

Book Reviews

ASIA GENERAL

East Asian Security. Edited by MICHAEL E. BROWN, SEAN M. LYNN-JONES, and STEVEN E. MILLER. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1995. 351 pp. \$18.00.

The editors of *International Security* have done a huge favor for students of contemporary East Asian international relations by collecting that journal's best articles on the security dynamics of the region into a single volume.

The collection of essays opens with two neorealist treatments of the East Asian security system by Aaron L. Friedberg and Richard K. Betts. Friedberg's title, "Ripe for Rivalry," and his observation that Asia faces "a race between the accelerating dynamics of multipolarity, which could increase the chances of conflict, and the growth of mitigating factors that should dampen them" both capture the essence of the empirical studies that follow. Betts, after dutifully outlining the competing liberal and realist explanations for the changes in the region, knocks down the liberal view and offers a series of policy recommendations based on a neorealist calculation of U.S. interests in the region.

The Friedberg and Betts chapters are both based on assumptions about how East Asian states assess relative power. The nine empirical studies that follow the two theory chapters generally confirm these assumptions, but with some important exceptions and caveats. In his chapter on regional arms trade, for example, Desmond Ball argues that there is more potential for a regional arms race than there is actual movement at present.

On China, the jury is split. Denny Roy outlines the now familiar themes of the hegemonistic "middle kingdom" (though in fairness it should be noted that his original article appeared in 1994—well before the Taiwan Straits incident woke up official Washington to the "China problem"). Roy's observation that interdependence might only heighten Beijing's sense of insecurity and competition is one that should be well considered by those crafting a strategy of engagement with China. On the other hand, his warning of the destabilizing effects of an "economically gigantic China" does remind one of the revisionists' doomsday predictions about Japan a decade ago. In his study of China's behavior in the Spratlys dispute, Michael G. Gallagher sees far more potential for complex interdependence to constrain any irredentist policies from Beijing. Gallagher's conclusion regarding the Spratlys is contradicted by the evidence presented in the next chapter by Gerald Segal. Segal argues that China should have been constrained in the Spratlys, but was not. He calls for a collective strategy of "constraint" in East Asia, but sets a generally pessimistic tone about the ability of the United States or the rest of the region to move beyond the simple extremes of "containment" and "engagement" in its policies toward Beijing.

The China section closes with two essays on Chinese nuclear strategy. Alistair Iain Johnstone provides a fascinating glimpse inside China's changing nuclear

warfighting doctrine. His argument that Beijing is moving from “minimum” to “limited” concepts of deterrence (in which nuclear weapons would have increased utility in warfighting) represents the best empirical work in the entire volume. However, his policy prescriptions for changing the PLA’s emerging doctrine by (in effect) unilaterally changing U.S. nuclear strategy or expanding bilateral dialogue with Beijing will not be compelling to those who agree with the rest of the book’s neorealist assumptions about the limits of interdependence. Veteran China watchers Banning N. Garret and Bonnie S. Glaser echo many of Johnstone’s observations in their own analysis of Chinese views of arms control. They make the important point that U.S. strategy has yet to determine how China fits in our own post–Cold War rules for arms control, theater missile defenses, and extended deterrence.

The Japan section of the book features two essays that rebut the revisionists’ and structuralists’ arguments that Japan will emerge as an independent threat to the United States after the Cold War. Peter J. Katzenstein and Nobuo Okawara deconstruct systems level explanations and instead focus on domestic norms and institutions to explain why Japan’s postwar pacifism will endure. Thomas U. Berger assesses the postwar security policy debate in Japan and argues that a near permanent shift has occurred in Japan’s political culture (one he captures in his clever subtitle, “From Sword to Chrysanthemum”). While effective in their deconstruction of the old “Japan threat” crowd, however, Katzenstein, Okawara, and Berger fail to answer two important questions begged by the preceding sections: how would Japan respond if force were used in its neighborhood, and what role will Japan play in the fluid regional environment described by Friedberg, Betts, and the rest of the authors?

The editors of *East Asian Security* warn in their preface that the book has gaps. The most notable is the lack of analysis on the future of the Korean Peninsula. Conflict on the Korean Peninsula defined U.S. strategy in Asia at the beginning of the Cold War and the transformation of the Peninsula could be the critical determinant of great power relations in Northeast Asia after the Cold War. Even with this missing element, however, this book should be mandatory reading for any course on contemporary East Asian international relations. The articles were influential in the policy and academic communities when they were first published between 1993 and 1996, and subsequent events are proving that the book will be no less important in the years ahead.

MICHAEL GREEN
Institute for Defense Analyses

Comparing Development Patterns in Asia. By CAL CLARK and K. C. ROY.
Boulder, Colo. and London: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1997. 197 pp. \$45.00.

Much has been written about the East Asian economic miracles in the past three decades, but little study has been done to compare the development patterns between the burgeoning East Asia and the lagging South Asia. The book by Cal Clark and K. C. Roy represents a new endeavor to fill this academic vacuum.

The book seeks to explore the evolving political economies of East and South Asia in the context of contending theories about development. Over the last several decades, development studies have evolved through a series of dichotomous debates between: (1) modernization theory and dependency theory over whether capitalism and modernization promotes or prevents development; (2) neoclassical economics and the development state approach over whether market or state is more important in