

THE US "REBALANCE" TOWARDS ASIA: TRANSATLANTIC PERSPECTIVES

Edited by PETER HERRLY and HUGO MEIJER,
in collaboration with NATALIE BOLL

N° 16 - 25 JUN 2013

<http://www.sciencespo.fr/ceri>



CERI
STRATEGY
PAPERS



SciencesPo.

CERI
CNRS

The US “Rebalance” Towards Asia: Transatlantic Perspectives

This paper is based on the proceedings of the eponymous conference organized by CERI with the collaboration of the Association of the United States Army and the support of the Royal United Services Institute, the University of Notre Dame, and the US Embassy in Paris.

Editors: Peter HERRLY and Hugo MEIJER
Conference report: Natalie BOLL

Peter F. HERRLY, Colonel, US Army (Retired) is a recognized expert in strategic leadership and organizational transformation. He was Chief of Doctrine on the US Joint Staff, working directly with Generals Colin Powell and John Shalikashvili, from the end of the Cold War until his departure to France in 1995. In Paris, he was US Defense Attaché, where he worked closely with the French and other major European armed forces to develop effective operational partnerships in a variety of areas. Today, he directs European military history study programs for the benefit of the US Armed Forces in Europe. He sustains his research interests as *professeur associé* at Sciences Po and is an organizer of and a regular participant in historical and political seminars and conferences. He is also the President of Herry Group, an international consulting and executive development firm. He also serves as Director for European Affairs for the Association of the United States Army, and as such he helps maintain close partnerships with counterpart organizations in Europe, notably in Germany, France, and the United Kingdom. He was principal author of *Joint Warfare of the U.S. Armed Forces* and numerous articles on military and historical subjects. He was commissioned from the University of Notre Dame and holds an advanced degree from the University of Wisconsin in history. He taught military history, strategy, and organizational culture at the United States Military Academy at West Point and the National War College.

Hugo MEIJER, the scientific coordinator of the conference, is Research Associate at CERI and a Postdoctoral Research Fellow at the Strategic Research Institute of the Military Academy (IRSEM, Paris), where he works on the research project *The European Arms Embargo on China-Transatlantic Perspectives*. He received his Ph.D. in Political Science-International Relations at Sciences Po. His dissertation examines the making of US export control policy on defense-related technology toward the People's Republic of China since 1979 on the basis of a broad range of primary sources (interviews, declassified documents, Congressional hearings, and Wikileaks/Cablegate). He earned a Master's Degree in International Relations from the Paul Nitze School of Advanced International Studies at Johns Hopkins University (Bologna and Washington D.C., 2008), and graduated in Economics from LUISS Guido Carli University (Rome, 2005). In 2010, he was a Visiting Scholar at the Sigur Center for Asian Studies of the Elliott School of International Affairs at George Washington University (Washington D.C.).

Natalie BOLL is a student at the University of Notre Dame majoring in International Finance with a French concentration and an Italian Studies minor.

Executive Summary

In January 2012, the Obama administration announcement of the US “rebalance” towards the Asia-Pacific sparked a variety of reactions across the globe. Following a decade of conflict in the Middle East, this strategic development seemed to signal a new direction for American foreign policy in the 21st century. However, the intentions of rebalance have often been misunderstood, with important implications in Asia and Europe, and transatlantic perspectives on the so-called “pivot” are vital to understanding the evolution and impact of this policy shift.

To this end, an all-day conference was held at the Center for International Studies and Research of Sciences Po (CERI) in Paris with the collaboration of the Association of the United States Army and the support of the Royal United Services Institute, the University of Notre Dame, and the United States Embassy in Paris. The event featured three panels of scholars and experts and a select European and American audience gathered to share their perspectives on this important topic.*

The first set of panelists delved into the analysis of the origin and evolution of the policy itself, assessing its goals in the military, economic and diplomatic dimensions. Rear Admiral (retired) Michael McDevitt argued that the policy objectives adopted by the Obama administration have supported the aim of investing more of the various instruments of national power in Asia to align American foreign policy with its long-term economic interests for the 21st century, an aim largely consistent with the “traditional balance” that has characterized US security policy vis-à-vis Asia for a century. On the other hand, Dr. Joanna Spear espoused a somewhat contrarian view, especially in reference to the military domain, suggesting that the US rebalance is merely a transitory policy that will not be sustained and arguing that American military involvement in the Asia-Pacific has been relatively meager. For his part Dr. Guillaume de Rougé insisted that besides the military sphere, the deepening of the US engagement in the multilateral diplomatic institutions and economic arrangements in East Asia has proven vital to achieve its foreign policy and economic goals in the region.

Dr. Isabelle Facon’s lunchtime presentation analyzed the policy’s impact on Russia’s foreign and defense policy interests. Russian reactions have been notably muted concerning this policy, a strategic move Russia perceives as China-focused. Furthermore, the US rebalance follows Russia’s own rebalance to enhance its socio-economic development in its eastern territories and to make its policy more comprehensive with regards to Asia

* The discussion portions of the conference were held under the Chatham House Rule, a rule of non-attribution, so participants could speak freely.

as a whole and less Sino-centric. Though the American strategic development is seen as useful for Russian interests such as more leverage for Moscow in Europe, the general consensus in the Kremlin seems to be that the rebalance is a liability for Russia.

The second panel discussed the reactions of the countries that form the Asia-Pacific region. Dr. Emmanuel Puig focused on the opacity of China's reactions, though it seems clear that the overall consensus among PRC elites is that the "pivot" is aimed at China. He stressed China's reluctance to engage in open conflict with the US despite any threats the rebalance may pose. Dr. Guibourg Delamotte argued that Japan and South Korea seem to outwardly perceive the move in a positive light, although their respective leaderships have occasionally seemed concerned by the American willingness to adopt a more confrontational attitude towards China. Dr. Eric Frécon spoke on implications in Southeast Asia, suggesting that the rebalance has reinforced previous US efforts to encourage maritime security in the region, but has had unintended consequences that may have negative reverberations.

The final panel focused on transatlantic implications, first with regards to military engagement and then concerning the consequences of the US rebalance for Europe. US Army Lieutenant Generals David Hogg and Donald Campbell emphasized that despite the reduction of American forces in Europe over the years and increasing budget constraints, the US remains committed to its partnership with Europe. This continuing engagement can be especially seen in the dramatic evolution of genuinely multinational training between the US and European allies and partners. Dr. Eva Gross explained that after the initial fear of abandonment subsided, the Europeans have drawn the conclusion that the announced rebalance should reinforce a certain sense of realism in the European-American partnership, leading Europeans to take their own security responsibilities more seriously domestically and globally. Dr. Nicola Casarini made the final presentation, offering that Europe's economic and security stakes in the Asia-Pacific can be seen as largely complementary to those of the US, but the EU is untrammled by military allegiances and is more focused on pursuing soft power in the region.

Opening Remarks and Keynote Address

Dr. Christian Lequesne, Director of CERI at Sciences Po Paris, and Lieutenant General (retired) Guy Swan, Vice President for Education at AUSA, opened the conference with remarks emphasizing the pertinence of the issue at hand and the importance of open intellectual exchange. The significance of this dialogue was underlined due to the sense of misunderstanding often surrounding the rebalance policy announced in January 2012. They underlined the overall sense of commonality among transatlantic partners. Indeed, Lieutenant General Swan noted that the location of the conference has an important place in the history of international relations. Just outside, there is a plaque commemorating the signing of the Treaty of Paris on September 3, 1783 in the very same building (once the *Hôtel d'York*) with Benjamin Franklin, John Adams, and John Jay as representatives for the newly-formed United States of America, and David Hartley for the British crown.

Prof. Frédéric Charillon, Director of the Institute for Strategic Research of the Military Academy (IRSEM), gave the keynote address. He started by discussing the appellation itself. Is the focus on the “pivot”-“rebalance” distinction important, or does this focus on semantics distract from the substance of the issue? In any case, both concepts suggest the notion of change in today’s international affairs – change in foreign policy priorities, in the international system, in perceptions by world players, etc. This brings to light the structural dilemma at hand – namely, is the rebalance a product of the changed international system or vice versa? Finally, rebalancing involves more than two actors. Prof. Charillon insisted that despite their international stature, China and the US do not wield the power to reshape the global stage alone. This is why a transatlantic dialogue plays such a crucial role in an American policy directed at the Pacific.

The redeployment of the US presence in Asia will probably not result in a Cold War-type structure. Although China can be seen as a peer competitor of the US in terms of population, power and resources, regional and global interdependence make it difficult to envisage new containment policies and zero-sum games akin to those of the Cold War era. Another reason why the strategic rebalance will not be as central as anticipated is that it is met with mixed feelings among Asian regional actors. There has been a call for a more significant American presence in the region from some states for national sovereignty motives, but including a shared overall agenda. As such, the nations of the Asia-Pacific will be consumers, not followers, of the strategic policy. Finally, although Asia is on the rise, it will not eclipse the strategic importance of other world regions, including Europe, the Middle East, Africa, etc. America’s European allies remain the only partners who can share its global liberal agenda of freedom and democracy. If it is true that Asia plays an increasingly important economic and political role in the

global scene, this only means more contributions will be required from Europe in terms of maritime security and negotiations. Furthermore, it is likely that Asian partners will be required in order to deal with new tensions in the Middle East, the development of new governments in Africa, and other issues sprouting in other regions.

Prof. Charillon then offered some concluding remarks. Firstly, although fears that the US and China are on the path to a new Cold War will likely not be realized, there is a risk of a dual track international system, with a global multilateral power structure, but a bilateral regional competition in Asia. Secondly, there are probably too many concepts and frameworks in the region, but not enough substance. The risk is then that this will provoke various forms of nationalism among the countries of the region. The affected countries are unsure about the sustainability of the existing frameworks, leaving a general sense of insecurity. Finally, the actual challenge is not to prevent an Asian century, but rather to enter a peaceful Asian century, not to prevent new primacies, but to engender global security.

Panel I: From “Pivot” to “Rebalance”: 18 Months On

The first panel featured scholars and experts from France, Great Britain, and the United States presenting and discussing the US strategic “rebalance” towards the Asia-Pacific region in terms of its origins, evolution and goals, and how these goals have been acted upon in various dimensions: military, diplomatic, and economic.

Rear Admiral (retired) Michael McDevitt of the Center for Naval Analyses, Washington, D.C., made the first presentation. He focused on the policy objectives of the rebalance, with a specific regard towards their origin and evolution. He then analyzed the major drivers of the policy, and finally took a look at continuities and discontinuities in contrast to previous US administration policies.

The Obama administration has consistently maintained the goal of investing more in Asia to align American resources with its long-term economic interests for the 21st century. In other words, the aim is to create more jobs in the United States by selling American products in Asia. Regional stability is important to achieving this objective. To that end, the rebalance wants to ensure that the United States maintains its key role in the economic, political, and security relationships with the Asia-Pacific nations. Perhaps a better way to understand the rebalance policy is that it seeks to restore the “traditional balance” that has characterized US security policy since the Spanish American War by making certain East Asia remains a strategically important focus area for Washington, something that has not always been evident during the last decade of conflict in the Middle East. It is also important to point out that the preferred “term of art” is rebalance not pivot.

According to RADM McDevitt’s presentation, this policy has six aims (as highlighted by then Secretary of State Hilary Clinton):

- strengthen American bilateral alliances;
- deepen working relations with the rising Asian powers of China, India, Indonesia, and Vietnam;
- more deeply engage with Asian multilateral institutions (this is something that Democratic Administrations have emphasized more than Republican ones), e.g. ASEAN defense ministers meetings and the East Asian Summit;
- expand trade and investment, such as via the Transpacific Partnership (TPP), a continuation of Bush administration policy (this may meet with both internal and international obstacles due to the concerns of the domestic automotive lobby and the unwillingness of Asian nations to participate);
- establish a more broadly-based military presence;

- focus on rules and legal-based behavior in order to further the advancement of democracy and human rights, including resolving the disputes in the South China Sea diplomatically.

The next important question RADM McDevitt addressed concerned US views on the place of China in this strategic development. It is often assumed that China is the main focus of the policy, and even more specifically that “containment” is the true goal of the “rebalance.” Beyond US policymakers’ denial that this is the case, this is unlikely because no other regional powers would be willing to take definitive sides against China, their largest trading partner and a decided geopolitical power. They are always going to live in the shadow of China. Nevertheless US policymakers deem it crucial to maintain credible military capability and presence in this dynamic region in order to balance the economic and security effects of China’s rise.

Another significant aspect of the rebalance strategy is the message of “reassurance,” reassuring US friends and allies that the US is in East Asia for the long haul. This is intended as a corrective to a narrative that was gaining momentum in 2009-10 that America was being eclipsed by China. America was not being pushed out of East Asia and furthermore is quite capable of satisfying its security obligations to allies and friends. Another motivation behind the reassurance message is non-proliferation – Washington does not want regional allies to lose faith in their alliances with the United States and seek to independently guarantee their security, perhaps by developing nuclear weapons. The reassurance message remains a work in progress because there is still skepticism in the region about America’s staying power.

Finally, RADM McDevitt identified five ways in which the rebalance strategy was actually being implemented:

- the substantial increase in investment of American security, economic, and diplomatic resources in Southeast Asia during the past four years – according to some estimations, to the highest levels since the Vietnam War;
- a systemic response to the Chinese military efforts to attain an anti-access/area denial (A2AD), a military concept of operations that the Chinese call “counter-intervention”;
- the more assertive political expressions of what constitutes acceptable behavior in the Asian maritime domain;
- the increased multilateral involvement as noted above;
- and the firm refusal to negotiate with North Korea unless its nuclear program is on the table. In other words, Washington is not willing to “accept” North Korea as a nuclear weapons state, and hence Pyongyang’s desire to discuss a peace treaty and normalization of

relations is not going anywhere without first addressing the nuclear issue.

Dr. Joanna Spear, Associate Professor at George Washington University and currently a RUSI Senior Visiting Fellow, then presented an analysis of the military dimension of the pivot, characterized first as quite meager in reality – rebalance as a sort of policy bubble or even illusion. She traced the constraints on developing a more robust military shift to the Pentagon's variety of external and internal drivers. Externally, opportunities to shift military resources presented themselves with the drawdowns in Iraq and Afghanistan, scheduled for completion by the end of 2014, and with the death of Osama bin Laden. However, the fundamental changes in the Arab world also provide continued challenges. On the internal side, political appointees at the outset of the first Obama administration were driven by the usual desire to make their mark, a push to actually change policy to meet new strategic realities, and to set priorities for the Department of Defense; but most of those appointees are no longer in their positions.

Next Dr. Spear discussed the New Strategic Guidance (NSG), titled *Sustaining US Global Leadership: Priorities for 21st Century Defense*. This Department of Defense paper outlines a prioritized list of the ten primary missions of the US Armed Forces, only four of which are new since the 2010 Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR). Despite the longevity implied by the title, Dr. Spear questioned this very aspect. Some argue that complicated conflicts in Afghanistan and Iraq distracted from American core interests (such as Iran and North Korea), and so the most recent QDR does not reflect the long-term realities. Others have expressed dissatisfaction with the counterinsurgency effort, seeing it as a waste of resources. Furthermore, it has brought to light the usual inter-service rivalries and search for new roles, missions, and equipment.

Such a document has garnered a number of criticisms. It assumes those risks originate from high technology, state-based risks, as opposed to the hybrid, proxy violence challenges more likely to occur. With the birth of the policy, mention of China was taboo, despite that the policy very much concerns this major Asian power. Moreover, many geographical regions were entirely neglected, and economics is not acknowledged as a potential cause of conflict or constraint on America's actions. Finally, many seemed to embrace the NSG because of its "realism" through discussion of inter-state and high technology war, but it is unclear that the document is "realist".

However, there has been a decidedly lopsided approach to addressing the new missions for the US armed forces. One of the most often discussed – and the clear favorite of the Navy and the Air Force – is A2AD planning, one of the four new missions. In addition to its newness, it defines clearer roles

for the Navy and Air Force. Such a policy has proven easier to plan for, being a more classic “kinetic” military operational design, and as it involves sophisticated hardware it is attractive to the defense industry. And yet, it is crucial to examine how reasonable and feasible this mission is. The emerging doctrinal approach to this mission, the so-called AirSea Battle, has grown more intriguing in its effort to bring together cyber, space, and undersea aspects, and is now being looked at in a fully joint manner. However, a downside could arise if in its application this doctrine would take away or diminish the opportunity for strategic pauses in escalation.

Dr. Spear presented the actual military developments of the NSG as meager, including the Navy-Marine exercises such as Dawn Blitz (2013) with Canada, Japan, and New Zealand, the expansion of US forces in Australia at the Pine Gap Joint Defense Facility, and the deployment of ships to Singapore. However, most actions foreseen or announced are more future budgetary and planning focused in anticipation of more favorable economic conditions.

Nonetheless, it is important to remember the already significant US military presence in the region. With the deployment of additional forces in alignment with the NSG, it looks as if the future focus will be more on nimble “swing forces” based in the US, without a substantially increased theater presence.

The three facets of sustainability of such an announced policy must be taken into account: people, money, and events. In terms of personnel, as noted above, the original leaders of the policy have vacated their roles, which could be taken as signaling that the policy is not being given top priority. The recent US budgetary “sequestration” means that after obvious cuts have been made, difficult choices will remain, and there will be a lack of serious money for new expeditionary missions. Finally, events around the globe have been pulling attention away from Asia, not to mention that China in some, if not many, ways may also be a potential partner in managing global affairs. In that context, there is the concern that regional partners and allies may overcommit the USA.

Dr. Guillaume de Rougé made the final presentation, focusing on US diplomatic and economic engagement in the Asia-Pacific. In order to remain anchored to Asia-Pacific, the main engine of global economic growth, the US must tame China and reaffirm its role as a legitimate regional stabilizer. US credibility is at stake, as the costs of its presence rise inexorably. Regional economic interdependencies are gradually benefitting China, while the US military guarantees and economic market share are eroding. Therefore, through the “pivot”, or “rebalancing”, the US testifies to the need to rethink its now twenty-year-old approach of cooperation and competition with China.

Looking to recent events, US participation in the G8 shows both trans-Atlantic and trans-Pacific economic engagement, with a general increase in interest in macroeconomic issues. In the Asia-Pacific, there exists a diverse spread of economic institutions, including the TPP, the Regional Comprehensive Economic Partnership (RCEP), and a variety of free trade agreements (FTAs) – though it is often difficult to distinguish between political military alliances and economic relationships.

Some FTAs are between the US and its allies and partners, while others are among regional powers, such as the trilateral agreement between China, South Korea and Japan. There is also the ASEAN Economic Community Forum 2015 project (which since being launched in 2012 has perhaps proven too ambitious with a 2015 timetable) and the RCEP, the equivalent of the “ASEAN +6”, which is in its fifth round of negotiation.

The juxtaposition of China-led RCEP and US-led TPP has suggested to some that this is a new type of Cold War structure. However, both institutions originated in Asia itself. In the case of the TPP, there was initial support from South America, which has grown to include important participation from North America and, recently, Japan. Some TPP countries share membership in RCEP, and the organizations have ended up playing complementary roles. Interest in one has provoked increased interest in the other, despite differences in membership, scope, and ambitions.

The TPP is purported to be the most important FTA in the history of the US as well as for the regional powers of the Asia-Pacific – trade has especially blossomed between Southeast and Northeast Asia in recent years. This implies an increased need for regulation and dispute settlement mechanisms, as the countries are experiencing tremendous development and associated economic shocks. These institutions are thus even more necessary, considering there is no dispute settlement process existing within ASEAN (important for conflicting continental and peninsular interests), or indeed between ASEAN and China.

It is important to consider the increasingly difficulty with which economic growth can be measured, as such techniques as “made in”, GDP, etc. are not reliable. Additionally, countries no longer buy what they need; they buy what they need to produce the goods they will sell. The US is the current global leader, but it will not have the same pull with China in developing favorably asymmetric conditions in FTAs.

In such negotiations, China would have three primary options: play the RCEP card despite that many members are US partners or allies; play the TPP card, though there is little interest in China joining this negotiation, and it does not currently meet the requirements; and finally the World Trade Organization (WTO), taking the negotiations to the global, as opposed to

regional, level. Regardless, it is important that the negotiations be multilateral and not bilateral, in terms of parties' willingness to make concessions.

As for diplomatic issues, beyond North Korea and Taiwan, maritime concerns have come to the forefront, with the main near-term American diplomatic goal seeming to be the containment of China's coercive diplomacy in the South and East China Seas. This would also seem to include a more robust forward military presence; however, due to diminishing resources, this may not be feasible in the long run. There exists the desire to maintain a very visible profile vis-à-vis China as well as the basic need to maintain the freedom of navigation, which introduces private actors. In a variety of forums meeting on this issue, the US maintains a noticeable presence, but one that existed before the rebalance and likely will after.

The focus on maritime issues underlines the need for China and the US to test each other's limits in order to identify the extent of their competition, outside of military issues and mostly in economic terms. This could lead to new forms of "strategic stability" between the two countries, dampening the prospect for escalation crisis and conflict, preventing major disturbance of economic growth and prosperity.

In order to continue the stability sought by the rebalance policy, the US has two complementary options: the creation of an "Asian NATO", allowing the US to take the back seat, backed up by multilateral economic agreements; or a sort of "co-dominion" between the US and China, treating China as a regional superpower.

Panel I Discussion

The discussion following the morning panel featured a lively exchange among panelists and attendees alike. One topic was the relationship between balancing and engaging China and how this plays out in the current US discourse regarding policy implications. There are hundreds of US-China bilateral discussions among government officials (mainly economics- and security-focused). This day-to-day engagement indicates that both countries recognize the importance of a continuing dialogue. However, there is tight control from the White House, which has a vested interest in ensuring the success of the policy, and especially preventing conflict with China. One participant offered that the main American approach should be retaining ascendancy and "educating China in the rules of the game".

Another participant commented on the fact that a strong US interest in Asia is nothing new, as it can be traced back to the Spanish-American War. The annexation of the Philippines served as a military and economic three-quarter way house to China, even a century ago. More recently, regular engagement began in 1998 under President Clinton and has continued with in a variety of ways. One expert suggested that US involvement in the TTIP, in addition to the Pacific-focused TTP, shows a dual “pivot”: trans-Atlantic and trans-Pacific.

The next topic of discussion covered the US military presence in the Asia-Pacific region. One speaker insisted that although significantly increased forces in the region are not likely, there seems to be no intention to withdraw forces. Another expert commented that the US needs to figure out how to accomplish more with less, hinting at the use of “swing forces” as a solution to this issue, to which someone remarked on the importance many nations place on the number of troops deployed in a region (despite the reliance on high technology in today’s world that would seem to reduce the importance of “boots on the ground”).

It was then claimed that the US rebalance has led to a test of US leadership by China, a Chinese effort to drive a wedge between America and its Asian allies. Consequently, US “reassurance” to its partners is crucial because a sense of weakness on the part of the US will be a detriment to its allies and raise China’s already elevated confidence levels. Another expert countered that China has internal problems to concern itself with, issues that will become more apparent as the economy slows.

Attendees also discussed the many facets of China’s global involvement. Taking a very direct approach with engaging countries, China has interests in businesses and natural resources around the globe, especially in the developing countries that make up Africa and South America. One interlocutor noted that China treats Latin American interests with the appearance at least of respectful attention, in contrast with many Western nations. The diaspora of Chinese people was also touched on, investing China both emotionally and monetarily. Another commentator noted the irony in the fierce competition between Chinese state-owned enterprises (SOE) around the globe, suggesting they are more capitalist than the capitalists. This globalization of Chinese power gained through economic impetus brings security issues into play. With the integration of China into global markets, what is perhaps most worrisome for other world powers is that China does not explain the reasons for its actions.

A final discussion looked briefly at the likelihood of the NSG having long-term strategic implications. One attendee insisted that while the policy was not intended to be applied only in the short-term, it is likely that that will be the case. Another countered that it is unlikely that NSG will be overtaken by

events; QDRs rarely have long-lasting influence, and so even if the 2014 QDR counters the NSG, the American policy focus on the Asia-Pacific is likely to remain.

Lunchtime presentation: US Policy Change and Russian Foreign and Defense Policy Interests

Dr. Isabelle Facon, Senior Research Fellow at the Strategic Research Foundation in Paris, gave the lunchtime presentation focusing on how Russia is impacted by the US rebalance. Although not a part of the Asia-Pacific, as a country that spans Europe and Asia, it is implicated in the rebalance policy, and its reactions play an important role on the global stage.

Perhaps most striking about Russia's reactions to the US strategic rebalance towards Asia is how quiet officials have been, in contrast to the Kremlin's sometimes harsh positions on Washington's policies in Europe and Eurasia. The first explanation Dr. Facon offered suggests that Russia has still not found out whether the American policy will impede its own rising ambitions in the region. Another possibility deals with geopolitics, Russia's basic assumption being that the US is acting primarily to contain China – in other words, Russia is not *the* target. A final explanation for Russia's relative silence on the "pivot" is its perception of continuity: according to Russian officials, the rebalance is hardly a break with previous policy. In general, Russian leaders are still in the process of assessing whether the strategic rebalance will be more instrumental or detrimental to their country's interests in Asia and globally.

Dr. Facon also emphasized that Russia has pursued its own rebalance towards Asia, declared even before the American move, because of a motivation to develop relations and find new markets in such a dynamic theatre. Firstly, it perceives a vital need to resuscitate socio-economic development of its far eastern territories. However, Russia does not want this development to be dominated by concerns over China's growing economic presence in Russia's Far East as has occurred with the raw materials thus far. Moscow is looking to avoid the entrenchment of economic distortions that could have serious geopolitical consequences in the long run. Secondly, Russia wants to make its Asian foreign policy less Sino-centric. Previous Russian policy was dictated by necessity in reaction to China's rise and the relative weakness of Russian capabilities. Now, however, there is a new effort afoot to correct the Sino-centrism in the coming years, an effort the US rebalance may help or complicate.

Dr. Facon then analyzed how the US rebalance could, in the perception of Russian leaders, prove instrumental for Russia. Moscow, for which the rebalance is essentially about containing China, first sees the move as having the potential to elevate itself in Washington's geo-political calculations if the US looks for partners or, more negatively, is willing to lessen the strengthening of Sino-Russian relations. A second possible

positive consequence of the American strategic policy, in Russia's perception, is that a US focus in the Far East could mean Russia will have an expanded capacity to maneuver in Europe and maybe more leverage in regions such as the Caucasus and Ukraine if the US leaves Europe deal with the management of the strategic situation there. With these issues left to Europeans to sort out, the Russians anticipate having more say in proceedings because they see the Europeans as a weaker power. Finally the fact that the future of the Sino-Russian relationship is a source of concern in Russia makes Russian scholars and officials wonder about the possible impact of the US pivot from the point of view of Russia's willingness to strike a better balance of power with Beijing.

Some scholars (liberal and Western-oriented) argue that one of the only factors preventing China from turning Russia into a pawn is the US rebalance. As such, it would be prudent for Russia to ally, or at least align, itself with the US. Without going that far, many in Moscow note that Russia and the US share the goal of balancing China (although they have uneven capabilities of shaping the situation), an objective that both consider achieving by a more active presence in the Asian sphere. However, this approach does not seem to be the generally accepted mood in Moscow due to an overall lack of trust between the former Cold War rivals. Furthermore, alignment with Washington would not be coherent with the strategy Russia has been pursuing thus far: in order to keep under control the possible negative effects for itself of China's rise, Moscow has been very careful to avoid antagonizing China, to avoid any moves which Beijing could perceive as directed against it.

Dr. Facon identified one positive aspect of a stronger US presence in Asia for Russia's own agenda. It deals with China's current military posture, which is mainly focused on the Taiwan Strait, South China Sea, and Western Pacific, which is to say away from Russia. Russia anticipates that further US involvement will only encourage this trend.

In general however, it seems the US rebalance is considered a liability to Russian interests. Firstly, it reduces Russia's margins for maneuver in developing a policy of multi-polarity in Asia, which is already a difficult feat. It also makes China more suspicious that Russia's moves in Asia are undertaken under American influence. Finally, an extended US presence risks triggering a long-term increase in friction and tension between the US and China, in which Russia may be faced not only with more instability in its neighborhood but also with a difficult choice between Beijing and Washington.

Dr. Facon concluded by highlighting that Russia may feel "trapped" by its tendency, over the past two decades, due to its weakened power base, to

constantly (and more or less skillfully) play the China card versus the US and vice versa.

Discussion

Following Dr. Isabelle Facon's presentation on the Russian perspectives concerning the strategic rebalance, there was a brief discussion. One participant insisted that Russia's interests in the US rebalance to Asia demonstrate its desire to remain an important figure on the world scene.

Another interlocutor commented on Russo-Japanese relations, specifically regarding the revisiting of the 1956 negotiations on territorial disputes. With Prime Minister Abe again in power in Japan, it is likely that there will be further communications between Moscow and Tokyo. However, both countries face domestic debate concerning this issue.

Russia finds Japan an interesting potential partner for multi-polarity in Greater Asia, for foreign investment in the Far East, and for technology transfers in Russia's effort to modernize. Because of these opportunities, it seems Russia is enthusiastic about solving these disputes.

The final topic focused on Russia's feeling of isolation vis-à-vis the US, Europe, and even China and Japan. Because of these sentiments, Russian strategists feel the necessity of retaining tactical nuclear weapons, always wary of what is occurring on its periphery. In addition, President Obama's recent statement in Berlin indicating a desire for talks with Russia to reduce deployed nuclear capabilities now implicates China as an important factor for Russia's consideration, as Russia may fear that too many cuts would reduce its stature vis-à-vis China.

Panel II: “Rebalance” in Asia

The second panel of the day set out to establish and analyze how the American rebalance has affected regional security policies in Northeast and Southeast Asia. In particular, it examined the impact of the US policy shift on China’s foreign and defense policy interests, on South Korea and Japan’s relations with the US, and on the maritime security dynamics in Southeast Asia.

Dr. Emmanuel Puig, a Senior Researcher at the Asia Centre in Paris, presented China’s reactions, focusing on its foreign policy as well as its military modernization. He stressed that there is no truly open discussion about the US strategic rebalance in China, even among scholars.

Although it is difficult to find official statements or authoritative articles published at the time of the announcement of the rebalance in late 2011, such initial Chinese reactions as were noted to the strategic rebalance were decidedly muted and cautious. However, this relative silence was not due to a sense of surprise vis-à-vis the strategic development, but rather due to the fact that at the same time, China was entering a year of political turmoil. This exerted restraint on the expression of official opinion on foreign and domestic policy.

In the meantime, non-official articles were published, often by former party leaders, which were often taken as official statements. These articles displayed a decidedly hawkish tone, demonstrating nationalistic feelings in a martial and unbalanced manner. As the principal source of Chinese responses, this sparked worry among policymakers in the US. The rhetoric complained of a return to Cold War mentality, the containment of China, the aggressiveness of the US, and the potential destabilizing effects in the region of such a policy move. The economic aspects, e.g. the TPP, were largely left out of the evaluation of the policy.

With the actual announcement by President Obama, official views were increasingly published, and hawkish views waned in popularity. Now that the Chinese leadership transition has been resolved, more coherent perspectives are being expressed, although mainly in domestic conferences, with little publication of the discussions abroad.

This led into the second part of Dr. Puig’s presentation, in which he focused on the current Chinese perceptions of the US policy with a particular regard towards diplomacy and defense. In terms of diplomacy, the rebalance was no surprise for Chinese officials, and it even helped identify three significant issues for Chinese policy: clarify if this shift is purposefully meant to follow a confrontational path; calculate the sustainability of this strategic American

move; understand whether and how this development will impact China's influence in Asia.

Dr. Puig's analysis of these recent views expressed by Chinese officials drew two conclusions:

- First, there is an overall coherence among Chinese policymaker views. It is assumed that the rebalance is a direct challenge to China, but it has not been interpreted as a true threat (except for commentators in the PLA). The Chinese do not see how the rebalance, or indeed the TPP, will significantly influence their power in the Asia-Pacific, though this does push China to rethink its policy in the region.
- Second, the officials still seem to be puzzled by the US' strategic choice. The main queries posed have to do with the timing of the rebalance and the amount of publicity it was given: Is it too late? Why such emphasis?

About six months ago Chinese diplomats began to react to the rebalance in terms of developing a new posture and narrative in Europe, the Middle East, and Africa that offers support to these regions in order to play off the abandonment they might feel from the US turn towards Asia. As such, the rebalance is perceived as an opportunity for China.

A final facet of the diplomatic response is the "March West" strategy being mulled over by Beijing policymakers: instead of focusing on "zero-sum" relations with the US in the Pacific, China should focus more energy on being proactive in Central and South Asia as well as in the Middle East.

As for the defense aspect, perspectives from the People's Liberation Army (PLA) see fewer opportunities coming out of the US strategic rebalance. There are few official statements, but there have been numerous criticisms of the AirSea Battle Concept (ASBC), which is seen as destabilizing, aggressive, and an explicit threat to engage China in an arms race. China understands its military inferiority to the US and perceives a threat in the ASBC against A2AD efforts. The most recent air show in China was a political display of China's increasing ability to counter US shows of strength. In general, the rebalance has fueled insecurities over the lack of operational capabilities of PLA troops, which has led to much pressure on Chinese defense industries.

In sum, while China has no desire for engaging in conflict with the US over the rebalance, there is no doubt in China that the policy is focused on "balancing" China.

Dr. Guibourg Delamotte, a Research Fellow at INALCO's Japanese Studies Center and Associate Research Fellow at CERI, gave the next

presentation, addressing the policy's impact on Northeast Asia, specifically in Japan and on the Korean peninsula. She explained that overall, Japan and South Korea welcomed the announcement, despite an uneasiness stemming from the fact that the US is ambivalent towards China with which it wishes to engage, and which it also seeks to contain.

The US rebalance had more impact on Japan's defense posture than on Korea's: Japan requires more encouragement to make even slight changes to its defense policy. However, assessing the impact of the US rebalancing as such is difficult: changes in Japan's defense policy stem from its increased fears (vis-à-vis its neighbors), rather than from the new US policy. As for US presence in Asia, the rebalancing does not imply an increase in US troops, on the contrary. The tendency for the past ten years or so has been to decrease their number. Both South Korea and Japan welcome this decrease. However, both nations realize that what it implies for them is a greater military self-reliance. Japan is for instance contemplating allowing its self-defense forces preventive strike capabilities (vis-à-vis a North Korean ballistic missile offensive) or setting up a Marine Corps (to ensure a better protection of its remote islands, vis-à-vis China). Such changes to Japan's defense posture would change nothing to the balance of the Japan-US security alliance: Japan must defend itself first, and the US provides backup, as well as nuclear deterrence.

The rebalancing has had little impact on Japan's relations with the US and its allies in the region. For a number of years the US has encouraged its allies to establish links between themselves, and sought to replace the "hub and spokes" structure with a "cobweb". Japan has been eager to pursue this strategy, as it aims to counterbalance China (South Korea needs China in negotiations with North Korea and is cautious not to antagonize China). In addition, Japan has developed relations with countries in the Pacific: Australia, India, and now Indonesia, the Philippines, and Vietnam, with important overtures to South Korea. Cooperation has also been established with the UK in terms of the exchange of sensitive information, with plans to do the same with France.

The US rebalancing has done little to reduce tensions in the region. Relations between Japan and South Korea as well as South Korea and China remain largely unchanged, in spite of the fact that the US encourages cooperation between the two nations. Both countries were about to sign a defense cooperation agreement, but the signature was postponed by South Korea due to the upcoming presidential elections at the time. Nationalistic tension between South Korea and Japan has escalated in the past few years, and the two countries' relations are increasingly dominated by internal politics. The generational shift which has taken place in Japan and South Korea accounts for much of this increased tension. Leaders in both countries seek to strengthen their political bases, and South Korea

welcomes the opportunity of appearing to see eye to eye with China. Recent tensions in the Korean peninsula are not attributable to the rebalancing because North Korea follows its own agenda.

In conclusion, Japan and South Korea welcomed the announcement of the rebalancing, though they struggle to see what it might imply for relations with China and are waiting to see if the policy is sustainable.

Dr. Eric Frécon, an Assistant Professor at the École Navale and Coordinator of the Southeast Asia Observatory at the Asia Centre, concluded the panel with a presentation on reactions from Southeast Asia, particularly concerning maritime security. In Southeast Asia the US strategic rebalance has been perceived as maintaining the continuity in recent American foreign policy in the region.

Prior to the announcement of the US strategic rebalance in January 2012, there was already a formidable American presence in the Asia-Pacific waters. The strong naval posture was represented by US aircraft carrier visits, troops in the Philippines, and the recent decision to send littoral combat ships (LCS) to Singapore, for instance. These American initiatives put pressure on the nations of Southeast Asia, who were less than keen to have such an imposing American presence in the region, producing positive effects such as the Malacca Straits patrols, Eyes in the Sky air patrols, and the Malaysian Maritime Enforcement Agency (MMEA).

In addressing the effects of America's rebalance on Southeast Asia, Dr. Frécon proceeded to analyze the answers to traditional and nontraditional maritime threats via defense policy and naval diplomacy, the topic of freedom of navigation, and the unexpected consequences besides maritime security.

Although the rebalance was again perceived as a continuation of previous policy, it has had new impacts because of a new context. Issues such as budgetary concerns as well as domestic and international pressures have shaped how the US has been able to pursue its goals for the rebalance, and there has been considerable effort to strike a delicate balance, aiming for a light, but effective, footprint without any rolling back. It is also important to consider the complexities presented by maritime law (e.g. dealing with the tidal waters of archipelagic states).

The US policy has given much attention to the prevention of traditional threats, such as A2AD, ASBC, etc., including through naval drills aimed at encouraging cooperation among nations. As for the non-traditional threats, there has been support from behind including the training law enforcement agents, provision of equipment, and sharing of intelligence. Finally, there has been much reaching out from senior leaders and participation in

regional forums, renewing and updating relationships between the US and Southeast Asian countries.

Dr. Frécon suggested that the freedom of navigation issue is the primary focus of the rebalance with regard to maritime topics. It has had geographical manifestations in all the choke points in Asian waters. The doctrinal manifestations can be seen in Indonesian efforts at developing sea denial, for instance. The third aspect of the effort has been the legal discussions towards a non-restrictive definition of exclusive economic zones (EEZ).

Dr. Frécon identified some unexpected consequences of the rebalance outside the realm of maritime security. One such is a potential for an arms race or pressure for modernization, though there has been nothing to conclusively define the military development in the region as such. Another unintended consequence is the possibility of US partners and allies pursuing dangerous initiatives because of the perceived safety of the American umbrella, such as the Philippines reaction to the Scarborough Shoal issue in 2012. Perhaps most important is the notion of “bamboo diplomacy”, i.e. bending in the wind, in this case nations shifting between catering to the US and cooperating with China.

Panel II Discussion

The discussion following the second panel first focused on the presentation by Dr. Guibourg Delamotte on the impact of the Rebalance on Japan and the Korean peninsula. It then opened up to topics pertaining to China, Southeast Asia and maritime security, and the strategic move’s implications in Asia in general.

Participants first addressed how South Korea and China are postured against Japan and the effects on the US. It was offered that South Korea realizes the centrality of the US to its security policy, and has not brought up contentious issues with China as it recognizes that this would heighten tensions. The peninsular power also depends on good relations with China for reasons of a shared border and the North Korea Six-party talks. Japan, on the other hand, is not downplaying its tensions with China. It has sought appeasement, but China has adopted a non-cooperative and confrontational stance. These postures have not had a significant impact for the US, as both South Korea and Japan clearly identify the US as their ally – as opposed to China. One participant offered that the rebalance has in fact had an impact in Japan with regards to the revision to guidelines involving such issues as the ASBC, i.e. a dramatic increase in the amount of attention aimed towards access denial.

Another topic of discussion was the implications of the June 2013 Obama speech in Berlin concerning the reduction of the world's nuclear stockpiles. It was suggested that the very definition of extended deterrence is being brought into question as US allies reassess the viability of the US commitment. Indeed, South Korea and Japan are both in need of reassurance. In Japan's case, there have always been doubts about the US commitment to put itself in danger in response to an attack against Japan, and now it especially fears being neglected for China. The Japanese are aware of their need to build up their defense capabilities, which will require backup from the US, but this effort has been met with constitutional complications. A need to engage in negotiations with China before categorizing the nation as an enemy has also been identified.

One interlocutor brought up the possibility that there is a sort of European, or at least French, rebalance towards the Asia-Pacific, as suggested by recent visits to the region by President François Hollande and the beginning of negotiations for an economic partnership agreement (EPA) between the EU and Japan. However, these talks are likely to be difficult due to domestic opposition. Hollande's visit has created expectations that with the adoption of an EPA, there will be greater cooperation on security issues. Nonetheless, the dialogue will only be bilateral. Furthermore, Japan is concerned that France does not share its perception of China's threat, and so France must convince Japan it shares the same strategic interests regarding the major Asian power.

Participants then delved further into the issue of Japan becoming more self-reliant, with a specific regard to its constitutional restraints, and the consequences of this for South Korea as far as nuclear deterrence is concerned. The consensus was that increasing defense self-reliance has long been discussed in Japan (on the order of 50 years), but only now is it beginning to gain momentum, and changes will likely occur as incremental developments. It was offered that South Korea will have difficulty trusting Japan, especially due to internal politics and nationalism. And yet, it is unlikely that the US or indeed the P5 (the five permanent nations of the United Nations Security Council) would be in favor of Japan gaining nuclear capabilities, which is something South Korea should take into account.

During the part of the discussion on China and Southeast Asia, one topic participants focused on was the broad range of actors involved in the South China Sea and the consequent problems this poses to the PRC in terms of foreign policy coordination and consistency/coherence. One participant suggested that right now Southeast Asian nations are "soft-hedging", or rowing between two reefs. On the one hand, they depend on China as an economic locomotive, but on the other, the US is crucial as a security guarantor. This playing both sides shows that there is continuity. However, the rebalance has allowed Southeast Asia some space to move, such as in

the case of the democratic transition and distancing from China pursued by Myanmar.

Another interlocutor brought up the issue of the shortcomings in Chinese efforts in soft power diplomacy in the past decade. Nations that successfully pursue soft power diplomacy lay hold to three primary criteria: attention, influence, and attraction. While the US is possessor of all three, China lacks attraction. This is perhaps why the rebalance has been wanted by Southeast Asian nations as well as by other regional powers like Australia, New Zealand, and Japan because it is perceived as strengthening their sovereignty.

The state of Sino-Japanese relations was the next topic of discussion. Currently, the two nations do not see eye-to-eye, in a period when strong anti-Japan sentiments reign in China and strong anti-China feelings are widespread in Japan. One participant suggested that hope will come in the form of a new generation of Chinese journalists whose media outlets, though not private, are at least more open, and who can attempt to bridge the gap with Japanese journalists, breaking down propaganda with more informative articles and documentaries.

One participant brought up the disputes concerning the “nine-dash line” as it applies to the exclusive economic zones (EEZs) of the Philippines and Vietnam. These EEZs are important because reports say that nearly all the oil in the region is located on the continental shelf of Vietnam and the Philippines. Although the Philippines have recently taken China to court concerning this issue, it remains to be seen how this dispute will be resolved.

Attendees then discussed China’s reactions to American defense training and exercise initiatives as the US seeks to implement the NSG. One interlocutor noted that a retired PLA specialist had commented that it was understood that these exercises were designed to show China that US forces in the region were operational. This led to the question of whether the PLA has reached genuine operational capability, a hotly debated topic among PLA officials. While many leaders are perhaps overly proud of the new capabilities of the PLA, others have started to be more vocal in expressing the fact that the PLA has not actually reached combat readiness. There is much internal debate regarding how to improve operational capabilities and become more mobilized.

The attendees finished the discussion by returning to the topic of soft power diplomacy efforts in China. Although there was again a consensus that China does not have official soft power in terms of attention, influence, and attraction (attraction being the key shortcoming), one specialist pointed out its sort of unofficial soft power during the 1960s. This was a period when

Chinese culture experienced much attraction among young Westerners, despite that diplomatic relations were much worse at the time and Mao was in power. Indeed, contemporary Chinese officials are puzzled to realize they do not fully possess soft power, but they understand that it depends upon outsiders' perceptions. Although Beijing has established the Confucius Center, many argue it has not been very successful in promoting the Chinese culture, especially as it does not focus on contemporary culture. And yet, there is a sort of unofficial soft power in that increasing numbers of Western students are learning the Chinese language and going there to study.

Panel III: Impact on Transatlantic Relations

The final panel of the day discussed the consequences of the US rebalance towards Asia for Europe. The speakers addressed the evolution of US military engagement on the Continent, and then proceeded to analyze the implications for transatlantic political and defense relations and the effects on Europe's interests in Asia.

Dr. Michael Desch, Professor and Chair of the Department of Political Science at the University of Notre Dame, provided background, touching on the evolving nature of the US commitment to Europe, not only post-Iraq and Afghanistan, but in the period since the early 1990s. While US land forces on the Continent have shrunk exponentially in size in the past few decades, in contrast the political military scope of NATO began expanding in the early 1990s, including debated NATO military operations in the Balkans. Following the initiation of US operations in Afghanistan and Iraq, there was important military buildup outside the European domain, though with the support of forces stationed on the Continent.

Lieutenant General David Hogg, US Military Representative to the NATO Military Committee, and Lieutenant General Donald Campbell, Commanding General, US Army Europe, jointly gave the first presentation, emphasizing that the United States remains committed to NATO and its European partners. They pointed out that it is difficult to ignore how intertwined Europe and the US are regarding their democratic values, the connections among the business and economic communities, and the shared growth in military might. The combined Alliance forces have undertaken numerous operations including the Cold War, the Balkans, Libya, Mali, etc.

The strength and power of the relationship manifest themselves in a variety of ways. One example is the NATO declaration of Article 5 (committing each member state to consider an armed attack against one state to be an armed attack against all states) following the attacks on September 11, 2001, as initiated by the allies of the US. The American holiday Memorial Day is another striking example of the close rapport. Every year, there are ceremonies at each of the twenty American military cemeteries in Europe, where soldiers and civilians from both sides of the Atlantic gather to commemorate the sacrifices of the men and women who fought to preserve freedom and democracy.

As for the evolution of the military commitment, the US remains committed to the training and military exercises with its European partners. There have been significant efforts to increase the understanding and cohesion between American and European forces. Beginning in the 1980s, the

training of US troops in Europe was separate from European troops, with most intercontinental interaction occurring in the upper echelons of the militaries, i.e. little bi- or multilateral training took place. Following the fall of the Berlin Wall in the late 1980s, there was a significant reduction of US forces on the Continent and the birth of the Partnership for Peace program aimed at creating trust between NATO and the former Soviet Union. There was slightly more integration in training exercises, but it was still relatively meager. In the middle of the following decade, the ongoing operations in Iraq and Afghanistan showcased participation from US and European troops, and there was significant intercontinental cooperation at a level never reached during the Cold War. In the future, the US strategy is to remain engaged with its European partners with a special focus on maintaining personal and professional relationships with its allies. The growing capabilities provided by defense-related technological advances will also continue to play a large role, increasing efficiency despite depleted forces. Collaboration with NATO Response Forces will be a driver to transition the US and its allies from post-Afghan 2014 to future threat environments, with a continued emphasis on interoperability. This evolution demonstrates a continued commitment by the US to the transatlantic relationship with the expectation that its European partners will also invest in their own initiatives for common defense and collective security.

The generals asserted that Europe remains a cornerstone and catalyst for America's engagement in the global scene. It is crucial to focus more on such initiatives as multilateral training and the development of partner capacity. It is also interesting to note that 91% of the non-US forces in ISAF are from Europe, and much of the training occurring at US bases in Europe is multinational. This represents an important focus on interoperability and the consolidation of infrastructure, reinforcing the message of the strong US commitment to Europe.

Dr. Eva Gross, a Senior Analyst at the EU Institute for Security Studies in Paris, next examined the transatlantic relationship, specifically analyzing how the strategic rebalance was perceived by Europe, the perceptions of the US role in Europe, and the current and future implications on the Atlantic Alliance.

The initial European reaction to the US rebalance was often alarm and concern over the fabric of the transatlantic relationship. The announcement of the rebalance also signaled to Europeans that the time had come to take their own security responsibilities more seriously, domestically and globally. The announced "rebalance" could even be seen as indicating that alliances would no longer be valued for the sake of the partnership itself, but instead for the practical role these alliance relationships would play in evolving geopolitical realities. It also led to soul-searching reflecting on the US role in Europe and a re-evaluation of Europe's own interests in Asia.

Dr. Gross emphasized the importance of considering the background in Europe at the time of the announcement of the policy. In addition to the challenges of austerity in response to the financial crisis, the value of European integration was brought into question. There was also an ongoing restructuring in Brussels following the Lisbon Treaty.

Nevertheless, the US continues to have important interests in the Middle East and this indicates that the US will maintain a presence in Europe and continue close collaboration with its transatlantic allies and partners. Indeed, it can be seen from recent appointees to the second Obama administration that although the official policy is the rebalance towards Asia, there is also a focus on having experienced transatlantic advisors, thus maintaining a close US-EU rapport.

From this, Dr. Gross explained that the implications for transatlantic relations are encouraging, but not altogether different than they previously were. Recent years have been marked by increasing EU-US cooperation, including Department of State-EU collaboration on post-conflict reconstruction efforts and joint engagement in theatres. This is an effort both countries can build upon in the future. Nonetheless a thread of continuity has carried through in the European effort to become more militarily self-reliant. Stagnation remains despite the implications of the pivot and the usual admonitions that Europe is not considered a partner in terms of military capability. This is due to austerity, but also importantly, to strategic culture.

Dr. Nicola Casarini, also a Senior Analyst at the EU Institute for Security Studies in Paris, gave the seminar's final presentation, speaking on the impact of the rebalance on Europe's strategic and economic interests in Asia and how they are affected by a changing US strategy. He stressed that the EU is mainly a trading power. In fact, it ranks second in largest trading partners in the Asia-Pacific – behind China, but ahead of the US – meaning the EU is China's most important trading partner. Today nearly one-third of EU exports are destined for the Asian market, which offers rapidly expanding market opportunities for Europeans businesses who rank among the largest foreign investors in the region.

Furthermore, the seventeen-member Eurozone holds even more power in the region as euro-dominated assets account for approximately a quarter of Asia's major economies' holdings. These holdings total at more than one-third in China, the world's largest holder. As a result, the euro is the secondary reserve currency in Asia, ahead of the yen. When it comes to the European sovereign debt crisis, the major Asian economies represent a quarter of the purchasers of European Financial Stabilization Mechanism-issued bonds for the Irish and Portuguese bailout programs in 2010.

Over the last fifteen years, a core group of European powers (“Core-Europe”, similar in membership to the Eurozone) has developed high-tech and space technology cooperation with important Asia-Pacific actors. Core-Europe’s jointly developed satellite system Galileo is based on key agreements with China, India, and South Korea. Moreover, Asia represents an up-and-coming market for increasingly export-dependent European aerospace and defense industries.

The European sector has developed an important presence in the market of military equipment in South and Southeast Asia in recent years, especially in submarines, frigates, corvettes, and jet fighters. In fact, European defense firms share 7% of China’s defense budget, in spite of the 1989 arms embargo against Beijing. Additionally, according to the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI), Asia imports nearly half of its arms from Europe and the US, approximately 20% and 29% respectively. Europe is not a major military power in Asia, but it does play an important role in the provision of arms (even more so than the US or China) to the small countries making up Southeast Asia.

Not being a hard military power, Europe has still contributed to security measures in the region as its economic interests depend on safe maritime routes and a stable environment. The EU contributes through multilateral initiatives, taking part in the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF), the Asia-Europe Meeting (ASEM), and the Korean Peninsula Energy Development Organization (KEDO). European efforts have also made significant contributions to the furthering of democracy and peace agreements among the countries of the Asia-Pacific. Finally, Europe is the largest distributor of development aid and humanitarian assistance in the region, fitting with the EU’s image as primarily being a pursuant of soft power.

Dr. Casarini noted that the EU itself does not have troops in Asia, although specific member nations such as Great Britain do. Unknown to many is the fact that some European powers (Great Britain, France, and Germany, for instance) have pursued defense dialogues and military relations with the Asian allies of the US, as well as with China itself, facilitating the training of Chinese military officers and the exchanges of high level visits. Indeed Sino-French and Sino-British collaboration extend to include port calls and joint naval search and rescue exercises with the goal of building trust and exchanging information.

The EU’s main political interests in Asia come first as political stability, but also entail regional integration and confidence-building measures, distinguishing it from other international actors. Indeed, Europe has been instrumental in the creation of ASEAN+3, the main institutional framework promoting regional integration. Although the EU cannot offer security

measures on par with those of the US, it does furnish the Asia-Pacific with a model for inter-state relations and cooperation among former rivals.

In conclusion, the European Union has significant interests in Asia, and its presence is felt across the full policy spectrum, from a common currency to FTAs, space technology to arm sales. Thus, the Union could be considered a sort of minor Asian power. In spite of inescapable competition for the market shares of the region, the European political presence is very much complementary to that of the US, particularly in promoting sets of multilateral-based rules and standards.

However, an important difference between the transatlantic partners exists in that Washington's strategic rebalance towards Asia is widely interpreted as being aimed at balancing China, and so by putting the focus on the reinforcement of its security alliances in the area, the US policy stands the risk of resulting in greater polarization in the realm of the Far East in addition to the emergence of zero-sum relations. In contrast, the Union's presence and policy is unhampered by military allegiances and lacks any specific target country. As such, Dr. Casarini emphasized the importance of continuing a transatlantic dialogue to further each power's understanding of the other's policy and interests in Asia in order to facilitate a more streamlined joint approach.

Panel III Discussion

The final discussion first addressed the transatlantic implications of the rebalance. First, one participant pointed out an area of disconnect not deeply analyzed during the third panel: the use of NATO as opposed to the EU in the discussion of European interests. It was suggested that the disconnect may stem from US participation in an old organization (NATO), which may no longer be as relevant as it once was. The original purpose of NATO was set out as threefold by NATO's first Secretary General, Lord Ismay: to *keep the Russians out of Europe*, the Americans involved in Europe, and the *Germans down*. However, the future objectives of NATO were brought into question. In contrast, another expert insisted on the commonality of NATO and the EU, not only in terms of member states, but also in terms of goals, suggesting that the two organizations complement each other on mission sets. Yet another expert commented on the growing economic, diplomatic, and security capabilities of the EU, meaning NATO is not the only organization to approach concerning European or transatlantic affairs.

An attendee then brought into question the possibility of a sort of "Asian NATO". There have been efforts to this effect, but the current global context differs from that at the start of NATO in a variety of ways, most markedly

because China is not the same type of power the Soviet Union represented during the Cold War. It is difficult to say whether such an organization in the Asia-Pacific is feasible, but it would have, in the view of the attendee, the potential to make significant economic and security contributions. Another participant chimed in, countering that it would be impossible to create a NATO-equivalent in Asia without Chinese membership because no nations want to be perceived as having even an implicit anti-China bias.

The question of European nations taking sides with China or the US was also put on the table. One expert asserted that the EU is not in a position to take sides as things currently stand (barring an attack from China), although there is a distinct possibility that member states with sufficient capabilities can and have adopted their own policies in given cases. This inability of the EU to reach internal agreement on EU-China relations is brought about by a variety of events in the recent past, such as the unsuccessful attempts at lifting the arms embargo in the early 2000s. Thus, China represents both a threat and an opportunity to a number of European member states.

Participants went on to discuss the multinational training facilities for NATO, as well as non-NATO, troops. Such a system has provided many nations with the opportunity to develop training standards. Although not all participating countries belong to NATO, this effort demonstrates their desire to be a part of a larger effort. One attendee offered that while NATO is important for purposes of interoperability, it may not always be the right tool. There are some cases where the EU civilian label may be more effective, providing the opportunity for collaboration between the organizations.

Another expert commented on the previous talking point wherein European defense companies' major interests in the Chinese market were noted. It is important to remember that these same companies also have major economic interests in American markets. Recalling the 2003-05 period during which there were attempts to lift the Chinese arms embargo, there was retaliation from both the American Executive branch and Congress. Taking into consideration the industry's interests split between the Chinese and the US markets, it was thought that, for most European defense companies, the pendulum still swings in favor of the US market.

One interlocutor questioned the possibility of the use of multinational capabilities, such as the forces used in Iraq and Afghanistan, for purposes of maritime security in Southeast Asia. Another insisted that such a development would be unlikely, not in terms of the strategic rebalance, but because of the current sequestration-induced budgetary challenges facing the US.

Conference Speakers

Lt. Gen. Donald M. Campbell Jr. is the Commanding General of US Army Europe and the 7th US Army, headquartered in Heidelberg and Wiesbaden, Germany. He is a Distinguished Military Graduate of Kansas State University, where he was commissioned as an armor officer in 1978. His previous various assignments included: Commander of the 1st Brigade, 4th Infantry Division; Chief of Staff, 4th Infantry Division; Deputy Commanding General-West for US Army Recruiting Command; Chief of Staff, V Corps, then based in Heidelberg, Germany, with duty as the Multi-National Corps-Iraq Chief of Staff; Deputy Commanding General, I Corps; Commanding General, US Army Armor Center at Fort Knox; Commanding General of the US Army Recruiting Command. His most recent assignment was as the Commanding General, III Corps at Fort Hood (April 2011-November 2012). Lt. Gen. Campbell is a graduate of the Armor Officer Basic Course, Infantry Officer Advanced Course, US Army Command and General Staff College and the US Army War College. He holds a Master's Degree in Administration from Central Michigan University.

Dr. Nicola Casarini is Senior Analyst in the European Union Institute for Security Studies (EUISS) in Paris where he deals with EU-China and EU-East Asia relations, Chinese foreign policy and East Asia's security. Before joining the EUISS, he was Marie Curie Research Fellow (2008-2010) and Jean Monnet post-doctoral Fellow (2006-2007) in the Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies at the European University Institute (Florence), as well as Associate Fellow for China and East Asia (2007-2010) at the Istituto Affari Internazionali (Rome). He holds a PhD in international relations from the London School of Economics and Political Science; a Diplôme d'Etudes Supérieures from the Graduate Institute of International Studies (Geneva), and a BA in political science from Bologna University. He has published works on EU-China and EU-East Asia relations, European foreign policy, Chinese foreign policy, and East Asia's security.

Prof. Frédéric Charillon is the Director and co-founder of the Institute of Strategic Research of the Military Academy (IRSEM, Paris). Professor of political science at the University of Auvergne Clermont I, he also teaches at Sciences Po in Paris and the *École Normale d'Administration* (ENA), as well as being a Visiting Professor at several foreign universities. He is a researcher at the Michel de L'Hospital Center (University of Auvergne), the Center of Studies and Research on Administrative Science (CERSA), and is associated with the Center for European Studies at Sciences Po. He has directed IRSEM since 2009, before which he directed the Center for Studies in Social Sciences of the Defense (C2SD) since 2004. Frédéric Charillon co-directs the International Studies Section (SEI) of the French Political Science Association (AFSP).

Dr. Guibourg Delamotte is Associate Professor of political science at the Japanese Studies Department of the French Institute of Oriental Studies (INALCO), where she teaches international relations and Japanese politics. She is Adjunct Research Fellow at CRCAO, Asia Centre, CERI-Sciences Po and Temple University. From May to July 2010 she was Fellow at the National Institute of Defense Studies (Tokyo), and invited by the JIA in April 2006. She is a Science Po (Paris) and University of Oxford (*M. Jur*) graduate. Her book on Japan's defense policy (PUF, 2010) is based on her PhD dissertation (EHESS, Paris, 2007), which received the highest honors and the Shibusawa-Claudé Award (2008). Her recent publications include contributions in books published by Philippe Picquier Publishing (*Le monde vu d'Asie*, 2013; *Démocraties d'Asie*, 2013), Hermann Publishing (*La démocratie et la guerre au 21^e siècle*, 2011), Global Oriental (*Seapower and Maritime Strategy in Britain and Japan*, 2012) and Routledge (*Globalisation and Defense in the Asia-Pacific*, 2009).

Dr. Guillaume de Rougé is currently a Lecturer at Sciences Po in Paris and at the University of Paris 8 Vincennes–Saint-Denis. He is also a Policy Advisor on US strategy at the Foresight and Long-Term Planning Unit in the Directorate for Strategic Affairs (DAS) in the French Ministry of Defense. He holds a doctorate in Contemporary History from the University of Paris 3–Sorbonne Nouvelle (2010), where he co-founded and co-animates a workshop on historical approaches to nuclear and security issues during the Cold War. He has earned Masters degrees in European politics at the University of Paris 3–Sorbonne Nouvelle (2005); international relations at the Institute of International and Strategic Relations (IRIS) in 2003; and public law, political science and philosophy at the Panthéon-Assas University–Paris 2 in 2002. In 2005, he participated in a defense seminar at the Institute of Advanced Studies in National Defense (IHEDN).

Prof. Michael Desch is Chair of the Department of Political Science at the University of Notre Dame. He was the founding Director of the Scowcroft Institute of International Affairs and the first holder of the Robert M. Gates Chair in Intelligence and National Security Decision-Making at the George Bush School of Government and Public Service at Texas A&M University from 2004 through 2008. Prior to that, he was Professor and Director of the Patterson School of Diplomacy and International Commerce at the University of Kentucky. From 1993 through 1998, he was Assistant Director and Senior Research Associate at the Olin Institute. He spent two years (1988-90) as a John M. Olin post-doctoral Fellow in National Security at Harvard University's Olin Institute for Strategic Studies and a year (1990-91) as a Visiting Scholar at the Center for International Studies at the University of Southern California before joining the faculty of Political Science at the University of California, Riverside (1991-1993). He received his BA in political science (1982) from Marquette University and his AM in international relations (1984) and PhD in Political Science (1988) from the University of Chicago.

Dr. Isabelle Facon is a Senior Research Fellow at the Strategic Research Foundation (FRS, Paris). A specialist on Russian security and defense policies, she has been working extensively on Russian military affairs, the military reform process, defense industry issues and the evolution of civil-military relations. She has also devoted a lot of research to the study of Russia's foreign policy. She spent her academic time at Université Paris 4-Sorbonne; she also stayed one year at Oxford University, as an Associate Member of Saint Antony's College. Since 2008, she has been a Senior Lecturer at Ecole Polytechnique and has also been contributing, since 2003, to two Masters at the Institut Catholique de Paris. She is a member of the scientific council of the on-line review "Journal of Power Institutions in Post-Soviet Societies" and a member of the French International Studies Association. She has authored more than 100 publications, both in France and abroad.

Dr. Eric Frécon teaches international relations at the French Naval Academy. He also coordinates the Observatory on Southeast Asia at the Asia Center in Paris. He was Deputy Editor of the bimonthly publication "Diplomatie" in 2011-2012, as well as Research Fellow associated with the Indonesia program of the S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS) in Singapore, where he spent three years. Previously, he occupied post-doctoral positions at the École Normale Supérieure in Lyon, at the Eastern Asia Institute (IAO), and was research manager at the French Navy's Center for Higher Learning. In 2007, he defended his doctoral dissertation at Sciences Po on maritime piracy in East Asia, after earning an advanced degree in international relations at the University of Paris 1–La Sorbonne. He has also taught at Sciences Po in Paris, at the Institute of Political Studies in Lyon, as well as at the University of Lyon 2. His latest book, *Chez les pirates d'Indonésie* ("With the Indonesian Pirates") was published in 2011.

Dr. Eva Gross joined the EUISS in April 2013. At the EUISS she deals with the Transatlantic Forum, India and AfPak, and other CSDP-related issues. Prior to joining the EUISS, she was a Fellow at Stiftung Neue Verantwortung, a think-tank in Berlin, where she

worked on a project on Germany in Europe (2012-2013). From 2007 to 2012 she was Senior Research Fellow and head of the research cluster on European Foreign and Security Policy at the Institute for European Studies, Vrije Universiteit Brussel. She has held visiting positions at the Center for Transatlantic Relations, SAIS-Johns Hopkins University in Washington, D.C., the Center for European Policy Studies in Brussels, and CERl. She was a Visiting Fellow at the EUISS during spring 2008, where she authored an occasional paper on the EU's contribution to Security Sector Reform (SSR) in Afghanistan. She holds a PhD in international relations from the London School of Economics and Political Science, and a BA and MA from the University of Southern California in Los Angeles.

Lt. Gen. David R. Hogg is currently the United States Military Representative to the NATO Military Committee. He was commissioned as an Armor Officer after graduating from the United States Military Academy. His key leadership assignments include service as Battalion Commander, 2-37th Armor, 1st Armored Division, Friedberg, Germany; Commander, 2nd Brigade Combat Team, 4th Infantry Division, Fort Hood, Texas; Commander, Operations Group, Fort Irwin, Calif.; Assistant Division Commander-Support, 1st Armored Division, Baumholder, Germany; Commanding General, 7th US Army, Joint Multinational Training Command (JMTC), DCOS-JOPs, ISAF and later Deputy Commander NTM-A. LTG Hogg was previously the Commanding General, US Army Africa. He is a graduate of the Armor Officer Basic and Advanced Courses, Airborne and Ranger Schools, Combined Arms and Services Staff School, US Army Command and General Staff College, School of Advanced Strategic Arts program, and United States Army War College. He holds a Master's degree in Military Arts and Science and also in National Security Strategy.

Dr. Christian Lequesne has been Director of CERl since 2009. He holds degrees from the Institute of Political Studies in Strasbourg and from the College of Europe, Bruges as well as a PhD in political science from Sciences Po. He started his academic career as Assistant at the Department of Political and Administrative Studies of the College of Europe (1986-1988) before joining CERl in 1988. He was Deputy Director of CERl between 2000 and 2003; Director of the Centre Français de Recherche en Sciences Sociales (CEFRES) in Prague from 2004 to 2006; and LSE-Sciences Po Professor at the European Institute of the London School of Economics and Political Science from 2006 to 2008. He was a member and Vice President of the Board of Directors of Sciences Po from 2007 to 2013 and a member of the Board of the federation of universities Sorbonne Paris Cité. He sits on the Editorial Board of the "Journal of European Integration" and is a member of the scientific committees of the journals "Politique Européenne" and "Etudes Européennes". He also is a regular columnist on European affairs in the daily newspaper *Ouest-France*.

Rear Admiral Michael McDevitt is a Senior Fellow associated with CNA Strategic Studies, a division of the Center for Naval Analyses (CNA); a not-for-profit federally funded research center in Washington, D.C. During his 16 years at CNA, as both a manager and Vice President and now as a Fellow, he has had a number of papers published. His most recent research focus has been the maritime security issues along the Indo-Pacific littoral, the US rebalance to Asia and the maritime dimension of China's national strategy. During his navy career he spent his operational time in the Pacific, including a two-year assignment in Sasebo, Japan. He held four at-sea commands, including an aircraft carrier battle group. He was the Director of the East Asia Policy office for the Secretary of Defense during the George H.W. Bush Administration. He also served for two years as the Director for Strategy, War Plans and Policy (J-5) for US CINCPAC. He concluded his active duty career as the Commandant of the National War College in Washington, D.C. He is a graduate of the University of Southern California and has a Master's Degree in US Diplomatic History in East Asia for Georgetown University. He is also a graduate of the National War College.

Dr. Emmanuel Puig is Senior Researcher at Asia Centre (Paris) and Lecturer at the Institute of Political Studies of Lille. He leads two research programs on the evolution of China's foreign policy and on the evolution of China's domestic security. He is a member of the International Studies Association (ISA) and participates in the SITC Project (Study of Innovation and Technology in China) of the Institute on Global Conflict and Cooperation, University of California in San Diego. He holds a PhD in political science from the Institute of Political Studies of Bordeaux (2007) and was post-doctoral Fellow at CNRS in 2008. His current research focuses on political and organizational changes in Chinese defense industries, on the evolution of the domestic security issues in China and on the consequences of these developments on Chinese foreign policy.

Prof. Joanna Spear is on sabbatical from the George Washington University where she is an Associate Professor of International Affairs and Director of the Elliott School's Security Policy Studies Program. At George Washington University she was the Founding Director of the National Security Studies Program, an executive education program serving the needs of the Department of Defense and other federal agencies. She was previously Director of the Graduate Research Program and a Senior Lecturer at the Department of War Studies, King's College, London. In addition, she has been a post-doctoral Research Fellow at Harvard's Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs and a Visiting Scholar at the Brookings Institution and at the Institute for Defense and Security Analyses (New Delhi). She is the co-editor, with Dr. Paul Williams, of *Security and Development in Global Politics: a Critical Comparison* (Georgetown University Press, 2012). She is the author of *Carter and Arms Sales: Implementing the Carter Administration's Arms Transfer Restraint Policy* (Macmillan, 1995) and is currently working on a book on the defense trade, provisionally entitled *State-Firm Relations in the Contemporary Defense Trade*.

Lt. Gen. Guy C. Swan III currently serves as AUSA Vice President, Education. During more than 35 years of active service he commanded at every level through Army Service Component Command. A career armor/cavalry officer, his general officer assignments included Commanding General, US Army North/5th Army; Commanding General, US Army Military District of Washington and Commander, Joint Force Headquarters-National Capital Region; Commanding General, 7th Army Training Command, US Army Europe/Seventh Army; Chief of Staff and Director of Operations, Multi-National Force-Iraq during Operation Iraqi Freedom; Director of Operations, US Northern Command; and Chief of Army Legislative Liaison. General Swan's other key assignments included Commander, 11th Armored Cavalry Regiment; Assistant Deputy Director for Strategy and Policy for the Joint Staff; and Deputy Operations Officer for the 1st Armored Division during Operations Desert Shield/Desert Storm. A 1976 graduate of the United States Military Academy at West Point, General Swan holds a Master of Military Art and Science degree from the United States Army's School of Advanced Military Studies. He also holds a Master of Arts degree in National Security Studies from Georgetown University and was a National Security Fellow at the John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University.