created the potential for violent military clashes in the region. The Cold War that ended in Europe did not end in East Asia, and as a result the history disputes that fuel tensions in the region continue to be sources of conflict and instability. U.S. policymakers should begin to focus their efforts on actively helping to resolve these historical issues. In concrete terms, this means that Washington should opt for strategic clarity with regard to its security guarantees to Taiwan by offering to defend Taiwanese democracy, but not its sovereignty.

Washington should also work with Seoul, not against it, to engage Pyongyang, the ultimate goal being to end the Korean War. These steps will also require the United States to pay close attention to the historical debates that have fueled the region's suspicion of Japan. Many observers have noted that Beijing has strong suspicions of U.S. efforts to strengthen the U.S.-Japan alliance, particularly on Taiwan-related matters.[79] In practical terms, this means that the United States must look beyond its immediate concerns with its war on terror and reassess the destabilizing impact that Japanese remilitarization could have on the region.

Although there is nothing inevitable about conflict in East Asia, there is the possibility that a North Korean or Taiwanese crisis could inadvertently spiral out of control, particularly if Washington fails to manage the competing nationalisms in the region. To that end, the United States should work with its allies in the region to overcome the unresolved legacies of East Asia's Cold War—rather than inadvertently inflaming them.

## ENDNOTES

1. Lee Dong-min, "President Bush Urges Asian Nations to Forget the Past for a Better Future," *Yonhap News*, November 8, 2005.

2. "Hillary Clinton Bemoans 'Historical Amnesia' in Korea," *english.chosun.com/w21data/html/news/200519/2005102000615.html*.

3. A noted exception to this lacuna in the political science literature on East Asian security issues is the work of Thomas Berger and Peter Katzenstein. See Thomas Berger, *Cultures of Antimilitarism: National Security in Germany and Japan*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998; "Set for Stability? The Ideational Basis for Conflict in East Asia," *Review of International Studies*, Spring 2000; "The Construction of Antagonism: The History Problem in Japan's Foreign Relations," in G. John Ikenberry and Takashi Inoguchi, eds., *Reinventing the Alliance: U.S.-Japan Security Partnership in an Era of Change*, New York:

Palgrave Macmillan, 2003; Peter Katzenstein, *Cultural Norms and National Security: Police and Military in postwar Japan*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1996; Peter Katzenstein, ed., *The Cultures of National Security: Norms and Identity in World Politics*. See also Gerrit W. Gong, ed., *Remembering and Forgetting: The Legacy of War and Peace in East Asia*, Washington DC: The Center for Strategic and International Studies, 1996; G. John Ikenberry and Michael Mastanduno, eds., *International Relations Theory and the Asia Pacific*, New York: Columbia University Press, 2003; Jutta Weldes *et al*., *Cultures of Insecurity: States, Communities and the Production of Danger,* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999.

4. Thomas Berger, "The Construction of Antagonism: The History Problem in Japan's Foreign Relations," in Ikenberry and Inoguchi, eds., *Reinventing the Alliance: U.S.-Japan Security Partnership in an Era of Change*, p. 65.

5. Although neoliberalism and neorealism differ in their respective views of the power of institutions to shape and guide state actions, both approaches share a similar view of the international system as composed of state actors who rationally seek to maximize their interests within the structural constraints imposed by their external environments. As such, these approaches share the view that all state actors are likely to behave in similar ways when confronted with similar external circumstances. Both neoliberal and neorealist literature on the future of East Asian international relations is vast. Key works of both theoretical persuasions include David M. Lampton, *Same Bed, Different Dreams: Managing U.S.-China Relations, 1989-2000*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001; David Shambaugh, "Containment or Engagement? Calculating Beijing's Response," *International Security*, Vol. 21, No. 2, Autumn, 1996; John Mearsheimer, *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*, New York: Norton, 2001; Richard Berstein and Ross H. Munro, *The Coming Conflict with China*, New York: Alfred A Knof, 1997; Aaron Friedberg, "Ripe for Rivalry: Prospects for Peace in a Multipolar Asia," *International Security*, Vol. 18, No. 13, Winter 1993/1994; Aaron L. Friedberg, "The Future of U.S.-China Relations: Is Conflict Inevitable?" *International Security*, Vol. 30, No. 2, Fall 2005; Amitav Acharya, "Will Asia's Past Be Its Future?" *International Security*, Vol. 28, No. 3, Winter 2003/04; Thomas J. Christensen, "Posing Problems without Catching Up: China's Rise and Challenges for U.S. Security Policy," *International Security*, Vol. 25, No. 4, Spring 2001; Thomas Christensen, "China, the U.S.-Japan Alliance, and the

Security Dilemma in East Asia," *International Security*, Vol. 23, No. 4, Spring 1999; "Fostering Stability or Creating a Monster? The Rise of China and U.S. Policy Toward Asia," *International Security*, Vol. 31, Summer 2006; David Shambaugh, "China Engages Asia: Reshaping the Regional Order," *International Security*, Vol. 29, No. 3, Winter 2004/05; Alastair Iain Johnston, "Is China a Status Quo Power?" *International Security*, Vol. 27, No. 4, Spring 2003.

6. While realism as a whole has been associated with zero-sum thinking and severe pessimism about international politics, many realists actually are optimistic about the future of the Asia-Pacific region and U.S.-China relations in particular. See Aaron L. Friedberg, "The Future of U.S.-China Relations: Is Conflict Inevitable?" *International Security*, Vol. 30, No. 2, Fall 2005, pp. 7-45.

7. David Shambaugh, "China Engages Asia: Reshaping the Regional Order," p. 99.

8. Eugene Matthews, "Japan's New Nationalism," *Foreign Affairs*, November-December 2003.

9. The history and use of the analytical category of "strategic culture" is well laid out in Alastair Iain Johnston's "Thinking about Strategic Culture," *International Security*, Vol. 19, No. 4, Spring 1995. Although loosely defined, the term "strategic culture" to describe how different states adopt particular strategic preferences that are rooted in the early or formative experiences of a state implies a view of culture that is more or less ahistorical and static. Similarly, the idea that a particular "East Asian pattern" of international relations that can predict future relations between China, Korea, and Japan, defined in this case as hierarchical, more peaceful, and more stable than the West, raises the same issue of stasis vs. change. Some scholars have posited that the relations among East Asian countries may revert back to their "strategic culture" or "historical patterns," with China once again becoming the gravitational center of East Asia's regional stability. But such a view discounts the fact that China in 2006 is not the same China as 1706, and that the experience of the past 200 years—and certainly the last century—have altered China's strategic and security outlook fundamentally. Moreover, the idea that the pre-modern East Asian international system was somehow more peaceful and stable than the West discounts the often violent reality of traditional Sino-Korean (and intra-Chinese) relations. See Alastair Iain Johnston's *Culture Realism: Strategic Culture and Grand Strategy*

*in Chinese History*, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1995; David Kang, "Getting Asia Wrong: The Need for New Analytical Frameworks," *International Security*, Vol. 27, No. 4, Spring 2003; David Kang, "Hierarchy, Balancing, and Empirical Puzzles in Asian International Relations," *International Security*, Vol. 28, No. 3, Winter 2003/04; David Kang, "Hierarchy and Stability in Asian International Relations," in G. John Ikenberry and Michael Mastanduno, eds., *International Relations Theory and the Asia Pacific*, New York: Columbia University Press, 2003.

10. Thomas Berger, "Set for Stability? Prospect for Conflict and Cooperation in East Asia," *Review of International Studies*, Vol. 26, 2000, p. 420.

11. Diplomats as well as scholars of international relations long have understood the importance of identity, perception, and emotion in world politics. Indeed, the concept of a security dilemma, according to Neta Crawford, "pivots on perceptions of intention, not reality: what one group does to defend itself may be perceived as aggressive by another group. Emotions are part of the perceptual process." Crawford, p. 133. The constructivist approach thus offers a particularly innovative understanding of balance of power theory, the security dilemma, and neoliberal cooperation theory in that it concentrates on issues of identity in world politics and the theorization of domestic politics and culture in international relations theory. See Neta Crawford, "The Passion of World Politics: Propositions on Emotion and Emotional Relationships," *International Security*, Vol. 24, No. 4, Spring 2000, p. 133. For critical reviews of constructivism and world politics, see Jeffry T. Checkel, "The Constructivist Turn in IR Theory," *World Politics*, Vol. 50, No. 2, January 1998; and Emanuel Adler, "Seizing the Middle Ground: Constructivism in World Politics," *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol. 3, 1997; Alexander Wendt, *Social Theory of International Politics*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1999; David Campbell, *Writing Security: United States Foreign Policy and the Politics of Identity*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1992; Judith Goldstein and Robert O. Keohane, *Ideas and Foreign Policy: Beliefs, Institutions, and Political Change*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993; Jim George, *Discourses of Global Politics: A Critical (re)Introduction to International Relations*, Boulder, Co: Lynne Rienner, 1994; Alexander Wendt, "Anarchy Is What States Make of It: The Social Construction of Power Politics," *International Organization*, Vol. 46, No. 2, Spring 1992; Alexander Wendt, "Collective Identity Formation and the

International State," *The American Political Science Review*, Vol. 88, No. 2, June 1994; Alexander Wendt, "Constructing [etc.]," in Peter J. Katzenstein, ed., *The Culture of National Security: Norms and Identity in World Politics*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1996; Jutta Weldes *et al*., eds., *Cultures of Insecurity: States, Communities and the Production of Danger*; Friedrich V. Kratochwil, "Is the Ship of Culture at Sea or Returning," in Lapid and Kratochwil, *The Return of Culture and Identity in IR Theory*, Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 1996; Ted Hopf, "The Promise of Constructivism in International Relation Theory," *International Security*, Vol. 23, No. 1, Summer 1998.

12. A useful text that treats the importance of historical memory and identity to U.S. policy is Gong, *Remembering and Forgetting: The Legacy of War and Peace in East Asia*.

13. For a good summary of the events leading up to the historic February 13, 2007, deal, see Gavan McCormack, "A Denuclearization Deal in Beijing: The Prospect of Ending the 20th Century in East Asia," *Japan Focus*, February 14, 2007, *www.japanfocus.org/products/details/2354*.

14. In an article on Tiananmen Square, Wu Hung describes what he sees as the complex relationship between memory and event: "Memory, though invisible and hidden, bridges separated events into a continuous process" so that with every new and momentous event, like the death of leader or a national crisis, the memories associated with a particular Memorial change, while the Memorial itself often assumes a new identity. Hung discusses this process in his analysis of the Monument to the People's Heroes in Tiananmen Square. Whereas the Monument originally was erected to announce the birth of Mao Zedong's revolutionary China, its meaning gradually changed over time so that by 1989, it had assumed an altogether different identity, one that now opposed the Chinese Communist Party and the "revolutionary China" that Mao had created. See Wu Hung, "Tiananmen Square: A Political History of Monuments," *Representations*, Vol. 35, Summer 1991, pp. 84-117.

15. Rana Mitter, "China's 'Good War': Voices, Locations, and Generations in the Interpretation of the War of Resistance to Japan," in Sheila Miyoshi Jager and Rana Mitter, eds., *Ruptured Histories: War, Memory, and the Post-Cold War in Asia*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2007.

16. Rana Mitter, "A Slow Remembering: China's Memory of the War against Japan," *International Institute for Asian Studies, Special Issue: The Asia Pacific Wars: History and Memory,* No. 38, p. 14.

17. Arthur Waldron, "China's New Remembering of World War II: The Case of Zhang Zizhong," *Modern Asian Studies*, Vol. 30, No. 4, 1996.

18. *Ibid*, p. 972.

19. *Ibid*.

20. Arif Dirlik, "Past Experience, If Not Forgotten, Is a Guide to the Future"; and "What Is in a Text? The Politics of History in Chinese-Japanese Relations," *Boundary 2*, Vol. 18, No. 3, 1991.

21. *Ibid*, p. 42. See also Allen S. Whiting, "Chinese Nationalism and Foreign Policy After Deng," *The China Quarterly*, No. 142, June 1995.

22. Arthur Waldron, "China's New Remembering of World War II: The Case of Zhang Zizhong," Modern Asian Studies, Vol. 30, No. 4, October 1996. See also Rana Mitter, "Behind the Scenes at the Museum: Nationalism, History, and Memory in the Beijing War of Resistance Museum, 1987-1997," *The China Quarterly*, No. 161, March 2000.

23. Dirlik; "Past Experience," and "What Is in a Text?" p. 43.

24. *Ibid*, p. 57.

25. Xiaomei Chen, *Occidentalism: A Theory of Counter-Discourse in Post-Mao China*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995. See also Suisheng Zhao, *A Nation-State by Construction Dynamics of Modern Chinese Nationalism*, Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2004.

26. Suisheng Zhao, *A Nation-State by Construction: Dynamics of Modern Chinese Nationalism*, Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2004; Peter Hays Gries, *China's New Nationalism: Pride, Politics, and Diplomacy*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004; and Maria Hsia Chang, *The Return of the Dragon: China's Wounded Nationalism*, Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 2001.

27. Ben Xu, "Chinese Populist Nationalism: Its Intellectual and Moral dilemma," *Representations*, No. 76, Autumn 2001, p. 121. See also Peter Hays Gries, *China's New Nationalism: Pride, Politics and Diplomacy,* Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004.

28. Edward Friedman, *H-Asia*, January 24, 1998.

29. Suisheng Zhao, "Chinese Intellectuals' Quest for National Greatness and Nationalistic Writings in the 1990s," *The China Quarterly*, No. 152, December 1997, p. 738. See also Suisheng Zhao, "Nationalism's Double Edge," *Wilson Quarterly*, Vol. 29, No. 4, Autumn 2005; Joseph Fewsmith, "Neoconservatism and the End of the Dengist Era," *Asian Survey*, Vol. 35, No. 7, July 1995.

30. Ben Xu, p. 123.

31. According to Robert Bickers and Jeffrey Wasserstorm, Mao never proclaimed that the "Chinese People have stood up" when he declared the founding of the People's Republic. Yet, the tenacity of this myth is revealed in which issues of national humiliation, recognition, and dignity formed Chinese national self-perceptions. See Robert Bickers and Jeffry Wasserstorm, "'Shanghai Dogs and Chinese not Permitted' Sign: Legend, History and Contemporary Symbol," *The China Quarterly*, June 1995; and John Fitzgerald, "China and the Quest for Dignity," *The National Interest*, Spring 1999.

32. Suisheng Zhao, "China's Pragmatic Nationalism: Is it Manageable?" *The Washington Quarterly*, Vol. 29, No. 1, Winter 2005-06.

33. Eugene Matthews, "Japan's New Nationalism," *Foreign Affairs*, November-December 2003. See also Gavan McCormack, "Nationalism and Identity in Post-Cold War Japan," *Pacifica Review*, Vol. 12, No. 3, October 2000.

34. Masaru Tamamoto, "Japanese Discovery of Democracy," *Nautilus Policy Forum*, accessed at *www.nautilus.org/fora/security/0638Tamamoto.html*; Yoichi Funabashi, "Japan's East Asia Problem: A Sixtieth Anniversary Perspective on the Postwar," *Japan Focus*, accessed at *www.japanfocus.org/products/details/1978*; Aaron Gerow, "Consuming Asia, Consuming Japan: The New Neonationalist Revisionism in Japan," in Mark Selden and Laura Hein, eds., *Censoring History*, New York: M. E. Sharpe, 2000; Gavan McCormack, "The Japanese Movement to Correct History," in Mark Selden and Laura Hein, eds., *Censoring History;* Yoshiko Nozaki, "The 'Comfort Women' Controversies: History and Testimony," *Japan Focus*, accessed at *www.japanfocus.org/products/details/2063*. For an excellent overview of Japan's "history problem," see Timothy Brook, "The Tokyo Judgment and the Rape of Nanking," *The Journal of Asian Studies*, Vol. 60, No. 3, August 2001; and Fransizka Seraphim, "Re-Locating War Memory at Century's End: Japan's Postwar Responsibility and Global

Public Culture," in Jager and Mitter, eds., *Ruptured Histories: War, Memory, and the Post-Cold War in Asia*.

35. Hisashi Owada, "Japan in the Post-Cold War," *Sasakawa Peace Foundation*, October 2002, accessed at *www.spfusa.org/Program/av2002/oct0702.htm*. See also Alan Dupont, "The Schizophrenic Superpower," *National Interest*, Spring 2005, Issue 79; and J. Victor Koshmann, "National Subjectivity and the Uses of Atonement in the Age of Recession," *The South Atlantic Quarterly*, Vol. 99, No. 4, Fall 2000. For a good discussion of neonationalism and popular culture, see Aaron Gerow, "Fantasies of War and Nation in Recent Japanese Cinema," *Japan Focus*, accessed at *www.japanfocus.org/products/details/1707J*, p. 5. In his analysis of two popular recent war films (Aegis, "Bokoku no ijisu," director, Sakamoto Junji; and Yamato, "Otokotachi no Yamato," director, Sato Jun'ya) that have recently made a splash in Japan, Gerow writes:

> Here are examples of Japanese putting their lives on the line to protect not only the fatherland (*sokoku*) but millions of fellow countrymen from dying in a single attack, groups willing to [put the] military to good use—all examples which could imbue "pride" in their nation. These are not melodramatic tales of young Japanese dying for a losing nation found in the fifties and sixties war films, but of battles fought and won with the protagonists living on.

According to Gerow, the movies express many of the basic tenets of the Japanese right, the most central of which is that the warped history of the postwar has robbed Japan of its standing as a "normal" nation.

36. Alan Dupont, "The Schizophrenic Superpower," *National Interest*, Spring 2005, Issue 79, p. 2. For a good discussion of Japan's so-called "schizophrenic" nationalism, see J. Victor Koshmann, "National Subjectivity and the Uses of Atonement in the Age of Recession," *The South Atlantic Quarterly*, Vol. 99, No. 4, Fall 2000.

37. Ann Sherif, "Lost Men and War Criminals: Public Intellectuals at Yasukuni Shrine," in Jager and Mitter, eds., *Ruptured Histories: War, Memory and the Post-Cold War in Asia*.

38. Rana Mitter, "Old Ghosts, New Memories: China's Changing War History in the Era of Post-Mao Politics, *Journal of Contemporary History*, Vol. 38, No. 1, 2003.

39. Perry Anderson, "Stand-Off in Taiwan," *London Review of Books*, Vol. 26, No. 11, June 3, 2004, p. 3.

40. Edward Vickers, "Frontiers of Memory: Conflict, Imperialism, and Official Histories in the Formation of Post-Cold War Taiwan Identity," in Jager and Mitter, eds., *Ruptured Histories: War, Memory and the Post Cold War in Asia*, p. 20.

41. Perry Anderson, "Stand-Off in Taiwan," p. 6.

42. The much-discussed scenario of China's future ability or inability to conquer and occupy Taiwan in a traditional D-Day style invasion is discussed in Thomas J. Christensen, "Posing the Problem Without Catching Up: China's Rise and Challenges for U.S. Security Policy," *International Security*, Vol. 25, No. 4, Spring 2001. For a discussion that focuses on invasion scenarios, see Michael O'Hanlon, "Why China Cannot Conquer Taiwan," *International Security*, Vol. 25, No. 2, Fall 2000. See also David Shambaugh, "A Matter of Time: Taiwan's Eroding Military Advantage," *Washington Quarterly*, Vol. 23, No. 2, Spring 2000; and David Shambaugh, "China's Military Views the World: Ambivalent Security," *International Security*, Vol. 24, No. 3, 1999/2000. See also Alastair Iain Johnston and Robert S. Ross, "Comparative Deterrence: The Taiwan Strait and the Korean Peninsula," in Alastair Iain Johnston and Robert S. Ross, eds., *New Directions in the Study of China's Foreign Policy*, Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2006.

43. Edward Cody, "China Sends Warning to Taiwan with Anti-Secession Law," *Washington Pos*t, March 8, 2005.

44. Robert Sutter, "The Taiwan Problem in the Second George W. Bush Administration—US Officials' View and Their Implications for US Policy," *Journal of Contemporary China*, Vol. 15, No. 48, August 2006, pp. 417-441.

45. Malcolm Cook, "Taiwan's Identity Challenge," *SAIS Review*, Vol. 25, No. 2, Summer-Fall 2005, p. 89.

46. *Ibid*, p. 90.

47. Perry Anderson, "Stand-Off in Taiwan," p. 8.

48. Liu Ji, "Making the Right Choices in Twenty-First Century Sino-American Relations," *Journal of Contemporary China*, Vol. 7, No. 17, 1998, p. 96.

49. Cook, "Taiwan's Identity Challenge," p. 87.

50. Nancy Bernkopf Tucker, "Strategic Ambiguity or Strategic Clarity," in *Dangerous Strait: The U.S.-Taiwan-China Crisis*, Columbia University Press, 2005, p. 204.

51. Andrew Peterson, "Dangerous Games Across the Taiwan Strait," *The Washington Quarterly*, Vol. 27, No. 2, Spring 2004, p. 36. See also Edward Friedman, "China's Dilemma on Using Military Force," in Edward Friedman, ed., *China's Rise, Taiwan's Dilemmas, and International Peace*, New York: Routledge, 2006.

52. Perry Anderson, "Stand-Off in Taiwan," p. 6.

53. Trevor Corsen, "Strait-jacket," *The Atlantic Monthly*, December 2004, p. 57.

54. *Ibid*.

55. Thomas Christensen, "The Contemporary Security Dilemma: Deterring A Taiwan Conflict," *The Washington Quarterly*, Vol. 25, No. 4, Autumn 2002, p. 8.

56. Corsen, p. 55.

57. Philip Saunders, "Long Term Trends in China-Taiwan Relations: Implications for U.S.-Taiwan Policy," *Asian Survey*, Vol. 45, No. 6, June 2005, p. 991.

58. Christensen, "The Contemporary Security Dilemma," pp. 19-20.

59. *Ibid*, p. 20.

60. Perry Anderson, "Stand-Off in Taiwan," p. 7. For a discussion of settler nationalism, see Benedict Anderson, "Western Nationalism and Eastern Nationalism: Is There a Difference that Matters?" *New Left Review*, May/June, 2001. See also Wang Chaohua, "A Tale of Two Nationalisms," *New Left Review*, Vol. 32, March-April 2005.

61. Perry Anderson, "Stand-Off in Taiwan," p. 8.

62. Charles Horner, "China and the Historians," *The National Interest*, Vol. 63, Spring, 2001, p. 86.

63. Perry Anderson, "Stand-Off in Taiwan," p. 7.

64. *Ibid*, p. 8.

65. Selig Harrison, *Korean Endgame: A Strategy for Reunification and U.S. Disengagement*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003, p. 83.

66. Sheila Miyoshi Jager, "Time to End the Korean War: The Korean Nuclear Crisis in the Era of National Division," Nautilus Institute, *www.nautilus.org/fora/security/0693MiyoshiJager.html*.

67. Jiyul Kim, "Pan-Korean Nationalism, Anti-Great Powerism and U.S.-Korean Relations," *Japan Focus*, accessed at *www.japanfocus.org/products/details/1679*. See also Sheila Miyoshi Jager and Jiyul Kim, "The Korean War After the Cold War: Commemorating the Armistice Agreement in South Korea," in Jager and Mitter, *Ruptured Histories: War, Memory and the Post-Cold War in Asia*.

68. See for example, Pak Myŏng-nim's *Hanguk 1950: Chŏnjaeng kwa p'yŏnghwa* (*Korea 1950: War and Peace*), Seoul: Nanam ch'ulp'an, 2002. A respected historian who teaches at Yŏnse University, Pak currently serves as an adviser to Roh Mu-Hyun on North-South affairs. He also is a strong advocate of making the July 27-August 15 a "peace celebration period" to change the focus of the Armistice Day celebration beyond the Korean War. The book, which is nearly 800 pages long, incorporates not only the new materials on Nogun-ri but other civilian massacres committed by the North and South Korean military, as well as those allegedly committed by U.S. forces, in a section titled "War and Civilians: Unification, Eruption, and Massacre," chap. 6, pp. 330-339. See also Kim Chi-hyŏng, *Nambuk ŭl innun hyŏndaesa sanch'aek* (*A Stroll Through Modern History Beyond the North and South Division*), Seoul: Tosŏ chu'ulpan sŏnin, 2003. The title refers to a unified history of modern Korea. One of the striking features of this collection of essays is the extremely positive and human portrayal of North Korean leaders Kim Il Sung and Kim Jong Il (Kim Jong-il). In January 2000, the liberal press broke a major story based on newly discovered documents and photographs from the U.S. National Archives that graphically show the execution of 1,800 political prisoners by the South Korean military and police, an incident that was long believed to be true but unsupported by documentary evidence. The number believed to have been killed, according to these press reports, was roughly 8,000 people, although this figure is not corroborated with documentary evidence. *Han'gyŏrae 21*, January 20, 2000, pp. 20-27. Another liberal journal, *Mal*, stoked the flames of anti-Americanism further with a series of articles in its February 2000 issue that provide both documentary and photographic evidence of killings of civilian political prisoners, allegedly Communists, by South Korean forces in Seoul in April 1950 before the war began, at Taejŏn in early July 1950, and at Taegu in August 1950 and April 1951. Both the January and the February stories strongly implicated the United States with photos showing American officers calmly observing the

executions. In June 2000 *Wŏlgan Chosŏn* published a long article on the North Korean massacre of several thousand civilians and prisoners of war (POWs), South Korean and American, at Taejŏn in late September 1950. For a more detailed analysis of this revisionist history, see Sheila Miyoshi Jager, "Re-writing the Past/Re-Claiming the Future: Nationalism and the Politics of Anti-Americanism in South Korea," *Japan Focus*, July 29, 2005, accessed at *www.japanfocus.org/products/details/1772*.

69. Sheila Miyoshi Jager and Jiyul Kim, "The Korean War After the Cold War: Commemorating the Armistice Agreement in South Korea," p. 6.

70. See David C. Kang, "A Better Strategy," *Washington Post*, November 28, 2005.

71. "Pukhaeksatae kachang k'un ch'eakim mikuk 43%, pukhan 37%" ("Main Responsibility for North Korea's Nuclear Tests: The United States, 43%; North Korea, 37%"). KBS poll published in *OhmyNews*, October 17, 2006.

72. "South Korean Opinion Polls: Majority Favors Nuclear Weapons; 1980s Generation Question U.S. Ties," *WMD Insights*: *Issues and Viewpoints in the International Media*, December 2005/ January 2006 Issue, accessed at *www.wmdinsights.com/11/EAI_ South KoreaOpnion.htm*.

73. Glen Kessler and Dafna Linzer, "Rice Trip to Push Full Sanctions for North Korea," *Washington Post*, October 19, 2006.

74. Bill Powell, "Why the U.S. and South Korea Don't See Eye to Eye," *Time* Magazine, November 20, 2006, p. 3.

75. Michael A. Fletcher, "Pacific Rim Statement on North Korea Falls Short of What Bush Sought," *Washington Post*, November 29, 2006.

76. Dan Blumenthal and Aaron Friedberg, "Not Too Late to Curb Leader—The Road to Pyongyang Runs Through Beijing," *The Weekly Standard*, February 12, 2007.

77. The so-called "apology decade" of the 1990s when Japan attempted to reconcile with its neighbors by offering direct apologies for the country's misdeeds during the war, effectively came to an abrupt end with the rise of pressures affecting Japan's new security concerns in Asia. Since then, more and more Japanese have begun to question the wisdom of the self-imposed constitutional restrictions on the military, particularly after North

Korea's 1998 *Taepodong* missile launching. Many Japanese now believe that Japan must become more resolute and assertive in defending its vital interests, and supported former Prime Minister's Koizumi's talk of constitutional reform and declared desire to see Japan become a "normal" country. As regards supporting Japan's remilitarization, the United States ought to consider the short-term marginal benefits in the light of likely long-term damage to East Asian peace and stability. Already a growing number of American and foreign diplomats and academics worry that increasing tensions between Japan, China, and South Korea will make it more difficult to find a regional solution to the North Korean nuclear issue. Further deterioration in these relations could also complicate U.S. relations with China and South Korea, which already are under stress. Moreover, because of security links between the United States and Japan and U.S. support of expanded Japanese military capabilities, increasing tensions between Tokyo and Beijing have the potential to worsen Sino-American relations, thereby increasing regional instability. Alan Dupont "The Schizophrenic Superpower," *National Interest*, Issue 79, Spring 2005, p. 2. For a good discussion of Japan's so-called "schizophrenic" nationalism, see J. Victor Koshmann, "National Subjectivity and the Uses of Atonement in the Age of Recession," *The South Atlantic Quarterly*, Vol. 99, No. 4, Fall 2000. Also see Alexis Dudden, "The End of Apology," *Japan Focus*, accessed at *www.japanfocus.org/products/details/1611*.

78. Masaru Tamomoto, "How Japan Imagines China and Sees Itself," p. 14.

79. Japan has recently enacted two new controversial laws to enable the Self Defense Force (SDF) to assist U.S.-led military operations in Afghanistan and Iraq. Under the second law, enacted in August 2003, Japan approved a plan to dispatch several hundred ground troops to Iraq at the end of that year. On December 9, 2004, the government also extended the SDF's Iraq mission under the 2001 Anti-Terrorism Special Measures law, which had been enacted as a temporary one with a 2-year life span but since has been extended. In addition, Japan will introduce a U.S. missile defense (MD) system in 2007, and the two countries also have agreed on the development of a more advanced MD system, starting in fiscal year 2006, to counter missile threats from North Korea. Meanwhile, in February 2005, Japan joined the Bush administration in identifying security in the Taiwan Strait as a "common strategic objective." See Anthony Faiola, "Japan

to Join Policy on Taiwan," *Washington Post*, February 18, 2005. See also Richard Boucher, "Joint Statement of the U.S.-Japan Security Consultative Committee," February 19, 2005, accessed at *www.state.gov/r/pa/prs/ps/2005/42490.htm*. For a good overview of the changing U.S.-Japan alliance, see Michael J. Green, "U.S. Japanese Relations After Koizumi: Convergence or Cooling?" *The Washington Quarterly*, Vol. 29, No. 4, Autumn 2006; and Aurelia George Mulgan, "Beyond Self-Defense? Evaluating Japan's Regional Security Role under the New Defense Cooperation Guidelines," *Pacifica Review*, Vol. 12, No. 3, October 2000. See also Gavan McCormack, "Remilitarizing Japan," *New Left Review*, Vol. 29, September-October 2004.