

AIU
Global Review

Volume 4
2012

Published by
Akita International University
Press

Akita, Japan
2012

Editorial Board

Editor-in-chief: Mark WILLIAMS, Ph.D.

Editor: TOYODA Tetsuya

Assistant Editor: Percival Santos, Ph.D.

Editorial Assistant: HASEYAMA Yoriko

ISSN 1883-8243

© COPYRIGHT 2012 Akita International University Press

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Publisher: Mark Williams
Akita International University Press
Akita city, Yuwa, Japan 010-1292
[HTTP://www.aiu.ac.jp](http://www.aiu.ac.jp).
Tel : 81-18-886-5900
Fax: 81-18-886-5910

Printed in Japan

In Memoriam

President Mineo Nakajima

I shall never forget my first meeting with the late President Mineo Nakajima. It took place in the President's office at Tokyo University of Foreign Studies and, at the time, I was a junior lecturer in the Department of East Asian Studies at the University of Leeds in the UK. I had come to sign a student exchange agreement between our two universities and, as a scholar of contemporary Japanese society, I was acutely aware of the awkward difference in status. As soon as he entered the room, however, I was put at ease. Flashing that enigmatic smile, which all who encountered Dr Nakajima will surely recall, he reached out to me, and we were soon involved in deep discussion on the respective merits and problems of the UK and Japanese higher education systems. And I think it is fair to say that we continued that conversation for the ensuing twenty years.

In the years that followed our first meeting, I had several opportunities to interact with Dr Nakajima – in Tokyo (where he always favored the 'Tokyo kaikan Union club' as offering the most convivial of surroundings!), in Leeds and, later, in Akita. And although each time we met, it seemed that our conversation had moved on, that there were new and interesting developments, and that the focus of his attention had shifted to his latest project or idea, his interest in the bigger picture – the state of the university sectors in our two countries – never wavered. Particularly since his untimely passing this past February, I have spent much time trying to analyze this phenomenon, and I have to conclude that it is symptomatic of a man driven by an insatiable desire to make a difference – in a variety of arenas.

At Tokyo University of Foreign Studies, the focus was on the creation of a new type of university governance structure and, by the time he left that institution in 2001, the old mold had been broken and a new 'academic culture' was germinating. At the same time, however, Dr Nakajima had been carefully nurturing his reputation as one of Japan's foremost commentators on East Asia, especially China and Taiwan, whilst at the same time emerging as a prominent advocate of radical reform of English language teaching in the Japanese schooling

sector. Indeed, regarding the latter, he was one of the earliest and most outspoken advocates of the introduction of earlier and more practical English classes into the compulsory school curriculum – and his was a significant voice on the Central Council for Education and the Education Rebuilding Council, two government committees examining this issue.

It was, however, following his departure from Tokyo University of Foreign Studies that Dr Nakajima was really empowered to show his true colors. Learning that Minnesota State University had abandoned its campus in Akita in northern-western Japan and, encouraged by Mr Sukeshiro Terata, then governor of the prefecture, to become involved in a committee exploring the possibility of taking over the vacated facilities and establishing a ‘campus with a difference’ (as Dr Nakajima liked to describe it), it was not long before the vision of a university devoted to the ‘international liberal arts’ had taken shape. And governor Terata did not need to look far in his search for a suitable founding President.

Kokusai kyōyō daigaku opened for business as a pioneer ‘public university corporation’ in April 2004, the name carefully selected by Dr Nakajima to reflect his desired focus on ‘international liberal arts’. Significantly, however, he chose ‘Akita International University’ as the English name, this in a desire to reassure the residents of Akita prefecture of his desire to ensure a mutually beneficial relationship between the University and the local region. From the outset, the challenge was clear: how to succeed with his vision for a new kind of university in the face of deep-rooted skepticism, both locally and nationally? ‘All classes to be taught in English’; ‘a compulsory year of study at one of the University’s overseas partners’; ‘at least one year spent living in one of the on-campus dorms’: the new University sought from the outset to ensure that its niche in an ever-declining market was clearly delineated.

For all his inherent enthusiasm and optimism, however, even Dr Nakajima cannot have envisaged the success that his dream has achieved during its first nine years of existence. Regularly cited in the national press as one of the most competitive universities in the country and the focus of constant media attention seeking to understand the ‘secret’ of the ‘100% employment success’ achieved by the first few

cohorts of graduates, AIU has already emerged as a serious player in the national higher education sector. More specifically, in the context of the current overwhelming focus in Japan on the nurturing of ‘global *jinzai*’ (human resources), the University has found itself in receipt of major support from the Japanese Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology in its past two funding rounds to implement programs aimed at creating a curriculum fit for this purpose. Both of these initiatives were close to Dr Nakajima’s heart. In the first, several small groups of AIU students will team up with groups of students from several of its US partner institutions and, in each case, the group will spend considerable time in the field (both in the US and in Akita) working as a team to explore a shared social issue (such as regional regeneration or community well-being) and producing a final report. The second project, entitled ‘Cultivation of “Global Leaders”’, aims to strengthen our teaching expertise and enhance the University’s support activities for students’ self- and active-learning and will enable it to invite distinguished professors from around the globe to offer intensive courses in key areas as well as to send our faculty members to learn from our partner universities. Both of these projects are designed to further develop the various ‘transferable skills’ (such as critical thinking and communication skills) that have been at the heart of planning for this University since its inception – and on which Dr Nakajima personally set so much store.

Let me conclude by introducing a haiku that the President’s family received shortly after his death from one of his relatives who is a poet. In Japanese it reads, ‘*Uyamaware, rin to hishō ya, yuki no yari*’. Translation is never an easy task, and it becomes particularly complicated in the case of poetry, especially with haiku, which rely so much on word play. In the end, however, we have agreed on the following:

‘His revered spirit
is now soaring in awesome heights.
The shards of snow’.

The ‘shards of snow’ here refer to the occasionally painful battering of the Akita snow with which all who have experienced an Akita winter are familiar; it can indeed feel as if we are being attacked by a ‘spear’ (*yari*). At the same time, however, the last line, *yuki no yari*, also refers

to Mt. Yarigatake, the famous mountain near his beloved birthplace of Matsumoto in Nagano Prefecture, where Dr Nakajima loved to indulge his passions for mountain climbing and painting. What I think we can take from this haiku is that the spirit of the founding President of AIU lives on: his vision is clear and it is our responsibility to ensure that his legacy does indeed survive, that AIU does indeed continue to ‘soar’ towards those ‘awesome heights’.

Needless to say, it will take a great deal more time and effort before AIU is recognized, not only by many in Akita Prefecture but also by the rest of the country and the world, as a pioneering model for producing outstanding individuals through higher education. The seeds have, however, been planted – and, as the University moves into its second decade, it is incumbent on us all to remember the contribution of the man without whom none of this would have come into being.

*(Professor) Mark Williams
Acting President
Akita International University*

Life and Works of Mineo Nakajima

Career

- 1960: B.A. in China Studies, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies
1965: M.A. in International Relations, the University of Tokyo
1977-95: professor at Tokyo University of Foreign Studies
1977-78: visiting professor at the Australian National University
1980: Ph.D. in Sociology, the University of Tokyo
1980-81: visiting professor at the Institut d'Etudes Politiques de Paris
1992-93: visiting professor at the University of California, San Diego
1995-2001: President of Tokyo University of Foreign Studies
1998-2001: Vice-President of Japan Association of National Universities
1998-2006: Secretary-General of the University Mobility in Asia and the Pacific (UMAP)
2000: The Grand Order of the Star, Republic of China
2004-2013: President and Chairperson of the Board of Trustees, Akita International University
2008-2013: President of the Talent Education Research Institute (Suzuki Method)

Major Works

- Gendai Chugokuron (On Contemporary China: Ideology and Politics)*, Aoki Shoten, 1964.
Chuso Tairitsu to Gendai (The Sino-Soviet Confrontation in Historical Perspective), Chuokoronsha, 1978.
Pekin Retsu Retsu (Beijing in Flux), Chikuma Shobo, 1981 [Suntory Academic Prize winner].
'Foreign Relations: from the Korean War to the Bandung Line' in *Cambridge History of China*, vol. 14, edited by R. MacFarquhar and J. K. Fairbank, (Cambridge University Press, 1987), 259-90.
Chugoku no Higeiki (Tragedy of China), Kodansha, 1989.
Kokusai Kankei Ron (International Relations), Chuokoronsha, 1992.
Chugoku-Taiwan-Honkon (China, Taiwan and Hong Kong), PHP Institute, 1999.
Nijuisseiki no Daigaku (Universities in the 21st Century), Ronsosha, 2004.
Zenkyu Kyoiku Ron (On Global Education), Nishimura Shoten, 2010.
Naze Kokusai Kyoyo Daigaku de Jinzai ha Sodatsunoka (How are global individuals cultivated at AIU?), Shodensha, 2010.

Sekai ni Tsuyosuru Kodomo no Sodatekata (How to educate world-class children), Forest Publishing, 2011.

Wisdom of Asia, coauthored with Lee Tenghui, Akita International University Press, 2012.

CONTENTS

In-Memoriam of President NAKAJIMA Mineo: Mark WILLIAMS, Vice President and Acting President, Akita International University	v
List of Contributors	xii
Submission of Manuscripts	xiv
Papers:	
Internationalization of Higher Education in Korea: The Role of English-medium Instruction. Walter A. FOREMAN and PARK Siheung.....	1
English Language Teaching in Elementary Schools in Japan - The Case for an Integrated Curriculum. Kola OLAGBOYEGA	20
Is there a New Cold War in Asia? TAKEMOTO Shuhei	39

List of Contributors

(Alphabetical Order by Surname)

Walter A. FOREMAN

Mr. Walter Foreman has served as the Manager of Communications and Protocol in the Office of International Affairs at Korea University since February 2012. Originally from Canada, he is a long-term resident of South Korea, having first arrived in the country in March 1998. Currently, he is completing his doctoral degree in English Education at Korea National University of Education, where, as a visiting professor in the Department of English Education, he taught pre-service and in-service public school English teachers for seven years. Mr. Foreman has published a series of middle and high school English textbooks for the Korean Ministry of Education, Science and Technology as well as several English textbooks for the private sector. In addition to his work at Korea University, he also hosts a weekend radio talk show on Seoul's first and only 24-hour all-English radio station, 101.3 tbs eFM. Mr. Foreman can be reached at: wforeman@korea.ac.kr.

Kola OLAGBOYEGA

Dr. Kolawole Waziri Olagboyega is an Associate Professor of English and Applied Linguistics at the Graduate School of Global Communication and Language, AIU. He is an Associate Editor of *Interfaces*, an online journal of Woosong University, South Korea; and has published widely in the area of Applied Linguistics and Language Teaching. His publications include *Communicative Grammar for High School and University Students* (2013); "Japanese English": Structure of the Verb Phrase (*Intercultural Communication Studies XXI: 1*, 2012); Is English-as-an-International-Language Natural, Neutral and Beneficial in Japan? (*The Scientific and Technical Reports*, 2011); He is a Fellow of the University of Cambridge Commonwealth Society.

PARK Siheung

Dr. Siheung Park has served as the Director of the Office of International Affairs at Korea University since December 2004. As of April 2013, he has been promoted to the position of Director of Korea University Business School. He completed his doctoral degree in Public Administration at Korea University in August 2011. Dr. Park can be reached at oacs99@korea.ac.kr.

TAKEMOTO Shuhei

Mr. Takemoto joined Akita International University as lecturer of international relations in September 2012. His current research focuses on the Cold War history, which has led to the publication of so far two articles: “The Study of Nixon Administration’s Détente Policy towards the Soviet Union: Focusing on the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks and the Summit Negotiations” in *Language, Area and Cultural Studies*, No. 18 (2010); and “The “Dual Détente Policy of the Nixon Administration: Reconsidering the ‘China Card,’” in *The Bulletin of China Studies*, No. 11 (2012).

Mark WILLIAMS

Dr. Mark Williams took his BA in Japanese Studies at the University of Oxford and a PhD in Japanese Literature at the University of California, Berkeley. He has spent most of career at the University of Leeds, UK, where he remains Professor of Japanese Studies. He was Head of East Asian Studies between 2000-04, and Chair of the School of Modern Languages and Cultures between 2006-11. He was also President of the British Association for Japanese Studies, 2008-11. He is currently on secondment as Vice President for Academic Affairs at Akita International University. He has published extensively, in English and Japanese. His published works include: *Endō Shūsaku: A Literature of Reconciliation* (Routledge); *Christianity and Japan: Impacts and Responses* (Macmillan; co-edited with John Breen); *Representing the Other in Modern Japanese Literature: A Critical Approach* (Routledge; co-edited with Rachael Hutchinson) and *Imag(in)ing the War in Japan: Representing and Responding to Trauma in Post-war Japanese Literature and Film* (Brill; co-edited with David Stahl). He is also the translator of *Foreign Studies* and *The Girl I Left Behind*, two novels by the Japanese author, Endō Shūsaku. He can be reached at: m-b-williams@aiu.ac.jp.

Submission of Manuscripts

Authors wishing to submit articles for consideration must send them to AIU Press (aiupress@aiu.ac.jp) as an attachment to an email.

Manuscripts must be submitted no later than November 15 for consideration in the next issue of the *AIU Global Review*. The *Review* is published at the end of the Japanese fiscal year ending March 31.

All manuscripts undergo peer review by at least two or three qualified scholars. Authors whose manuscripts are accepted for publication will be notified along with reviewer comments. All revisions must be completed by the end of January and the revised manuscript returned via email attachment to the editor.

Manuscripts MUST conform to the following guidelines:

1. All articles must be the result of original academic research.
2. Manuscripts are to be submitted in Microsoft Word format, single spaced, Times New Roman font, size 10.5 or 11.
3. Include a concise abstract at the beginning of the manuscript with a brief, one paragraph biography on the final page.
4. Capitalize each major word in the manuscript's title, section heading and illustration titles.
5. Embolden section headings.
6. *Italicize* all foreign words (including Japanese words) and titles of books.
7. No paragraph indentation but a single space between paragraphs.

8. Each header should contain the page number in the upper left corner and the article's title opposite the page number.
9. Sources must be cited in a consistent, internationally approved format, with citations as footnotes, endnotes or included within the text.
10. All charts, maps or other illustrations will be reproduced only black in the journal. No color reproductions will appear.
11. Questions should be directed to either the editor or assistant editor.

Internationalization of Higher Education in Korea: The Role of English-medium Instruction

PARK Siheung & Walter A. Foreman

I. Introduction

The internationalization of universities in Korea involves, at the university level, measures such as hiring foreign faculty, recruiting international students, encouraging student and faculty mobility through exchange partnerships, and increasing the amount of English-medium instruction. At the governmental level, the Korean government supports the internationalization of universities in Korea with programs such as *World Class University*, a program to recruit outstanding overseas researchers, and *Study Korea*, a program to recruit outstanding international students. In total, Korea hopes to attract 200,000 international students by 2020.

One key factor in achieving this ambitious recruitment goal is language. As the Korean language is one spoken only on the Korean peninsula, universities in Korea have looked to English as the *de facto* language of internationalization. Resultantly, English-medium instruction at universities in Korea has become an essential part of their internationalization efforts. It is worth mentioning however that English-medium instruction is just one of many pieces in the internationalization puzzle at universities in Korea and indeed around the world. As proof of this, contemporary discussions of the internationalization of higher education have given rise to a new term: Comprehensive Internationalization (CI). This new term is meant to encapsulate more fully the multifaceted and component-like nature of internationalization.

The Center for Internationalization and Global Engagement (CIGE) at the American Council on Education (ACE) describes CI as, “a strategic, coordinated process that seeks to align and integrate policies, programs, and initiatives to position colleges and universities as more

globally oriented and internationally connected institutions” (ACE 2012). In more detail, CIGE identifies six interconnected elements, positioned horizontally, that form the basis for CI: Articulated Institutional Commitment, Administrative Structure and Staffing, Curriculum, Co-curriculum, and Learning Outcomes, Faculty Policies and Practices, Student Mobility, and Collaboration and Partnerships. Needless to say, as this definition of CI comes from the *American Council on Education*, any mention of English, or language in general, is absent, given America’s status as in “inner circle” country in terms of its use of English (Kachru, 1992).

However, for “outer circle” or “expanding circle” countries, English-medium instruction often plays a major role in internationalization frameworks. Yet, this reliance on English is not always permanent. Pundits have argued that internationalization of education can be a means to strengthen national identity and thereby escape colonial (mostly English) languages by opting to use local language(s) for instruction once a leveling of the playing field, so to speak, has been achieved as a result of becoming part of the global environment through internationalization efforts (Knight, 1997). In addition, once the process of internationalization at a given institution has progressed to a point of substantial traction, the focus on English-medium instruction subsides (De Wit, 2012). As de Wit put it, in answering the question of why institutions undertake the process of internationalizing, there must be a shift away from numerical quantifiers such as the number of incoming and outgoing students and the percentage of courses offered in English and a shift toward learning outcomes. The bigger question of why institutions embark on the journey of internationalization in the first place is well beyond the scope of this paper, but it is an important enough question to warrant at least a cursory treatment here.

One of the reasons that the question itself is so broad is that the answer will vary depending on where the question is being asked. For example, a world-class institution in the US may have very different reasons for introducing internationalization into its operations than a newly established institution in a developing country in Asia. However, a seemingly widely accepted answer to the question of ‘why’ comes from the International Association of Universities (IAU)’s 2006 International Conference under the theme of “Internationalization

of Higher Education: New Directions, New Challenges.” In a paper presented at that conference (IAU, 2006), the following six reasons were given for internationalization:

- To increase student and faculty international knowledge capacity and production (22%)
- To strengthen research and knowledge capacity and production (21%)
- To create international profile and reputation (18%)
- To contribute to academic quality (14%)
- To broaden and diversify the source of faculty and students (13%)
- To promote curriculum development and innovation (8%)

Needless to say, the rationale behind why institutions commit to internationalization in the first place is as diverse as the concept of internationalization itself. However, this paper will focus on the internationalization efforts made by universities in Korea, with special attention paid to English-medium instruction at Korean universities.

II. Internationalization Trends among Universities in Korea

Universities in Korea are responding promptly to strengthening international competition in a multitude of ways, including sending students overseas, constructing large-scale special-use dormitories, and establishing support offices to attract foreign faculty and international students. In addition, organizational and structural changes have also contributed to internationalization. These changes include creating new executive positions and elevating the status of international affairs departments. This section will examine the following aspects of internationalization in Korean universities: foreign faculty, student mobility, and increasing English-medium instruction.

A. Foreign Faculty

Attracting foreign faculty is an internationalization strategy of great interest to both universities in Korea and the Korean government. As a result, the number of foreign faculty working at Korean institutions of higher education has increased each year since 2004. In fact, the growth rate of foreign faculty in Korea has exceeded the growth rate of all faculty in Korea.

According to a Comprehensive University Assessment conducted on 88 universities by the *JoongAng Daily*, the foreign faculty ratio over the past six years has increased steadily each year from 4.93% in 2006 to 8.27% in 2011 (Table 1). Such an increase in the number of foreign faculty serves to increase the amount of courses taught in English. In addition, it serves to attract international exchange students to Korea, which is part of a virtuous cycle as international exchange is usually conducted on a one-to-one basis. In other words, more foreign faculty means more international students to Korea which means more Korean students overseas.

B. Student Mobility

The Korean government, in an effort to support the internationalization of universities in Korea, has enacted national policies to attract international students. Programs such as *Study Korea*, administered by the Ministry of Education, Science and Technology (MEST) and government scholarships administered by the National Institute for International Education (NIIED) help to attract international students to Korea. Table 1 shows the annual increase of international students over the past six years growing from 1.27% in 2006 to 3.77% in 2011.

At the university level, individual universities have increased the number of student exchange agreements with overseas partner universities. The result has been an increase in the number of exchange students over the past six years, from 0.8% in 2006 to 1.97% in 2011 (Table 1). Other factors leading to this increase include reforming curricula, expanding educational facilities, improving lecture facilities, constructing special-use dormitories, increasing the number of foreign faculty, and offering more English-medium courses.

In terms of sending students overseas, Table 1 shows an increase from 0.55% in 2006 to 1.42% in 2011. Despite the relative size of the increase, the number of Korean students sent overseas as part of student exchange is the lowest of all measured factors, which suggests that there is much growth potential in this area.

C. English-medium Instruction

One of the primary internationalization strategies at universities in Korea is to offer English-medium instruction. This strategy is an important element in recruiting international students and attracting exchange students from partner universities. Table 1 shows the increase of English-medium instruction over the past six years from 3.44% in 2006 to 11.85% in 2011.

It is worth noting that the current ratio of English-medium instruction is the highest of all measured factors, suggesting the importance of this strategy in the internationalization of universities in Korea. Also worthy of note is the difference between the increase of foreign faculty and the increase of the proportion of courses offered in English. As the latter is larger than the former, it suggests that Korean faculty are also delivering courses in English.

Table 1: Yearly Internationalization Assessment Index Status by Assessment Criteria

Section	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Foreign Faculty Ratio	4.93	5.64	5.90	6.62	7.50	8.27
International Student Ratio	1.27	1.57	2.05	2.66	3.09	3.77
Lecture in English Ratio	3.44	3.53	4.91	6.45	8.67	11.85
Exchange Student Recruitment Ratio	0.80	1.26	1.42	1.65	1.59	1.97
Exchange Student Dispatch Ratio	0.55	0.71	1.00	0.90	1.00	1.42

Source: Research & Development Center, *JoongAng Daily*

Universities in Korea have made marked progress in their internationalization efforts, including attracting foreign faculty, increasing student mobility, and offering more English-medium instruction. Primary among these factors is increasing the number of courses offered in English as a means to facilitate student mobility, attract foreign faculty, and consequently improve their positions in the global rankings.

III. Factors Influencing Proliferation of English-medium Instruction

A. External Factors

(1) Government Policy

Before the Lee Myung-bak administration took office in late February 2008, the Presidential Transition Committee announced that general subjects in primary and secondary schools could be taught in English; however due to public opposition, the plan was eventually cancelled and English remained a subject of study in primary and secondary schools, rather than becoming a medium of instruction. Despite this failure to shift English away from a subject of study and toward a method of instruction, the Lee administration did increase English class hours, and enacted several sub-policies to promote English education.

(2) Higher Education Evaluation

Since the early 2000s, universities in Korea have begun to pay increased attention to university assessments and rankings. As shown in Table 2, the ratio of English-medium courses was included as an assessment item in some evaluations, but not others; however, it can be assumed that increases in the number of foreign faculty and international students may indirectly affect the amount of English-medium courses. In either case, the increased importance placed upon university assessment rankings has led to increases in the number of courses taught in English at Korean universities.

Table 2: University Assessment Weighting Values per Assessment Criteria by Media Institutions

Section	<i>JoongAng Daily</i>	Chosun-QS AUR	QS WUR	THE WUR
Foreign Faculty Ratio	20	2.5	5	3
International Student Ratio	15	2.5	5	2
Lecture in English Ratio	20	–	–	–
Exchange Student Recruitment Ratio	10	2.5	–	–
Exchange Student Dispatch Ratio	5	2.5	–	–

Internationalization Total Score	70	10	10	5
Overall Rating Score	350	100	100	100

Source: Research & Development Center, *JoongAng Daily*

(3) Requirement of English Proficiency for Employment

For several years, perhaps even decades, the new employee recruitment guidelines for Korea's major conglomerates have indicated that applicants have some sort of English proficiency certification such as TOEFL, TOEIC, or more recently, the Korean-produced TEPS. An even more recent trend however, is the requirement of English speaking-based test scores such as TOEIC Speaking or Oral Proficiency Interview-computer (OPIc). The OPIc test, in particular, increased in popularity after being adopted by Samsung Group, Korea's leading conglomerate, as a requirement for new job applicants.

(4) Early Overseas Study & Entrance Examination Fever

Although having declined dramatically over the past couple of years, many Korean primary and secondary students still study abroad. One of the main reasons for this is to secure English language skills leading to favorable scores on college admission examinations. To combat this, large numbers of international schools or international departments at universities, which mediate instruction entirely or primarily in English, have emerged.

B. Internal Factors

(1) Internationalization of University Campuses

As increasing numbers of university students in Korea avail themselves of study abroad opportunities offered by their respective institutions, consequently, more and more international university students arrive in Korea. As such, the amount of English, not only in lectures in Korean universities, but also around Korean campuses themselves, has increased. In short, more international students using English as a first or second language, require increases in English-medium courses, as well as English-based support offices and facilities.

(2) University Presidential Selection Systems

The method of selecting presidents for Korean universities changed

in the late 1990s. The new system elects presidents by the direct participation of professors, and as such, presidential candidates now present election campaign pledges to lure votes. Often, these pledges involve increased internationalization efforts, which often bring with them increases in English-medium instruction, by inviting foreign faculty members and requiring Korean faculty to lecture in English. The former usually being more popular than that latter, but not always so.

(3) Joint Degrees/Remote Lectures with Foreign Universities

Implementing joint degree programs or conducting cyber-lectures with international partners contribute to increased use of English. Some programs involve a non-English-speaking country, like Korea, engaging with an English-speaking country, like the United States of America; these interactions require a common language, which more often than not is English. Other cases involve interactions between two non-English-speaking countries, such as Korea and Japan. In these cases, a common language is required, which again, is more often than not, English.

(4) Competition

Competition is a driving force in many industries and in many parts of the world; tertiary education in Korea is no exception. The policies and actions of top-ranked schools are often mimicked by lower-ranked schools. In particular, policies regarding English-medium instruction are watched and followed quite closely. Table 3 shows six of the top-ranked schools for the percentage of courses offered in English.

Table 3: Percentage of English-medium Courses in Korea's Top Six Universities

University	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
KAIST	21.43	35.18	50.83	67.94	50.00	50.00
POSTEC	8.10	10.10	18.86	18.32	49.22	50.00
Handong Global University	20.50	22.82	23.61	29.73	40.30	40.53
Ewha Womans University	4.52	11.76	18.97	20.23	30.23	37.10
Hankuk University of Foreign Studies	2.71	20.35	31.39	35.12	36.34	36.04
Korea University	26.22	22.18	24.83	27.57	30.85	35.72

Source: Adapted from the Research & Development Center of the *JoongAng Daily*

IV. Governmental Policies to Promote English-medium Instruction

A. Government Policy

Korea's Ministry of Education, Science and Technology (MEST) lacks direct policies for lectures in English in higher education; however, as shown in Table 4, the government implements internationalization policies that indirectly affect the matter. And while English has always been a matter of importance to the Korean government, it is only since the 1990s that the matter became paramount.

In 1995, the Kim Young-sam government released its so-called "5.31 Education Reform Plan" to establish a new educational system to lead the era of globalization and informatization.¹ The first section of this plan focused on the internationalization of Korea's universities and discussed the possibility of producing professional human resources in international relations, improving policies for foreign students, supporting international exchange, and establishing a Korean cultural identity. It was the first major governmental policy to mention specifically the internationalization of higher education in Korea.

In 1998, the Kim Dae-jung government established an advanced human resources training project known as Brain Korea (BK) 21. One of this project's objectives was to enhance international competitiveness in Korean universities by allowing domestic students and professors to participate in exchange programs with foreign students and professors. Later, in July 2001, the Kim government released a comprehensive plan to increase the number of international students to improve the international competitiveness of Korean universities. This policy focused on neighboring Asian nations, but also focused on heretofore non-traditional academic exchange partners such as, Australia, Canada, and New Zealand.

¹ The Civilian Government's Education Reform Committee released the 2nd education reform plan (February 9, 1996), the 3rd education reform plan (August 20, 1996), and the 4th education reform plan (June 2, 1997).

In 2004, the Roh Moo-hyun government announced the “Study Korea Project.” This project sought to improve the efficiency of Korean universities and enhance their competitiveness through internationalization. The project also tackled declining domestic admissions and looked toward increased international student recruitment of 50,000 by 2010; at the time, Korea had just 11,000 international students. By 2010, the project had surpassed its goal by 10,000 and attracted 60,000 international students.

In 2008, the Lee Myung-bak government announced its “World Class University (WCU)” project, designed to develop world-class research-centered universities that support technological development and research and to develop human resource development in convergence and integration. The ultimate objective of the WCU project is to secure Korea’s future by increasing its capabilities of generating creative practical knowledge and of creating new knowledge-based industries by taking advantage of overseas scholars who possess excellent research capabilities.

Spurred by these governmental efforts, universities in Korea have enacted policies to strengthen international competitiveness and to foster global leaders.

Table 4: Governmental Internationalization Policies for Higher Education

Year	Project	Purpose/Goal
2001	Comprehensive Plan to Expand International Student Recruitment	To attract international students
2004	Study Korea 2005	To attract 50,000 international students
2008	World Class University	To foster world-class research-focused universities by employing foreign scholars with excellent research capabilities
2008	University Education Capacity Enhancement	To provide financial support for excellent universities as determined by educational competence and performance
2012	Study Korea 2020	To attract 200,000 international students by 2020

Source: Adapted from press materials from the Ministry of Education, Science and Technology

B. University Internationalization at Korea University

Korea University (KU) made a major shift toward internationalization upon the celebration of its centennial in 2005. The origins of this transformation can be traced back to 1994 President Hong Il-sik's "KU Vision 2005" project that focused heavily on internationalization. Later, in 1998, President Kim Jong-bae instigated the "Global KU" project that focused on internationalization & informatization. In 2003, then President Eo Yun-dae instituted his own "Global KU Project" that focused exclusively on internationalization. Table 5 shows the scope of President Eo's 2003 "Global KU Project." One part of this project dictated that faculty hired after 2003 were to be required to give six hours of instruction in English. In addition, an English proficiency system was implemented for students entering KU from 2004. Finally, the school also made it mandatory for students to take a minimum of five units in their major in English. As a result of these measures, the percentage of English-medium courses increased from 9.8% in 2002 to 38% in 2012.

Table 5: Korea University's Global Korea University Project

Category	Sub Category	Main Content
Global Standard	Global Knowledge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Taking five units delivered in English • Implementing double major policy
	Global Communication	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reforming General English to focus on English Conversation • Submitting official scores for English and Chinese Character for graduation qualification
Global Network	Global Campus	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sending large numbers of students overseas to on-site dormitories • Expanding and strengthening student exchange programs
	Global Link	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishing KU's International Summer Campus • Increased numbers of lectures in English
Global Scope	Global Leadership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hosting lectures by global political leaders • Hosting lectures by world renowned scholars and Nobel laureates
	Global Service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overseas volunteering activities • Overseas internships

Source: Adapted from Korea University's Global KU Project

V. Statistical Data of Proliferation of English-medium Instruction in Korea

A. University Assessment by the *JoongAng Daily*

According to the internationalization section of a comprehensive university assessment conducted on 88 universities by the *JoongAng Daily*, the number of English-medium courses has increased more than 30 percent each year since 2007 (see Table 6).

Table 6: Percentage of English-medium Courses at Korean Universities

Year	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Rate (%)	3.44	3.53	4.91	6.45	8.67	11.85
Growth Rate (%)	–	2.62	39.09	31.36	34.42	36.68

Source: Adapted from the Research & Development Center of the *JoongAng Daily*

As shown in Table 7 and attributed to by innovation theory², in terms of the ratio of lectures in English, the top two universities that account for more than 50% are innovators, the second best 10 universities that account for more than 30% are early adopters. The 30 universities that account for more than 5% and less than 30% are early majors. Lastly, the 45 universities that account for less than 5% are late majors and laggards.

Table 7: Analysis of English-medium Instruction for Universities Evaluated by the *JoongAng Daily*

Lecture in English Ratio	Number of Universities
Universities with more than 50%	2
Universities with more than 45%	0
Universities with more than 40%	2
Universities with more than 35%	4
Universities with more than 30%	4
Universities with more than 25%	3

² In innovation theory, 2.5% are innovators, 13.5% are early adopters, 34% are early majors, 34% are late majors, and 16% are laggards

Universities with more than 20%	1
Universities with more than 15%	3
Universities with more than 10%	6
Universities with more than 5%	17
Universities with less than 5%	45

Source: Adapted from the Research & Development Center of the *JoongAng Daily*

VI. Characteristics of English-medium Instruction in Korea

The main factor affecting internationalization policies meant to strengthen Korean universities' international competitiveness is English-medium instruction. Therefore, the following section will examine previous studies about the same phenomenon at Korean Universities with a view to discovering the characteristics of this type of instruction.

A. Previous Research

In much of the research focusing on the necessity of English-medium instruction, students' gave negative responses. Overall, female students showed a more negative attitude toward English-medium instruction compared to male students. In addition, females indicated higher expectations for the effects of English-medium instruction and for the instructors (Yu and Jeong, 2009).

In research focusing on the realities and efficiency of English-medium instruction, many students indicated that they only selected lectures in English because it was required. In addition, students indicated that often both Korean and English were used in the classroom. English would be used for lectures and questions, but Korean would be used for group activities and discussion. Finally, in terms of the efficacy of English-medium instruction to improve students' English proficiency, most responded negatively (Kang and Park, 2005).

Looking at satisfaction levels toward English-medium instruction at colleges of education throughout Korea, most respondents indicated that their language skills are insufficient to take lectures in English, and

that they have reservations toward English-medium instruction (Gang et al., 2007).

In the social sciences, many students indicated having chosen English-medium instruction because they had no alternatives if they desired to improve their English proficiency. In addition, Sim (2010) discovered that learning efficiency suffers and the pressure felt by individual learners increases among students who lack prior experience in taking lectures in English and who are suddenly required to do so.

Perhaps unsurprisingly, Park (2009) discovered that the level of understanding in English-medium courses was lower than that of Korean-medium courses. Park also noted that lower-year students with less background in their particular majors showed an even greater lack of understanding of the content of courses offered in English.

According to a study (Oh and Lee, 2010), professors understand the necessity of English-medium instruction and anticipate that both their own English proficiency and students' English proficiency can be improved through such instruction. Further, to improve the quality of English-medium instruction, instructors should have sufficient English language skills to encourage active student participation in presentations, discussions, feedback, individual consultation, interaction, and the like.

As previous research suggests, a majority of those involved, both teachers and learners, recognize the necessity of English-medium instruction; however, both sides harbor concerns over its efficacy. Students in particular indicate feeling a great sense of unease at having to take English-medium courses.

B. Korea University's English-medium Instruction Assessment

The Office of Academic Affairs at Korea University, in evaluating the effectiveness of English-medium instruction at Korea University, found that, unsurprisingly, students' overall satisfaction and level of understanding of English-medium courses were positively correlated with their level of English proficiency. In addition, these students indicated that their English proficiency increased via English-medium instruction. The main factor behind these findings was students' active

in-class participation and increased preview and review of materials as a response to the challenge of learning in English.

The results of the English-medium instruction evaluation vary depending on students' grade. Third-year students' overall satisfaction and understanding of English-medium courses was highest, while those of first-year students were the lowest. In terms of language proficiency improvement via English-medium instruction, fourth-year students showed the largest increase, while first-year students showed the lowest.

Another key factor in students' overall satisfaction with English-medium instruction, their degree of understanding, and level of language improvement is the professors' level of preparation. More preparation by instructors led to increases in students' satisfaction, understanding, and improvement. Interestingly, class size was also found to play a role in these areas, with classes of fewer than 30 students showing increases in all three measures.

Based on these findings, the following conclusions can be drawn. Students require prior learning processes to improve their foreign language proficiency and foreign language understanding to participate actively and to increase their satisfaction and understanding in English-medium courses. In addition, students must participate actively in class by asking questions and taking part in presentations. They must also thoroughly preview and review all class materials. In addition, professors are required to prepare their lessons thoroughly, so that students can improve their satisfaction and understanding of English-medium instruction and their own foreign language proficiency. Lastly, class size should be under 30 students.

VII. Challenges and Obstacles in Proliferating English-medium Instruction in Korea

Instructors opposed to English-medium instruction report that students understand only 30 to 40 percent of lecture content. Despite having obtained their degrees from overseas institutions that taught in English, many younger instructors do not have prior experience teaching in English. In addition, these non-native-English instructors sometimes receive complaints from students who are native speakers of English

or who hold near native-like proficiency. As such, these non-native instructors who are unskilled at lecturing in English express great difficulties and hardship. This is primarily due to the onerous task of having to teach in English, especially when international students and exchange students attend their classes.

Students, especially those not from foreign language high schools, also have significant reservations toward English-medium lectures as they encounter this type of instruction for the first time when they enter university. On the other hand, students that are familiar with expressing their thoughts and ideas in English may benefit from English-medium instruction because they were either international students in English speaking countries, graduates of foreign language high schools in Korea, or admitted students through special screening for overseas nationals. This raises issues of fairness since these students with high English proficiency often receive higher grades more easily compared to students who are unfamiliar with English-medium instruction.

Teaching in English in quantitative fields such as Science and Engineering, Business Administration, or Economics may be desirable. However, objections have been raised in the humanities or social sciences as students must engage in critical and analytical thinking as well as intense discussion and it is assumed that students cannot do this in a language other than their first.

The media and other such organizations also oppose this practice. Although they recognize its importance, they oppose its introduction by raising issues regarding methodology and practicality as well as the danger of students' significant lower level of understanding, and lastly, the significantly reduced transmission of knowledge.

VIII. Concluding Remarks

It is no exaggeration to say that English-medium instruction at Korean universities occupies a primary place of importance in their internationalization projects. English-medium instruction is the one element that connects all of the elements in their internationalization plans. As a result, universities in Korea try to achieve it through hiring foreign faculty and requiring Korean non-native faculty to teach in English. In addition, in order to improve students' English proficiency,

universities have modified general English curricula to focus more on conversation skills and have recruited native speakers of English to teach these courses. Other measures that universities have taken to internationalize include requiring students to take courses in their majors in English; requiring officially-certified English scores for graduation; and having students participate in various international exchange programs such as student exchange programs, visiting student programs, and international internships.

However, though the expansion of English-medium instruction may be inevitable, more attention must be paid to the efficacy of these lectures. English-medium instruction should be introduced and promoted only when accompanied by proper support systems, including such measures as the thorough preparation of instructors and a careful preview and review of materials by students. Finally, it is important to remember that English-medium instruction may suit certain fields, namely physical sciences and business, better than others such as social sciences.

Traditional English education in Korea focused mainly on grammar and sentence structures by reading, analyzing, and translating English sentences. It did not teach English as a means of communication. As such, upon entering universities that teach in English, students are faced with an unfamiliar learning process. Although belated, the government has recognized these problems and has switched the focus of the curriculum from grammar and reading comprehension to conversation. However, students are still often stuck with studying English privately to prepare for English at university. Adding to this issue is the fact English-medium instruction is absent from primary and secondary schools in Korea. Therefore, for Korean universities to continue on their chosen paths of internationalization, a more holistic approach is required; one that reaches all areas of society, not just tertiary education.

References

- American Council on Education (ACE) website (<http://www.acenet.edu/news-room/Pages/CIGE-Model-for-Comprehensive-Internationalization.aspx>), accessed December 28, 2012.
- De Wit, H. (2012). *Partners and Competitors: Who wins and who*

- loses in the new internationalization area? *AIEA Conference*, Washington DC, February 21, 2012.
- Gang, S. & Park, H. (2004). Study on Lectures in English for Major Units in the Engineering Field. *Engineering Education*, 11(1), 54-58.
- Gang, S., & Park, H. (2005). English as a Medium of Instruction of Engineering Education. *Korean Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 21, 155-174.
- Gang, S. et al. (2007). Survey on Students' Understanding and Satisfaction toward Lectures in College of Education. *Pedagogical Research*, 11-2, 637-656.
- IAU (2006). Internationalization of Higher Education: New Directions New Challenges. Paper presented at the Observatory on Borderless Higher Education.
- Kachru, B. (1992). *The Other Tongue: English across cultures*. University of Illinois Press
- Knight, J and De Wit, H. (1997). *Internationalisation of Higher Education in Asia Pacific Countries*. EAIE, Amsterdam, 1997
- Oh, H., & Lee, H. (2010). Exploration for Characteristics and Supporting Measures of Effective Lectures in English. *Modern English Education*, 11-1, 191-211.
- Park, H. (2009). Long-term Qualitative Research on Domestic University Students' Learning Strategies and Competence Achievement in the Major Lectures in English. *Korean Society of Educational Psychology*, 23-1, 197-217.
- Sim, Y. (2010). Research on University Students' Awareness toward Lectures using English as a Medium, *English Language and Linguistics*, 22-4, 211-229.
- Yu, G., & Jeong, H. (2009). Research on University Students' Awareness and Preference toward English Major Instruction (EMI). *English Language and Linguistics*, 28, 67-89.

Chosun-QS Materials

Innovation Theory

JoongAang Education Development Institute

JoongAng Daily

Korea University Catalog

Korea University's Global KU Project

Korea University's Regulations and Enforcement Bylaws

Korea University's Teaching and Learning Development Center
Materials

QS WUR Materials

THE WUR Materials

University's College Education Empowerment Project

English Language Teaching in Elementary Schools in Japan – The Case for an Integrated Curriculum –

Dr. Kola Olagboyega

Abstract

The Japanese Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science, and Technology (MEXT) revised its new course of study in 2008 with the introduction of English classes at elementary schools from 2011. The new curriculum introduced focuses on speaking and listening skills and recommends the avoidance of reading and writing. This is justified by a suggestion that reading and writing will cause motivational problems among the students and that the inclusion of reading and writing will undermine the junior high curriculum. In Japan, English has been taught through the grammar translation method for many years. The general dissatisfaction with the communicative ability of the Japanese students has also been blamed on the emphasis on grammar and translation. Communicative lessons have been introduced slowly and to varying extent throughout the school system and these lessons tend to be fun, and game based and are not formally tested. This has led to an association between listening/speaking based lessons and high motivation. The motivational problems, therefore, appear to be related to teaching method and the level of language difficulty rather than to the language skills in question. This paper argues that neglecting reading and writing skills could cause greater motivational problems in the long run and create problems for the students with their language development, creating yet a bigger gap

between the elementary and junior high curriculums.

Introduction

In 2008, the Japanese Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science, and Technology (MEXT) revised its new *course of study* with the introduction of English classes at elementary schools from 2011. It should be noted that before the new English language policy was enacted, several elementary schools had introduced English activities in various forms in Japan (Hall, Yamazaki, Takahashi and Ishigame 2012). The new curriculum focuses on speaking and listening skills and does not recommend the teaching of reading and writing. This is justified by a suggestion that teaching the latter two will cause motivational problems among the students and that they will undermine the junior high curriculum (Kikuchi 2009, Beebe 2001, Berwick and Ross 1989, Kimura, Nakata and Okumura 2001, Teweles 1996, Yamashiro and McLaughlin 2001, and Carreira 2012).

These suggested motivational problems are however probably associated with the general dissatisfaction felt by those who have passed through the rigorous Japanese exam system (Teweles 1996, Berwick and Ross 1989). In Japan, English has been taught through the grammar translation method for many years (Riley 2008, Olagboyega 2011). As a result many associate reading and writing with difficult translation exercises and the manipulation of grammar in artificial exam and classroom situations (cf. Kikuchi 2009, Beebe 2001, Berwick and Ross 1989, Kimura, Nakata and Okumura 2001). The general dissatisfaction with the communicative ability of Japanese students has also been blamed on the emphasis on grammar and translation (ibid.). Communicative lessons have been introduced slowly and to varying degrees throughout the school system and these lessons tend to be fun, game-based and are not formally tested. This has led to an association between listening/speaking based lessons and high motivation (cf. Torikai 2009). In the words of Dr. Mineo Nakajima (2004), “the elementary school English teaching activities ... are generally designed to provide enjoyable contact with the language through games and similar means”.

Dr. Nakajima was also the chairman of the 22-member advisory panel to the then Education Minister Hirofumi Nakasone. The panel, which

was established in January 2000, was charged with examining ways of improving English education in Japanese schools. The panel's most important recommendation was that English should start being taught at elementary level. However, they did not support the introduction of reading and writing at this level. Nakajima, a proponent of the *Suzuki method*, has always insisted on cultivating aesthetic sentiments as well as language education "when children still have a flexible brain". Therefore, he believes that "English should be taught to first- and second- graders as part of special activities" (2006).

A key issue for both the advisory panel and for those who opposed their recommendation, was the issue of student motivation with respect to the introduction of English curriculum at elementary schools (cf. Yukio Otsu 2006). The relevance of Gardner's (1985) motivation theory in second language acquisition to this issue cannot be over-emphasized. Motivation has been identified as the learner's orientation with regard to the goal of learning a second language (Gardner 1985, Crookes and Schmidt 1991). It is thought that students who are most successful when learning a target language are those who like the people that speak the language, admire the culture and have a desire to become familiar with or even integrate into the society in which the language is used (Falk 1978). This form of motivation is known as integrative motivation. According to Norris-Holt (2001), when someone becomes a resident in a new community that uses the target language in its social interactions, integrative motivation is a key component in assisting the learner in developing some level of proficiency in the language. It is also theorized that "integrative motivation typically underlies successful acquisition of a wide range of registers and a nativelike pronunciation" (Finegan 1999:568). However, this kind of motivation for learning English obviously does not apply in elementary schools, where, even the Ministry of Education (MEXT) had hinted that communicative ability is not the main purpose of instruction; rather it is for self-confidence or self-expression.

In contrast to integrative motivation is the form of motivation referred to as instrumental motivation. This is generally characterized by the desire to obtain something practical or concrete from the study of a second language (Hudson 2000). With instrumental motivation the purpose of language acquisition is more utilitarian, such as meeting the requirements for school or university graduation, applying for a

job, requesting higher social status (Norris-Holt 2001). Instrumental motivation has been identified as being higher among students studying English language in Japan. This is because they study English mainly to pass various examinations in junior, senior high schools and university entrance examinations (Kikuchi 2009, Beebe 2001, Berwick and Ross 1989, Kimura, Nakata and Okumura 2001, Teweles 1996, Yamashiro and McLaughlin 2001). However, this kind of motivation in learning English obviously does not apply in elementary schools either, as students do not have to take examinations to pass the course.

Some studies have shown that affective factors contribute to motivation for L2 learning (Honda & Sakyu, 2004; Wu, 2003). For instance, Carreira (2012:197) reports on Wu's (2003) studies in China which demonstrates that "a predictable learning environment, moderately challenging tasks, necessary instructional support, and evaluation emphasizing self-improvement were effective in promoting children's self-perceptions of L2 competence". However, none of the conditions observed by Wu in China are present in the English language policy in elementary school in Japan. In Japan there is no curriculum. It is emphasized that the "curriculum" should be developed by the students and their needs. It is assumed that the language that will be required to complete the activities or tasks that the teacher assigns shall be the language that should be taught (MEXT 2001, 2005). However, the teachers have little experience eliciting language from students and moreover lack the language ability to do so in such a manner. The lack of a standard English curriculum, uniform teaching methods and a minimum level of competence in the language has led to differences in materials, methodology and content in elementary school classrooms across the country.

I will argue that in fact neglecting reading and writing skills could cause greater motivational problems in the long run and create problems with students' language development, creating yet a bigger discrepancy between the elementary and junior high curriculums. For me, the motivational problems that Japanese students experience in learning English in school are related to teaching method and the level of language difficulty rather than to the language skills in question.

An additional problem is the transition between elementary and junior high school. Without consequent change in the junior high curriculum

whatever we teach in elementary school could be said to undermine the junior high system. Prof. Kumiko Yorikai of Rikkyo University investigated the issue of textbooks (or lack of it) in elementary schools in Japan. She observes (2009) that even though MEXT has produced and issued *Eigo Noto* (English Notebook) to be used during English lessons, some local boards of education have opted not to have schools use the workbooks, whilst schools in other areas use them selectively. She concludes emphatically that “such discrepancies ... (will become) a serious issue for middle schools”.

I do not share Yorikai’s pessimistic view of the elementary students’ English abilities once they transition to junior high. I would like to argue that a positive approach to the elementary school curriculum followed by graded changes in the junior high curriculum could help our students greatly with their language development. Ellis (2005) described ten principles for instructed language learning. Using these ten principles to support their study on integrated language curriculum, Duibhir and Cummins (2012) conclude that “the implications of these ten principles are that learners acquire the target language as a result of active engagement with the language by means of *oral and written activities* (both inside and outside the context of the school) that generate personal investment on the part of the learner” (italics added). I would now like to take a closer look at a more appropriate alternative from which the students could benefit.

The Integrated Approach

The integrated approach in language teaching is “the teaching of the language skills of reading, writing, listening and speaking, in conjunction with each other, as when a lesson involves activities that relate listening and speaking to reading and writing” (Richards, *et al.* 1992:184).

The four main skills of reading, writing, listening and speaking are often considered separately. Sometimes they may be grouped into the closely connected speaking/listening, and reading/writing categories or into the productive (speaking and writing) and receptive (listening and reading) categories (Celce-Murcia, 2001:45). However, in everyday life there are situations when we will be required to use a combination of two, three, or even all four skills at the same time. Although reading,

and particularly writing are far less important in the daily lives of young children, “if we look around us in our daily lives we can see that we rarely use language skills in isolation but in conjunction, ... even though the classroom is clearly not the same as ‘real’ life, it could be argued that part of its function is to replicate it” (McDonough & Shaw 1993: 202).

It is advisable to consider students’ wants and needs when we decide on the balance of skills in the course of designing a course for them. However, at present, the only real need regarding English for students in Japan is the one related to the exams for which primarily only reading and writing skills are required. MEXT, and the students themselves, may actually desire communicative competence, but at present it is the need to pass the reading and writing-heavy exam-based system, which is of prime concern to the students and consequently to their classroom teachers.

For the elementary school system, whether we are guided by the present students’ exam-related needs or the desire to replicate ‘real life’ in the classroom, some work with the written code would seem to be both essential and desirable. As with the British model, student performance and success at elementary level is judged and evaluated by those in the junior high system, which is at present extremely reliant on the written code.

As Harmer (2001:52) explains, it is almost impossible to use one skill in isolation. In fact, there are many communicative situations, which require the use of all four skills. Even in the simple case of a classroom situation we are likely to want to take some record of what we have ‘learned’, even if that lesson’s aims are listening and speaking. The diligent student would read over his/her own notes prior to the next lesson to recall what they have been doing. This would, of course, not be so true for young children but through holistic work on all four skills at an early stage, we could help increase the learning efficiency of our students for the future by enabling them to keep some record of the work they have covered.

Speaking and listening skills by themselves will not achieve the goals of increased communicative competence. Even if we had to meet the disparate goals of replicating ‘real’ life as well as passing written

exams with the aim of progressing to the next educational level, I will argue that we can give our students a more solid language base by teaching a well balanced integrated course:

One of the most significant features of communication is that ... it cannot easily be analysed into component features without its nature being destroyed in the process. ... the ability to handle these abilities in isolation is no indication of ability to communicate (Morrow 1981:61).

It is often mentioned in the literature that we learn in the order Listening → Speaking → Reading → Writing (Milton, 2009, Saville-Troike, 2006, McDonough and Shaw, 1993) and that we would expect to see greater progress in the receptive skills of listening and reading at the early stages. However, this should be taken as a kind of insight into the nature of language acquisition and should not be considered as a necessary teaching sequence.

After interviewing elementary school students who had been learning English at many schools for varying lengths of time, over a period of seven or eight years Paul (1992:39) noted, that “The vast majority of the children could produce very little English”. He goes on to state that:

The children who had learned to read and write as well as speak performed consistently better in the oral interviews. They could clearly remember much more of what they had learned. I can only speculate as to what the reasons are. Perhaps it is because reading and writing help to consolidate and solidify what is spoken. Perhaps it is because if the children can read and write, they can practice English more effectively at home between lessons. Maybe there are other reasons.

Though there could be numerous other reasons for the results that Paul claims to have noticed and far more detailed research would be required to justify his claims, it appears that work with the written language could provide important support for what has been learned in the classroom and this can give rise to learning opportunities elsewhere.

Paul goes on to note the inappropriacy of many elementary texts written in Europe or America, as they are designed primarily for children who use the Roman alphabet in L1. Basing materials on such texts is likely to lead to confusion and motivational problems. Particularly in Japan's situation, where the students probably have only one English lesson a week and no other exposure to English outside the classroom, by neglecting reading and writing skills we are reducing students' retention potential as well as limiting their learning opportunities. For large numbers of students it is very difficult to give out of school speaking and listening assignments at this level. On the other hand, reading and writing assignments are easy to produce and grade, and provide important exposure to L2 outside the classroom. This fact adds support to my position that successful English language learning at elementary level should include all the four skills.

In Japan, although there is little opportunity or need to listen to or speak English outside the classroom, written English is used extensively in pop-culture, fashion and advertising. These could be valuable learning opportunities for learners. Productive writing is not a realistic or practical goal for young children but writing can play an important support role to reading as listening does to speaking. Commenting on what research reveals about learning to read and write, Fillmore (1991) states that "oral and written language experiences should be regarded as an additive process, ensuring that children are able to maintain their home language while also learning to speak and read English". Echoing Fillmore's words years later, Chun (2006) concludes that "writing is one way of providing variety in classroom procedures". Furthermore, "it provides a learner with physical evidence of his achievements and he can measure his improvement. It helps to consolidate their grasp of vocabulary and structure, and complements the other language skills" (Ibid.). The mechanics of writing the Roman alphabet are very different to that of Japanese characters (*Kanji*). Junior high students often struggle with the writing system to begin with. This fact suggests that work on the mechanics of the writing system in elementary school could help relieve some of the burden in junior high.

Pronunciation has long been a problem for the Japanese. Many young students resort to using *Katakana* as a way of recording and memorizing what they have learned during class time. *Katakana* does

not resemble English pronunciation and gives the students a false sense of accomplishment which can later lead to disillusionment. In their extensive survey of the Japanese learner's problems of demotivation when studying English, Kikuchi and Sakai (2009:196) found out that teachers' poor pronunciation is a demotivating factor, as some of the respondents claim that they "became demotivated when the teacher's pronunciation was very much like reading katakana". Exposure to the written word from an early age could help the students become more aware of the differences between the shape and sound of English and that of Japanese.

A fundamental insight developed in children's early years' instruction is the alphabetic principle, the understanding that there is a systematic relationship between letters and sounds (Adams, 1990). The research of Gibson and Levin (1975) indicates that the shapes of letters are learned by distinguishing one character from another by its type of special features. Teachers will often involve children in comparing letter shapes, helping them to differentiate a number of letters visually. I have used alphabet books and alphabet puzzles effectively and I have observed tremendous results in my classes with elementary school students at a community center in Akita, Japan. This method in which children can see and compare letters may be a key to efficient and easy learning and it may be a further reason for introducing reading and writing at elementary level.

The Elementary/Junior High Border

MEXT claim that reading and writing in elementary school will undermine the junior high school curriculum (MEXT 2001, 2005). Nevertheless, curricular conflicts with junior high will occur with any elementary school course introduced without graded change in the English curriculum throughout the system. A move to introduce English nationally in elementary schools followed by subsequent graded changes in the junior high school *course of study* could lead to a great improvement in the students' English ability. However, without a change throughout the system, in four or five years' time, first year junior high school students will simply be learning to write and learn the grammar to explain what they can already use orally. In the system as it operates at present it is not sufficient to be able to produce language, students are also required to manipulate language in artificial ways. In order to be able to do this the students need to

acquire the grammatical terminologies in their L1. This is likely to cause huge motivational problems. This is one of the points made by Yukio Otsu, a professor of psycholinguistics at Keio University (2006). The gap needs to be bridged and a well integrated four skills approach from the beginning would be a sound base on which to build. Of course, in an ideal world, language instruction should be geared towards communicative competence in L2. This could usher in a top-down change in the current exam system. This development could lead to positive backwash and help teachers reach the goal of replicating ‘real life’.

The Phonics Approach

The teaching of reading and writing is generally taught to young children using either the whole word approach or by breaking the words into their phonic components i.e. phonics. A survey I conducted in spring 2012, showed that phonics is by far the most popular method in Japan (with forty-eight of the fifty teachers who replied claiming to use phonics either by itself or in conjunction with whole word techniques). Why should this be so? Phonemic awareness refers to a child’s understanding and conscious awareness that speech is composed of identifiable units, such as spoken words, syllables, and sounds. Training studies have demonstrated that phonemic awareness can be taught to children as young as age five (Bradley and Bryant 1983; Lundberg, Frost, & Peterson 1988; Cunningham 1990; Bryne & Fielding-Barnsley 1991).

A debate between the proponents of the phonics approach and those of the whole word teaching method has been ongoing for many years around the world. This disagreement encompasses the teaching of English as an L1 as well as an L2. Elementary school students in Japan in general start with no experience with the English language and no knowledge of the Roman alphabet. The students lack English vocabulary and “they also cannot serve as their own model for the sounds of English” (Goya 1992:4). Though there are many studies that support whole word teaching methods, Goya (1992: 3) claims that:

Nearly all research comparing whole language with sight-reading and phonics contain an unstated and unrecognized assumption, which is, that the population being studied already

possesses the verbal code. When we teachers try to put such research into practice, we find that the research does not apply to a student population which does not have the requisite verbal code.

In Japanese, the name of the letter and its sound are the same but in English they are very different. This fact in itself often comes as a shock to students. However, their biggest problem with phonemic awareness of L2 at the early stages is interference from Japanese. Japanese consists of consonant + vowel pairs, which when applied to a borrowed language leads to pronunciation problems and confusion. Consonant clusters, for example, do not exist in Japanese. According to Kirkpatrick (2007:18), “this explains why the word ‘strike’, which has the three-consonant sound cluster ‘str’, is pronounced something like /seteraika/ by Japanese speakers of English, as Japanese is a CV language”. We can help our students overcome many of the pronunciation problems they will face later by teaching the pronunciation of single phonemes at elementary level.

Using phonics in isolation is not a practical solution to students’ problems due to the problems with the English phonic system. English is far from uniform and some of the most common and simple words are ‘exceptions’ to phonic rules. For this reason, I feel that a combination of sight reading and work with phonics is a more realistic solution. Goya (1992:2) suggests that phonics “is essential to skilled reading. What we don’t know is whether phonics is intuitive or a learned skill, and whether all children require the same amount and intensity of phonics training”. He goes on to argue that:

The few students who have managed to figure out English phonics on their own often cannot explain it to anyone else. They don’t know why a word is spelled a certain way; they just have a feel for it. Determined students who can’t figure phonics out compensate by memorizing every word, as if they were learning a pictograph system such as Chinese characters most simply give up (Ibid.:5).

I have seen cases of students who have picked up the skills of phonics without any training. These have all been students who have done well at school and who would be considered achievers. However,

other students who do not pick up these skills lack an awareness of the connection between the sounds and the written code of English. These students rely completely on memorization, and cannot even attempt to read words they have not memorized. An awareness of the relationship between the sound and the written code of the language (though somewhat imperfect) can help aid memorization and help the students become more independent readers. For these reasons I believe some formal work with younger learners in elementary school with the skills of reading and writing, with particular emphasis on phonics, is valuable (See also, Bhatia and Ritchie 2006, Chomsky 2002, Pennington 1996).

In a joint study, the International Reading Association (IRA) and the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC), US., rightly claim that “children acquire a working knowledge of the alphabetic system not only through reading but also through writing” (2012). They cited a classic study by Read (1971) which found that “even without formal spelling instruction, preschoolers use their tacit knowledge of phonological relations to spell words”. They conclude that “writing activity sends the important message that writing is not just handwriting practice – children are using their own words to compose a message to *communicate with others*” (italics added). After all, this is the essence of language learning. If this idea applies to children learning English as a foreign language as well then the conclusion must be that Japanese children should also acquire a working knowledge of the English alphabetic system at elementary level.

Conclusion

In order to achieve our aim of communicative competence, it appears that an integrated curriculum giving fairly equal weighting to the four skills from the start is the best solution. Certainly, the introduction of the mechanics of writing at an early age could help students with their language skills development. Productive writing skill is perhaps neither a realistic nor practical goal though work with the written code can help support the students’ reading skills and give them a greater holistic language experience in L2.

With regard to reading and writing, using a balance of phonics and sight words seems to be a popular method for combating pronunciation

problems, helping bridge the gap between the sounds of English and the written word, and finally helping the students become independent learners. Too much dependence on the teacher, particularly teachers with poor language skills, no training or experience, may only add to problems in the already troubled English *course of study* in Japan.

At present the students' only needs are those related to the written examination. This in itself suggests that the absence of reading and writing in the earlier stages is a little strange. Nevertheless, we could hope to replicate 'real life', and give our students a holistic experience of English with a well thought out curriculum, including a graded change aiming for communicative competence throughout both junior high and senior high curriculums. In this case, work on all four skills would seem to be both practical and desirable as it helps to bridge rather than widen the gap between elementary school and junior high. Writing specifically on the importance of writing skills for second language learners, Carson (2001) notes that "learners who believe that learning a language is primarily an oral-aural activity might have little motivation to attend to written tasks with the result being errors in writing that might not occur in speech". And, this is my experience with elementary school English language learners in Japan.

Finally, it is worth noting that over four decades of ineffective English teaching methods at high school level have not yielded any measurable results in terms of the general population's ability in English. Thus, the introduction of an ill-conceived English 'curriculum' in a non-English speaking country like Japan, and the nature of the exam oriented education system practiced there, cannot be justified in light of that failure. In an earlier study, this researcher concludes that the 'beneficial' nature of the spread of English in the Japanese context can be summed up by the English language's role in international relations, politics and commerce (Olagboyega, 2011). Miyagi, Sato and Crump, (2009) assert that English education prepares "students to interact with the international community, which has obvious economic and political benefits" – as the ability to communicate in English is necessary in the modern globalized world. In my opinion, to have studied the language is beneficial for those Japanese who go on to careers that use English, but for most people who never need to use English in a meaningful way, the language is not that 'beneficial'. In Japan, the 'beneficial' nature of the spread of English is dependent on the individual's

proficiency in the language: those with a high proficiency in English can reap the benefits, while those with a low or no English ability at all are left without access to the same career paths and opportunities. The majority of jobs and interactions in Japan require very little or no English. There is, therefore, no evidence to suggest that introducing English language at even younger age will make a difference.

Bibliography

- Aizawa, Kazuo. 2006. Rethinking frequency markers for English-Japanese dictionaries. In M. Murata, K. Minamide, Y. Tono and S. Ishikawa (eds.) *English Lexicography in Japan* (pp. 108-119). Tokyo: Taishukan-shoten.
- Beebe, J.D. 2001. Japanese secondary students attaining oral proficiency: Interviews with more and less proficient individuals. In P. Robinson, M. Sawyer, & S. Ross, (Eds.). *Second Language Research in Japan*. (pp. 163-180). Tokyo: Japan Association for Language Teaching.
- Berwick, R., and Ross, S. 1989. Motivation after matriculation: Are Japanese learners of English still alive after exam hell? *JALT Journal*, 11(2), 193-210.
- Bhati, Tej., and Ritchie, William. 2006. *The Handbook of Bilingualism*. UK: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Brown, H.D. 2000. *Principles of language learning and teaching* (4th ed.). Englewood Cliffs NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Carreira, Junko Matsuzaki 2006. Motivation for Learning English as a Foreign Language in Japanese Elementary Schools. In *JALT Journal*, Vol. 28, No. 2, November 2006 (pp. 135-155).
- _____ 2012. Affective Factors Contributing to Intrinsic Motivation for Learning English among Elementary School Students in Japan. In Theron Muller, Steven Herder, John Adamson and Philip Shigeo Brown (eds.). *Innovating EFL Teaching in Asia*. Britain: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Carson, Joan G. 2001. Second Language Writing and Second Language Acquisition. In Tony Silva and Paul Kei Matsuda (eds.) *On Second Language Writing*. London LEA. p.191-199.
- Carter, Ronald and David Nunan. (eds.) 2001. *The Cambridge Guide to Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Celce-Murcia, Marianne and Olshtain, Elite. 2000. *Discourse and Context in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Celce-Murcia, Marianne. (ed.) 2001. *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language* (Third Edition), USA: Thomson.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1957. *Syntactic Structures*. The Hague: Mouton.
- _____ 1965. *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. Cambridge MA: MIT Press.

- _____. 2002. *On Nature and Language*, ed. A Belletti & L. Rizzi. Cambridge: CUP.
- Chun Tae Ho. 2006. "Four Skills of Language Learning: Listening, Speaking, Reading and Writing". In *WriteWork* (February 2006). Accessed January 26, 2013 from <http://www.writework.com/essay/four-skills-language-learning-listening-speaking-reading-and-writing/html>
- Dornyei, Z. 2001a. *Teaching and researching motivation*. Harlow: Longman.
- _____. 2001b. *Motivation strategies in the language classroom*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Ellis, Rod. 1994. *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- _____. 2005. Principles of instructed language learning. *System*, 33(2), 209-224. j.system.2004.12.006
- Falk, J. 1978. *Linguistics and language: A survey of basic concepts and implications* (2nd ed.). John Wiley and Sons.
- Finegan, E. 1999. *Language: Its structure and use* (3rd ed.). Harcourt Brace.
- Gardner, Robert C. 2010. *Motivation and Second Language Acquisition: The socio-educational model*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Goya, Sandra. 1992. *Cracking the code: Adapting Phonics to Japanese Students*. Tokyo: Shurai Educational Press.
- Hall, James, M., Yamazaki Tomoko, Takahashi Chohei, and Ishigame Takeru. 2012. Adapting English Picture Books to an ELF Context: A Study of Collaboration between Elementary School Teachers and TEFL Practitioners in Rural Japan. In In Theron Muller, Steven Herder, John Adamson and Philip Shigeo Brown (eds.). *Innovating EFL Teaching in Asia*. Britain: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Harmer, Jeremy. 1991. *The Practice of English language Teaching*. Harlow: Pearson Education Ltd.
- Honda, K., & Sakyu, M. 2004. Multiple models of motivation for Japanese EFL learners: An investigation into concepts in different paradigms. *Annual Review of English Language Education in Japan*, 15: 41-50.
- International Reading Association and the National Association for the Education of Young Children. 2012. Learning to Read and Write: What Research Reveals. In *Readingrockets.org*. Retrieved on January 26, 2013 from <http://www.readingrockets.org>.

- org/article/4483/
- Kikuchi, Keita and Sakai Hideki. 2009. Japanese Learners' Demotivation to Study English: A Survey Study. In *JALT Journal*, Vol. 31, No. 2, November 2009. (pp. 183-204).
- Kimura Y., Nakata Y., & Okumura T. 2001. Language learning motivation of EFL learners in Japan – A cross-sectional analysis of various learning milieus. *The JALT Journal*, 23, 47-68.
- Kirkpatrick, Andy. 2007. *World Englishes: Implications for International Communication and English Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McDonough, Jo., & Shaw, Christopher. 1993. *Materials and Methods in ELT: A Teacher's Guide*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Milton, James. 2009. *Measuring Second Language Vocabulary Acquisition*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science, & Technology. 2001. *Shougakkou eigokatsudou jissen no tebiki [Practical handbook for elementary school English activities]*. Tokyo: Kairyudo Publishing.
- Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science, & Technology. 2005. *Shougakkou eigokatsudou jishijoukyou chousakekka gaiyou (Heisei 16 nendo) shuukei. [2004 implementation report on English activities in elementary schools]*. Retrieved January 30, 2013, from http://www.mext.go.jp/b_menu/shingi/chukyo/chukyo3/siryu/015/05071201/005/002.html.
- Miyagi, K., Sato, M., & Crump, A. 2009. To challenge the unchallenged: potential of non-'standard' Englishes for Japanese EFL learners. *JALT Journal*, 31, 2, p. 264.
- Morrow, Karen. 1981. *Principles of Communicative Methodology*. In Johnson and Morrow (eds.) 59-66.
- Nakajima, Mineo (November 15, 2004). "Globally speaking, Japan needs English for tots". An opinion editorial (point of view) in The Asahi Shimbun. Accessed November 18, 2012 from <http://www.asahi.com/english/opinion/TKY200411150089.html>
- _____ (May 18, 2006). "Primary school English: An advocate states his case". In *Yomiuri Shimbun/Daily Yomiuri*. Accessed November 18, 2012.
- Norris-Holt, Jacqueline. 2001. "Motivation as a Contributing Factor in Second Language Acquisition". In The Internet TESL Journal, Vol. VII, No. 6, June 2001. Accessed January 26, 2013 from <http://iteslj.org/Articles/Norris-Motivation.html>

- Olagboyega, Kolawole Waziri (2011). EIL: Is EIL Natural, Neutral and Beneficial in Japan? In *The Scientific and Technical Reports of Faculty of Engineering and Resource Science, Akita University*, 32:7-13.
- Otsu, Yukio. (June 30, 2006). “Why primary school English puts off students”. In *Yomiuri Shimbun/Daily Yomiuri*. Accessed November 18, 2012.
- Paul, David. 1992. Can Japanese Children Learn English?. *Cross Currents* XIX:1 (Summer) 37-40.
- Pennington, Martha. 1996. *Phonology in English Language Teaching: An International Approach*. London: Pearson Education.
- Richards, Jack, Platt, John., & Platt, Heidi. 1992. *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching & Applied Linguistics*. UK: Longman.
- Riley, P.A. (2008): *Reform in English Language Teaching in Japan*. Yokohama: Kanto Gakuin University.
- Saville-Troike, Muriel. 2006. *Introducing Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Tomlinson, Brian. 1998. *Materials Development in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Torikai, Kumiko. 2009. “Seeds of English learning / Primary classes aim is for children to enjoy language”. In *Daily Yomiuri* (May 5, 2009). Accessed January 26, 2013 from <http://educationinjapan.wordpress.com/edu-news/english-language-education-in-japan/html>
- Wu, X. 2003. Intrinsic motivation and young language learners: The impact of the classroom environment. *System*, 31: 501-517.

Kolawole Waziri Olagboyega (Ph.D.) is Associate Professor at the Graduate School of Global Communication and Language, Akita International University. He is an Associate Editor of *Interfaces*, an online journal of Woosong University, South Korea; and has published widely in the area of Applied Linguistics and Language Teaching. His publications include “Japanese English”: Structure of the Verb Phrase (*Intercultural Communication Studies XXI:1*, 2012); The Communicative Approach to Language Teaching: Some Strengths and Weaknesses (*The Scientific and Technical Reports of Akita University*, 2012); The nominal structure of Japanese English (*AIU Global Review*, 2010). He is a Fellow of the Cambridge Commonwealth Society.

“Is there a New Cold War in Asia?”

Shuhei Takemoto

Introduction

This essay will review three books that Dr. Mineo Nakajima, the President of Akita International University, has co-published or edited. They are *The Wisdom of Asia*,¹ *Choutaikoku Chugoku no Honshitsu*² (*The Essence of Superpower China*), and *Beichu Shinsensou*³ (*U.S.-China New War*). The significance of these three works is that they have anticipated the probability of a “U.S.-China New Cold War” as early as the year 2000.

Ever since the end of the Cold War and the demise of the Soviet threat, the prospects for the future of U.S.-China relations have been under considerable academic debate, especially by American scholars.⁴ Although scholars present conflicting arguments, the main question seems to be whether China will be a challenger to the existing order in the Asia-Pacific region or a beneficiary. Nakajima’s three prescient works emphasize the necessity for Japan and Taiwan to implement a

¹ Lee Tung-hui & Nakajima Mineo (Translated by Alexander K. Young), *The Wisdom of Asia* (Akita: Akita International University Press, 2012).

² Mineo Makajima ed., *Choutaikoku Chugoku no Honshitsu* [The Essence of Superpower China] (Besto Sinsho, 2012).

³ Mineo Nakajima and Yoshihisa Komori, *Beichu Shinsensou* [U.S.-China New War] (Bijinesusha, 2006).

⁴ Although this is not the place for full literature review, the following works neatly outlines the debates regarding the prospect of future U.S.-China relations. Aaron L. Friedberg, “The Future of U.S.-China Relations: Is Conflict Inevitable?” *International Security*, Vol. 30, No. 2 (Fall, 2005), 7-45., David L. Shambaugh, *Tangled Titans: the United States and China* (MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishing, 2012). For some recent diverse arguments about U.S.-China relations, see Aaron L. Friedberg, *A Contest for Supremacy: China, America, and the Struggle for Mastery in Asia* (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 2011), Andrew Nathan and Andrew Scobell, *China’s Search for Security* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2012), Henry Kissinger, *On China* (New York: Penguin Books, 2012).

united firm containment policy with the United States against Chinese expansion. Nakajima’s arguments, thus, falls under the same line as the conservatives in the United States or, in terms of Aaron Friedberg’s classification, “realist pessimists.”⁵

The purpose of this paper, however, is to argue that under the current strategic situation, in which the Chinese military is gaining capability to deter, delay, and deny the United States’ ability to operate in the Asia-Pacific region, the validity of a containment policy is suspect. Japan and Taiwan must also consider pursuing diplomatic initiative (i.e. a *détente* policy) towards China for the purpose of easing political tensions, deepening economic interdependence, and encouraging confidence building.

1. The Wisdom of Asia

The Wisdom of Asia is a book co-authored by Lee Teng-hui, the former President of Taiwan, and by Dr. Mineo Nakajima. It is an English translation of a Japanese book titled *Ajia no Chiryaku*, published in the year 2000. The difference between the original Japanese version and the new English translation is that two new chapters were added. One is a “‘the Narrow Road into the Interior’ and the Bushido Spirit.” It is based on a special lecture titled, “Japanese Education and Taiwan-the Road I Walked,” given by former President Lee at Akita International University on June 6, 2007. The second new chapter that was added is former President Lee’s comments on the Great East Japan Earthquake of March 2011 titled, “A personal view on the handling of the Great East Japan Earthquake as well as Japan’s reconstruction and recovery.”

The issues raised in this book are significantly broad. Lee and Nakajima present intelligent remarks on international politics, international economy, U.S.-China relations, Chinese history, Taiwan politics, and Japanese politics. The book also reflects on the personal life of former President Lee before he became a politician and how that experience has effected his decisions as a leader of a nation. The breadth of these issues directly represents the depth of knowledge of these two brilliant figures.

⁵ Friedberg, “The Future of U.S.-China Relations.”

Although it is impossible to discuss all of the issues discussed in this book, three things ought to be mentioned for the sake of Japan-Taiwan relations in the 21st century. First, is the historical significance of the democratization of Taiwan. In the year 2000, a second presidential election was held and the Taiwanese people chose Chen Shui-bian and Ms. Lee Hsiu-lien of the Democratic Progressive Party as their new President and Vice-President. It was the first transfer of power from the ruling party (the National Party; KMT) to the opposition party by direct democratic election in Chinese history. Throughout Chinese history, the Chinese have maintained an “Imperial-type power structure” and changes of rulers occurred not through the will of the people but through revolution of dynastic change or hereditary succession following a ruler’s death. Thus, as Nakajima mentions, “Taiwan has liberated Asia’s international relations space from the world to the Chinese.”⁶ In this way the Taiwan Presidential of 2000 was “truly epoch-making” and this historical event was only possible through Lee’s strong determination to revise the constitution to establish a system of direct presidential election.

The second important issue is the deepening of Taiwan’s sense of identity. Nakajima states in this book that it was only after the inauguration of former President Lee that Taiwan for the first time experienced the development of a sense of identity. The Republic of China was founded in 1912 as a result of the Hsinhai Revolution. After losing the civil war to the Communists in 1949, the Nationalist government moved to Taiwan and imposed military occupation on the island. In terms of International Law, the Nationalist government has effectively controlled Taiwan since 1949, thus it satisfies the condition of being a sovereign state. However, the National government was, after all, “an external regime.” In other words, the people of Taiwan were not able to govern themselves. Therefore, changing the domestic political system by constitutional revision in 1991 and forming a government that sufficiently reflects the will of the people through democratic elections was the only way to connect the people of Taiwan to the external regime. Thus, the process of democratization has nurtured the identity of the Taiwan people.

The third and final issue is how Lee has succeeded in constructing

⁶ *The Wisdom of Asia*, 23.

a “special state-to-state relationship” with China. In other words, Lee has been able to challenge the Chinese interpretation that “Taiwan is a province of China and the People’s Republic of China is the central government” or “Taiwan is just a local government.” Nakajima considers the democratization process of Taiwan in terms of horizontal and vertical transformation. Horizontal in the sense that democratization has occurred in the world to the Chinese, and vertical in the sense democratization deepened Taiwan’s sense of identity. Through these dual transformations, Taiwan has been able to claim its sovereignty and pursue its relationship with China on the basis of a “special state to state relationship.”

Although *The Wisdom Asia* was published in 2012, most of the details have not been updated since 2000 when the originally Japanese version was written. Therefore, it is difficult to abstract what exactly is the “wisdom” necessary for Japan and Taiwan in current Asia that, as most people would agree, has experienced significant change in the past decade or so. Nakajima vaguely mentions that, “future relations of the U.S. and communist China will probably become more complicated. It is therefore necessary for both Japan and Taiwan to have more education in a future, knowledge-moved strategy, what the title of this book calls *The Wisdom of Asia*.”⁷ But what exactly is the complexity of current U.S.-China relations? And what is the knowledge that Japan and Taiwan should share under the current U.S.-China relations?

2. *Choutaikoku Chugoku no Honshitsu* [The Essence of Superpower China]

To answer these questions that Nakajima has failed to articulate in *The Wisdom of Asia*, it might be worthwhile to review two other works by Nakajima to acquire more insights about the current international situation in the Asia-Pacific region and the “wisdom” necessary for Japan and Taiwan.

First is the *Choutaikoku Chugoku no Honshitsu* [The Essence of Superpower China]. Nakajima in this book has characterized the current U.S.-China relations as a “U.S.-China New Cold War.” His reasons are that China is pursuing a military expansionist policy and

⁷ Ibid., 71.

the fact that China is still a communist nation.⁸ Nakajima states that under the situation of a “U.S.-China New Cold War,” Japan, Taiwan, and South Korea should act in unity with the United States based on universal principles, such as human rights and democracy, and stand firm to contain the further expansion of Communist China.

Nakajima’s concern, however, is that standing firm against China has always been shaky for Japan. According to Nakajima, this is because of the images or the perceptions that the Japanese people share towards China. Nakajima raises three factors that construct these images or perceptions.

First is the impact of the Chinese civilization and Sinocentrism. Surely, Japan has been strongly influenced by Chinese civilization. After all, China is said to be a country with a long history of over 4,000 years. Not only has Japan introduced kanji from China, Buddhism was also imported through China. During the Sui Dynasty and the Tang Dynasty, Japan has sent special envoys to study in China. Thus, it is hard to negate the fact that the Japanese people have a sense of high respect towards the Chinese civilization.

Nakajima, however, stresses the difference between “civilization” and “culture.” Nakajima sees civilization as a historical “stock” and culture as a “flow” with more flexibility. Nakajima points out the fact that China is a continental country that has rejected foreign influence. Being oblivious to foreign influence has enabled China to maintain a process of a domestic struggle for political power in order to preserve an authoritarian regime. On the other hand, Japan is an insular country that was fairly open to foreign influence not only from China, but from others as well. Thus, Japanese culture was always in the process of change and construction. Through this process Japan has cultivated its own unique culture that is very different from China.⁹

The second factor that Nakajima raises is the sympathy that the Japanese people, especially the intellectuals, share towards the Chinese Revolution. In Japan, socialism was well received by the intellectuals. These intellectuals were strongly impressed by the

⁸ *Choutaikoku Chugoku no Honshitsu*, 41.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 12-17.

works of Karl Marx such as *Capital* and *The Communist Manifesto*. They regarded domestic revolution and regime change as the final destination for postwar Japan. However, after the failure of the anti-U.S.-Japan Security movement in 1960, these intellectuals began to see the Chinese Revolution as the realization of their own ideal. In other words, intellectuals started to construct an idealistic image of China, which merely was a reflection of their self-image. As the tragedy of the Tiananmen Incident demonstrates, that idealistic image of China was from reality.¹⁰

Third is the sense of guilt towards the Chinese people. It is a historical fact that the Japanese army invaded Chinese territory. As Nakajima emphasizes, however, wars happen according to the unique international political situation at that time. Also it is not only the Chinese people who are victims of war. Japanese people have also suffered severely from the war with the United States and not to mention the atomic bomb dropped at Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Furthermore, China has fought many wars with foreign nations after the end of the Second World War. China fought with South Korea, India, the Soviet Union, and the South Vietnamese. As Nakajima states, this evidence is significant when we consider the fact that not a single person, omitting condemned criminals, was killed by the Japanese governmental power during the postwar years. Addition to this, China is violating human rights by suppressing minorities in Tibet and Uygur. Therefore, Nakajima states that there is no need for the Japanese people to have a self-tormenting view of history and not to mention a sense of inferiority towards the Chinese people.¹¹

Nakajima argues that the Japanese people should overcome these false images and perceptions towards China and understand the essence of China in the current atmosphere of international relations. Nakajima argues that China is currently expanding its influence to the South China Sea and causing frictions not only with Taiwan but also with Southeast Asian countries such as Vietnam, the Philippines, Malaysia, and Borneo. It is a well-known fact that China is claiming the right of possession of the Senkaku Islands. However, Nakajima's concern does not end here. Nakajima is cautious that some people in China are

¹⁰ Ibid., 17-19.

¹¹ Ibid., 20-22.

now starting to claim that Okinawa belongs to China. Nakajima draws on John King Fairbank’s famous concept of “Chinese World Order,” which is a very unique Chinese vision of world order. Under this concept Okinawa is included in the sphere of influence of the Chinese emperor.¹² In sum, Nakajima stresses that Japan should be liberated from the images and perceptions mentioned above and show strong leadership to contain the expansion of China by uniting with Taiwan, the Southeast Asian countries, the United States and South Korea.

3. *Beichu Shinsensou* [U.S.-China New War]

The second work by Nakajima is *Beichu Shinsensou* [U.S.-China New War] co-authored with Yoshihisa Komori, a conservative journalist. Komori in this book also analyzes the U.S.-China relations as a “U.S.-China New Cold War.” In contrast to Nakajima, Komori focuses more on the changes in the United States. Komori states there is a growing tendency among the people who are observing China to coin the phrase “New Cold War” to describe current U.S.-China relations. He points out four events that shape this new perception of China.¹³

First is Newt Gingrich’s comment that “World War III” has already begun in international politics. Gingrich is a former member of the House of Representative and an influential conservative ideologue. Gingrich articulates that China, along with Islamic extremists, is becoming one of the major challengers to the existing international order constructed by the United States. Gingrich further states that this challenge is equivalent to the threat the United States faced with the former Soviet Union.

The second event that Komori mentions is that a “China League of Congress members” was assembled in June 2005. The members of this league stressed five areas in which China’s actions were of serious concern to the United States. These were i) military buildup, ii) economic growth and expansion in trade, iii) violation of intellectual property rights, iv) acquisition of energy resources and v) oppression of freedom. These members stressed that these actions are mainly

¹² John King Fairbank (ed.), *The Chinese World Order: Traditional China’s Foreign Relations* (Harvard University Press, 1968), 2.

¹³ *Beichu Shinsensou*, 36-40.

consequences of the fact that China remains a communist dictatorship. They have all emphasized the significance of acknowledging the fundamental difference in political systems and fundamental values between the United States and China.

The third event is the publication of an article by Robert D. Kaplan titled, “How We Would Fight China: The Next Cold War” in *The Atlantic Monthly* in June 2005. In this article, Kaplan emphasizes that the United States and China are following a collision course owing to China’s growing global influence combined with ideological confrontation. Komori states that this article coined the phrase “New Cold War” which then became widely used inside the United States.

The fourth and final issue that he mentions is a book titled, *Showdown: Why China Wants War With the United States* by Jed L. Babbin and Edward Timperlake, who were both senior Department of Defense officials. The authors of this book lay out several military scenarios in which a hot war between the United States and China might happen. They conclude that the United States should establish a firm deterrence mechanism with its allies. From these four issues, Komori states that the situation of U.S.-China relations is becoming very similar to that of a “Cold War.”

To be sure, Komori acknowledges that there are significant differences between the “U.S.-China New Cold War” and the U.S.-Soviet Cold War. He mentions three factors.¹⁴ First is the fact that China does not negate capitalism. Thus, in ideological terms the United States and China are not in complete conflict with each other. Secondly, unlike the Soviet Union, China still does not have the capability to destroy the United States. And thirdly, in contrast to the Soviet Union, China is not using its military forces to drag Third World nations into its sphere of influence to fight against the United States. In other words, The U.S. and China are not engaged in global confrontation.

Despite these differences between the U.S.-Soviet Cold War and the “U.S.-China New Cold War,” this author still emphasizes that the current situation should be perceived as a “New Cold War.” He then articulates certain trends in recent Chinese foreign policy. He

¹⁴ Ibid., 40-42.

mentions that Chinese influence is becoming global in nature. China is planning to develop relationships of a military as well as economic nature with several nations, such as Venezuela, Bolivia, and Cuba in Latin American, Sudan, Angola, and Zimbabwe in Africa, and Iran and Libya in the Middle East. The essential feature of these nations is that they are undemocratic developmental dictatorships, with most of them being anti-U.S. Komori states that this behavior that China is manifesting is very similar to that of the Soviet Union during the Cold War era.¹⁵

After Komori’s analysis of the emerging “U.S.-China New Cold War,” Nakajima also calls for grand strategy to contain the communist giant. Nakajima refers to George Kennan, the original architect of the containment policy against the Soviet Union, and emphasizes that, “it is essential to construct a China containment system with a George Kennanistic view.”¹⁶

Both authors, thus, share the vision that there is an emerging “U.S.-China New Cold War” in the Asia-Pacific region. Then, as Nakajima articulates, should a new grand strategy to contain the expansion of China be the “wisdom” for Japan and Taiwan in the years ahead?

The rise of China and its inevitable desire to project power is surely going to be the single most important issue for nations in the Asia-Pacific region. So one may plausibly argue for the implementation of a policy of containment against China and for the application of a “U.S.-China New Cold War” as a new paradigm for international politics in the Asia-Pacific region.

However, one significant weakness in Nakajima’s and Komori’s argument is that although they are referring to the current situation in the Asia-Pacific region as a “U.S.-China New Cold War,” they neglect the structural realities of the U.S.-Soviet Cold War and how it affected the Western European nations. In other words, if the Cold War analogy is to be used to accurately understand the current international situation in the Asia-Pacific region, it is insufficient merely to argue that there is a “U.S.-China New Cold War” due to the rise of Chinese military

¹⁵ Ibid., 42-44.

¹⁶ Ibid., 50.

power or to the fact that China is still a communist nation. More data should be provided on how the West European nations perceived the U.S.-Soviet Cold War because in some cases they did not share the same vision as the United States. What were the dilemmas for the West European nations? Were they always able to feel secure just by allying with the United States? These perceptions of the West European nations during the Cold War era might provide the correct lessons or “wisdom” for Japan and Taiwan.

The next section will analyze the current international situation in the Asia-Pacific region and discuss which aspects of the current U.S.-China relations resemble the U.S.-Soviet equivalent. Then, it will abstract lessons for Japan and Taiwan from the historical experience of the West European nations during the 1970’s.

4. Emerging Bipolar Structure in Asia-Pacific Region

The Asia-Pacific region seems to be in the midst of a significant transformation. The reason for this is not so much due to the decline of U.S. power. Surely, the United States has been trimming its total defense budget ever since the start of the Obama Administration. The more important factor is the growing Chinese military power.

The rise of Chinese military power is not limited to the increase of Chinese defense spending which is indeed the largest in East Asia.¹⁷ It is where the Chinese military are headed, what they are capable of doing, and what it is creating in the Asia-Pacific region that deserves more attention. First of all, the U.S. Department of Defense (hereafter DOD) reports that the geographical domain in which Chinese military power is capable of operating is expanding beyond the “first island chain,” which includes Taiwan and Okinawa, to the “second island chain,” which extends from Japan to Guam.¹⁸

¹⁷ Although China’s defense budget remains opaque, it is said that its amount for the year 2011 was 601.2 billion yuan. This amount is the largest in East Asia and surpasses that of Japan in U.S. dollar terms. *NIDS China Security Report 2011* (The National Institute for Defense, 2012), 4.

¹⁸ *ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS Military and Security Developments Involving the People’s Republic of China 2011* [http://www.defense.gov/pubs/pdfs/2011_CMPR_Final.pdf], 23.

The DOD has also been increasingly concerned about the modernization of China’s A2/AD (anti-access/area denial) capabilities.¹⁹ “Anti-access” and “area denial” refer to capabilities to deter or counter adversary forces from deploying or operating in a defined geographical space with the combination of medium and short range ballistic missiles, cruising missiles, submarines and other conventional weapons. What is striking about these growing A2/AD capabilities, is that China is developing precision-strike capabilities to attack U.S. bases or U.S. vessels and submarines. If successful, China will be in a position to neutralize the forward deployment of the United States military forces in the Asia-Pacific region. This specifically means that in case of contingencies, for example in the Taiwan Straits or the Senkaku Islands, the Chinese military can prevent the United States from coming to aid of its allies. In other words, the extended deterrent power of the United States, which was the essential element for the national security for Japan and Taiwan ever since the start of the Cold War, is now in jeopardy.

Besides the rising A2/AD capabilities, China is also acquiring strategic capabilities by deploying ICBMs (Intercontinental Ballistic Missiles) that could reach the homeland of the United States. The DOD estimates that China currently possesses 50 to 75 mobile ICBMs (Intercontinental Ballistic Missiles).²⁰ To be sure, this number is still very low compared to that of the United States.²¹ Thus, the probability of China achieving strategic parity with the United States in the near future is unrealistic. Nevertheless, one should note that China does have the capability to cause major destruction to major cities in the United States.

In responses to these developments, President Obama announced on

¹⁹ *NIDS China Security Report 2011* (The National Institute for Defense, 2012), 12., For further analysis regarding Chinese military capability and modernization see Ashley J. Tellis and Travis Tanner (eds.) *Strategic Asia 2012: China’s Military Challenge* (Seattle and Washington, D.C.: The National Bureau of Asian Research, 2012).

²⁰ *ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS Military and Security Developments Involving the People’s Republic of China 2011* [http://www.defense.gov/pubs/pdfs/2011_CMPR_Final.pdf], 88.

²¹ Ashley J. Tellis and Travis Tanner (eds.) *Strategic Asia 2012: China’s Military Challenge* (Seattle and Washington, D.C.: The National Bureau of Asian Research, 2012), 388.

January 2012 that the Asia-Pacific region would be the new “strategic pivot” of U.S. foreign policy. The *Quadrennial Defense Review Report 2010* (hereafter *QDR 2010*),²² which Secretary of Defense Robert Gates calls the wartime *QDR*, places strong emphasis on the forward deployment of U.S. military power in the Asia-Pacific region. The *QDR 2010* addressed a new concept called a “joint air-sea battle concept” to defeat adversaries with sophisticated A2/AD capabilities that is challenging United States’ freedom of action in the region. The *QDR 2010* does not provide detailed descriptions, but there is a common understanding among experts that this “joint air-sea battle concept” is equivalent to the “joint air-land battle concept,” which was the operational concept for NATO in Europe during the 1970’s. The purpose of this “joint air-land battle concept” was to prevent the breakthrough of Warsaw Pact forces not just by defensive engagements in the front lines but also attacking in depth the follow on forces of the Warsaw Pact.²³ Although Dan Blumenthal, an expert on East Asian security issues and U.S.-China relations, is pessimistic about whether the United States has the sufficient resources to implement this operation plan,²⁴ what is significant is the fact that the DOD is currently applying a 40 year-old battle concept from the Cold War period against China. The United States is also emphasizing strengthening strategic cooperation with allies in the region, first and foremost with Japan. In sum, the United States is currently “rebalancing” its concentration and its resources to confront the Chinese military expansion in the Asia-Pacific region.

Throughout the Cold War era, the United States enjoyed unchallenged hegemonic power in the Asia-Pacific region despite the general understanding that it and the Soviet Union were the two dominant superpowers at the time. The military power deployed by the Soviet Union and China in the Asia-Pacific region was significantly inferior to that of the United States. In other words, the Soviet Union and

²² *Quadrennial Defense Review Report, February 2010* [<http://www.defense.gov/qdr/qdr%20as%20of%2029jan10%201600.PDF>]

²³ *East Asian Strategic Review 2012* (Tokyo: The National Institute for Defense Studies, 2012), 229.

²⁴ Dan Blumenthal, “The U.S. Response to China’s Military Modernization,” in Ashley J. Tellis and Travis Tanner (eds.) *Strategic Asia 2012: China’s Military Challenge* (Seattle and Washington, D.C.: The National Bureau of Asian Research, 2012), 308-340.

China did not have the capability to fully challenge the military power projection of the United States during that time. We could say that the strategic situation in the Asia-Pacific region is going through a significant transformation for the first time in post-war history. In Henry Kissinger’s words, a “revolutionary power” is appearing, with the capability of deterring the military operation of the United States (a “conservative power”) and with the intention of challenging the status quo.²⁵

Thus, there is a high probability that the Asia-Pacific region will be the theatre of intense U.S.-China rivalry during the 21st century. Then, could it be argued, as Nakajima emphasizes, that this current situation in the Asia-Pacific region resembles the U.S.-Soviet Cold War? At a glance, the current bilateral relationship between the United States and China looks nothing like the U.S.-Soviet Cold War. First of all, tensions between the United States and China are limited to the Asia-Pacific region, while the U.S.-Soviet Cold War was global in nature. Secondly, the two countries are much more interdependent economically, and the state of their bilateral communications is much more advanced than it was for the United States and the Soviet Union.²⁶

If, however, there is an aspect where current U.S-China relations resembles the U.S.-Soviet Cold War, it is the bipolar structure of international politics emerging in the Asia-Pacific region. One should note that the bilateral relationship between the United States and the Soviet Union was not merely about confrontation. It was more of a mixture of confrontation and cooperation. The United States and the Soviet Union started to realize that despite their differences a total war was not an option and they gradually increased bilateral communications on various issues such as security, politics, trade and cultural cooperation. In other words, the United States and the Soviet Union were the co-managers of international affairs.²⁷ As mentioned

²⁵ Henry Kissinger, *A World Restored: Metternich, Castlereagh and the Problems of Peace, 1812-1822* (Phoenix: Phoenix Press, 2000), 3.

²⁶ Ashley J. Tellis and Travis Tanner (eds.) *Strategic Asia 2012: China’s Military Challenge* (Seattle and Washington, D.C.: The National Bureau of Asian Research, 2012), 382-383.

²⁷ To capture the essential characteristic of the U.S.-Soviet relations, one should reexamine the numerous bilateral agreements signed by President Richard Nixon and General Secretary Brezhnev between the periods of the

above, China possesses the capability to neutralize the United States' ability to project military power in the Asia-Pacific region. On the other hand, the United States and China are also constructing a bilateral mechanism, such as the U.S.-China Strategic and Economic Dialogue (S&ED), to enhance economic interdependence and bilateral communications. Thus, under the current situation, although seeds of confrontation do exist, the likelihood that the United States and China will pursue an all-out confrontation is extremely low. In time, they will gradually learn to bilaterally manage and overcome their differences. The implication that can be drawn from these facts is that security, political, and economic issues in the Asia-Pacific region will be significantly influenced by the confrontational and cooperative relationship between the United States and China. In other words, U.S.-China bilateral relations will be the independent variable of international politics in the Asia-Pacific region in the 21st century.

5. A “Long Peace” in the Asia-Pacific?

John Lewis Gaddis, in a famous article titled the “Long Peace,” emphasized that the Cold War was a unique period in international history when there were no wars fought between the great powers despite their strong antagonism.²⁸ One of the factors that Gaddis articulated that contributed in causing this “long peace” was the bipolar structure of international politics. Would, then, the emerging bipolar structure in the Asia-Pacific region enhance stability and provide a “long

Moscow Summit in May 1972 and the Washington Summit in June 1973, which is said to be the peak of the U.S.-Soviet détente. The most important agreement was the ABM (anti-ballistic missiles) Treaty. It severely limited the number and the location of ballistic missile defense systems each nation could deploy. By signing this treaty, the leaders of the two nations were made sure that if one side ever launched a nuclear attack, it would force the other side to retaliate and eventually lead to a nuclear holocaust. Thus, the ABM Treaty played the role of institutionalizing the situation of mutual nuclear deterrence (or MAD: mutual assured destruction), which was the foundation of strategic stability between the United States and the Soviet Union. Other agreements that sprang from the U.S.-Soviet détente, such as the “Basic Principles Agreement” and the agreement on the “Prevention of Nuclear Wars,” outlined the spirit of peaceful coexistence complimenting the strategic stability.

²⁸ John Lewis Gaddis, “The Long Peace: Elements of Stability in the Postwar International System,” *International Security*, Vol. 10, No. 4. (Spring, 1986), 99-142.

peace” as John Lewis Gaddis would say?

As mentioned above, an all-out war between the United States and China is unlikely. Thus, U.S.-China relations are headed towards stability. What is essential, however, especially for Japan and for Taiwan is that stability between the United States and China will not translate into peace in the Asia-Pacific region. According to what Glenn Snyder has explained as the “stability-instability paradox,” stability between great powers can be a major factor of regional instability.²⁹ In other words, the very assurance that an all-out war between the superpowers is impossible would induce limited small-scale aggression by the aggressor or the “revolutionary power” in the regional front lines. It is possible to say that this “stability-instability paradox” is gaining plausibility in the Asia-Pacific region. Thus, under the current situation, skirmishes by the Chinese Navy in the East and South China Sea will likely increase. These geographical spaces, by the way, are areas that the Chinese government is claiming as “core interests.”

One important issue that is not unrelated to the “stability-instability paradox” situation is the problem of deterrence failure. In a classic study that analyzed when and how deterrence fails, Alexander George and Richard Smoke articulate that the most rational way for the aggressor to challenge the status quo is the “fait accompli strategy.” George and Smoke clarify two conditions in which the aggressor will most likely pursue this strategy. The first is when the aggressor perceives that there is no commitment by the defender. The second is when the aggressor perceives that risks can be controlled. Under these two conditions, the aggressor will try to establish a new fait accompli by initiating a quick and decisive aggression (a blitzkrieg) depriving time and opportunity for the defender to act.³⁰

As the *QDR2010* indicates China’s growing A2/AD capabilities means that China could neutralize U.S. commitment to defend Japan and

²⁹ Glenn Snyder, “The Balance of Power and the Balance of Terror,” in Paul Seabury ed., *The Balance of Power* (San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company, 1965), 199.

³⁰ Alexander L. George and Richard Smoke, *Deterrence in American Foreign Policy: Theory and Practice* (Columbia University Press, 1974), 534-548.

Taiwan in case of contingencies at the Taiwan Strait or the Senkaku Islands. Furthermore, as we have seen the chances of an all-out war between these the United States and China are considerably low. In other words, the probability is high that the aggressor perceives that risks can be controlled. Therefore, the two conditions for deterrence failure outlined by George and Smoke seem to apply in the Asia-Pacific region.

In sum, the emerging strategic situation in the Asia-Pacific region might turn into stability and “long peace” for the United States and China, but for Japan and Taiwan, it can translate into a threat to their national security.

6. The Wisdom of Asia in the New Cold War: Inquiry into the European Cold War History

What, then, should be the “knowledge-led strategy” for Japan and Taiwan? What is the “wisdom” necessary under the current situation? To be sure, as Nakajima emphasizes, strong unity with the United States to contain further Chinese expansion is paramount. As seen above, it is most likely that deterrence would fail in the event China perceives that the US’ commitment to defend Japan and Taiwan is shaky and when China perceives that the risks of an all out confrontation can be controlled. So it is essential for Japan and Taiwan to send the message that the United States has an unwavering commitment to their security. Furthermore, in order to further strengthen American commitment, it is crucial that these two allies modernize their conventional forces. The chances of China executing a blitzkrieg attack, for instance in Senkaku, are high were China to perceive that a new *fait accompli* could be established before the United States could come to the aid of its ally. Thus, the Japanese Self-Defense Force will have to do defend the islands initially, in order to buy time for the United States to come to aid.

As Kennan, however, defines containment policy, it is a “long-term, patient but firm and vigilant containment of Russian expansive tendencies.”³¹ Thus, it is fundamentally a long-term defensive policy

³¹ X [George Kennan], “The Sources of Soviet Conduct,” *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 25, No. 4 (July, 1947), 566-582.

to deal with existing threats. However, for Japan and Taiwan, who are geographically located at the frontlines and who have to cope with continuous small-scale provocation by the Chinese military forces, a containment policy is not always reassuring. Something else must be considered.

It is worthwhile to speculate for a moment on how the West European nations perceived the U.S.-Soviet Cold War because if anything it was these nations who lived under constant direct fear of the Soviet Union. Before the acquisition of Soviet ICBMs, the West European nations were able to rely on the strategy of “massive retaliation” by the US’ nuclear power to counter all sorts of Soviet military aggression. However, the West Europeans began to doubt whether the United States would use nuclear weapons against the Soviet Union; the U.S knew that its own cities would suffer in retaliation after the introduction of ICBMs put American cities under direct threat of annihilation. In other words, for the West European allies, the credibility of the extended nuclear deterrence of the United States seemed diminished.

Other developments in U.S.-Soviet relations raised additional suspicions on the part of the West European nations. First, the peaceful resolution of the Cuban Missile Crisis and the construction of U.S.-Soviet Hotline in 1962 confirmed that the two superpowers had ruled out nuclear war as an option. This made the West European allies question the nuclear guarantee of the United States once again. Secondly, as the Soviet Union deployed more ICBMs during the 1960’s, the momentum of U.S.-Soviet bilateral cooperation accelerated. The ABM (Anti-ballistic missiles) Treaty signed by Nixon and Brezhnev in 1972 severely limited the means to defend against a nuclear attack. With this treaty, the leaders of the two superpowers were able to make sure that if one of them ever launched a nuclear attack, the other side would still be able to retaliate and inflict unacceptable losses to the aggressor, thus making a nuclear exchange unthinkable. The fact that the two superpowers would not fight a total nuclear war was once again confirmed, this time however by official agreement. In short, the ABM Treaty institutionalized U.S.-Soviet stability.³² Thus, the stability between the United States and the Soviet Union was significantly enhanced from the period of 1960’ to the early

³² See note 23.

1970's.

As the “stability-instability paradox” implies, U.S.-Soviet stability does not automatically translate into greater security for Western Europe. Although avoiding an all-out war was in everyone's interest, the West European nations viewed the cooperative developments between the United States and the Soviet Union as a construction of a “U.S.-Soviet Condominium,” which would involve sacrificing their interests. For instance, the Western European nations feared that the a “U.S.-Soviet Condominium” would in fact induce Warsaw Pact's conventional forces making a limited small-scale aggression (a blitzkrieg) to change the status quo and establish a new *fait accompli* in the front line of the Cold War, i.e. Berlin. Western Europe feared that for the sake of protecting American cities the United States would have to recognize the new status quo in Berlin. They did not have the capability to defend themselves from the conventional forces of the Warsaw Pact because the conventional forces of NATO were much inferior. Therefore, they feared that the United States' willingness to exercise deterrence would waver as U.S.-Soviet cooperation deepened. In other words, the decoupling of NATO became a severe issue for Western Europe after the 1960's.³³

How did the nations of Western Europe react to the danger that arose from the “stability-instability paradox?” In December 1967, the Belgium Foreign Minister Pierre Harmel outlined a new strategy for NATO, titled “the Future Task of the Alliance,” known as the “Harmel Report.”³⁴ The report stated that the primary function of NATO has been and will be “to maintain adequate military strength and political solidarity to deter aggression and other forms of pressure and to defend the territory of member countries if aggression should occur.” The essence of the “Harmel Report,” however, was the second new function. The report stated that “the possibility of a crisis cannot be

³³ For a comprehensive account of U.S.-West European relations during the Cold War era, see Jussi M. Hanhimaki, Benedikt Schoenborn and Barbara Zancheta, *Transatlantic Relations since 1945: an Introduction* (New York: Routledge, 2012), Vojtech Mastny, Sven G. Holtsmark and Andreas Wenger, *War Plans and Alliances in the Cold War: Threat Perceptions in the East and West* (New York: Routledge, 2006).

³⁴ The full text of the “Harmel Report” can be found at http://www.nato.int/cps/en/SID-BA26CFB3-D565C04C/natolive/official_texts_26700.htm.

excluded as long as the central political issues in Europe, first and foremost the German question, remain unsolved.” The report continues by stating that, “military security and a policy of détente are not contradictory but complementary.” Furthermore, “the way to peace and stability in Europe rests in particular on the use of the Alliance constructively in the interest of détente.” Therefore, the “Harmel Report” articulated that the compatibility of “deterrence,” “defense,” and “détente” should be the official strategy of NATO.

After the announcement of the “Harmel Report,” Willy Brandt, the West German Chancellor, pursued the so-called “Ostpolitik (Eastward diplomacy)” to normalize relations with East Germany, Poland, and the Soviets Union. Diplomatic normalizations between these pivotal nations eventually led to the establishment of the CSCE (Conference of Security and Cooperation in Europe) in 1975, which was the hallmark of the European détente. Simply put, the European détente was a process of normalization of relations, conclusion of non-aggression pacts, recognition of post World War II borders, implementation of arms control negotiations, promotion of economic and cultural interdependence, and construction of confidence building measures in the European region. Through this process, regional stability in Europe was significantly enhanced. It was indeed a logical way of dealing with the regional instability that stemmed from the excessive bipolar structure of the U.S.-Soviet Cold War.

The Cold War in Europe during this period of détente was an era for reconfirming alliance unity and eliminating the seeds of confrontation in the European region. Without these dual efforts by nations who were geopolitically located at the front line of the U.S.-Soviet Cold War, the Soviet Union would not have been deterred and the Cold War in Europe would not have been a “Cold” War. Therefore, with the great benefit of hindsight, one can argue that this process of détente in the European region had a significant effect in overcoming the East-West division of Europe. It might, then, be wise for the leaders of Japan and Taiwan to seriously consider why NATO is often referred to as the most successful alliance in modern history.

Conclusion

One interesting aspect about the history of the Cold War is that we

could never know for sure why it ended without any wars in Europe. This is simply because of the difficulty of providing substantial evidence for something that never happened. Thus, although recent Cold War historians like to emphasize that this process of détente in the European region had a significant effect on overcoming the East-West division, it will remain merely a thesis.³⁵

If it is impossible to answer why war did not break out in Europe during the Cold War era, it is equally impossible to prove whether deterrence theory works or not. The very fact that there were no wars makes it impossible to prove that deterrence has worked in Europe during the Cold War. In other words, there might be other factors than deterrence that might have contributed in bringing peace. At the same time, however, we can never completely negate the significance of this theory. The one time we can negate deterrence theory is when wars actually occur in Europe, which we have not experienced. Thus, deterrence theory, or the question of why there were not wars in Europe during the Cold War, is fundamentally a “counter-factual proposition”³⁶ because we can never prove or deny it by evidence.

Does the fact that European Cold War history or deterrence theory is fundamentally a “counter-factual proposition” deprive our motivation to study it? Would it not at least behoove us to pay attention to the factors that might bring peace? It might be wise for Japan and Taiwan to consider all sorts of elements that might make peace possible in the Asia-Pacific region. Inquiry into the European Cold War history might be a good starting point because despite the strong antagonism and the mass military forces deployed, there were no wars. It was one of the most rare periods in human history. This might be the “wisdom” needed for Asia in the 21st century.

Surely, there is the problem of drawing conclusions from simple historical analogy, regarding the fact that historical events are

³⁵ Andreas Wenger, Vojtech Mastny, and Christian Nuenlist eds., *Origins of the European Security System: The Helsinki Process Revisited, 1965-1975* (New York: Routledge, 2008), Odd Arne Westad ed., *Reviewing the Cold War: Approaches, Interpretations, and Theory* (New York: Routledge, 2004).

³⁶ Edward Thompson, *Beyond the Cold War: a New Approach to the Arms Race and Nuclear Annihilation* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1982), 13.

essentially unique and that history never repeats itself. However, as Henry Kissinger says, “whatever relationship exists depends, not on a precise correspondence, but on a similarity of the problems confronted.”³⁷ The dilemmas that Japan and Taiwan are experiencing today seem very familiar to the ones West Germany and France faced during the Cold War. And these dilemmas are the products of the bipolar structure emerging in the Asia-Pacific region, which is also similar to the European region during the Cold War. Pessimistic thinking? Perhaps. But when it comes to national security and crisis management, it is better to be a pessimist than an optimist so that we can prepare for the worst-case scenarios. Thus, under the situation in which a bipolar structure in the Asia-Pacific region is emerging, a pragmatic diplomacy to politically stabilize the relationship with China, the same kind former President Lee pioneered to construct a “special state-to-state relationship,” is needed more than ever. In the final analysis, this is possible because Japan and Taiwan have the bonds of democracy. We share the culture to pursue our goals through peaceful means without resorting to violence.

³⁷ Kissinger, *A World Restored*, 331.

