
Intellect and Decent Purpose

REMARKS AT THE ANNUAL ACADEMIC CONVOCATION
THE FLETCHER SCHOOL

GEORGE R. PACKARD

September 7, 2012

Dean Bosworth, Dr. Gould, Professor Trachtman, Ms. Paulson, distinguished faculty, fellow Fletcher graduates, especially of the classes of 1937, 1947, 1956, 1960, and 1962, and current students in the most important academic enterprise in America today:

I am deeply honored to receive the Fletcher Distinguished Leadership Award, particularly because it comes from the Fletcher Class of 1947—whose members, including Dr. James Gould, are part of the “greatest generation” of Americans—heroes who don’t talk much about their role in saving the world from tyranny. I am especially conscious of the role that Dr. Haydn Williams has played in conceiving of this award. Haydn has been my mentor and friend for more than five decades. It was my privilege to serve on the board of The Asia Foundation while he was its president and I know what a vital role he has played in building a peaceful, productive American presence in the region.

I am also indebted to Dean Bosworth for the fine example of statesmanship and diplomacy that he brings to our school, not to mention his earlier leadership of the U.S.-Japan Foundation from which I benefit every day.

George R. Packard *has been President of the United States-Japan Foundation since July 1998. Dr. Packard is also Adjunct Professor of Political Science at Columbia University, where he offers a graduate seminar on US-Japan Relations from Pearl Harbor to the Present. Earlier in his career, Dr. Packard was an intelligence officer and later a special assistant to US Ambassador Edwin O. Reischauer in Tokyo. He received his MA and PhD from The Fletcher School. The emphasis added is the author’s own.*

The Fletcher School changed my life. I came here in the fall of 1958, an undergraduate English major with a couple of years of military service under my belt, and soon fell under the influence of four unforgettable professors:

- Leo Gross, whose passion for the rule of law in international affairs was contagious;
- Ruhl Bartlett, whose Wilsonian idealism inspired our study of the history of American foreign policy;
- George Halm, who taught this English major why economics mattered;
- And most of all, Allan Cole, my mentor in East Asian Studies, whose encouragement and wise counsel led me toward a PhD, a published book, and a career in East Asian affairs. His rock solid integrity later caused him to take early retirement rather than occupy a chair named for Ferdinand Marcos. He is one of my heroes, and I am sad to note that he died at the age of ninety-seven in January of this year. These scholars have inspired me throughout my career.

If I reflect on some of the things I didn't learn or didn't anticipate while at Fletcher back in 1958, I would have to say that the cause of world peace remains more elusive than I imagined in those hopeful days.

For example, many of us in the late 1950s tended to view President Dwight D. Eisenhower through a media caricature—as a rather tired and doddering old man who liked to play golf more than govern. Today, with the passage of time and as result of several new biographies, he comes across to me, at least, as perhaps the greatest president of the twentieth century and maybe of all time, for these reasons:

- He ended the Korean War in 1953; in fact, I would have been in Korea as a forward observer in the Field Artillery had he not done so. After that, not one U.S. soldier died in combat for the rest of his presidency;
- He overrode his top advisors who wanted to intervene to help the French in Vietnam in 1954 at the time of the siege of Dien Bien Phu;
- He caused Britain, France, and Israel to pull back from the Suez invasion in 1956;
- He overruled his generals in the 1958 Quemoy-Matsu crisis who argued for using nuclear weapons against the mainland Chinese;
- He curbed the insatiable appetite of the Pentagon for ever more bloated budgets, and in most years balanced the budget and held down inflation;

- In 1953 he ended desegregation in Washington, DC and in the Armed Forces; and
- In 1957 he sent the 101st Airborne Division to Little Rock, Arkansas, to integrate Central High School.

But most of all, he gave us that amazing farewell address to the nation in 1961 in which he warned against the dangers of a “military-industrial complex.”

“In the councils of government, we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex. The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will persist,” he declared.

And then toward the end of the speech, in a lesser-known sentence which I think captures the ideals of The Fletcher School, he said, “together we must learn how to compose differences, not with arms, but with *intellect and decent purpose*.”

Intellect and decent purpose. I firmly believe that the spirit that drove our founder, Dr. Austin Barclay Fletcher, in the darkening skies of 1933—as Hitler, Mussolini, Stalin, and Tojo were
 gaining power—is as valid today as it was then, and must remain at the core of the school’s mission. It was all about intellect and decent purpose: bringing the lessons of history, economics, law, area studies, and languages—the fruits of scholarship in those fields—to the creation of foreign policymaking in the cause of peace.

*..it is not enough to be right;
 we had better be ready to
 defend our ideas by engaging
 in the jungle of politics and
 bureaucratic infighting.
 We need to form alliances,
 fight back against powerful
 interest groups, speak out
 courageously at the right
 moment, and play the
 political game with gusto.*

You might say, correctly, that the cause of peace has not advanced very much since Ike’s warning. One strains to hear an ounce of “intellect and decent purpose” in the media today. The frighteningly misguided wars in Iraq and Afghanistan indicate we learned nothing from the Vietnam tragedy.

If I ask myself what I *wish* I had learned at Fletcher, I suppose it would be this: we can use our knowledge of history, economics, cultures, and languages to come up with a brilliant, enlightened set of policy goals. But it is not enough to be right; we had better be ready to defend our ideas by engaging in the jungle of politics and bureaucratic infighting. We need to form alliances, fight back against powerful interest groups, speak out courageously at the right

moment, and play the political game with gusto. We need to keep in mind that at every juncture powerful forces are lined up to silence or defeat us.

Ideally, some Fletcher graduates will be elected politicians, like Senators Pat Moynihan, William Fulbright, or Mike Mansfield, where you will have a platform and the power to influence policy. Or you will serve as staff members to such leaders. But whether you are scholars or practitioners, journalists or diplomats, members of the military or intelligence services, business or NGO leaders, American or foreign, the mission must be the same: to seek out avenues where peaceful negotiations can prevail over raw power.

I was privileged to serve under Ambassador Edwin O. Reischauer in Tokyo and to observe how he used his deep knowledge of Japanese history

..... and his pragmatic understanding of the Washington bureaucracy to maintain civilian control of U.S.-Japan policy. But Reischauer was an exception. Unfortunately, those who run most of the large U.S. embassies around the world today are also those who contributed most to electing the president. And language, area expertise, and scholarship have been devalued.

There is a long, unhappy tradition in America of suspecting that a person who knows a foreign language and is comfortable in a foreign culture must be somehow disloyal to America. We need to speak out more and fight against this crippling ignorance.

But there are still many ways in which intellect and decent purpose can prevail. One key is to stand tall against those who would marginalize your expertise in a language or area. Senator

McCarthy succeeded in purging the State Department of a generation of dedicated China experts by questioning their loyalty. There is a long, unhappy tradition in America of suspecting that a person who knows a foreign language and is comfortable in a foreign culture must be somehow disloyal to America. We need to speak out more and fight against this crippling ignorance. Why is it that almost every foreign ambassador in Washington is fluent in English and well-versed in American politics and yet we persist in sending amateurs to protect and advance our most vital interests abroad?

I recall one appalling statistic from the report by James Baker and Lee Hamilton on the Iraq war: in the American Embassy of about 1,000 persons, in 2003, there were only six Arabic speakers!

Or recall the critical time in late 1963 when President Lyndon B.

Johnson, in office for less than two months, put together a task force of some forty officials from the State Department, the Pentagon, and the National Security Staff to decide what to do about the rapidly deteriorating situation in South Vietnam. Only one member of that group, a young Foreign Service officer named Paul Kattenburg, had actually served in Vietnam and studied its history. He advised against sending massive American troop support to bolster the shaky South Vietnamese government. Yet, Kattenburg was dismissed from the group by William P. Bundy because Bundy deemed him too pessimistic. President Johnson, a novice in international affairs, accepted the specious argument of Secretary of State Dean Rusk and others that Communist China was behind the Vietcong insurgency and that, if it prevailed, all the other Southeast Asian nations would fall like dominoes to the Communist pressure. Fifty-eight thousand young Americans died as a result of that grievous misunderstanding.

I am especially concerned today about the growth of the cottage industry in America that argues that war with China is inevitable. Maybe you remember when Japan was portrayed as a dire threat to American security in the 1980s. Young Americans would soon be sweeping up around Japanese computers, we were warned. *The Coming War with Japan* was a hot book in 1990. Neither of its authors had ever been to Japan until they went there to sell the book in 1991.

Today, we have a new book in the same vein by Princeton Professor Aaron Friedberg entitled *A Contest for Supremacy: China, America and the Struggle for Mastery in Asia* (2011). In his preface, Dr. Friedberg, who served on the National Security Council staff under Vice President Dick Cheney, boasts that he does not speak or read Chinese but that such expertise is not needed in order to accept his thesis that war is inevitable. The experts are dismissed with a wave of his hand.

Meanwhile, we learn that Andy Marshall, age ninety-one, the head of the Office of Net Assessment in the Pentagon and a revered guru of the neocon establishment, is gaming the coming war with China and calling for a massive buildup of American naval and air power in the Western Pacific.

Of course, you know who is reading and enjoying these accounts most of all: that would be the Chinese People's Liberation Army and its naval arm. Like the Pentagon, they will use these threats to demand, and probably get, new funding for the weapons of their grandest dreams. And so we are in an arms race, with self-fulfilling prophecies burgeoning on each side.

Who is standing up and speaking out against this sort of nonsense? Where in the Bible is it written that the United States must struggle to be

master of Asia? And why do we assume that rising powers must go to war with established powers?

Henry Kissinger addressed this question eloquently in his 2011 book, *On China*. He recounts the arms buildup of Germany and England and how Eyre Crowe, a mid-level British diplomat, foresaw war as inevitable in 1907. It was a classic security dilemma. Both sides, Crowe said, would be foolish to credit the statements of peaceful intentions of the other. Both should understand that capabilities, not intentions, are critically important. Therefore both must escalate the arms race.

But Kissinger argues that war between the United States and China need not happen this time—that a NATO-like security architecture in the

The challenge for Fletcher graduates and current students is this: how can we become a countervailing force against this continuing march of folly?

Asia/Pacific region can ease tensions over the disputed territories and lead to peaceful settlement of disputes in the Pacific community. And he notes, wisely I believe, that if any of the leaders in 1914 who took their nations to war could have foreseen the shattered world that would result from the war, they would have found a peaceful solution. That certainly is the case today. There

will be no winners in an all-out war with China.

The challenge for Fletcher graduates and current students is this: how can we become a countervailing force against this continuing march of folly? How can Americans stand up against the incredible power of the arms industry and the members of Congress whom they own; against the 30,000 K Street lobbyists in Washington who work tirelessly every day to win new contracts and bigger budgets for their bosses in the arms industry; and against the intellectuals who sing their tunes? Did you know that there are more members of military marching bands in America than there are Foreign Service officers? How can we put our knowledge to the service of composing differences?

I take heart from the move last year of the World Peace Foundation to our school. One of their posters proclaims: “Don’t be ashamed to stand for peace.” I would go further: “Don’t be afraid to fight for peace.” The odds against us are enormous. But our cause is unassailable.

I urge that all of us should rally around the power of *intellect and decent purpose*. *We can and we must prevail*.

Thank you. ■

The Devolution of American Power

AMITAI ETZIONI

The theory that the world is moving from a unipolar order, dominated by the United States, to a multipolar distribution of power has led to a robust debate concerning the consequences of this change on the international order. However, the global power distribution is currently following a different pattern. Instead of what is conventionally addressed as a *global* unipolar to multipolar shift, in fact *rising powers are mainly regional powers, not global ones*, although they may have global reach. This pattern should be expected to continue in the near future and should be accounted for in order to make sound policy.

It follows that the movement away from a unipolar world should not be equated with one in which more global powers contend with each other; nor should it be equated with a world in which new powers take over from an old, declining power. Moreover, it should not be assumed that the world will be less ordered. Instead, to a significant extent, the change seems to be toward more regional autonomy, or increased *devolution*, and greater variety in the relationships between the United States and regional powers. These relationships may see regional powers serve as *junior partners* to the global power and assume some of the global power's regional responsibilities. Or these relationships may produce *junior adversarial* regional powers that seek greater relative regional control in defiance of the United States, but seek at most limited realignment of power on the global stage.

In the process of devolution, the increase in regional self-government and pluralism are much less challenging to the global power than

Amitai Etzioni served as a senior advisor to the Carter White House; taught at Columbia University, Harvard University and The University of California at Berkeley; and is currently a university professor and professor of international relations at The George Washington University. His latest book is *Hot Spots: American Foreign Policy in a Post-Human-Rights World* (Transaction, 2012).

the redistribution of power implied by multipolarity. Indeed, as junior regional powers increasingly act as partners and assume regional responsibilities, they enable the global power to scale back its global commitments without losing much of its weight in international developments. Similarly, the desire for regional control among rising powers can be more readily accommodated than aspirations to challenge the United States as a global superpower.

It must be noted that the notion of devolution as used here is that of an ideal,¹ and as such there will be significant variation in its real-world instantiations. However, the process of devolution suggests a logical pattern of behavior for all actors involved, upon which various powers can construct a viable strategy.

While the movement from a uni- to a multipolar distribution of global power is considered by some to be “positive” and more supportive of international institutions,² others consider it as “negative” and likely to lead to confrontation between the declining power and the rising ones.³

The move to a higher level of regional pluralism is a double-edged sword. The effect of the transformation depends on the particular accommodation pattern that develops between each regional power and the global power... this pattern can vary from that of a junior partner to that of a regional antagonist.

In truth, the move to a higher level of regional pluralism is a double-edged sword. The effect of the transformation depends on the particular accommodation pattern that develops between each regional power and the global power. As indicated previously, this pattern can vary from that of a junior partner to that of a regional antagonist.

Stated in other terms, if unipolarity is compared to hierarchy and multipolarity is compared to flat systems or networks, regional pluralism is analogous to increased subsidiarity.

Importantly, the accommodation pattern between the global superpower and regional powers is fundamentally different from the one between declining and rising global powers. In the former case, the regional powers do not seek to modify or replace the global rules or change the global distribution of public goods. Instead, they aim merely to gain local exemptions from the rules, variants in the ways they are applied, or increases in their share of distributed benefits. Superpowers may prove unwilling to accommodate such regional challenges and regional challengers may hold that they have been insufficiently accommodated.

However, such global/regional accommodations are, in general, easier to reach than the global/global accommodations between declining and rising global powers, and thus are less likely to lead to outright conflicts. With devolution, the central power yields, therefore risking much less when pluralism increases than when a transition from uni- to multipolarity takes place. This is one of the principle strengths of pluralism.

Devolution differs significantly from arguments put forth in the 1980s in favor of burden-sharing.⁴ Burden-sharing only occurs between a superpower and that power's junior regional partners. However, devolution involves increased autonomy on the part of both junior partners and those who may have interests distinct from, or against those of, the presiding global power; there is no predilection towards according a greater regional role to allies over other neutral states. In this sense, devolution is characteristic of the post-Cold War environment, where a majority of states are neither explicitly pro-American nor anti-American, but instead maintain a far more complex relationship with the global superpower.⁵

COMPETING HYPOTHESES

In order to apply this theory, it is possible to use the fairly wide consensus that U.S. power is declining, or at least that the power of other nations is rising in comparison. The *decline of U.S. power* is largely attributed to its economic difficulties,⁶ its political gridlock and polarization,⁷ the side-effects of its prolonged involvement in two wars,⁸ and the decline of its "soft power."⁹ However, whether one agrees that U.S. power is declining or how the cause and scope of decline is assessed, the question of whether the new powers are mainly regional or global ones and the nature of their relationship with the United States remains important.

In fact, a fair number of scholars embrace the hypothesis that the *world is moving toward a multipolar order*. As far back as the early 1990s, Samuel Huntington predicted "a truly multipolar 21st century."¹⁰ Robert Kagan observed that "when most people think of a post-American world, they think of a return to multipolarity—an international configuration of power where several powers exist in rough parity."¹¹ Similarly, John Ikenberry observed that "we are in the transition from 'America, Inc.' to 'Worldco,'" which will have "a new board of directors and stakeholders."¹²

On the other hand, some analysts of the changing world order, such as Shi Yinhong and Yan Xuetong, believe that we are not moving towards multipolarity, but *towards bipolarity*. They argue that if the United States is declining and China is rising more quickly than any other potential power

contenders, then the United States and China may become roughly equal powers.¹³

Still other scholars contend that, although other nations are rising, they are not nearly as powerful as the United States. In *The Post-American World*, Fareed Zakaria acknowledges that unipolarity is waning due to a broader global diffusion of power, but argues that “the notion of a multipolar world, with four or five players of roughly equal weight, does not describe reality today or in the near future.” Citing the European Union’s inability to “act militarily or politically as one” and the fact that China and India are still very much developing countries, Zakaria writes that the international system is “more accurately described by . . . [the] term ‘unimultipolarity,’ or what Chinese geopoliticians call ‘many powers and one superpower.’”¹⁴ Joseph Nye Jr. sees a shift toward multipolarity in some aspects of the international order and the continuity of unipolarity in others.¹⁵ Yet, all view the new powers as major global actors.

Richard Haass challenges this notion of multipolarity, arguing that we are actually entering an “age of nonpolarity” because, although the United States is declining, other nations will not be able to fill the vacuum in power.¹⁶ Niall Ferguson similarly refers to the rise of “apolarity” and a coming era in which “instead of a balance of power, there [will be] an absence of power.” He worries that the “alternative to a single superpower is not a multilateral utopia, but the anarchic nightmare of a new Dark Age.”¹⁷ Zbigniew Brzezinski holds that the United States decline will not foster the rise of new global powers that will support order, but will lead to a decline in world order and increased nuclear proliferation.¹⁸ Finally, Kagan also predicts that a U.S. decline would likely result in armed conflict as rising nations jostle for power, democracy declines due to the rise of authoritarian China, and nations retreat from the global free-market economy and freedom of the seas.¹⁹

The National Intelligence Council, however, acknowledges the possibility that a multipolar system could lead to greater burden-sharing and revitalize multilateralism and global institutions.²⁰ Zakaria also predicts that the new world order will be “more democratic, more dynamic, more open.”²¹

However, a different pattern is developing in the relationship between the United States as the superpower and rising powers. This can be seen in the cases of China, the European Union, India, and Russia—powers considered to be on the ascendancy or previous challengers to a U.S.-dominated unipolar world. The pattern follows that: (a) so far the nations frequently considered to be rising global powers are nations that have mainly increased

their potential—not actual—power; (b) the increase in actual power that has occurred is largely regional, although it typically has some global implications; and (c) the main question for the foreseeable future is not whether the rising powers will replace the United States as a global power, but what the nature of the pattern of accommodation will be between the global and regional powers. Ultimately, the question will then be whether the United States will accept increased regional autonomy and whether the new powers will find the increased regional freedom and accommodations sufficient.

CHINA

The nation most often cited as driving the global power shift from unipolar to bipolar or multipolar is China. Many view China as well on its way to becoming a global power, one that may contest—and according to some, supplant—the power of the United States. Elizabeth Economy holds that “Beijing has launched a ‘go out’ strategy designed to remake global norms and institutions.”²² Similarly, Barry Buzan finds that “China is currently the most fashionable potential superpower and the one whose degree of alienation from the dominant international society makes it the most obvious political challenger.”²³ A recent study shows that in fifteen of twenty-two nations surveyed, the majority of the public believes that China either already has or eventually will replace the United States as the world’s leading superpower.²⁴ Additionally, Michael McFaul and Kathryn Stoner-Weiss have acknowledged China as “an undisputed global power.”²⁵

In line with power transition theory, some predict that the United States and China are bound to engage
in major armed conflict in the future.²⁶

Kagan holds that “wars tend to break out as a result of large-scale shifts in the power equation, when the upward trajectory of a rising power comes close to intersecting the downward trajectory of a declining power.”²⁷ Historians point to major cases substantiating this concept—the Peloponnesian War between Athens and Sparta, the Napoleonic Wars, and in particular the conflict for power between Great Britain and Germany during World War II—and predict that a similar struggle could break out between China and the United States.²⁸ Other

So far, however, China has shown limited intentions of becoming, and has built few capabilities to become, a global power. Absent this element of intent, its capabilities alone cannot be interpreted as a threat.

notable scholars of international relations understand the risks associated with a “power transition” in East Asia as America’s major geopolitical challenge.²⁹

So far, however, China has shown limited intentions of becoming, and has built few capabilities to become, a global power. Absent this element of intent, its capabilities alone cannot be interpreted as a threat. One should note from the onset that many of the observations about the rise of China refer to the size of its economy—which measures potential but not actual power³⁰—and this growth is often overestimated. China’s per capita income is roughly only one-tenth that of the United States; in fact, China’s per capita income in 2010 was \$4,260 compared to the United States’ \$47,140, placing China roughly on par with countries such as Ecuador and Algeria.³¹ This gap is expected to persist for decades, with U.S. per capita gross domestic product (GDP) remaining nearly three times that of China through 2050.³² It is this figure, rather than the total size of the Chinese economy, that is more relevant, because it limits the resources that China can commit to an expansionist foreign policy. China’s government is tasked with providing for four times as many people as the United States and combating the poverty found in a very large number of rural households.³³ Widespread corruption, as well as glaring inequality between affluent city dwellers and the rural poor, fosters political instability. Unless the Chinese government is willing to risk being overthrown, it cannot shift large amounts of resources to a military buildup, to say nothing of extensive overseas geopolitical designs. Moreover, there is no reason to assume that its economy can keep growing at the rapid pace it did in earlier stages of development.³⁴

Furthermore, China’s military power is mainly concentrated in its own region and will be for the foreseeable future.³⁵ According to Kenneth Lieberthal, “there is no serious military man in China or in the United States who thinks that China has any prayer of dominating the [United States] militarily in the coming three or four decades,” an assessment shared even by more hawkish China experts.³⁶ China’s navy has rarely been deployed outside its regional waters, and, when it has, the deployments have been for humanitarian and anti-piracy purposes.³⁷ While the United States has deployed hundreds of thousands of troops in roughly 150 countries around the world,³⁸ including countries near China such as Japan, South Korea, and more recently Australia and Singapore, China has no overseas bases. Furthermore, while the United States has eleven aircraft carriers that serve to project its power worldwide, China has one.

Likewise, China’s weapons are largely designed to ensure regional, not

global, dominance. China's "regionally-focused" military thus tends to base its most advanced systems opposite Taiwan, and it has focused its efforts on projects such as improving its anti-access and area denial (A2AD) capabilities—designed to “deter or counter adversary forces from deploying to, or operating within, a defined space.”³⁹ China's BeiDou satellite navigation system, which facilitates accurate targeting of missiles and bombs, is reported to currently provide China with regional and not global navigation capability.⁴⁰ Robert Ross finds that “the transformation of the PLA [People's Liberation Army] into a region-wide strategic power will require many decades. The transformation of China's national military, the PLA, into a global strategic power is an even more distant prospect.”⁴¹

Moreover, China's role at the UN reflects its reluctance to flex its power on a global level. While in the 1990s China “expressed considerable concern over the West's ‘new interventionism’ in Kosovo and Iraq, China's actual position [was] far more nuanced and pragmatic.”⁴² China contributed police to peacekeeping efforts in Kosovo despite its initial opposition to intervention there. Despite its opposition to the first Gulf War, China also refrained from vetoing Resolution 678, which authorized the use of all necessary means to restore peace and security after Iraq's invasion of Kuwait. Crucially, China has also often voted “absent” when the UN Security Council acted in ways that differed from China's views rather than exercising its veto. As of December 2008, China had exercised its veto power only six times, while the United States had done so over eighty times.⁴³

China sees its key geopolitical issues as regional, mainly concerning Tibet, Taiwan, and notably the standing of the South China Sea.⁴⁴ China claims large parts of the South China Sea as part of its Exclusive Economic Zone—a claim that has generated considerable opposition from other nations in the area including Vietnam, Malaysia, and the Philippines. Critics of China's foreign policy worry that it will use its military to enforce this claim, pointing out that China has used force in a number of its past border disputes. However, most of these incidents took place almost a generation ago. China's expressed foreign policy doctrine is that of a “peaceful rise;” yet more recently, the policy has been called “peaceful development,” as China has “semantically tempered” the term to reassure countries such as the United States that its ascent will not be a zero-sum game.⁴⁵ In accordance with this policy, in recent decades China has often reached compromises in conflicts with its neighbors, settling them via negotiations or other peaceful mechanisms.⁴⁶ Between 1949 and 2005, China settled seventeen of its twenty-three territorial disputes with other

governments, offering “substantial compromises in most of these settlements, usually receiving less than 50 percent of the contested land.”⁴⁷ Thus, even at a regional level, China has displayed little tendency to flex its power in recent decades. As Christopher Pehrson of the Strategic Studies Institute has observed:

China is aware of the possibility that its growing stature could be construed as a threat to other countries in Asia, so a generally benign approach to gain influence is pursued through the use of investments, development packages, and diplomatic gestures... Even with respect to Taiwan, Chinese policy attempts to balance the “stick” of diplomatic and military pressure with the “carrot” of mutually beneficial cross-strait economic ties.⁴⁸

Moreover, far from helping China become the regional hegemon, Beijing’s territorial claims have moved its neighbors to court the West and seek stronger alliances with the United States in order to “balance” China. This pattern is not only seen in Japan, Malaysia, and the Philippines, but

...far from helping China become the regional hegemon, Beijing’s territorial claims have moved its neighbors to court the West and seek stronger alliances with the United States in order to “balance” China.

also in a former close ally of China—Vietnam. Even Burma has sought to put some distance between itself and China; for example, in October 2011, Burma suspended construction on a \$3.6 billion Chinese-backed dam project.⁴⁹ The decision is widely seen as a demonstration of the Burma government’s eagerness to signal that it is not a client of China.⁵⁰

It remains to be seen if China will stick to its doctrine of peaceful development or if this is merely a diversion until it is ready to become a global power. Beyond certain instances of cooperation and rhetorical assurances, a sustained pattern of accommodation has yet to be firmly established to allow a better prediction of the more distant future.⁵¹

Turning from military and economic matters to those of ideation, while some consider China’s state capitalism to be a model that ideologically competes with the democratic capitalism favored by the United States, China has shown little interest in promoting it as global model. The current trend in Chinese leadership does not show an expansionist ideology, nor does it have a design for a new world order. In 2004, Premier Wen Jiabao promised that China’s ascendancy “will not stand in the way of any other

country, nor pose a threat to any other country, nor come at the cost of any other country.”⁵² And Professor Yan Xuetong assured those in the West unsettled by China’s growing economic and military strength that “China’s current goal . . . is to struggle for equal status in the international community, it is not to be a global hegemon.”⁵³

Some critics do not trust these declarations and view them as being designed to downplay China’s rise to power until it is ready to unveil its newly acquired might. They point to some statements made by Chinese strategists to this effect.⁵⁴ However, few contest that, based on an examination of its actions and independent of its declared intentions, China is so far primarily building up its regional power.

China has two major domestic strategic interests with global implications: its economy and its political stability. Both of these require a secure flow of raw materials and energy. It therefore is seeking to develop its land-based pathways and ports. Recently, it completed the Chongqing-Xinjiang-Europe railway to serve as a link between Europe and the manufacturing hubs and industrial belt in the south and southwestern parts of the country.⁵⁵ In addition, it has established pipelines to acquire oil from Russia and Turkmenistan, and is building oil and gas pipelines to Burma.

Some have suggested that China is establishing a series of ports (a “string of pearls”) that will eventually serve to establish naval dominance from the South China Sea through the Strait of Malacca to the Indian Ocean and the Arabian Gulf. However, the Indian government noted that the claims that China was converting Burma’s Coco Islands into a naval base were incorrect,⁵⁶ and both the Sri Lankan president and Bangladesh’s foreign minister have publicly assured their citizens that the Chinese port investments in their countries are strictly commercial.⁵⁷ China’s interest in foreign ports seems to stem from a desire to avoid dependence on the “chokepoint” of the heavy-traffic Strait of Malacca, which serves as a haven for pirates.⁵⁸ As Christopher Pehrson has noted, “China’s development of [its] strategic geopolitical ‘pearls’ has been non-confrontational, with no evidence of imperial or neocolonial ambition.”⁵⁹

All of this is not to suggest that China has no global profile. It has become a member of the World Trade Organization, increased its contributions to the International Monetary Fund, and supported Westphalian norms of sovereignty.⁶⁰ It has also become the largest provider of peacekeepers among the permanent five members of the UN Security Council.⁶¹ However, acting on one or more of these limited matters on a global scale does not make a global power. None of these entail application of power as the term is commonly defined—in other words, the capacity of A to make B

follow a course preferred by A. While this does not prove that China could not one day become a global power that will contest the United States, so far there are few signs to this effect. Devolution here takes the form of China assuming some of the United States' regional responsibilities while also striking its own course. Whether the United States will accommodate these aspirations or will seek to actively resist them is still far from clear.

If one assumes that China's rising power—thus far and in the near future—is largely regional, the question of whether this growth will be mainly adversarial or compatible with the prevailing international order depends in part on the United States.⁶² If the United States ceases to sell arms to Taiwan, stops urging India to build up its military in order to contain China, welcomes China's quest to secure pathways for its vital needs of raw materials and energy, limits rather than increases U.S. military forces in the region, and commits itself not to move its army to Chinese borders from the demilitarized zone should the North Korean regime collapse, it will accommodate China's regional rise. However, if the United States takes the opposite course in these matters and instead seeks to ring the country with military bases and form military alliances in the area to "contain" China, a confrontation is more likely.⁶³

THE EUROPEAN UNION

Much has been made in previous decades of the rise of the European Union (EU) as a global power, one that would challenge or even replace the United States. In 2002, Charles Kupchan predicted that the EU would supplant the United States as the world's next great power. He wrote, "not only is American primacy far less durable than it appears, but it is already beginning to diminish. And the rising challenger is not China or the Islamic world but the European Union."⁶⁴ John McCormick called the EU a "superpower," pointing to the EU's rising influence in the international community and European countries' efforts to counter U.S. foreign policy in Iraq.⁶⁵

Some academics also observed a tendency on the part of the EU to partner with countries such as China and/or Russia to counter the United States. The first years of the new millennium saw a "remarkable blossoming of Sino-European ties."⁶⁶ The EU surpassed the United States as China's largest trading partner in 2004.⁶⁷ As Roberto Foa has noted, the foremost factor that brought Brussels and Beijing closer together was "the unilateralism of the Bush administration, which led both Chinese and Europeans to see in each other the means toward a balanced international

order.”⁶⁸ During the rapid growth in bilateral political cooperation in the early 2000s, the EU developed a “strategic partnership” with China that stressed the EU and China’s “shared responsibilities in promoting *global* governance [emphasis added].”⁶⁹ The United States responded by seeking to weaken the EU. In particular, the United States’ support for Turkey’s bid for membership in the EU was interpreted by many as “an attempt to weaken Europe by placing a Turkish economic, demographic, and cultural millstone around its neck.”⁷⁰

In actuality, the EU turned out to be a predominantly regional power, a fairly weak and largely cooperative power onto which the United States has unloaded some of its responsibilities. The EU did succeed in forming a regional community that seems to have eliminated war among nations that fought each other for centuries (and that in the past required U.S. military help to end their wars). However, the EU remains reliant on the U.S. nuclear umbrella to protect it from regional attacks and, for the same reason, supports the continued presence of U.S. troops in the region. Thus, it continues to rely on the United States as a global power and often takes direction from the United States on strategic matters, although less so than during the Cold War years.

On the global level, the EU as a community and its core members on their own (including the UK, France, and Germany), are able to project power on a more limited basis. And when such power has been applied—with rare exceptions such as the Suez War in 1956—it has been in support of U.S.-guided missions with the European nations acting as junior partners in alliance with the United States. These include Iraq both in 1991 and 2003-11, Afghanistan beginning in 2001, and often within the UN Security Council.

One may argue that the EU (or at least some of its major members) is playing a global diplomatic role, one that mitigates and moderates American foreign policy, while basically supporting it—in other words, acting like a global, albeit junior, partner. For instance, it is important to

The EU did succeed in forming a regional community that seems to have eliminated war among nations that fought each other for centuries... However, the EU remains reliant on the U.S. nuclear umbrella to protect it from regional attacks and, for the same reason, supports the continued presence of U.S. troops in the region.

consider the active role Germany, France, and Britain have had in negotiating with Iran and in promoting Israeli-Palestinian peace negotiations. However, in all of these instances, comparatively little has been achieved. True, European forces helped legitimize American missions in Afghanistan and sent combat troops. However, these amounted to a small fraction of the total forces and their rules of engagement limited their contributions.

Both the EU's limited power and its role as a junior partner for the United States were highlighted during the 2011 Libyan campaign. True, NATO's European members initiated the intervention. However, they soon discovered that they were highly dependent on American military help during the campaign. The United States provided about three-quarters of the aerial tankers, without which the NATO strike fighters could not have reached their targets and returned to base. When the European stock of precision-guided weapons ran low after only a couple of months, the United States had to provide supplies. In addition, few attack missions were flown without American electronic warfare aircraft operating above as "guardian angels."⁷¹

Thus, despite expectations that the EU would become a new global power challenging the United States, it has so far turned out to be mainly a regional power, predominantly acting in tandem with the United States. In this case, a stable accommodation has been reached between the superpower and the rising regional power.

INDIA

Like China, India is often described as an emerging global power. George Yeo Yong-Boon, Singapore's Minister of Foreign Affairs, observed in 2008 that there has been "an enormous shift of power and influence in the world. It is mainly a story of the rise of China and India."⁷² American officials have acknowledged India's ascendancy and called upon its leaders to responsibly manage its new position in the world order.⁷³

Many refer to the rapidly growing Indian economy as indicative of India's growing strength. Its economy is currently the ninth largest in the world by nominal GDP⁷⁴ and the fourth largest by purchasing power parity.⁷⁵ However, the size of India's economy points to potential but not actual power. Like China—or even more so, given India is a democratic regime—India may well have to commit the majority of its resources to providing for the economic well-being of its population rather than projecting power onto other nations, especially outside of its region. India's low income per capita (a mere \$1,340, placing it roughly on par with

Papua New Guinea)⁷⁶ is a much more telling figure than the size of its GDP. It still has widespread poverty, with approximately forty percent of the population below the international poverty line of \$1.25 per day.⁷⁷ Its infant mortality rate is over twenty times that of Japan, or roughly equal to that of Namibia.⁷⁸

During the Cold War, India was either allied with the USSR or was non-aligned, while Pakistan allied itself with the United States. Since 1990, and especially during the George W. Bush administration that initiated an agreement for the United States to help India's nuclear program, the United States has sought to court India as a regional partner in order to balance China.⁷⁹ However, as a regional power, India has often sought to follow its own course rather than serve as a regional junior partner for the United States. So far, it has resisted U.S. pressures to settle its differences with Pakistan. It has increased its arsenal of nuclear arms and is one of the four nations outside the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, which includes 190 nations and is strongly favored by the United States and its allies. India also did not support the United States in global negotiations concerning climate change, instead siding with China on this matter. It supported some sanctions against Iran but not others, and opposed sanctions against the repressive military regime in Burma. It also expressed opposition to military intervention in Libya. Moreover, India has been said to provide funding and training to terrorists groups like the Balochistan Liberation Army in Pakistan's tribal areas with the goal of destabilizing the country, an aim clearly at odds with American efforts to cultivate Pakistan as a partner in the War on Terror.⁸⁰

In other instances, India has cooperated with the United States on vital issues such as countering terrorism within its borders, as well as maritime defense and intelligence, as indicated by their joint response to the Mumbai terrorist attacks. The United States and India also hold joint military exercises and work together to combat transnational crime including piracy, smuggling, and trafficking.

Yet, despite this relationship, it is difficult to predict what trajectory India's foreign policy will take in the future, given that it lacks an "overall template."⁸¹ As Evan Feigenbaum notes, while India "has moved beyond nonalignment," it is still unclear if its foreign policy vision entails a deeper partnership with the United States.⁸² Pratap Bhanu Mehta has observed that "it is . . . too premature to conclude that the logic of regional balancing will drive India into an alliance-like relationship with the [United States.]"⁸³

As a regional power, India has not been a leader as much as it has clashed with its neighbors. It has frequently clashed with Pakistan, backed

the Tamil insurgency in Sri Lanka, interfered in the internal affairs of Nepal and Bangladesh, and supported opposition to the government of Afghanistan—gaining the animosity of the governments of all these nations. It has also clashed with China over border issues.

Despite the fact that it is often referred to as a global power or a nation on its way to becoming one, India's projection of power and its contributions to the discharging of global responsibilities are limited. India ranks

Despite the fact that it is often referred to as a global power or a nation on its way to becoming one, India's projection of power and its contributions to the discharging of global responsibilities are limited.

twenty-seventh in soft power, which places it behind Portugal.⁸⁴ Its contributions to foreign aid and investment overseas, especially in Africa, are minor compared to those of China, Japan, and Russia. It "remains more a beneficiary of public goods than a producer of them, especially when it comes to security."⁸⁵ Although it maintains a large military in terms of troop size, its military equipment remains outdated despite recent modernization efforts.⁸⁶ The lack of success in gaining a permanent seat at

the UN Security Council is symptomatic of its weakness as a global power.

In short, India may have the potential to become a global power given its large and growing economy and hence could one day be considered part of the global multipolar array. So far, however, there are few indications that it is moving to play such a role. Indeed, India is not even a major regional power. As far as India's relationship with the United States as a global superpower is concerned, it is conflicted; sometimes it cooperates with U.S. interests and sometimes it resists or follows its own course. In short, it is at best an unreliable junior partner.

RUSSIA

Russia is the only nation that currently truly poses not just a regional but global challenge to the United States, albeit a minor one. Russian nuclear forces are able to strike the U.S. mainland and cause considerable harm. Russia has also shown a willingness to actively oppose U.S. policies as part of maintaining its global profile. It is much more likely to cast a veto in the UN Security Council than is China—in fact Russia has cast roughly twenty times as many vetoes as China—and China usually does not make use of its veto unless Russia already has.

Russia continues to seek to play a role in all regions of the world, despite its relative weakness as a power. It strongly supports the Assad regime in Syria, actively participated in the six-party talks with North Korea, sought to improve its relations with China, cooperates with Japan in the area of energy, and has increased its sphere of influence in Africa. In fact, Russia recently established a joint project with Nigeria to develop oil fields there and construct a pipeline to Europe.⁸⁷ In addition, it maintains a close relationship with Cuba and Venezuela; in 2011, Russia was Venezuela's main source of arms for ground forces.⁸⁸ Russia also recently used its supply of energy to Europe, via a pipeline, to exert pressure on Europe's policies and successfully blocked European and American plans to continue to expand NATO eastward to include more former Soviet Republics. Further, it has laid claims to a large segment of the North Pole and sent military units to enforce these claims. All this shows that, unlike other powers who tend to limit their influence to their own region, Russia has extended its reach to almost every corner of the globe.

In some matters, Russia has indeed cooperated with the United States. It helped supply troops in Afghanistan.⁸⁹ It agreed with the United States to reduce the level of nuclear strategic armaments under New START (Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty), and it participated for decades in the Global Threat Reduction Initiative and in the Cooperative Threat Reduction Program, albeit as a secondary—i.e. junior—partner in programs initiated and largely paid for by the United States.

Yet, while Russia prefers to see itself as a global power, its global leverage is typically limited by its innate economic weakness. Its economy is much smaller than that of China or India⁹⁰ and is crippled by endemic corruption, dependence on energy exports, and state-supported monopolies that crowd out entrepreneurs and foreign investors.⁹¹ Often, it acts more

to hobble the United States rather than set a course in line with its own preference. For example, in Syria it blocked moves by the United States and its allies, but did not put forward a viable way to end the conflict. It slowed down Western sanctions against Iran, but found no way to prevent it from advancing its nuclear program. Thus, while acting on a global scale

.....
While Russia prefers to see itself as a global power, its global leverage is typically limited by its innate economic weakness. Often, it acts more to hobble the United States rather than set a course in line with its own preferences.

and possessing the ability to impede other states from implementing their goals, Russia lacks the capacity to act as a major international power and has given up on a distinct global design since the collapse of the Soviet Union.

However, Russia remains a powerful regional actor that is often antagonistic to the United States. The United States could not stop Russia when it invaded Georgia and “annexed” South Ossetia and Abkhazia, or when it devastated Chechnya in violation of basic human rights—a much more violent repression than the one that led to the 2011 intervention in Libya. Russia stopped NATO’s eastward expansion and rebuilt its relationship with several former Soviet Republics. Moreover, it succeeded in causing the United States to reposition and scale back its missile defense system.

By playing a global role and by projecting power in all regions of the world, contemporary Russia comes much closer than any other nation to illustrating what multipolarity would look like, distinct from regional pluralism. However, given the fragility of its economic and political systems, its power projections are no match for those of the United States, even given the relative decline of U.S. power.

CONCLUSION

Much of the discussion about the changing distribution of power in the world focuses on whether the power of the United States is declining, whether new global powers are rising to displace it, and how these changes may affect the international order. This article argues that, for the foreseeable future, the rising challengers will remain largely regional powers. On the whole, the changing global order involves increased regional pluralism, or devolution, rather than a rise of multipolarity or a displacement of the United States as the predominant hegemonic power.

Given that the rising powers seek mostly regional influence, they can be more easily accommodated by the United States than if they sought to challenge the United States as a global power. These accommodations are less likely to be conflict-prone if they are correctly understood to involve regional-to-global power shifts rather than global-to-global ones. ■

ENDNOTES

- 1 In the Weberian sense of the term. See: Max Weber, *The Theory of Social and Economic Organizations*, L. Henderson and T. Parsons (trans.) (Glencoe, Ill. The Free Press, 1947): 324-340.
- 2 Karl W. Deutsch and J. David Singer, “Multipolar Power Systems and International

- Stability,” *World Politics* 16.3 (April 1964): 390-406; Paul W. Schroeder, “The 19th Century International System: Changes in the Structure,” *World Politics* 39.1 (October 1986): 1-26; Randall L. Schweller and David Priess, “A Tale of Two Realisms: Expanding the Institutions Debate,” *Mershon International Studies Review* 41.1 (May 1997): 1-32.
- 3 The literature on this question is vast, see for example: Kenneth Waltz, *Theory of International Politics* (Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1979), Chapter 8; Robert Gilpin, *War and Change in World Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), Chapters 5 and 6; William Wohlforth, “Unipolarity, Status Competition, and Great Power War,” *World Politics* 61.1 (January 2009): 28-57.
 - 4 For example: John R. Oneal and Mark A. Elrod, “NATO Burden Sharing and the Forces of Change,” *International Studies Quarterly* 33.4 (December 1989): 435-456.
 - 5 Bruce W. Jentleson, “Accepting Limits: How to Adapt to a Copernican World,” *Democracy: A Journal of Ideas*, Issue 23 (Winter 2012).
 - 6 Christopher Layne, “This Time It’s Real: The End of Unipolarity and the *Pax Americana*,” *International Studies Quarterly* 56.1 (January 2012): 203-213; Roger C. Altman and Richard N. Haass, “American Profligacy and American Power – The Consequences of Fiscal Irresponsibility,” *Foreign Affairs* (Nov./Dec. 2010): 25-34.
 - 7 Jack Snyder, Robert Y. Shapiro, and Yaeli Bloch-Elkon, “Free Hand Abroad, Divide and Rule at Home,” *World Politics* 61.1 (January 2009): 155-187; Charles A. Kupchan and Peter L. Trubowitz, “Dead Center: The Demise of Liberal Internationalism in the United States,” *International Security* 32.2 (Fall 2007): 7-44; and Charles A. Kupchan and Peter L. Trubowitz, “The Illusion of Liberal Internationalism’s Revival,” *International Security* 35.1 (Summer 2010): 95-109.
 - 8 Seth G. Jones, *In the Graveyard of Empires: America’s War in Afghanistan* (New York, NY: W.W. Norton, 2009); Zbigniew Brzezinski, *Strategic Vision: America and the Crisis of Global Power* (New York: Basic Books, 2012), Part 2.
 - 9 Joseph S. Nye, Jr., “The Decline of America’s Soft Power,” *Foreign Affairs* 83.3 (May/June 2004): 16-21. For example, the claim has been made that the Chinese model of authoritarian capitalism is now competing ideologically with democratic capitalism. See: Stefan Halper, *The Beijing Consensus: How China’s Authoritarian Model Will Dominate the Twenty-First Century* (New York: Basic Books, 2010).
 - 10 Samuel Huntington, “The Lonely Superpower,” *Foreign Affairs* 78.2 (March/April 1999): 35-49.
 - 11 Robert Kagan, *The World America Made* (New York: Knopf, 2012): 69.
 - 12 Mario Einaudi, “Ikenberry believes the ‘Liberal Leviathan’ will continue into the new global era,” *Cornell University Center for International Studies*, <http://einaudi.cornell.edu/node/7961>.
 - 13 Shi Yinhong, ‘Zhongmei guanxi yu zhongguo zhanlue’, *Xiandai Guoji Guanxi* 1 (January 2007): 35-36.
 - 14 Fareed Zakaria, *The Post-American World: Release 2.0* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company 2011): 53.
 - 15 Joseph S. Nye, *The Future of Power* (New York: Public Affairs, 2011).
 - 16 Richard Haass, “The Age of Nonpolarity: What Will Follow U.S. Dominance,” *Foreign Affairs* 87.3 (May/June 2008): 44-56.
 - 17 Niall Ferguson, “A World Without Power,” *Foreign Policy* 143 (July/August 2004): 32-39.
 - 18 Zbigniew Brzezinski, *Strategic Vision: America and the Crisis of Global Power* (New York: Basic Books, 2012).
 - 19 Kagan, *The World America Made*.

- 20 "Global Trends 2025: A Transformed World," National Intelligence Council, November 2008, www.dni.gov/nic/NIC_2025_project.html.
- 21 Zakaria, *The Post-American World: Release 2.0*, 53.
- 22 Elizabeth Economy, "The Game Changer: Coping with China's Foreign Policy Revolution," *Foreign Affairs* 89.6 (November/December 2010), 142.
- 23 Barry Buzan, *The United States and the Great Powers* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2004): 71.
- 24 "China Seen as Overtaking U.S. as Global Superpower," Pew Research Center, pewglobal.org/files/2011/07/Pew-Global-Attitudes-Balance-of-Power-U.S.-Image-Report-FINAL-July-13-2011.pdf.
- 25 Michael McFaul and Kathryn Stoner-Weiss, "The Myth of the Authoritarian Model," *Foreign Affairs* 87.1 (January/February 2008): 83-84.
- 26 Steve Chan, "Is There a Power Transition between the U.S. and China? The Different Faces of National Power," *Asian Survey* 45.5 (September/October 2005): 688.
- 27 Robert Kagan, *The World America Made*, 90. See also discussion of power transition theory in Jack Levy, "Theories of General War," *World Politics* 37.3 (April 1985): 344-374, 353-354; A.F.K. Organski, *World Politics* (New York: Knopf, 1968): Chap. 14; Jacek Kugler et al., *Power Transition: Strategies for the 21st Century* (New York: Chatham House, 2000): 31; David Rapkin and William Thompson, "Power Transition, Challenge, and the (Re)emergence of China," *International Interactions* 29.4 (October-December): 315-342, 317-318; and Geoffrey Blainey, *The Causes of War* (New York, Free Press, 1988), 113-114.
- 28 See: Steve Chan, "Is There a Power Transition between the U.S. and China? The Different Faces of National Power," *Asian Survey* 45.5 (September/October 2005): 687-701, 688. See also: Annette Freyberg-Inan, *What Moves Man: The Realist Theory of International Relations* (Albany, N.Y.: State University Press of New York, 2004): 23; Jack S. Levy, "Theories of General War," *World Politics* 37.3 (April 1985): 344-374, 353-354; and Jacek Kugler and A.F.K. Organski, *The War Ledger* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980).
- 29 Graham Allison, "Thucydides's Trap has been sprung in the Pacific," *The Financial Times*, August 21, 2012; David Shambaugh, "Introduction: The Rise of China and Asia's New Dynamics," in *Power Shift: China and Asia's New Dynamics*, ed. David Shambaugh (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2005): 1-20.
- 30 There is a long-standing debate on the correlation between size of GDP and military power. See: Michael Beckley, "Economic Development and Military Effectiveness," *Journal of Strategic Studies* 33.1 (February 2010): 43-79. On the importance of the difference between potential and actual power, see also: Samuel Bacharach and Edward Lawler, *Power and Politics in Organizations* (San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 1980).
- 31 "Gross national income per capita 2010, Atlas method and PPP," The World Bank, <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/DATASTATISTICS/Resources/GNIPC.pdf>.
- 32 Uri Dadush and Bennett Stancil, "The World Order in 2050," Carnegie Endowment for International Peace (2010), www.carnegieendowment.org/files/World_Order_in_2050.pdf.
- 33 See: "Rural and Urban Disparity in China," *China Labour Bulletin* (May 6, 2009), www.clb.org.hk/en/node/100454.
- 34 Barry Eichengreen, Donghyun Park, and Kwanho Shin, "When Fast-Growing Economies Slow Down: International Evidence and Implications for China," *Asian Economic Papers* 11.1 (February 2012): 42-87.
- 35 Bates Gill, "China's Evolving Regional Security Strategy," in *Power Shift: China and Asia's New Dynamics*, ed. David Shambaugh (Berkeley, CA: University of California

- Press, 2005): 247-265.
- 36 Amitai Etzioni, "Is China America's new enemy?" *CNN*, January 6, 2011, http://articles.cnn.com/2012-01-06/opinion/opinion_etzioni-china-enemy_1_zhu-chenghu-global-times-hong-lei/2?s=PM:OPINION.
 - 37 E.g., China deployed its navy to the Gulf of Aden in 2009 on an anti-piracy mission, a navy hospital ship conducted a humanitarian mission in Africa in 2010, and most recently a frigate that had been operating in the Gulf of Aden was used to evacuate Chinese citizens from Libya. Richard Weitz, "Operation Somalia: China's First Expeditionary Force?" *China Security* 5.1 (Winter 2009): 27-42.
 - 38 "Active Duty Military Personnel Strengths by Regional Area and By Country," Department of Defense, siadapp.dmdc.osd.mil/personnel/MILITARY/history/hst1109.pdf.
 - 39 Department of Defense, "Annual Report to Congress: Military and Security Developments Involving the People's Republic of China," www.defense.gov/pubs/pdfs/2011_CMPR_Final.pdf.
 - 40 *Ibid.*, 2.
 - 41 Robert Ross, "The Rise of Chinese Power and the Implications for the Regional Security Order," *Orbis* 54.4 (2010): 545.
 - 42 "China's Growing Role in UN Peacekeeping," International Crisis Group, http://www.crisisgroup.org/-/media/Files/asia/north-east-asia/166_chinas_growing_role_in_un_peacekeeping.pdf.
 - 43 "Changing Patterns in the Use of the Veto in the Security Council," Global Policy Forum, www.globalpolicy.org/component/content/article/102/32810.html.
 - 44 Zhang Yunling and Tang Shiping, "China's Regional Strategy," in *Power Shift: China and Asia's New Dynamics*, ed. David Shambaugh (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2005): 48-70.
 - 45 "China in the World—A Foreign Policy Overview," *World Savvy* 2 (June 2008), worldsavvy.org/monitor/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=126&Itemid=184.
 - 46 Zheng Bijian, "China's 'Peaceful Rise' to Great-Power Status," *Foreign Affairs* 84.5 (September/October 2005).
 - 47 M. Taylor Fravel, "Regime Insecurity and International Cooperation: Explaining China's Compromises in Territorial Disputes," *International Security* 30.2 (Fall 2005): 46. For example, in 2004 China relinquished a large part of Chinese Siberia that had been seized by Russian tsars in the nineteenth century in order to peacefully settle a border dispute. Malcolm Turnbull, "Power Shift: High White's 'The China Choice,'" *The Monthly*, August 2012, <http://www.themonthly.com.au/hugh-white-s-china-choice-power-shift-malcolm-turnbull-5847>.
 - 48 Christopher Pehrson, "String of Pearls: Meeting the Challenge of China's Rising Power across the Asian Littoral," Strategic Studies Institute (2006), www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pdffiles/pub721.pdf, 5 & 11.
 - 49 Kathrin Hille, "Burma dam disruption concerns China," *Financial Times*, October 2, 2011, www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/bccaef18-ece7-11e0-be97-00144feab49a.html#axzz1h5xithSk.
 - 50 Aung Hla Tun, "Myanmar shelves \$3.6 billion mega dam, officials say," *Reuters*, September 30, 2011, www.reuters.com/article/2011/09/30/us-myanmar-dam-idUSTRE78T10H20110930.
 - 51 For exceptionally important discussions of an alternative *regional* accommodation pattern between the United States, China, and other nations in the region, see: Henry Kissinger, *On China* (New York: Penguin Press, 2011), and Zbigniew Brzezinski, *Strategic Vision: America and the Crisis of Global Power* (New York: Basic Books, 2012).
 - 52 Esther Pan, "The Promise and Pitfalls of China's 'Peaceful Rise,'" Council on Foreign

- Relations, April 14, 2006, <http://www.cfr.org/china/promise-pitfalls-chinas-peaceful-rise/p10446>.
- 53 Yan Xuetong, "Possible Choices of a Rising China," *Strategy and Management* 6 (1995): 12-13.
- 54 See, e.g., Deng Xiaoping's recommendation to "hide our capacities and bide our time," discussed in Department of Defense, "Annual Report to Congress: Military Power of the People's Republic of China" (2007), www.defense.gov/pubs/pdfs/070523-china-military-power-final.pdf, 7.
- 55 Julia Gu, "The Chongqing-Xinjiang-Europe International Railway," *China Briefing*, February 20, 2012, www.china-briefing.com/news/2012/02/20/chinas-new-silk-road-the-chongqing-xinjiang-europe-international-railway.html.
- 56 Harsh V. Pant, "China's Naval Expansion in the Indian Ocean and India-China Rivalry," *Asia-Pacific Journal* (2010), www.japanfocus.org/-Harsh_V_-Pant/3353.
- 57 Daniel Kostecka, "Hambantota, Chittagong, and the Maldives—Unlikely Pearls for the Chinese Navy," *China Brief* 10.23 (November 2010): 8-11.
- 58 "China builds up strategic sea lanes," *Washington Times*, January 17, 2005, www.washingtontimes.com/news/2005/jan/17/20050117-115550-1929r?page=all.
- 59 Pehrson, "String of Pearls," 3.
- 60 Amitai Etzioni, "Changing the Rules," *Foreign Affairs* 90.6 (November/December 2011): 172-176.
- 61 Yang Jiechi, "Write Together a New Chapter of Common Development," Speech at China Development Forum 2011, Beijing, March 21, 2011, www.fmprc.gov.cn/eng/wjb/wjbz/2461/t808192.htm.
- 62 See, for example: David M. Lampton, "China's Rise in Asia Need not be at America's Expense," and Michael Yahuda, "The Evolving Asian Order: The Accommodation of Rising Chinese Power," in *Power Shift: China and Asia's New Dynamics*, ed. David Shambaugh (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2005): 306-328, 347-362.
- 63 For approaches on accommodating China, see: G. John Ikenberry, *Liberal Leviathan: The Origins, Crisis, and Transformation of the American World Order* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2011): 356; Charles Glaser, "Will China's Rise Lead to War?," *Foreign Affairs* 90.2 (March/April 2011): 80-91, 82-83; and Andrew J. Nathan, "What China Wants," *Foreign Affairs* 90.4 (July/August 2011): 153-158, 155.
- 64 Charles Kupchan, "The End of the West," *The Atlantic Monthly* (November 2002): 42-44.
- 65 John McCormick, *The European Superpower* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan 2007).
- 66 Roberto Foa, "The EU-China Relationship," *21st Century International Review* (March/April 2010), www.roberto.foa.name/Foa_EU_China_Relationship.pdf.
- 67 Thomas Lum and Dick K. Nanto, "China's Trade with the United States and the World," *CRS Report for Congress*, April 29, 2005, <http://fpc.state.gov/documents/organization/48587.pdf>.
- 68 Roberto Foa, "The EU-China Relationship," *21st Century International Review* (March/April 2010).
- 69 "A Maturing Partnership—Shared Interest and Challenges in EU-China Relations," European Commission, (2003), <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2003:0533:FIN:EN:PDF>.
- 70 Tariq Ramadan, "Turkey is part of Europe. Fear keeps it out of the EU," *The Guardian*, August 6, 2009, www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2009/aug/06/turkey-eu-membership.
- 71 "NATO after Libya: A troubling victory," *Economist*, September 3, 2011, www.economist.com/node/21528248.

- 72 Clara Ferreira-Marques, “Key quotes on the shift in global power,” *Reuters*, January 24, 2008, www.uk.reuters.com/article/2008/01/24/us-davos-power-idUKL2461117220080124.
- 73 See: “India an emerging global power: US,” *Times of India*, May 27, 2010, www.articles.timesofindia.indiatimes.com/2010-05-27/india/28304822_1_indo-us-strategic-dialogue-global-power-indian-delegation; and “India is a rising and responsible global power: Obama,” *Times of India*, June 4, 2010, www.articles.timesofindia.indiatimes.com/2010-06-04/india/28292047_1_responsible-global-power-statevisit-strategic-dialogue.
- 74 “Gross domestic product 2010, PPP,” The World Bank (2011), www.siteresources.worldbank.org/DATASTATISTICS/Resources/GDP_PPP.pdf.
- 75 Ibid.
- 76 Ibid.
- 77 See, e.g., United Nations Development Programme, “Human Development Report 2011,” www.hdr.undp.org/en/media/HDR_2011_EN_Complete.pdf.
- 78 “The World Factbook: Country Comparison of Infant Mortality Rate,” Central Intelligence Agency (2012), www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/rankorder/2091rank.html.
- 79 See, e.g., Evan Feigenbaum, “India’s Rise, America’s Interest: The Fate of the U.S.-Indian Partnership,” *Foreign Affairs* 89.2 (March/April 2010): 76-91.
- 80 Armin Tarzi, “Afghanistan: Kabul’s India Ties Worry Pakistan,” *Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty*, April 16, 2006, www.rferl.org/content/article/1067690.html.
- 81 Pratap Bhanu Mehta, “Still Under Nehru’s Shadow? The Absence of Foreign Policy Frameworks in India,” *India Review* 8.3 (July-September 2009): 210.
- 82 Feigenbaum, 80.
- 83 Mehta, 222.
- 84 Jonathan McClory, “The New Persuaders II: A 2011 Global Ranking of Soft Power,” Institute for Government (2011), www.instituteforgovernment.org.uk/sites/default/files/publications/The%20New%20PersuadersII.pdf.
- 85 Feigenbaum, 86.
- 86 For example, the Indian Air Force was widely criticized for its continued use of MiG-21 fighter jets, nicknamed “flying coffins” due to their high crash rate, and only recently announced plans to phase out the jets—a process that won’t be completed before 2017. See: Siddharth Srivastava, “India’s Flying Coffins,” *Asia Sentinel*, August 10, 2011, http://www.asiasentinel.com/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=3377&Itemid=425. Additionally, outdated T-72 tanks continue to be utilized, ammunition holdings “remain well below the necessary levels,” and the “poor state of the armory” was cited in official deliberations following the Mumbai attacks as “a binding constraint on military action.” See: Shashank Joshi, “India’s Military Instrument: A Doctrine Stillborn,” 2012, <http://shashankjoshi.files.wordpress.com/2011/09/indias-military-instrument-2011.pdf>.
- 87 Ariel Cohen, “Russia’s New Scramble for Africa: Moscow attempts to rebuild its sphere of influence in the African continent,” *The Wall Street Journal*, July 2, 2009, www.online.wsj.com/article/SB124639219666775441.html.
- 88 “Venezuela ranked top importer of Russian arms,” *RIA Novosti*, December 27, 2011, www.en.rian.ru/world/20111227/170519145.html.
- 89 Andre de Nesnera, “Northern Route a Key Supply Network for NATO Troops in Afghanistan,” *Voice of America*, July 16, 2012, <http://www.voanews.com/content/northern-route-key-supply-network-for-nato-troops-in-afghanistan/1416504.html>.
- 90 In 2011, Russia’s GDP accounted for only three percent of global GDP, while that of China accounted for over fourteen percent and that of the United States roughly nine-

teen percent. These figures are for GDP based on purchasing-power-parity (PPP) share of world total. See: International Monetary Fund, *World Economic Outlook Database* (October 2012 edition), <http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/weo/2012/02/weodata/index.aspx>.

- 91 “Fault Lines in the Russian Economy,” *World Savvy Monitor* 6 (November 2008), http://worldsavvy.org/monitor/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=370&Itemid=715.