Identifications: Answer ONLY 2 IDs: based on readings and class lectures, explain the significance of 2 of the following:

1. Ho Chi Minh
   Answer: Father of modern Vietnamese nationalism. Ho started as a Wilsonian liberal who attended the Versailles Peace Conference in 1919 to lobby Wilson to press France to give Vietnam its independence. When his efforts failed Ho became a communist. During World War II Ho and his communists rescued downed American pilots when Vietnam was occupied by Japan. In 1954 Ho and his communists defeated the French, and then went on to fight US efforts to defend South Vietnam as a separate independent and non-communist state. Ho died before Communist North Vietnam won the Second Indochina War and absorbed South Vietnam.

2. EAS Answer: The East Asia Summit: First held in December 2005. This summit was based upon a Chinese and Malaysian proposal to expand the ASEAN Plus Three Summit, which included the ASEAN countries plus China, Japan, and South Korea. As an East Asian summit, instead of an Asia-Pacific summit, it excluded the US. Japan supported the proposal, despite the exclusion of the US. After ignoring the proposal for a while the US belatedly lobbied against it, beginning in early 2005. Although Japan and other countries decided to go ahead with the summit anyway, Japan was able to dilute China’s influence by getting Australia and India included as members. Eventually, in 2010 Russia and the US were also admitted as members of the EAS and began participating from 2011. As a result of this expanded membership the EAS is becoming less an East Asia Summit and more an Asia-Pacific Summit, a bit like the annual APEC Summit.

3. Taft-Katsura Agreement
   Answer: An early 20th century US-Japan agreement under which the US recognized Korea’s control over the Korean Peninsula (formerly the Kingdom of Korea) in exchange for Japan’s recognition of US control over the Philippines, which the US seized from Spain during the Spanish American War of 1898. In recent decades this agreement has been highlighted by South Korean nationalists critical of the continued US military
presence in the ROK as evidence of US callous disregard of Korea.

4. 21 Demands:
Answer: The 21 Demands we issued by Japan to the Republic of China in January 1915. The Demands were issued in the context of World War I, specifically Japan’s capture of the German colony of Tsingdao on China’s Shandong peninsula at the start of the war, and the fact that the other imperialist powers in China, most notably Britain, France and Russia, were distracted by the war in Europe. It actually consisted of 14 “demands” and seven “wishes,” outlined in 5 groups. Among other things Japan demanded that China recognize Japanese control of the former German colony on the Shandong peninsula, and the extension of the Japanese lease on the South Manchurian railway. Overall the 21 demands aimed at establishing Japanese hegemony over China and Manchuria by establishing control of Chinese diplomatic, military, and political affairs. Japan was thus attempting to make China a protectorate. Japan was only partially successful in realizing these 21 demands, although the Versailles Peace Conference did recognize Japanese control over the former German colony in the Shandong peninsula.

**Essay:** Based on readings and class lectures, answer ONLY 1 of the following questions:

1. Until the 1960s, East Asia, like Europe, was essentially divided into opposing camps, with each being dominated by one of the two superpowers. Explain how and why this changed in the 1960s and 1970s.

Answer: The bipolar system of two opposing camps deteriorated in the 1960s and 1970s for three reasons. First, the Sino-Soviet split, and out of this, the emergence of China as a large and independent regional power. The normalization of Sino-US relations in 1972 contributed to the emergence of “triangular diplomacy in East Asia, whereby China and the two superpowers would compete for influence within their triangular relationship. Although there were neutral nations in Europe during the Cold War, none was of comparable size or influence to China, and no “triangular diplomacy” emerged in Europe. Japan’s emergence as an independent nuclear power from 1964 increased its significance.

The second reason was the emergence of Japan as an economic superpower by 1970. By 1970, Japan had emerged as the world’s third largest economy, and by 1981, it had
surpassed the Soviet Union to become the world’s second largest economy. The rise of Japan thus represented a shift in the distribution of capabilities away from dominance by the two superpowers, and toward a more multipolar balance power.

Finally, the Vietnam War led to a relative decline in US power, and hence, also contributed to a decline in the regional dominance of the two superpowers. As a result of the US defeat in Vietnam, the multilateral US alliance network in Southeast Asia, SEATO, collapsed. The Vietnam War to breaking down barriers between Communist China and the West, since Nixon’s normalization strategy toward China in the early 1970s was an important part of his Vietnam “exit strategy.”

2. Evaluate the argument made by David Kang in *China Rising* that East Asian nations, with the possible partial exception of Japan, are not alarmed by China’s growing power. What theoretical framework does he use to make this argument and how does he explain it? In light of developments in the region since Kang published his book evaluate whether Kang’s claim about the reactions of East Asian states still holds true.

Answer: Using a hybrid theoretical framework that blends elements of constructivist norms and identity, hegemonic stability versions of realism, and liberal arguments about the pacifying effects of economic interdependence, Kang builds a hybrid model predicting hierarchy in East Asia with China as the core or central state. This model falsifies realist balance of power theory that predicts that Asian nations should balance against China. The gradual development of norms and interdependent identities among other East Asian states and China during the Sino-Centric tributary system era that lasted until the 19th century created perceptions of China as a benign hegemon that did not threaten the independence or interests of its neighbors. These norms and identities continued to influence, or resurged in influence since the 1990s, the way that East Asian states view China’s rise, or rebound and its intentions. Consequently, Kang claims that East Asian nations “are likely to accommodate, rather than balance China, even if the United States reduces its presence in the region.” Kang’s argument that East Asian nations are not as alarmed by the rise of China as Realist balance of power theory and many Western observers think they should be was largely accurate during the first century of the 21st century, with perhaps only the partial exception of Japan. South Korea in particular did not appear alarmed, neither did the ASEAN nations of Southeast Asia. Even Vietnam, a traditional antagonist of China seemed to be
accepting of increasing Chinese dominance. Japan was more skeptical of China’s rise, but it nonetheless did not engage in any significant counter-balancing of China. Despite China’s large defense budget increases during this first decade of the 21st century Japan’s defense spending during this period ranged from stagnant to declining. However, events since 2010 might raise doubts about Kang’s thesis. Maritime disputes with Japan in the East China Sea, and with Vietnam, the Philippines, and to a lesser extent Malaysia, Brunei, and perhaps Indonesia in the South China Sea have flared up since 2010, increasing tensions and threat perceptions of East Asian nations toward China. This is especially evident in Japan, the Philippines, and to a lesser extent Vietnam. Japan has started counter-balancing China militarily since 2010 by launching a large buildup of its submarine force (to which China’s navy is very vulnerable) and by beginning to increase its defense spending from 2013. Nonetheless, the increases in Japanese defense spending remain modest, and other states like South Korea, Thailand, and to a lesser extent Indonesia, continue to accepting of China’s rise and show little sign of counter-balancing Beijing.