Identifications: Answer ONLY two IDs, minimum of 1/2 page each (25% each).
Using our readings and class lectures, explain the significance of two of the following:

1. **Treaty of Nanjing**
   Ans.: The Treaty of Nanjing (南京条約), concluded between Britain and Ching Dynasty China in 1842, ended the Opium War (1839-1842). Under this treaty the island of Hong Kong was ceded to Britain as a colony (the New Territories were added later). Additionally, under this treaty five Chinese ports opened to unrestricted foreign trade: Shanghai, Ningbo, Canton, Xiamen, Fouzhou. The treaty of Nanjing also obligated China to pay 21 million taels of silver as war reparations to Britain, and British subjects on Chinese soil were granted extra-territoriality, which meant that China did not have legal jurisdiction over British subjects in its territory. For example, if an Englishman committed a crime in China, that person would be judged according to English law, not Chinese law. English officials would also carry out any sentencing. The treaty of Nanjing was thus the first of the “Unequal Treaties” between East Asian nations and Western powers.

2. **Pu Yi**
   Ans.: The last emperor of China, and the last Emperor in the Manchu or Ching Dynasty. Assuming the throne as a toddler, his government was overthrown and the Republic of China was established in 1911-12. He continued to “reign” in the Forbidden City (the imperial palace) in Beijing for several years, but was then expelled by Chinese nationalists. He came under the influence of Japan and later was named Emperor of Manchuria after Japan’s Kwantung Army seized that territory, or Northeast China, from the Chinese Nationalist government. In fact, Pu Yi was merely a puppet ruler of the Japanese dominated Manchukuo state. In 1945 he was captured by the Soviet Red Army as he attempted to escape with Japanese officials to Tokyo. Eventually he was turned over to Communist China, where Pu Yi was imprisoned in a reeducation camp for many years. After a number of years he was released, became a gardener in Beijing, and passed away during the early stages of the Cultural Revolution.
3. **Fukuda Doctrine**

Ans.: Refers to a speech given by Japanese Prime Minister Takeo Fukuda in Manila in August 1977. There Fukuda laid out three pillars of Japan’s policy toward the region. First, he pledged that Japan would play a large political and economic role in Southeast Asia based on the promise to never become a military power. Second, he called for heart-to-heart diplomacy between Japan and Southeast Asia to build trust. Third, he promised to deal with Southeast Asian nations not only individually, but also as a group through ASEAN (thus becoming the first major power to recognize ASEAN itself as a partner), and to act as a bridge between ASEAN and the communist nations of Indochina (e.g. Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia). Fukuda also promised to significantly increase Japanese economic assistance to the region.

4. **APEC**

Ans.: Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation, often described as four-adjacents in search of a noun, APEC was established in 1989 at the initiative of Australia, but with significant behind the scenes support and encouragement from Japan. APEC is arguably the clearest embodiment of an Asia-Pacific definition of the region, i.e. a region that includes East Asia, Oceania, and the west coast of the Americas, versus an East Asian definition of the region. APEC also embraces open, not closed, economic regionalism, and has tended to see its role as supporting global trade talks through the GATT and more recently through the WTO. On both these counts, APEC represents a clear contrast to the relatively closed and East-Asia centric East Asian Economic Caucus, or EAEC, proposed by Prime Minister Mahathir of Malaysia at the beginning of the 1990s, even though EAEC, like APEC, was at least in part a regional response to fears of closed trade blocks emerging in Europe through the Maastricht treaty and the North American Free Trade Area, or NAFTA. Nonetheless, given the strong interest in global free trade on the part of Japan and East Asia’s other export oriented economies, APEC was embraced while the EAEC was rejected. While APEC was originally organized around trade and foreign ministers’ meetings, in 1993 on the initiative of President Clinton an annual APEC summit was established. APEC has attempted to remove trade and investment barriers among its members, but with mixed results.

**Essay:** This answer is worth 50%. Using our readings and class lectures, answer
only ONE of the following questions:

1. Describe and analyze the arguments for and against Japan apologizing to its East Asian neighbors regarding its history of occupation and colonization between the late 19th century and 1945. Which view is most convincing and why? What are the policy implications of your conclusion?

Ans.: According to one school of thought, that can perhaps be named the apologist school, Japan needs to apologize to the neighboring countries it invaded as a pre-requisite to achieving reconciliation with them and establishing long-lasting close and stable relations. This view points to what can be called the “German model” of how to properly and thoroughly apologize, and argues that by comparison Japan comes up short. The iconographic image of this model is of German Chancellor Willy Brandt falling to his knees before the monument to the Jews who perished in the Warsaw ghetto in 1970, an image that is said to represent a complete, unreserved and unconditional apology for past crimes. Germany’s good relations with its neighbors are claimed to have emerged from this type of apology. The apologist school argues that Japan should follow the Brandt model and make strong, unqualified, and frequent apologies to its Asian neighbors.

By contrast, another view, what could be called the the reconciliation first school, argues that the true “German model” is not one of humble and unreserved apologies, but rather an earlier “Adenauer model” from the 1950s, during which Germany did not apologize so much and provided relatively modest reparations (compensation) to the victims of Germany’s aggression. In this view, Germany’s reconciliation with its neighbors preceded the frequent and strong apologies of the Brandt era. In the reconciliation first view, German apologies were more a product of reconciliation rather than a cause of them. The reconciliation first school also argues that the Brandt-style apologies are the exception rather than the norm that can serve as a global standard. The reconciliation first school also argues that making frequent and strong apologies risks provoking domestic backlash in the state offering the apologies, thereby making the apologies themselves look insincere, and possibly endangering their long-term political sustainability in case the critics of apologies should come to power. Thus, the reconciliation first school suggests that Japan should be careful about making frequent, strong, and unconditional apologies for its past actions, and instead focus on other prerequisites of historical reconciliation such as avoid justifying or celebrating past aggression.
A third view argues that apologies are part of a larger set of measures that a state can take, which can be conceptualized as historical reassurance. The historical reassurance school thus argues that apologies are useful only in so far as they help to demonstrate to a former victim that the former aggressor country is aware of its history of aggression, and renounces the legitimacy of its former aggression, and therefore is not inclined to repeat that aggression. However, this third view, like the second, sees apologies as not necessarily being especially effective. Rather the historical reassurance school emphasizes the importance of other forms of reassurance, such as adopting public school textbooks and curricula that teaches a denationalized and honest history, and domestic places of public remembrance that effectively do the same. The common denominator with all these measures is that the state is able to reassure another through the sending of domestically costly signals about history that the state has no aggressive intentions toward the other.

The apologist and reconciliation first schools pose a “chicken and an egg” problem between themselves: namely, which comes first, apologies or reconciliation?

2. Describe and evaluate debates about the effectiveness of the multilateral Washington Treaty system. To what extent is this system a positive or negative model for East Asian nations today?

**Ans.** The multilateral Washington Treaty system was designed by the US, and to a lesser extent by Britain, to contain Japanese expansionism and, in particular, to forestall a naval arms race with Japan. Japan wanted to build up its navy, while the US, which could have easily won an arms race with Japan, did not want to engage in one because of a desire to reduce its defense budget after World War I. The US managed to cajole Japan into participating.

The Washington system consisted of three treaties altogether. The Nine Power treaty, which included Japan, the UK, the US, France, China, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Portugal, established fundamental principles for relations between these powers and China, especially the principle of “equal opportunity” for all foreign powers in terms of accessing all regions of the China market. This treaty built on the “Open Door Notes” the US issued in 1905, which called for open and equal trading rights throughout China, even in those areas effectively controlled by foreign powers. The Four Power Treaty, which included Japan, the UK, the US and France, called for these major powers to
uphold the status quo in East Asia. This treaty replaced the 1902 UK-Japan treaty of alliance, which the US insisted the UK and Japan abrogate.

The Washington Naval Treaty, or so-called Five Power Treaty, was the first example of multilateral arms control. The treaty limited the tonnage of capital ships, or battleships, with the US and UK given parity with ratios of 5:5 each. Japan was given the 2nd highest ratio of 3, and the stipulation that the combined tonnage of US and British capital ships in the Pacific could not exceed Japan’s overall tonnage limit. The Americans and the British also agreed to build no new fortifications west of Pearl Harbor in the Pacific or East of Singapore. France and Italy were each given a capital ship ratios of 1.75.

The naval treaty ratified Japan’s overall naval inferiority vis-à-vis the US and the UK. Yet some argue that the fact that this treaty forbade new naval fortifications by the latter two powers in East Asia and mandated that the combined strength of the US and UK fleets in the region could not exceed the size of the Japanese fleet effectively gave Japan de facto regional hegemony. Others cite this treaty as an example demonstrating the flaws of arms control in general. Certainly, this treaty was flawed because it only covered capital ships, thereby encouraging Japan to concentrate on new types of ships, such as aircraft carriers and submarines. Yet, in some ways this treaty helped to prevent a naval arms race for over a decade and the Washington treaty system overall helped to maintain stability in the region for that period. Indeed, the 1920s are notable for being the longest and most distinct period after 1875 during which Japan did not expand territorially. Since arms control agreements cannot be expected to last forever, this achievement can be considered significant. A more significant flaw of the Washington treaty system might be the 4 power treaty, which effectively deprived Japan of its military ally (Britain), and perhaps encouraged Japanese military actors to make a bid for regional hegemony in East Asia in the 1930s and 1940s.

Nonetheless, despite the possibility of looking at the Washington treaty system, including the naval arms treaty in a positive light, overall the assessments have been negative, and thus the Washington treaty has been cited as a form of regional multilateralism that East Asia should avoid. Skeptics of multilateralism thus use the Washington Treaty system to cast doubt on the effectiveness of East Asian multilateralism. Advocates of multilateralism could make a case for viewing the Washington system in a much more positive light and even as a potential example, but
have so far not done so.