THE EROSION OF THE BI-POLAR POWER STRUCTURE IN THE 1960'S: ITS IMPACT UPON EAST ASIAN INTERNATIONAL POLITICS

JOSEFA M. SANIEL

THE TALLEYRAND-METTERNICH TRADITIONAL EUROPEAN BALANCE of power, based on the world-power consensus of the "principle of legitimacy" which was maintained by the balancing role played by England, involved Asia more significantly in the second half of the nineteenth century. With certain modifications, this world power balance lasted to the end of World War II and was replaced by the bi-polar structure of international politics during the immediate post-World War II period.

Dividing the world around two power poles, the last arrangement included the so-called "Free World bloc" led by the United States of America and the "Communist bloc," by the Union of Soviet Socialist Russia (USSR) — later joined (but soon split) by the People's Republic of China (PRC). More apparent today is the new order of world politics evolving since 1960 from a series of events within the international scene, a process likewise transforming the international environment in East Asia. Such events, which have been phasing out the immediate post-war international order, seem to have opened new opportunities and presented more options to leaders of medium-and small-size countries, like the developing countries of Southeast Asia, in planning their respective nation's diplomatic and economic relations.

This paper will deal with selected developments in the decade of the sixties which can be considered as contributing to the erosion of the bi-polar power structure of the immediate post-war period. They are: the development of the European Economic Community as a power pole, the Sino-Soviet conflict resulting in a split within the "Communist bloc," as well as the loosening of dyadic ties between the United States and Japan and their impact upon East Asian International politics. These developments will be projected against the background of the collective-bilateral security systems existing in different parts of the world, including East Asia, and the emergence of *Panch Shila* in the fifties.

PANCH SHILA AND COLLECTIVE-BILATERAL SECURITY SYSTEMS

Since the turn of the 1960's, when the USSR and the PRC parted ways, certain developments in the international milieu followed with some degree of unpredictability. The bi-polarization (multipolarization?) of the hitherto monolithic Communist threat to the "Free World bloc" perhaps caused major Communist and non-Communist countries to feel less restrained or constrained in making their diplomatic moves towards the attainment of their own domestic or national goals. Even as such moves generated rapid changes in the world scenario, they contributed to the disappearance within a decade of the 'Cold War" frame of reference. Characterized by bipolar conflicts or the successive confrontations and disputes between Communists and non-Communists, the "Cold War" gradually gave way to détente among hostile powers in the late sixties, and then to rapprochément, during the opening years of the seventies.

Consequently, power realignments were evident until the two-dimensional power confrontation in world politics appears to be in the process of being replaced by what seems to be a far more complex multipolar or polycentric world. Discernible, though not yet set, is the new power equilibrium that is being worked out within the Asian and Pacific region by the United States, the USSR, the PRC (the three *super-powers*) and Japan (a *super-state* by virtue of her ranking as the third economic power in the world but with only a defense force and lacking nuclear capability). This arrangement seems to have given the impression that there is in Asia a "grand conspiracy" among the World powers. Consisting of complicated relations among powers and their respective ties with countries elsewhere, there are great possibilities that the seeming multi-polarization of world politics could create "entangling alliances" partly resulting from "secret diplomacy" which characterized the politics among powers before World War I. "Secret diplomacy," still possible today, is however not easy to undertake. As Japan's Foreign Minister Ohira wrote,[1]

> ...The World has become one great information society. It is now difficult to differentiate between the domestic and foreign affairs of a country. The situation is such that information on what a specific country thinks, what is happening inside that country and what is being planned by that country is known almost instantaneously throughout the world. The area of diplomatic secrets has been markedly reduced. . .

[1] "A New Foreign Policy for Japan," *Pacific Community*, Vol. III, No. 3 (April 1972), p. 415.

This state of affairs could serve as deterrent or a means of keeping powers from entering into "secret agreements" and consequently "entangling alliances."

Today's world therefore stands on the threshold of a hoped-for innovative ordering of international politics through the broadening of channels for negotiations and dialogues and, therefore, accommodation, rather than confrontations and disputes as human beings search for peace and security. Faced with the wonders and destructive effects of man's scientific discoveries, nations are now in quest for economic viability and political survival in a less polluted world. There is no doubt that it is imperative for contemporary men and nation-states to learn how "to co-exist" if they are to avoid destroying one another in the end.

The principle of co-existence is the core of the Five Principles (*Panch Shila*) enunciated by Jawarhalal Nehru and Chou En-Lai in 1954.[2] Adopted in 1955 by the Bandung conferees, these five principles were amplified in Bandung's Peace Declaration of ten principles.[3] The four other principles of *Panch Shila* were: (1) mutual respect for territorial integrity and sovereignty, (2) non-aggression, (3) non-interference in internal affairs and (4) equality and mutual benefit.

Alongside this idea of promoting peace within the framework of the Five Principles was the concept of defensive collective and bilateral alliances which were established at about the same time by the "Free World bloc" to secure the territories of members of the bloc in Asia from the bloc's perceived threat of Communism. One of these alliances was founded in Manila in September 1954, a year before Bandung: the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO). Intended to play a peace-keeping and security-maintaining role in Asia, SEATO was to function alongside the American post-war bilateral security agreements with the Philippines, Japan, South Korea, and Australia together with New Zealand (ANZUS), as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO; 1949) and the Central Treaty Organization (CENTO; 1955) were expected to do in Europe and West Asia.

---

[2] These principles are embodied in the text of the India-China Agreement on Trade and Intercourse Between Tibet Region of China and India issued in Peking on April 29, 1954 in *Foreign Policy of India. Texts of Documents* 1947-64 (New Delhi, 1966), pp. 198-206.

[3] "Final Communique of the Asian-African Conference Held at Bandung from 18th to 24th April 1955," *Asian-African Conference Bulletin, India Quarterly*, Vol. XI, No. 3 (July-September 1955), pp. 207-235.

II

THE EUROPEAN ECONOMIC COMMUNITY: A POWER POLE

Under NATO's protection, the establishment of the European Economic Community (EEC) by six of NATO's members— Belgium, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, Luxembourg, and the Netherlands— was a major event in the late fifties.[4] Its development in the next decade into a comparatively strong European Community (EC)[5] proved to the world how voluntary multi-national integration and cooperation for common benefits among members, imaginative planning, and diplomatic and managerial skills, could produce strong ties among countries attempting to survive and be heard within a harshly competitive world.

Part IV of the 1958 Treaty of Rome creating the EEC provided that the Community was to conclude associational agreements[6] with Mediterranean countries like Greece, Turkey, Spain, Israel, Tunisia and Morocco, the Caribbean dependencies, East Africa and eighteen African countries who later became signatories to the Yaounde Convention of July 20, 1963.[7] Being promoted today by the

[4] The European Economic Community was established with the European Atomic Energy Community in two treaties signed in Rome in 1958 by six members of the European Coal and Steel Community founded in 1952. M. Palmer, J. Lambert, *et al, A Handbook of European Organization* (New York, 1968), p. 167.

[5] The European Community as it exists today, comprises three distinct organizations: (1) the European Coal and Steel Community; (2) the European Economic Community; and, (3) the Atomic Community (Euraton). *Ibid.*, p. 167.

[6] K. Kojima, "A Pacific Free Trade Area Proposed," *Pacific Community*, Vol. III, No. 3 (April 1972), p. 585.

[7] The Yaounde Convention was an agreement signed in 1963 between eighteen former overseas countries and territories of the EEC members, on the one hand, and the EEC, on the other. It was a renegotiation of an earlier agreement concerning the establishment of associational ties between the EEC and each of these territories who had become independent by 1960. The major change was the extension of equal status by EEC to the eighteen African countries. The main provisions of Part IV of the Treaty of Rome (1958) which provided for such associational ties were virtually retained. They are: (1) the freeing of trade between EEC and its associates, with the latter permitted to apply customs duties considered necessary for their development, and for the protection of developing industries as well as the imposition of fiscal duties needed as a source of revenue; (2) the granting of direct aid in the form of investments by the Community as a whole which, under the earlier agreement, was to be channelled through a European Development Fund; the two kinds of projects that were to receive aid from the Fund were specified as follows: (a) *Social projects*, involving the provision of hospitals, teaching or technical research establishments and institutes for vocational training; and (b) *economic projects* of general interest directly connected with a program which, in practice has meant road-building, the provision of harbor facilities, water supplies and others. The Fund is to be administered by the EEC Commission responsible for allocating the funds available.

The Yaounde Convention established a Council of Ministers responsible for taking major decisions on the policy of the association. Meeting at least once a year, its chairmanship alternates between a minister from the associated countries and the Chairman of the Council of the Community. In 1965, a Secretariat was established in Brussels with a joint African and European staff. Palmer, *et al, op. cit.*, pp. 231-233.

EEC Commission, is the forging of associational links between the EEC and the third world countries of Southeast Asia, particularly the ASEAN countries, initially through a mutually beneficial trading arrangement.

The EEC and the ASEAN

The EEC Commissioner for External Affairs, Dr. Talf Dahrendorf, contacted each of the five ASEAN partners— Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore and Thailand— for trade discussion with the EEC. Starting this scheme early in 1972 by informing each of the ASEAN members about the EEC's keen interest in helping Asian regional groupings, especially ASEAN, Dahrendorf also pledged that EEC trade with the ASEAN would not diminish even after the enlargement of the Community.[8] The ASEAN five have so far agreed only on the need to negotiate as a whole in their efforts to secure better trading arrangements with Europe.

To undertake planning and discussion on the EEC-ASEAN trade ties, a standing Committee was established: one, in Bangkok for joint consultation among the five members; the other, in Brussels for talks with EEC.[9] It is not hard to imagine the effects of an associational agreement between the EEC and the ASEAN (if it materializes) upon the other world powers, especially Japan and the United States, and upon the international equilibrium in Asia. The expansion in January 1973 of the European Community into nine members, is viewed with apprehension by the world's leading countries, especially the Soviet Union. Linked with the EEC's neighboring East European countries, the USSR will have to face in Europe not only an increasing economic but also political competition from the EEC.[10]

[8] Seah Chiang Nee, "Talks on EEC Will Put ASEAN's Collective Strength to the Test," *The Asian*, April 2-8, 1972, p. 10.

[9] *Loc. cit.*

[10] A recent report describes as follows the reasons for the Soviet leaders' irritation of the enlargement of the EEC which is referred to us as a "narrow little grouping" in the Soviet press's campaign against the expansion of the common market:

(1) It is a blow against Soviet plans of preventing any political realignment in Western Europe.

(2) The entry of Britain into the EEC will add a "new element of realism and hostility towards the Soviet Union" and will cause "the foundering and Soviet attempts to range a United Europe against reactionary, insular Britain."

(3) The entry of two Scandinavian members of NATO-Denmark and Norway (recently Norway decided against joining the EEC)— in the common market would partly undercut Soviet policy aimed at developing "neutralist" relations with all four states in the area, i.e., Britain, Ireland, Denmark and Norway (now reduced to only three states).

The EEC: The World's Largest Trading Unit

"Even at its original size the Community has replaced the United States as the World's largest trading unit," goes the comment of a Japanese economist, K. Kojima, who supported his remarks with hard data.[11] "The enlarged Euro-bloc," he adds, "will continue and strengthen its inward looking policies, intensifying intra-regional development and raising the degree of self-sufficiency which are the purposes of its integration."[12] Kojima pointed out, for example, that the United States and the Pacific basin countries (both advanced and developing) are greatly concerned with the opening of the European Common Market to agricultural products from non-member countries. And because the industrial goods markets in the European Community is an important outlet for exports of manufactured and semi-manufactured goods from the United States, Japan and the developing countries, Kojima suggests that there should be a joint effort among the Pacific basin countries *to obtain a bargaining power equal to the Community.* He therefore proposed a plan for the establishment of a Pacific Free Trade Area which would enable the countries in the Pacific basin to deal with the EEC from a better position because the EEC now represents "'a formidable agglomeration of economic wealth and power."[13]

The scheme, it is supposed, could place the developing Asian countries in "associational ties" with the developed countries of the region. It could however compete with the EEC Commissioner's proposal to link with the EEC the developing countries of ASEAN by means of a mutually beneficial trade agreement. This EEC plan could hasten the achievement of its goal intended to help attain (by its earlier decision to implement in July 1, 1971) the United Nations Conference on Trade Development's (UNCTAD's) System of General Preferences for developing countries provided all the major industrialized countries would take similar action.[14]

The expansion of the European Community's economic and political power has made some students of international politics refer to the Community as one of five power poles in world politics—the other four being the U.S.A., the U.S.S.R., China and Japan.

(4) The enlargement of the common market would make the creation of a joint trade policy between Moscow and its East European partners scheduled for December 3, 1973, even more crucial.

See, "Wider EEC Setback for USSR," *Manila Times*, January 24, 1972, p. 16.

[11] Kojima, *op. cit.*, p. 585.

[12] *Ibid.*, p. 386.

[13] *Ibid.*, p. 387.

[14] "Common Market, Norway Enforce Trade Preferences for Have-nots," *Manila Chronicle*, July 1, 1971, p. 6. See also, "EEC OK's Trade Aid Scheme," *Manila Times*, April 6, 1971, p. 11.

The EEC: Its Problems

Although there was an awareness at the EEC Summit in Paris (October, 1972) of the economic and political power the European Community has acquired over the past decade, and that "Europe is a reality with its own personality," the EEC is in fact beset by divisions that have handicapped it since 1958 when it was founded. The members of the Community have not yet reached a consensus nor a commitment towards the creation of a Europe that is united politically and economically.[15] In other words, a Europe that can "speak with a single voice."[16] Neither has the EEC at this Summit made further commitments beyond a study program for the following year in its aid to developing countries or the third world.[17]

But could economic expansion of the EEC continue without making the Community organization unmanageable? Could EEC face a military threat, say, from any of the Warsaw Pact countries without NATO?[18] The answers to these questions could suggest the role that EEC will play in international politics. What is certain is that the European Community has developed during the sixties into one of the centers of international power thus partly accounting for the phasing out of the bi-polar or "cold war" frame of reference of world politics and the emergence of multipolarism.

III

THE SINO-SOVIET CONFLICT: TERMINATION OF PATRON-CLIENT RELATIONS

The establishment of the EEC was almost contemporaneous with the appearance in the open in 1960 of the Sino-Soviet dispute.

---

[15] *Time Magazine*, October 30, 1972, p. 6.

[16] "Euromart Nations Nearer to Unity," *Times Journal*, October 21, 1972, p. 12.

[17] "Euromart Summit Fruitful," *Times Journal*, October 23, 1972, p. 2.

[18] The "Warsaw Pact" countries (Albania, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Hungary, Poland, Rumania and the U.S.S.R.) pledged among other things, on May 14, 1955, to regard an attack on one of the members as an attack on all and provided for a unified military command. The collectivity has been referred to as the Communist equivalent of NATO (the North Atlantic Treaty Organization). NATO was founded in Washington, D.C. in April 1949 by Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, the United Kingdom. The United States, Greece, Turkey and the German Federal Republic were subsequently admitted to membership. The NATO members pledged themselves to develop their power, both individual and collective, and to resist aggression. They agreed that "an attack against one or more of them in Europe or America shall be considered an attack against them all."

For an analysis of the possible-negative effects of the expansion of EEC, see L. Gelber, "Enlargement of the European Community and Its Negative Global Effects," *Pacific Community*. Vol. III, No. 3 (April 1972), pp. 441-447.

See also "NATO Cracking; Assembly Opens," *Bulletin Today*, November 24, 1972, p. 2.

Centering on the ideological issue of the inevitability of war, this conflict also involved the principle of co-existence which the Moscow leaders interpreted (but Peking challenged) as rooted in the Leninist doctrine that states can co-exist regardless of differences in their social and political systems.[19] China's leaders charged the Russians of "modern revisionism." As a consequence, relations between the PRC (China) and the USSR were suspended and the Soviet Union's technical consultants were recalled thus suspending other forms of economic aid from the Soviet Union.

The Restoration of the China-Japan Trade

Into this situation moved Japan to supply China industrial goods, like steel and machinery, in exchange for Chinese products that Japanese businessmen could trade in Japan or elsewhere. The possibilities for expanding trade between the two countries was however limited by the "Yoshida Letter" assuring Taiwan that Japan would not extend long-term credits to China. Japan and the PRC pursued

[19] The stand of the Moscow leadership was that "wars are not fatally inevitable." It was defined by a presidium member, O.V. Kuusinin as follows: "The official doctrine of Soviet foreign policy is 'Leninist principle of peaceful coexistence' of states regardless of the difference in their social and political systems." Quoted in O. E. Clubb, "China, Russia and East Asia," *Pacific Community*, Vol. III, No. 4 (July 1972), p. 614.

S. Eto, however, states that at the Twentieth Party Congress held in February 1956, the Soviet Union changed its national objectives by "discarding" the Leninist doctrine of the inevitability of war and the necessity of violent revolution, and replacing it with the "non-revolutionary peace movement." According to Eto, this became a significant "turning point" in post-war international relations. Eto also mentions that the same Party Congress declared the validity of peaceful competition with capitalist economies. He remarks: "...never before had the Soviet Union renounced its ultimate goal of destroying the capitalist countries through political struggle. The statements made in the Twentieth Congress, however, did not call for a political struggle but an economic struggle to overwhelm capitalism. The aim of this declaration was to speed up the trend toward socialism by showing the world its superiority. This indeed marked the first step in peaceful coexistence which involved economic competition. In the seven-year plan (1959-1965) presented to the Twenty-first Congress in 1959, the Soviet Union withdrew from its previous closed socialist system, and proceeded on a path toward international division of labor and the doctrine of comparative costs." See S. Eto, "Improving Relations Between Japan and the Soviet Union," *Peace in Asia* (The Council of National Security Problems Papers; Tokyo, 1973), p. 49.

Peking, on the other hand, standing on the Maoist position which challenged Moscow's posture, held that such peaceful co-existence in foreign relations, together with the use of "capitalistic" devices (such as the profit motive and material incentives) in the domestic economy, constituted "modern revisionism," Clubb, *op. cit.*, p. 614.

For a Russian scholar's view on the prospects of coexistence in international relations, see E. S. Shershnev, "On the Prospects for the Development of International Relations of Principles of Peaceful Co-existence of States," *Peace in Asia*, pp. 9-15.

their trading transactions through Japanese "friendly firms"[20] and under the 1968 semi-official Memorandum Trade (MT),[21] the successor to the Liao-Takahashi (LT) Agreement signed in 1962,[22] for a five-year period, 1963-1967.

In 1970, the total trade of Japan was US$822.69 million of which US$253.8 million represented imports and US$568.87, exports. Upwards of 86% of the trade was done through Japanese "friendly firms." It yielded a total balance of trade in Japan's favor amounting to US$315.05 million[23] in 1970—a development which is interesting to those watching trading relations between the PRC or the Soviet Union on the one hand, and the countries of the "free world," on the other, which is generally a barter arrangement or an "absolutely balanced trade."

While Japan was trading with the PRC under the principle of "separating politics from trade" and the so-called three political principles in their relations,[24] she also had trading transactions with, and invested in, Taiwan with whose government Japan entered into a treaty normalizing relations in 1952. In 1970, Japan's total trade with Taiwan reached a high of US$951.18 million, US$250.76 million of which was Japan's imports and US$700.41 million, her exports.[25] From her trade with Taiwan in 1970, Japan realized a favorable balance totalling US$549.65 million, US$234.59 million more than her balance of trade with the PRC. But because of the PRC's large population and resource potential as well as a market for Japan's industrial goods, the PRC seems to offer much greater opportunities than Taiwan for augmenting Japan's trade and investment.

In 1970, the total investment of Japan in Taiwan was US$139 million in 151 projects. This amount declined sharply the following

---

[20] Trading companies affiliated with the Japan International Trade Production Association (JITPA) which have been politically acceptable to Peking. In 1969, eighty-nine per cent of Sino-Japanese trade was undertaken through this channel. "China's Foreign Trade in 1969," *Current Scene,* Vol. VII, No. 16 (October 7, 1970), p. 12.

[21] This agreement, the only non-private link between Tokyo and Peking before Prime Minister Tanaka's recent normalization of relations between the two capitals, was signed by men of high rank but not formally on behalf of the two governments and renewed from year to year. *Loc. cit.*

The Japanese government supervised trade, under this arrangement, through a Memorandum Trade Office whose chief was in-charge of negotiating from year to year with his Chinese counterpart the total volume of bilateral trade between their two countries.

[22] See Memorandum Agreement signed by Liao and Takasaki Tatsunosuke on November 11, 1962.

[23] Japan, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, *Statistical Survey of Japan's Economy* 1971, 43, 47. See also "China's Foreign Trade in 1969..." *op. cit.*, p. 12; *The Daily Yomiuri* (April 20, 1970).

[24] The three political principles were: that the Japanese government was to (1) stop regarding China with hostility, (2) stop taking part in a plot to create "two Chinas," and (3) stop obstructing efforts to normalize relations between Japan and China.

[25] *Statistical Survey of Japan's Economy 1971, op. cit.*, pp. 42, 46.

year because of the alleged eagerness of Japanese businessmen to establish ties with mainland China (where the Japanese had virtually no investment), especially in the wake of President Nixon's announcement in July 1971 that he would visit Peking early the next year.[26] It can therefore be said here that Japan-PRC contacts, which China encouraged after she cut her economic and military ties with the USSR at the end of the fifties, did add to the wearing away of the immediate post-war "bi-polar" international order or the "cold war" frame of reference of world politics.

France's Recognition of China

The disintegration of the Sino-Soviet bloc and therefore the "bi-polar" world order was accelerated in 1964 by the rapprochément between France, who was a member of the "Free World" bloc's Atlantic Alliance [NATO], and China, a Communist power which considered the leader of NATO—the United States—its principal enemy.[27] Under Charles de Gaulle, who was elected first President of the Fifth Republic in the same year EEC was founded (1958), France decided to deviate from the "Free World's" position of "non-recognition" of mainland China. In doing so, France became the second major Western country to recognize the PRC, the first one being Britain (on January 6, 1951).

Understandable are de Gaulle's subsequent moves in the field of international diplomacy. He decided that France practically withdraw from SEATO established by Dulles to combat Communist subversion and aggression in Southeast Asia, particularly the activities of China.[28] From the beginning, France was not a happy member of SEATO, thus suggesting the lack of strong cohesion among its members to achieve collective defense against Communist threat in Asia. In 1956, France publicly criticized SEATO's military operations, and at the SEATO Ministerial Conference held in Bangkok in 1961, France strongly opposed a Council resolution on Laos and refused to contribute troops should SEATO decide upon military action.[29] In 1967, France decided to evict the NATO headquarters from French soil, though she remained an unenthusiastic member of NATO.[30]

Therefore, in the face of the Sino-Soviet conflict and a possible escalation of the Vietnam war, the decision of France to recognize China in 1964 as well as the subsequent action she took as member

[26] "Investments of Japan Firms in Taiwan Decline," *Manila Daily Bulletin*, March 12, 1972, p. 18.

[27] F. Fejito, "France and China. The Intersection of Two Grand Designs," in A. M. Halpern (ed.), *Policies Toward China* (New York, 1965), pp. 42-53.

[28] "Will the SEATO be able to Survive French Recognition of Red China?" *Manila Daily Bulletin*, January 27, 1964, p. 3.

[29] G. A. Modelski, *SEATO; Six Studies* (Canada, 1962), pp. 4-5.

[30] G. D. Stoddard (ed.), *Living History of the World*, (New York, 1957), p. 272.

of SEATO and NATO, affected the bi-polar world power arrangement. They contributed to the liquidation of the strong anti-Communist position of the "Free World" bloc and can be taken as among the factors that paved the way for the emergence of a modified international order in the seventies.

China's Acquisition of Nuclear Capability

Also taking place in the 1960's was the PRC's successful detonation of her first nuclear device thus gaining for China one of the attributes of a "super power": a nuclear capability. This event took place in October 1964, at about the time Nikita Khrushchev was removed from both the positions of First Secretary of the Soviet Communist Party and Premier of the Soviet Union, and when the USSR faced domestic economic and political problems. China's nuclear explosion also approximately coincided with the eighteenth Olympiad held in Tokyo, a symbol of Japan's dramatic recovery during the postwar period.

The acquisition of nuclear capability by China revealed how far China had progressed in her nuclear weapons and military techniques as well as her determination to stockpile nuclear armament since 1958 (when China was facing the "ill fated" Great Leap Forward [1958-1959]). For it was in 1958 when Khrushchev refused the PRC's request of clear-cut assurance of nuclear protection in the event the United States would use nuclear weapon (as the U.S.A. did hint on September 28, 1958),[31] if the PRC forces would not stop their artillery attack on Quemoy and Matsu.

Khrushchev's decision was perhaps based in part on the fact that since 1949, the PRC refused to sign a non-aggression pact with the Soviet Union. Instead, China demanded for the return of Outer Mongolia. China also refused to consider a proposal of the Soviet Union for a joint Soviet-China fleet and for Soviet air bases in China, at a time the USSR desired to maintain her leadership of the world Communist movement.

Turned down by Khrushchev in 1958, the PRC leaders decided the following year to abrogate the country's defense technology agreement with the USSR and concentrate all her resources into the development of her own nuclear arms.[32] By then, China had achieved not only a thermo-nuclear weapon (hydrogen bomb) test but had also tested her nuclear war heads and a trigger device for a miniaturized hydrogen bomb or an Intercontinental Ballistic Missile

[31] H. Sekino, "China's Nuclear Armament and Its Effects on Pacific-Asia," *Pacific Community*, Vol. III, No. 4 (July 1972), p. 637.

[32] *Ibid.*, pp. 638-639.

(ICBM).[33] But the development of her delivery system appears to have lagged behind her nuclear development and facilities.[34]

At present, it seems that the primary aim of China's nuclear armament would be to achieve a minimum deterrent or second-strike capabilities, under certain limited conditions. Her major concern seems to be the attainment of a capability to survive a preemptive first strike or maintaining the invulnerability of her own launching sites. There are great possibilities in the 1970's for China to develop and possess practical nuclear weapons which could become effective invulnerable attack capability *against adjacent areas.* In other words,

> . . . the development of an offensive capability against adjacent areas through a conventional submarine missile force, and a theater nuclear retaliatory power through tactical nuclear weapons will effectively deter nuclear attacks against China by the United States and the Soviet Union and would have the effect of increasing the effectiveness of China's non-nuclear military forces.[35]

Moreover, in view of the United States-Soviet Union's Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT) Agreement of May 26, 1972, there exists between the United States and the Soviet Union a mutual deterrent from using nuclear weapons thus restraining either country from launching a first strike in retaliation, should China launch a non-nuclear attack upon an adjacent country.[36]

Confronted by China's growing nuclear capability, which she developed after the USSR refused to meet the PRC's request for nuclear protection in 1958, the second half of the sixties witnessed the countries leading the two opposing power blocs immediately following the war—the United States and the Soviet Union—move towards a détente with the PRC even as the USSR took steps in encircling mainland China who interpreted these moves as intended to isolate her from the rest of Asia.

The Sino-Soviet Border Conflict

The traditional expansionist tendencies of the Soviet Union and China, in addition to the ideological difference dividing them in 1960, created the recent clashes along the 4,500-mile frontier (for three centuries the scene of Chinese-Russian territorial disputes) and resulted in the Ussuri river exchange fire early in 1969. Dating back to 1960, when friendly relations between the two countries came to an end, these border skirmishes have been part of China's campaign to "correct" her so-called "friendship boundary," the name

---

[33] *Ibid.*, p. 639.
[34] *Ibid.*, p. 641.
[35] *Ibid.*, p. 648.
[36] *Ibid.*, pp. 649-650.

given the border after the Chinese Communists successfully gained control of mainland China in 1949. It has also been part of a general Chinese expansionist program which, in 1962, resulted in an attack on India and included claims against other neighbors.

The official *People's Daily* of Peking reported in 1963 that "when the time is ripe" China would liberate approximately a million square miles of territory held by the Soviet Union in Asia.[37] China claimed and the Soviet Union denied that the Russians acknowledged in 1964 that the barren island of Demensky or Chempao was Chinese territory.[38] In 1968, Peking charged the Soviet Union of "social imperialism" when the Warsaw Pact powers intervened in Czechoslovakia. Thus, when the border clashes took place in 1969, the Chinese perceived the USSR as an enemy competing with the United States—the "capitalist imperialist"—for the status of number one enemy, therefore wedging into the immediate post-war bi-polar structure of world politics.

The United States Plan In Asia: The Late Sixties

Two other important events relevant to a discussion of the Sino-Soviet conflict took place in 1969. The first one was the enunciation of the Nixon Doctrine in July stating that the United States was in the process of disengaging her ground troops from Vietnam through "Vietnamization" (which would leave the burden cf fighting upon Vietnamese) and that there would not be any future commitment of American ground troops in any war in Asia. At the same time, aware of her being a West Pacific power, the United States stressed her intention of remaining in East Asia.

The second event took place in November 1969, on the occasion of Japanese Premier E. Sato's visit with President Nixon in Washington. The Joint Communique issued at the end of the visit stated that "The United States and Japan should cooperate in contributing to the peace and prosperity of the region... that the two Governments should maintain close contact with each other on matters affecting the peace and security of the Far East including Japan..."[39] By this statement, the United States implied the acceptance of Japan as a *partner* in keeping the peace of Asia and revealed part of the American response to the changing conditions in Asia's international environment, including the Soviet Union's creeping encirclement of China as Britain phased out her military forces from East of the

---

[37] M. Harrelson "Russia-Red China Clash Over Friendship Border," *Manila Times*, April 4, 1969, p. 7A.

[38] *Loc. cit.*

[39] Quoted in O. E. Clubb, "China, Russia and East Asia," *Pacific Community*, Vol. III, No. 4 (July 1972), p. 615.

Suez and as the United States planned to withdraw her ground forces from Asia.

The Russian Thrust Into Asia

The Soviet Union was then gaining leverage in East Asia. Sometime between early 1965 and mid-1966, around the time the Indonesian Army virtually routed the Peking-oriented *Partai Kommunis Indonesia,* planners in Moscow decided a major policy: the need for the Soviet Union to support the interest of indigenous races in national struggles throughout Southeast Asia. Having chosen this course, Moscow projected the Sino-Soviet struggle into Southeast Asia where Russians pointed to the "overseas Chinese" as Peking's Fifth Columns.[40] Russian Communist diplomacy made its inroads into Malaysia and Singapore through a series of cultural cooperation programs and trade missions energetically pushing commercial projects.

By 1966, Russia established a Russian trade office in Singapore and in February 1968, she sent an Ambassador to Malaysia and another one to Singapore, a few months later. In 1969, the Soviet Union launched an all-out diplomatic offensive in East Asia aimed at winning allies or, at least, securing neutrality in the Area. To Mongolia, North Korea, India, Pakistan, Afghanistan, Malaysia, Singapore and the Philippines, went Soviet leaders to confer with each of the leaders of these Asian countries. And in North Vietnam, the Russians exerted every effort to under-bid China with supplies of arms and promises of sweeping aid after the war.[41]

Besides the border clashes, the Soviet Union's naval activities in the Indian Ocean, which started sometime in 1968, have added to a significant display of power politics. They constituted components of Soviet strategy in her conflict with China. Reports have it that Indian "facilities" for Soviet ships have been exchanged for Russian arms and submarines.[42] Though Soviet merchant ships have requested for facilities in the Singapore dockyard, the Soviet naval authorities have not yet requested for similar services.[43] Singapore is perhaps of greater strategic significance to the Soviet Union than it is for the United States. If freedom of passage via Singapore is secured, it would allow the Russians to link up their Black Sea naval forces with her Pacific Fleet based on Vladivostock, after the Suez Canal is reopened.

---

[40] Ian Ward, "The Soviet Union's Growing Interest in Southeast Asia," *Mirror,* July 28, 1969, pp. 5-6.

[41] *Loc. cit.*

[42] K. C. Thaler, "Russia Prepares to Fill Asia's Strategic Vacuum," *Manila Chronicle,* June 24, 1969, p. 2.

[43] Ward, *op. cit.*, p. 6.

A Soviet naval arc linking the Black Sea to the Indian Ocean and the Western Pacific could contribute to the Soviet Union's nuclear strategy against China, especially after the conclusion of the new Soviet-Iraq treaty. It could also help outflank the Southern front of NATO and exercise considerable leverage on Western Europe as it could post a threat to the latter's oil supply. The treaty with India, aid to Bangladesh, and cultural as well as commercial push to Southeast Asia could have completed the encirclement of mainland China by the Soviet Union if Japan and Taiwan were added to the chain.[44]

Therefore, in January 1972, Mr. Gromyko visited Tokyo and suggested that his country and Japan start discussing a peace treaty. Dangling before Japan trade and investment possibilities in Siberia, Gromyko also half hinted that the territorial issues concerning the four Kuriles islands occupied by Soviet forces since 1945 could perhaps be negotiated. Soviet threat to, and a Soviet presence on, Japan's trade lanes anywhere in the Indian Ocean or the Western Pacific, including the waters south of Japan and east of Taiwan, could have been used as bargaining points with Japan.

The USSR's naval thrust into Asia is part of the position she has taken *vis a vis* her conflict with China which has contributed to the phasing out of the bi-polar world. And so has the Soviet Union's call for an Asian Collective Security Pact.

The Russian Call for Asian Collective Security

In the midst of all the international planning and bargaining among the powers of East Asia, the Soviet Party leader, Leonid Brezhnev, announced at the Moscow World Communist Summit early in 1969 that "the course of events is putting on the agenda the task of creating an Asian Collective Security."[45] Intended to differ from the existing "military and political blocs of imperialism"[46] in Asia, this proposal of creating an "Asian Collective Security" was defended by the Soviet Union as aiming at the establishment of good neighbor relations among Asian countries, including the People's Republic of China. In 1972, following the USSR's successful push into Asia, her alignment with India in the Indo-Pakistan war and her conclusion of a long-term treaty of friendship and assistance with India, the

[44] Yuan-Li Wu, "Planning Security for a Small Nation; Lessons from Singapore," *Pacific Community*, Vol. III, No. 4 (July 1972), pp. 672-673.

[45] Quoted in Thaler, *op. cit.*, p. 2. For the Russian view of the Asian Collective Security System, see G. V. Astafiev, "The Situation in the East Asia and the Collective Security," *Peace in Asia, op. cit.*, pp. 37-43. See also H. Kotani, "Asian Security and the Soviet Plan for a Regional Security," *ibid.*, pp. 27-35. Kotani dates the Russian concept of an Asian security system to as early as 1954.

[46] "Russia Defends Collective Security Plan for Asia," *Manila Chronicle*, July 10, 1969, p. 4. See also Astafiev, *op. cit.*

Soviet Union renewed her call for collective Asian Security Pact, after the idea initially found little response among Asian countries. While India was prepared to go along with the Plan, Pakistan rejected it categorically mainly because it was directed against China with whom she had friendly relations.[47]

In addition to her proposal for a Collective Asian Security Pact, the USSR took steps to secure her territory in the West, in the event of a Sino-Soviet crisis, through the enunciation of the Brezhnev Doctrine.

The Brezhnev Doctrine

Formulated by Leonid I. Brezhnev, General Secretary of the Soviet Communist Party, the "Brezhnev doctrine" first appeared in September 1968 in *Pravda,* the official party newspaper. The "doctrine" justified the invasion the previous month of Czechoslovakia by the Warsaw Pact nations. Briefly, it states that Communist nations had the right to take action — even military action — whenever the Communist System in one of its allies is threatened. For example, "liberalism" in Czechoslovakia was considered as such a threat.

Brezhnev reiterated the "doctrine" at the Twenty-Fourth Party Congress held in 1971 when he proposed for a disarmament conference of the world's nuclear powers. According to Brezhnev, the Soviet Union was ready to work closely with other nations in such fields as pollution, disease control, development of resources, communications and transportation in outer space and oceans — all these, now included in what is referred to as the "Brezhnev doctrine." The latter proposals are among those that are to be considered at the European Security and Cooperation Conference in Helsinki. They can be taken as the Soviet Union's hope for bringing the European continent to a new era of prosperity and peace *guaranteed by a system of collective security.* But they can also be viewed as the USSR's attempts at achieving the consolidation of Europe in the West because of her desire to secure her rear in case any conflict with China should take place in the East.[48]

---

[47] According to Mustafa, "...Unable to wean Pakistan away from China, the Soviet Union shifted her strategy from accommodating both India and Pakistan to more forthright support to New Delhi. In such a situation as the crisis in East Pakistan created, the Russians opted for India. The Treaty of Friendship was not only a formalization of the close ties India and the Soviet Union has had in the process of forging for a decade but also signified Russia's determination to uphold her position on the Asian land mass in competition with other powers and her decision to discard the policy of spreading commitments in favor of concentration on selected areas. The treaty was in reality Moscow's answer to the links Washington and Peking are now developing." Z. Mustafa, "The 1971 Crisis in Pakistan, India, the Soviet Union," *Pacific Community,* Vol. III, No. 3 April 1972), pp. 513-514.

[48] This was Brezhnev's response to the earlier move of the United States and her allies in NATO when, in 1968, it was proposed that the NATO and the

All the foregoing moves of the Soviet Union have been considered by some observers of world politics as part of the Soviet Union's endeavor to fill the "power vacuum" being created from Afghanistan to Korea as a result of British withdrawal and American disengagement from Asia. But these moves can also be interpreted (and they have been interpreted by China) as directed towards the containment of the People's Republic of China on the Asian mainland. It appears that the key to the Soviet Union's Asia strategy is the growing fear of mainland China as a result of the PRC's progress in the nuclear weapons field. The Soviet leaders seem apprehensive of the danger of growing Chinese pressures against Soviet Far Eastern territories, including the empty spaces of Siberia. Thus, Russia's invitation for the cooperation of Japan and the United States in the development of Siberia's natural resources, including oil and other extractive minerals.

As the Soviet Union maneuvered for a strategically strong position in dealing with the People's Republic of China, the latter attacked the efforts of the former in Asia as part of what seems to be a deliberate move to isolate China in the region and accused the United States (later, Japan) for entering into collusion with the Soviet Union. On the other hand, the Russians feared a possible accommodation between Peking and Washington in order to isolate the USSR. The 1972 Nixon visits to Peking and Moscow tend to belie both China's and the Soviet Union's fears that the United States would assist the enemy of one against the other.

The Nixon Visit to Peking

The Nixon visit to China in February 1972 appears, in part, a consequence of two factors. The first one was the United States' intention of disengaging her ground forces from Asia which was mentioned earlier; the second, China's realization at the turn of this decade that she was friendless and "encircled" by three powers — the Soviet Union, the United States and Japan — all guided by ideologies opposing Maoism. And so early in 1970, Mao Tse-tung intimated to the American writer, Edgar Snow, that he was ready to welcome a visit from the American president. This was after the

---

Warsaw Pact countries conduct discussions on mutual and belated reductions of their respective military forces. The Warsaw Pact, in its first partial response suggested in June 1970 a limited discussion. See M. H. Koenig, "U.S. Giving Brezhnev Speech Closer Study," *Manila Chronicle*, April 3, 1971, p. 2. See also "Soviet Chief Spells Out Key Policies of Russia," *Daily Mirror*, March 31, 1971, p. 2.

For a background of the "Brezhnev doctrine" see the following articles contributed by two Russian scholars to *Peace in Asia*, *op. cit.*, V.V. Zhurkin, "Realities of International Situation and Ways of Strengthening Peace," pp. 617-622 and A.A. Iskenderov, "Prospects for Creating a New International System," pp. 23-36.

United States openly supported by military force Lon Nol's leadership in Cambodia, and the Soviet Union assisted North Vietnam and North Korea individually but not China. Meanwhile, the Asian revolutionary united front faced the United States and her allies in Northeast, East and Southeast Asia, thus opening the possibilities of a Sino-American confrontation, with the Soviet Union standing aside.

Confronted by the realities of the times, China suddenly dropped the "revolutionary foreign policy" she pursued from 1962 through the Great Proletarian Revolution (from 1966 to mid-1969), and did a 180 degree turn to return to the Five Principles (*Panch Shila*) as enunciated in 1954 by Nehru and Chou En-lai. It should be recalled here that after China accepted these principles at Bandung, the Soviet Union's emphasis of co-existence, provoked China to charge the USSR with "modern revisionism" therefore ending the friendly relations between the two countries at the turn of the 1960's.

The Sino-Soviet Détente

On September 11, 1969, however, Chou En-lai and Alexei N. Kosygin met at the Peking airport. Before Kosygin flew out of the Chinese capital, a joint communique [49] was agreed upon which, among other things, transferred the border issue to the diplomatic table. The border clashes suddenly ceased and the following year, the two countries exchanged ambassadors. In November of the same year, a trade agreement was signed — the first one between the two countries since the suspension of trade relations in 1967.[50] But there appears to be no significant warming of Sino-Soviet relations. According to a report, "China's approach to the Soviet Union was an example of Peking's pragmatic diplomatic methods designed to further Chinese aims without making any compromises with Maoist principles."[51]

It was by reason of hard necessity, not ideology, that China moved into a détente with the Soviet Union late in 1969 when she must have been convinced by the military build-up of Russia along the borders that it would be dangerous to continue direct confronta-

---

[49] The joint communique provided for a five-point peace plan:
(1) The two countries should agree to reopen border talks;
(2) They should withdraw their troops from the border;
(3) Troops on each side of the border should be instructed to avoid opening fire on each other;
(4) Both countries should end attacks on each other in the press and on the radio;
(5) They should agree to work towards the restoration of trade and other economic ties.

See *Keesing's Contemporary Archives...* Vol. XXVII (London, 1969-1970), p. 23645.

[50] Lee Lescaze, "Despite Trade Agreement Sino-Soviet Relations Remain Cold," *Manila Chronicle*, December 31, 1972, p. 13.

[51] *Loc. cit.*

tion. She could also have observed that the United States, through the "Nixon Doctrine," meant to maintain a military presence in the West Pacific by shifting from reliance upon her ground forces to one upon aid and naval power with employment of "friendly Asians" for any ground action.

The leaders of the People's Republic of China were aware of the economic power of Japan, her next door neighbor. They had observed the increasing defense forces of Japan under the first three Defense Build-up Plan and then were apprehensive about the plans that were being prepared for the country's Fourth Defense Build-up Plan (1972-1976). Moreover, the PRC had hoped she could gain admission as a member of the United Nations which she did on October 25, 1971, when the United Nations General Assembly voted 76-31 (with 17 abstentions) for the admission of the People's Republic of China and the expulsion of Taiwan. Within this international forum, China can now confront the USSR, the United States, and other countries she desires to challenge.

Today, the bilateral border negotiations are continuing between the Soviet Union and China amidst sharp propaganda charges and mutual accusations.[52] It is evident that both sides would like to maintain the channel of communications between them as a sounding board and a forum where some accord might be reached, "if Peking thinks the time is ripe and Russia feels the price is right."[53] Meanwhile, China has been very busy restoring diplomatic and trade ties with other countries, including the United States, Britain, West Germany, Canada, and other countries in the West while relations with the Soviet Union remain strained. Russia, on the other hand, has launched a new pressure campaign for a collective security pact in Asia under Moscow's leadership to curve China's influence in East Asia.[54]

China's Deputy Foreign Minister, Chiao Kuan-hua, at the United Nations, attacked the Russian moves within the international sphere.[55] As mentioned earlier, China suspects the Soviet Union's interest in pushing a European Security conference as "a ruse to consolidate and expand her influence in Europe" in order to gain a free hand against Asia and China in particular. Russia retorted that Peking has been moving towards the attainment of leadership of the Third World in an attempt to undermine anew the Moscow-led Communist camp.[56] The Sino-Soviet conflict has moved into a new high gear,

[52] "Sino-Soviet Relations. Border Talks Resume in Peking," *Philippines Evening Express*, October 19, 1972, p. 7.
[53] *Loc. cit.*
[54] "Russia Presses on Asia Security Pact," *Philippines Daily Express*, October 21, 1972, p. 7.
[55] "As Vietnam War Nears End, Russia, China Maneuver for 'sphere of influence,'" *Times Journal*, November 17, 1972, p. 2.
[56] *Loc. cit.*

reminiscent of the height of the "explosive conflict" a few years ago, with Russia and China maneuvering for rival power positions in Asia following the end of the Vietnam war.[57]

In sum, the Sino-Soviet conflict in the 1960's and other related developments which were discussed earlier, have caused changes in the international order and power alignments, particularly in Asia, hitherto gravitating around two power poles immediately after World War II.

IV

THE UNITED STATES AND JAPAN: LOOSENING OF DYADIC TIES

Unlike the abrupt termination in 1960 of the post-war dyadic (patron-client) relations between the People's Republic of China and the Soviet Union, similar ties between Japan and the United States have been phasing into a "partnership" more apparently taking shape in the late sixties. Making some observers of the international scene identify Japan as a power pole in a "quadrilateral" balance of power within the Asian region in the 1970's, the present "partnership" has been the result of a series of decisions made by American decision-makers since 1949, when mainland China became Communist. Faced with a *fait accompli* on the mainland and torn between it and the crises in other parts of the world (contingent to her role of leader of the "Free World" bloc, and her increasing economic problems at home), the United States realized the imperative of making peace with Japan. The American policy-makers recognized the need of strengthening Japan's economy by removing the proposed punitive provisions of the peace treaty and of rehabilitating her industries, if Japan was to serve as a major factor in the "Free World bloc's" defense against Communism in Asia.

The three-year period of the Korean war boosted Japan's economy and enabled her to rehabilitate from the ravages of war. Procurement for the United Nations military forces in Korea stimulated Japan's industrial production which increased and improved as American financial and technical aid were extended to equip new Japanese industries or modernize pre-existing ones. Constituting the foundations of her industrial recovery in the second half of the fifties — Japan's "Second Industrial Revolution" — it also made possible the Japanese government's deliberate policy of global trade expansion which catapulted the country to the world's third economic power before the end of the sixties — Japan's "economic miracle."

[57] *Loc. cit.*

The United States has contributed to this "economic miracle" by assuming the cost for the defense of Japan whose no-war constitution does not allow her to build up her armed forces and a nuclear capability. Within a decade from 1955, when Japan formulated her first economic plan (at a time she experienced for the first time in her history the largest rice crop and a $500 million balance of payments surplus),[58] to 1965, Japan had gone through a series of booms and recessions. Before the end of the period, Japan had rebuilt her industrial sector and accumulated a surplus of $2,000 million in 1964.[59]

Japan's Economic Rehabilitation
And Expansion of Trade With Asia

From the mid-fifties to mid-sixties, America urged Japan to re-establish ties with the Southeast Asian countries which, in Dulles' view, could re-orient Japanese economy towards this region and away from mainland China, Japan's traditional trading partner.[60] Marking the decade (1955-1965) were Japan's negotiations and settlement of her reparations payments with the countries she occupied during the last war and her conclusion of other bilateral agreements with them. Japanese foreign aid to Southeast Asia during this decade was largely channeled to the agricultural sector and given from commercial motives without much self-conscious relation to broader political objectives in Asia.[61]

> Aid was given grudgingly, on stringent terms with one eye on the balance of payments. Nobody wanted to throw away his hard-earned money on the undeserving poor of Asia. Most people with money to invest was beguiled by the chances of bigger profits at home.[62]

Japan's continuing economic growth since 1955 led her to deviate after 1958 from Dulles' earlier plan, *i.e.*, the plan of preventing Japan to deal with the PRC, when the USSR terminated her economic and security assistance to China. It will be recalled that trading relations with mainland China were undertaken under the principle of "separate economics from politics" and through "friendly firms."

---

58 L. Olson, *Japan in Post War Asia* (New York, 1970), pp. 21-22.

59 Japanese Ministry of Foreign Affairs, *Foreign Investment in Japan* (Tokyo, 1968), p. 4.

60 Address of J. Foster Dulles delivered on March 1, 1951 entitled "Laying the Foundation for a Pacific Peace," *Department of State Bulletin*, Vol. XXIV, No. 610 (Washington, D.C., 1951), p. 403.

61 Olson, *op. cit.*, p. 138. The Overseas Technical Cooperation Agency records that in 1955-1967, Japan sent mainly under the Colombo Plan arrangements, 488 technical specialists in all fields to Southeast Asia, including 120 in agriculture, the largest single category. Within the same period, Japan received 3,935 trainees in all fields from Southeast Asia, 794 of them in agriculture, again the largest category, *Ibid.*, p. 153.

62 *Ibid.*, p. 138.

This was supplemented by a Japanese-government-supervised trade initiated in 1962 under the Liao-Takasaki Agreement (LT), and in 1968, under the Memorandum Trade Agreement (MT). In effect, Japan was beginning to extricate herself from a close dyadic attachment to the United States (a feature of the post-war bi-polar world order) towards a more independent foreign policy posture which became increasingly so in the second half of the 1960's.

Already discernible in the polemics of the Japanese intellectuals and politicians since the 1960's, has been the reviving nationalism expressed in the desire for detachment from American ties and Japan's involvement in international activities apart from the United States. Articulated in the Japanese views of their country's new political roles *vis a vis* the "super powers" which they have termed as the "East-West problem," this awakened nationalism has also touched on Japan's economic role in the "North-South problem" involving her relations with the developing countries south of Japan.[63]

Japan's Economic Growth And Economic Aid to Asia

Since 1965, Japan's foreign policy has shifted from "Low Posture" to a "Forward Looking" policy, her response to a series of international developments taking place during the period. Among them were: the American escalation of the Vietnam war, which took place a year after China's nuclear explosion in 1964; the Chinese Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution; the US-USSR moves toward a power balance based on the concept of a "balance of terror in arms"; the critical domestic problems confronting the United States and the Soviet Union; the trend towards regionalism in Southeast Asia which Japan viewed as threatening to isolate her, as well as Japan's increasing concern for the security of the Malacca strait through which a large part of her oil supply and her trade are ferried by Japanese ships.

Premier Sato, who was confronted at the end of the sixties by a rapidly expanding economy generated by Premier Ikeda's economic plan of "Income Doubling," led his country into deeper involvement in Asia's regional organization.[64] Sato's government was also responsible in expanding trade with, and investment in, Taiwan and South Korea with whom Japan successfully negotiated a normalization agreement in 1965. Economically assisting the develop-

---

[63] The Japanese ideas expressed in various literary sources and official documents are summarized by Olson. *Ibid.*, pp. 118-158.

[64] For instance, Japan joined the Asian Parliamentarian's Union (APU), the Asian and Pacific Council (ASPAC) and the Asian Development Bank all of which included some or all members of such sub-regional organizations like ASEAN established in 1967 by Malaysia, Thailand, the Philippines, Singapore and Indonesia.

ing countries of Southeast Asia[65] so they can attain political stability and economic viability, was a concern of Japan who was aware that her economic prosperity and security depended on the peace and security of the rest of Asia. All this coincided with American hopes that Japan would increasingly share the responsibility of aiding developing countries and contributing to the peace and security of Asia.

The gradual detachment of Japan's dyadic ties with the United States in the late sixties was also a function of America's restoration of Japanese integral territories occupied since the end of the war. And it was a consequence of the resolve of the United States and Britain — traditional partners and war-time allies — to partially or completely withdraw their military forces from Asia.

Presaged in the agreements of the Summit Conferences held in Manila on October 24-25, 1966, was America's plan in Asia which was spelled out in July 1969, in the "Nixon Doctrine." The chiefs of state of the Philippines, the Republic of Vietnam, the Republic of Korea, Thailand, the United States, Australia and New Zealand indorsed a plan at Manila for troop withdrawal from Vietnam in their six-point plan for Vietnam stated in the final communique.[66] This was supplemented by the four "Goals of Freedom for Asia" and a "Declaration of Peace and Progress in Asia and the Pacific" which elaborated the four goals namely, (1) to be free from aggression; (2) to conquer hunger, illiteracy and disease; (3) to build a region of security, order and progress; and (4) to seek reconciliation and peace throughout Asia and the Pacific.[67]

The British Withdrawal
From East of the Suez

Not included in the Summit, Britain unexpectedly responded to what she perhaps viewed as the forthcoming changes in the Asian scene, by announcing in July 1967, her plans of massive military withdrawals from the "Far East" and a total pull out from her strategic bases in Singapore and Malaysia by mid-1970's. This move reflected the vital political and economic problems that the British Labor Party faced at home. It underscored Britain's growing emphasis on her cooperation with Europe, particularly with the EEC which she was intending to join.

---

65 Japan, for example, organized the Japanese Overseas Cooperation Volunteers (JOCV) or the "Peace Corps" who extended technical assistance to the recipient developing countries of Asia. She also called the Ministerial Conference for the Economic Development of Southeast Asia in April 1966 which has been meeting annually since then.

66 F. Pascual, "Allies Offer Troop Pullout— 6-point Peace Plan Indorsed," *Manila Times*, October 26, 1966, p. 1.

67 *Loc. cit.*

On the assumption that by 1975 the Vietnam war would be long over, the British defense planners held that Britain's military withdrawal from east of the Suez would not affect American position in Southeast Asia, despite American request for Britain to remain.[68] Moreover, the British leaders could have decided on the plan after having been convinced that, through regional cooperation extended by various international agencies (in some of which, like ECAFE, Britain was a member), the developing countries of Asia could be assisted in their endeavors to achieve economic development and security.

Britain's abdication from her ambitious and traditional role of global peacekeeper as well as her withdrawal from Asia as a major military power, took place in October 1971, without much fanfare and earlier than projected by her defense planners.[69]. But not before she signed earlier, in April, a Consultative Pact with her four overseas Commonwealth partners of the region—Australia, New Zealand, Malaysia and Singapore — an arrangement referred to as the "Little (British) Commonwealth SEATO" by the Philippines' Secretary of Foreign Affairs, Carlos P. Romulo.[70] Romulo also questioned whether the defense alliance was intended "to be part of the British, Australian and New Zealand contribution to SEATO or whether they will constitute an independent or even rival regional command."[71]

Japan's Demands For The Restoration Of Integral Territories

In November 1967, the year Britain announced her proposed withdrawal from the Far East and following Sato's eleven-nation tour of Southeast Asia and the Southwest Pacific, Prime Minister Sato met with President Johnson in Washington. The Prime Minister reported the desire for peace among Southeast Asian leaders and their fear of Communist China.[72]

---

[68] This was a plan included in the Labor Government's White Paper of 1967 projecting Britain's overall strategy in the seventies. It provided for phased withdrawals from the the Far East despite American requests for continued British military presence East of the Suez. See "U.K. to Withdraw Troops from Asia," *Manila Chronicle*, July 19, 1967, p. 2. See also "Far East Forces Delay in U.K. Pullout Seen," *Manila Chronicle*, July 20, 1967, p. 3; "Sun Sets—Britain Announces Pullout from Asia," *Manila Daily Bulletin*, January 18, 1968, p. 1.

[69] "U.K. Leaves Singapore," *Manila Chronicle*, October 31, 1971, p. 2.

[70] C.P. Romulo, "Why the 'Little (British) Commonwealth SEATO,' in Treaty Area" (Statement on matters affecting the treaty area during the 16th SEATO Ministerial Council Meeting in London, April 27, 1971, 1), *Philippines Herald*, May 2, 1972. See also Gerber, *op. cit.*, p. 437.

[71] "RP Questions Little Commonwealth SEATO," *Philippines Herald*, April 29, 1971, p. 1.

[72] "Sato Cites SEA Nation's Concern for Security," *Manila Times*, November 16, 1967, p. 13-A.

In the Joint Communique issued at the end of the meeting, Johnson and Sato agreed on immediate consultations concerning the return of Japan's full sovereignty over the Bonin Islands. Sato expressed the intention of the Japanese government "gradually to assume much of the responsibility for the defense of the area."[73] The agreement on the transfer of the Bonin and the Volcano Islands to Japan was signed on April 5, 1968. It provided that the United States would continue using the Loran navigational stations on Iwo Jima and Chichi Jima in accordance with the "Status of Forces Agreement between Japan and the United States." However, all other installations and sites were to be transferred to Japan.[74]

After the return of the Bonin Islands to Japan, Premier Sato said that Japan could not consider her independence restored until she regained sovereignty over Okinawa and the islands of the South Kuriles, especially the larger islands of Kunashiri, Etorufu, Habomai, and Shikotan, which were integral parts of pre-war Japan. However, the Russians occupied them by agreement at the Yalta Conference and under the terms of the San Francisco Peace Treaty.[75] As Russia never signed the Peace Treaty, Japan is now using it as an argument to hasten negotiations for a Soviet Union-Japan peace treaty which hopefully would settle in her favor her claims to the south Kurile islands.

The Kuriles area is the center of a fishing ground of Japan's vital fishing industry. Therefore, the islands claimed by Japan are important to the safety of Japanese fishermen who at present find themselves in Soviet territorial waters almost instantly after leaving Hokkaido. In fact, since 1945, the Russians have seized over one thousand fishing boats and arrested more than 10,000 Japanese fishermen.[76] But the Soviet Union has remained unwilling to negotiate with Japan on the Kuriles, although she seems to have recently relaxed her hitherto rigid position because of the continuing Sino-Soviet conflict and therefore the need for Russia to court Japan's goodwill if only to prevent a Sino-Japanese alliance that could threaten the Soviet Union's Asian territory. Under this circumstance,

---

[73] "Japan-United States; Mr. Sato's Visit to Washington, Discussions with President Nixon, Agreement on the return of Okinawa to Japan by 1972," *Keesing's Contemproray Archives*, Vol. XVII (London, 1969-1970), pp. 23698-23699. "Japan to Get Bonins Again," *Manila Times*, November 17, 1967, p. 2-A.

[74] "U.S. Agrees to Return Bonin," *Sunday Chronicle*, April 7, 1968, p. 3. See also "Costliest Real Estate. Japan Gets Back Iwo Jima from U.S.A.," *Manila Chronicle*, June 24, 1968, p. 2.

[75] P. Newsom, "Land Claims. Japan Seeks Return of Kuriles which Russia Got in Yalta Meet," *Manila Chronicle*, January 29, 1969, p. 5. See also "The Kurile—A Major Impediment to Closer Soviet-Japanese Relations," *Asia Research Bulletin, Systematized Data Abstracts, Statistics, Analyses, Comment*, Vol. I, No. 5, (October 1971), pp. 323-324.

[76] Newsom, *op. cit.*, p. 5.

it appears that Japan will deal with this territorial issue in her own way and time.

As to the restoration of Okinawa to Japan, the Johnson-Sato Communique of November 1967, established an Advisory Committee to the U.S. High Commissioner of the Ryukyus Islands including Okinawan, Japanese and American government representatives. The Committee was to recommend ways of removing the economic and social barriers between the Ryukyus and Japan proper.[77] The November 1969 Joint Communique issued at the end of the meeting in Washington by President Nixon and Prime Minister Sato, included an agreement that the administrative rights over Okinawa would return to Japan in 1972.[78] On this occasion, Premier Sato said, "I find the shape of a new Pacific Age when a new order will be created by Japan and the United States, two countries tied together by common ideals."[79] Sato's statement suggests a "partnership" was formed between the United States and Japan; the relationship between the two countries was now veering further away from a patron-client or dyadic relationship.

Okinawa was finally restored to Japan on May 15, 1972, after the following legal steps were taken: the signing of the Japan-U.S. Agreement on June 17, 1971 stating the reversion to Japan of the Ryukyu and the Daito Islands as well as the exchange of the Instruments of Ratification of this agreement on March 5, 1972.[80]

Related to the restoration of the Ryukyus is another Japanese territorial issue. It is concerned with Japan's claim of the Senkaku or the Tiao Yu Tai Islands which have been contested by the Republic of Korea and Taiwan since a 1967 ECAFE survey indicated that there might be valuable deposits of oil under the East China Sea.[81] Japan has had historical claims to the Senkakus which were discovered by a Japanese sailor in 1844 and annexed by the Japanese government in 1896.[82] The stand of Taiwan is based on the Continental Shelf Convention which would clearly give the Senkakus to her. Taiwan believes that Japan lost her right to the islands when she gave up her overseas territory in the San Francisco Peace Treaty. On the other hand, Japan pointed out that the Chinese claim was

[77] "Japan to Get Bonins Again," *op. cit.*, p. 2-A.

[78] "Reversion of Okinawa Hailed," *Manila Daily Bulletin*, June 21, 1972, p. 2. The date for the return of the Ryukyus was set on May 15, 1972 by Nixon and Sato at the San Clemente Summit on January 6-7, 1972. See A.E. Kaff, "After 27-year U.S. Rule: Japan Gets Okinawa," *Manila Chronicle*, November 23, 1969, p. 5.

[79] "Sato Sees New Age of Ties in Pacific," *Manila Chronicle*, November 23, 1969, p. 5.

[80] "Reversion of Okinawa..." *op. cit.*, p. 2. See also Kaff, *op. cit.*, p. 5.

[81] "Japan May Suspend Senkaku Oil Projects," *Manila Times*, March 5, 1971, p. 16.

[82] F. H. Marks, "Japan, Taiwan, Korea Assert Claim to China Oil Reserves," *Manila Daily Bulletin*, October 19, 1972, p. 9.

illegal and the Senkakus were to be returned to Japan along with Okinawa. Together with the Ryukyus and the Daito Islands, the Senkaku Islands were reverted to Japan by the United States in May 1972. Since then, Japan's 11th Regional Maritime Safety Headquarters announced in December of that year, that a total of 169 Taiwanese fishing boats had intruded into Japanese territorial waters around Senkaku Islands.[83]

The U.S.-Japan Agreement on Okinawa allowed American military bases to remain in Okinawa under arrangements of the U.S.-Japan Security Treaty. But these bases have been the targets of demonstrations, work stoppages and slow-downs as a result of the Okinawan resentment to continued American presence on the island. An American official who acts as a buffer between the island's prefectual government and the American military establishment is reported to have said: "There can be no doubt that the emotional aspects of the issue of American presence here far outweigh practical considerations such as jobs."[84]

At the end of 1972, Japan was faced, on the one hand, with an option to retain the American protecting nuclear umbrella; on the other hand, with the political outcry against the American role in Vietnam. The Japanese government could give up American protection by ending the U.S.-Japan Security Treaty which was renewed in 1970 with the proviso that it can be abrogated within a year's notice. This could indeed cut off the last significant dyadic link between Japan and the United States. But could this be accommodated within the American plan of the security of East and Southeast Asia in the 1970's first outlined in the "Nixon Doctrine?"

The "Nixon Doctrine"

The "Nixon Doctrine," mentioned earlier, coincided with and helped to generate a restructuring of the regional power balance in East Asia. Portending lessened American political activities in this region and reduced commitment to the defense of Asian countries, the "Nixon Doctrine" provided for the retention of American naval and air power within the area and the honoring of existing agreements with Asian nations.[85] It was a response to tendencies already developing and apparent in East Asia even before Nixon became President of the United States.

At the time the doctrine was enunciated, the United States was confronted by domestic burdens and increasing opposition against the Vietnam war as well as the cost of supporting America's role

[83] *Japan Times*, December 9, 1972, p. 2.

[84] "Accepts Chou Invitation; Talks Bared," *Daily Mirror*, July 16, 1971, p. 1.

[85] *U.S. Foreign Policy for the 1970's. Building for Peace. A Report to the Congress* by R. Nixon, February 25, 1971, pp. 4-8.

of global *gendarme* she assumed since the Pacific war's end, a role she now was convinced she could not continue performing everywhere. It was quite clear in July 1969 that the United States' intervention in Vietnam had failed to bring peace. And the power balance in East Asia was in the process of radical change. Not only was there a diminishing British military presence east of the Suez but the Soviet Union, locked in ideological struggle with Peking, was asserting a naval presence in the Indian Ocean, improving relations with the countries of Southeast Asia, and had even proposed a Moscow-led collective Asian Security Pact China interpreted as intending to isolate her in Asia. On the other hand, China continued to pursue her nuclear role and showed renewed interest in international affairs, following the dislocation and confusion of the Cultural Revolution. Japan had not only risen to the world's third industrial power but was also favoring an active Japanese political role in insuring the growth, stability and security of the Asian region.

After announcing that in the future American willingness to move to the defense of other nations would be limited, Nixon moved to scale down American military commitment in Vietnam and sought a meeting of minds with leaders of the People's Republic of China. As a consequence, the assumption from which American-established-post-World-War-II policy flowed were questioned, and Nixon's moves had unsettling effects upon the official attitudes of Asian and Pacific countries.

For example, in mid-1960's, Japan who was then seeking to create a new balance between reliance on the United States' strategic protection, on the one hand, and increased political independence on the other, had misgivings about the "Nixon Doctrine." But these were soon offset by America's readiness in November 1969 to return Okinawa to Japanese control.

The Nixon "Shokku"

Depending on United States military protection and a high-profile American presence in Asia as guarantees of stability, the Nixon moves awakened Japan to the reality that she now had to be prepared to formulate and pursue her own policies which had to be flexible. Japan, for instance, could be more free to pursue her own policies *vis a vis* China and Taiwan. Yet Japan was caught unprepared to face the Nixon "shokku" which took place a month apart of each other: on July 15, 1971 and August 15, 1971.

On the first date, President Nixon announced his plan of visiting mainland China before May 1972 at the invitation of Premier Chou En-lai. An unpredicted move of the United States, it took place fourteen days after the National Liberation Front's Seven-Point Plan was presented to the Americans at the Paris Peace talks. This plan included the idea that the United States and the Peoples of Indo-China settle the war between themselves without the PRC's interference. The plan also provided a prescription for South Vietnam's future foreign policy following the end of the Vietnam war which was to be one of peace and neutrality. In other words, South Vietnam was to establish relations with all countries, regardless of their political and social regime, in accordance with the five principles of co-existence (*Panch Shila*).[86] The Vietcongs' stand on *Panch Shila* appears to have coincided with Russia's support of these principles and the PRC's return in 1969 to the same principles she had previously advocated in 1955 at Bandung but repudiated in 1960 when she charged Russia of "modern revisionism" because of Russia's firm stand on co-existence.

All this suggests that by 1971, despite continuing cleavages among nations rallying around power poles, there existed certain principles that could be used as starting points for negotiation or dialogue among the Communists in the Asian region, if not between them and the non-Communists. The principles of co-cxistence and neutrality could have also influenced the five ASEAN countries meeting in November 1971 (a month after the PRC's entry into the United Nations) to express their desire for the neutralization of Southeast Asia and turn it into a "zone of peace, freedom, and neutrality" guaranteed by the big powers, but insulated from their great-power competition.

On the second date — August 15 — exactly one month after President Nixon made known to the world his intention of going to Peking, Nixon imposed an immediate ninety-day-freeze of all wages, prices and rents and an immediate ten percent surcharge (in effect, a duty) on about one-half of all the goods imported into the country to stop the dollar flow out of the United States. President Nixon also suspended the convertibility of the dollar thus allowing the value of the U.S. dollar to float in its relation to other currencies.[87]

The economic decision announced by President Nixon developed from the dollar crisis which was partly attributed to America's Vietnam war spending that had piled up dollars abroad. Moreover, the oversupply overseas of U.S. dollars, especially in Europe (Eurodollars), developed from payments for a rising volume of American imports due to higher prices of American goods caused by the long inflation within the United States, and the deliberate spending of dollars outside the country to obtain higher interest earnings avail-

[86] "Indo-China War Peace Talks," *Keesing's Contemporary Archives* (London, February 5-12, 1972), p. 25077. See also Clubb, *op. cit.*, p. 620.

[87] "Nixon Freezes Wages, Prices; Dollar to Float," *Manila Times*, August 17, 1971, p. 1.

able in some European countries and elsewhere.[88] Because approximately one-third of Japan's total trade was with the United States and irritations had increased in the two countries' trading relations owing to the highly competitive Japanese products like textile, cars, electric equipment, and the like, newspaper reports have it that Japan felt she was the target of Nixon's "new economic policy."

Both the July 15 and the August 15 announcements shocked ("shokku") not only the Japanese political and economic decision-makers who were not forewarned but also Japanese society, in general. Japan suffered a diplomatic blow to which she was unable to respond immediately and from which she has been recovering.

All this contributed to the slowly deteriorating mutual trust between the United States and Japan. As Emerson puts it,

> The diminution in Japanese-American trust in 1971 grew not only from the irritation of the textile controversy, but more fundamentally from American embroilment in the Vietnam war, pre-occupation with China, American anxiety over trade and payments deficits and Japanese economic competition... the "China shock" resulted not so much from what we [i.e., the Americans] did as from how we did it...[89]

The two Nixon "shokku" had a global effect. Not only was their impact felt by Japan who realized the urgency of taking a more independent posture in her political and economic relations with other countries of the world, but also in western European states as well as the Third World nations. Later that year, the United States warned Western Europe that the Americans meant to "defend vigorously" her trade interests which were to be jeopardized by special arrangements being negotiated between the European Community and the six countries of the European Free Trade Association (EFTA).[90]

Japan viewed Nixon's "new economic policy" as indicative of a trend towards "protectionism" at a time she was facing a similar development emerging within the Eurobloc. Yet, on October 25, 1971, at the United Nations General Assembly, Japan supported the United States stand on "two China," to the subsequent embarrassment of the Sato administration. The PRC's entry into the United Nations and the expulsion of the Republic of China, caused Japan to completely re-examine and re-study her China policy.

Perhaps as a gesture of appreciation for Japan's support of the United States' stand on the China issue at the United Nations and of making up for the lack of notice to Japan before Nixon's

---

[88] "The Dollar Crisis. What and Whys," *Manila Times*, May 7, 1971, p. 16.

[89] J. K. Emerson, "The United States and Japan: Uneasy Partner," *Pacific Community*, Vol. III, No. 4 (July 1972), p. 627.

[90] "U.S. Assails EEC, EFTA Trade Ties," *Daily Mirror*, November 1, 1971, p. 10.

announcement of his China visit and his "new economic policy," the American President invited Premier Sato to a summit conference at San Clemente, a month before his trip to Peking in February 1972. For Japan's consent to opening wider her market to American exporters, Sato was briefed on Nixon's intentions toward China and secured an agreement for an earlier reversion of Okinawa to Japanese control as well as the creation of a Tokyo-Washington "hot line,"[91] which can be taken as a symbol of Japan's changing status within the Asian if not within the world scene.

While these developments can be interpreted as moving Japan further away from her immediate post-war dyadic relations with the United States, it simultaneously reinforced the recently established position of Japan as an American "partner" in maintaining the international order within the Asian and Pacific region. This leaves Japan's security ties with the United States as the remaining significant factor of Japan's post-war dyadic relations with the United States. Briefly, Japan today is not yet a partner of the United States on an "equal" basis.

Certainly, at the beginning of 1972, Japan had moved a long way from a "client" state of her "patron" — the United States — the leading power among the Allied Powers in the Pacific, to whom Japan surrendered at the end of the war. Japan started to loosen her dyadic ties with the United States following her rehabilitation in the mid-fifties. As she proceeded in an unprecedented expansion of her economic growth in the 1960's, a feat which gave her late in the decade the economic capability of a "super power," and as the United States returned to Japan the areas she occupied after the war which were Japan's pre-war integral territories, the dyadic ties phased into a "partnership," though Japan is not yet an equal "partner." Japan's request for the return of her northern islands remains unheeded by the Soviet Union who has been unwilling to negotiate with Japan on the southern Kurile islands. The givens of the present Asian international environment, however, might change the Soviet Union's present stand in a manner favorable to Japan. Achieving the position of a creditor country owing to the economic power she acquired, Japan has become an economic-assistance-dispensing-country to the developing states of the world, especially to those of the East and Southeast Asian regions.

Developments during 1972, have proven that Japan can make and implement decisions within the international spheres independently of the United States. It is not inconceivable that the *Panch Shila's* five principles of co-existence as guidelines for the pursuance

[91] "More Yen for Nixon, a Hotline for Sato," *Manila Chronicle*, January 8, 1972, p. 3. See also "Nixon-Sato Confab Ends," *Manila Times*, January 9, 1972, p. 7.

and the promotion of world peace as well as the realities of international politics within the Asian and Pacific region at the turn of this decade, directed Japan's resolve to initiate moves in the international scene independently of the United States. For example, her normalization of her ties with China in late September 1972.

Japan's acceptance as an American "partner" in Asia and her normalization of relations with China are evidence of the eroded post-war bi-polar world power order. They have paved the way for the emergence of a new world power structure, the form of which is neither clear nor set in the early seventies.

V

THE EMERGING WORLD POWER STRUCTURE IN THE EARLY SEVENTIES AND EAST ASIAN INTERNATIONAL POLITICS

The emergence of the European Economic Community as an economic power pole, the conflict between the USSR and China terminating in the late fifties their patron-client relations, as well as the changing American Asian policy that contributed to the loosening of dyadic relations betwen the United States and Japan in the sixties, were the results of, or causes of other developments in the world. They contributed to the phasing out of the immediate post-war bi-polar world order and the appearance in the early seventies of a new world order.

In the first instance, the European Economic Community (EEC), the world's largest trading unit today, continues to depend on NATO for its security as it expands its associational relations to countries like those belonging to ASEAN. The voice of EEC can now be heard (perhaps not yet as one united voice) in international security and economic cooperation conferences led by the United States and the USSR, who have remained as the leading "superpowers." For example, at the current meetings of the European Security and Cooperation Conference at Helsinki and the negotiations on Mutual Balance of Forces Reduction (MBFR) involving the NATO and the Warsaw Pact countries. The increased economic power of the EEC has caused apprehensions not only to the USSR but also to Japan who has introduced, among others, the idea of a joint effort among the Pacific basin countries to obtain a bargaining power equal to the EEC. The EEC is now sometimes considered as one of five power poles in world politics — the other four being the U.S.A., the USSR, China and Japan.

Rooted in ideological and other differences between the Soviet Union and China in the late fifties, the Sino-Soviet conflict ended the patron-client relations between the two countries in the 1960's. The conflict and developments relevant to it, like the restoration of the China-Japan trade relations after the war, France's recognition of China, China's acquisition of nuclear capability, the Sino-Soviet border conflict, the changes in the United States plan in Asia, the Russian thrust into Asia and the call for Asian collective security by the Soviet Union, the Brezhnev doctrine, the Nixon visit to Peking and the Sino-Soviet détente late in the sixties, resulted in what has been described as the "triangle diplomacy" in East Asia during the opening years of the seventies.

Involving the United States, the Soviet Union and China, the "triangle diplomacy" can be viewed as stemming off from developments in Asia, including Japan's rise to the rank of the third economic power in the world though remaining a non-nuclear state. Japan's economic rehabilitation and expansion of trade with Asia and the rest of the world (especially with the United States) in the fifties, brought rapid economic growth (an "economic miracle") to Japan and Japanese economic assistance to Asia in the sixties.

All these developments took place during the last decade when Asia witnessed the British withdrawal from east of the Suez and the announcement by President Nixon of America's decision to withdraw her ground troops from Asia, though retaining her naval and air power, even as he assured the Asian countries with which the United States had existing agreements that such agreements would be honored. These series of events along with the return to Japan of her integral territories temporarily held by the United States since the war's end, transformed the dyadic relations between Japan and the United States into one of partnership (though not yet an "equal partnership") by the turn of the seventies. In 1972, a year after the two Nixon "shokku," Japan took a course of action independent of the United States when she normalized her relations with China in September, 1972. However, Japan continues to depend on her security agreement with the United States because of her "no-war" constitution restricting Japan from building herself up into a nuclear power.

At the end of 1972, it was quite clear that the bi-polar world order had eroded, a development which had influenced international politics in East Asia. Nevertheless, the leaders of the immediate post-war power blocs — the "Free World bloc" and the "Communist bloc"—continue to be the first and second ranking economic powers reckoned in GNP. These two "superpowers" also possessed "nuclear parity" which has served to stabilize mutual deterrence that appears to have reached a stage of being institutionalized by inter-government agreements in the early seventies. The United States and the Soviet Union concluded in May 1972 the first agreement, following the first round of Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT), and resumed the second round in November.[92] The "super-powers," as they are called, have also been the only countries possessing conventional forces equipped with global mobility.[93]

The full text of the Joint Accord between the United States and the USSR signed on May 29, 1972 after the first round of SALT, opened with an agreement that the two countries would conduct their relations on the basis of co-existence for "in the nuclear age there is no alternative to conducting their mutual relations." It continues with a statement that "Differences in ideology and in the social systems of the USA and the USSR are not obstacles to the bilateral development of normal relations based on the principles of sovereignty, equality, non-interference in internal affairs and mutual advantage."[94] These principles, which echo those of the *Panch Shila*, are also incorporated in the "US-China Communique" or the "Shanghai Communique" signed on February 28, 1972.[95]

The Shanghai Communique provides that while both parties recognize the existence of differences in their social systems and foreign policies, "the two sides agreed that countries, regardless of their social systems, should conduct their relations on the principles of respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of all states, non-aggression against other states, non-interference in the internal affairs of other states, equality and mutual benefit, and peaceful co-existence. International disputes should be settled on this basis, without resorting to the use or threat of force..."[96]

With the two agreements in view, it can be said that the United States and the Soviet Union as well as the United States and China agreed to be governed by the principles of co-existence or the principles of *Panch Shila* enunciated in the mid-fifties. Can it also be assumed that the countries involved in the "triangle diplomacy" in

---

[92] "U.S., Russ Start SALT-2 Talks," *Bulletin Today*, November 22, 1972, p. 4. According to this report, the first SALT round which lasted two and a half years resulted in the restriction of anti-ballistic missiles (ABM's) to two sites for each side, each side comprising not more than 100 rockets. It also temporarily suspended for five years any increase of intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBM's). In the second SALT round, the United States and the USSR hope to make the suspension of five years a permanent arrangement and, if possible, reduce the number of missiles. But it seems difficult to limit not only missiles but also the nuclear warheads with which they are tipped. Under the existing agreements, both sides are free to deploy increasingly destructive and subtle warheads, especially the independently guided warheads known as MIRV's of which as much as ten can be launched by just one rocket. Both countries will however face the problem of how to stop further underground nuclear testing by which these modern warheads are developed for small blasts could be held without anyone being able to tell the difference.

[93] O. Miyoshi, "Prospects for the New International System," *Peace in Asia*, p. 1.

[94] "Full Text of Joint Accord Betwen US, Soviet Russia," *Manila Times*, February 28, 1972, p. 8.

[95] "US-China Communique," *Manila Times*, February 28, 1972, p. 8.

[96] *Loc. cit.*

East Asia — the United States, the Soviet Union and China — would work among themselves within the framework of the principles of co-existence?

By the end of 1972, while the international situation was highly fluid, the outline of an emerging power structure was discernible. It was, as H. Kissinger described it, bi-polar militarily and multi-polar politically [97] and economically.

[97] Quoted in Miyoshi, *op. cit.*, p. 1.