Print ISSN 2433-4189 / Online ISSN 2433-4197

CENTER FOR GLOBAL SECURITY

グローバルセキュリティセミナー叢書　第６号
GLOBAL SECURITY SEMINAR SERIES NO. 6

NDA-FOI Joint Seminar

Nuclear Threshold Lowered?

Coedited by

Hideya Kurata and Jerker Hellström

防衛大学校先端学術推進機構
グローバルセキュリティセンター

1-10-20 Hashirimizu, Yokosuka, 239-8686 JAPAN

Global Security Seminar Series No.6

NDA-FOI Joint Seminar

Nuclear Threshold Lowered?

Coedited by

Hideya Kurata and Jerker Hellström

March 2021

Center for Global Security, National Defense Academy
Yokosuka, Japan

CONTENTS

GLOBAL SECURITY SEMINAR SERIES

Global Security Seminar Series is published occasionally by the Center for Global Security. The Center designs series of international seminars and other independent seminars. This series consists of the working papers of these seminars. The views expressed in this publication are solely of the authors, and do not necessarily represent those of the institutions or governments of the authors.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Center for Global Security (GS), National Defense Academy (NDA) and Totalförsvarets forskningsinstitut (FOI), Swedish Defence Research Agency, launched a joint research project, called NDA-FOI Joint Seminars based on the Memorandum of Understanding between Japan Ministry of Defense and Sweden Ministry of Defense on mutual defense cooperation.

This volume is based on the working papers presented at the NDA-FOI Joint Seminars on "Nuclear Threshold Lowered?" held on March 5, 2019. Most of the chapters are revised or up-dated to reflect the views expressed during the course of the seminar.

On behalf of GS and FOI, we would like to express our sincere appreciations not only to the contributors for their precious time and efforts in the process of this publication, but also to all those who attended the seminar and participated in the discussions. The views expressed in each of the chapters, however, strictly represent those of the respective authors, and so go the credits.

We hope the insights shared by the authors here invite a new round of discussion among readers. Comments and suggestions on our joint research project are more than welcome.

March 2021
Hideya Kurata
Director of Center for Global Security
National Defense Academy

INTRODUCTION

Hideya Kurata, Jerker Hellström, John Rydqvist, Johan Englund

Nuclear dilemmas in East Asia and the transatlantic region have continued to abate. However, the problem has been closely connected to the widespread political contention and hostile behavior from two major authoritarian regimes, namely, Russia and China, which continue to prioritize the modernization of strategic and non-strategic nuclear forces. Missile build-up has been of particular concern due to the dual nature of the systems. With their superior regional nuclear forces, Russia and China may intend to deter allied countries, such as the United States (U.S.), from intervening with its ally countries, should they determine that a local war of aggression is in their interest. Such examples include, but are not limited to, China's invasion of Taiwan or the Russian war against east European NATO countries or allies.

In war, missile forces can contribute to regional area access and denial because they can provide these powers with the capability to target strategic assets with high precision. At the same time, nuclear forces can be used to control escalation, such that war remains limited and winnable within terms favorable to China or Russia. In addition, the need to offset continued American superiority in terms of conventional strike capability can partially explain the focus on regional nuclear forces. Such regional strategic priorities are in contrast with arms control measures in several aspects. Therefore, Russia opts to breach its obligations to several arms control treaties, which led to the collapse of old arms control regimes, such as the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) treaty. Conversely, China continues to reject any serious dialog on regional and strategic nuclear balance, let alone accept participation in any new arms control regimes, whose fate is tied to the evolving European and East Asian developments. Failure from the Russian and U.S.

sides to negotiate a follow-on treaty to the New Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START), which is due to expire in 2021. The treaty can be prolonged for up to five years. However, regardless of agreement after the 2020 U.S. election, a new formula should be established if strategic arms were to remain restricted in the long-term.

Inherently, the nuclear dilemmas faced by the democratic alliance are a consequence of the ambitions and goals entertained by China and Russia. In their unique ways, they aim to reshape and dominate regional and global orders by changing norms and challenging the rights and interests of neighbors through military coercion or force if necessary. Hence, the free world is left with no choice but to react and resist the detrimental behavior of the two powers. In short- and medium-terms, such a scenario will necessitate reinforcement of deterrence across conflict domains, including extended nuclear deterrence. In the current situation, this scheme is the only means for ensuring strategic stability.

Alternatively, North Korea continues to develop short-, medium-, and long-range nuclear strike capabilities. In other words, the nuclear ambition of the regime in Pyongyang remains a major threat to international security. New initiatives by the Trump administration to find solutions to the nuclear problem on the Korean peninsula, such as two U.S.–Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) summits, prove to be null. In addition, although North Korea has refrained from nuclear or long-range missile tests since 2017, it will undoubtedly continue to advance its nuclear and missile capabilities. The jury is out to determine whether any progress can be made in the final year of the Trump administration. Therefore, any deal acceptable to North Korea should include a form of step-by-step sanction relief in return for a step-by-step complete, irreversible, and verifiable disarmament. Outside of North Korea, the world remains skeptical about its sincerity and, therefore, is reluctant to reward North Korea before the existence of a proof of substantial progress toward denuclearization. The track-record of the Kim regime, lack of trust between parties, and security dilemmas guiding the behavior of North Korean renders continued nuclear build-up an extremely more likely scenario to the detriment of other countries.

Many of the abovementioned issues were discernable even in early 2019 during a seminar convened by the Center for Global Security at the National Defense Academy (NDA) in Japan and the Swedish Defense Research Agency (FOI) to address security threats and responses to such challenges. This publication is based on papers presented at the joint seminar and subsequent discussions. The chapters presented herein provide various perspectives on security challenges as depicted by scholars from Japan and Sweden with special participation from scholars from the U.S.

In Chapter One, Frank Rose of Brookings (assistant secretary for arms control, verification, and compliance under the Obama administration), provides an assessment of the 2018 U.S. Nuclear Posture Review (NPR). Rose concludes that although the NPR of the Trump administration is indeed responsive to threats faced by the country and its allies, the President's controversial public statements and heavy price tag of the strategic nuclear modernization program challenged the bipartisan consensus on the nuclear policy. He notes that the chances of success of the Trump administration may improve with the calibration of its public messages; effective engagement of the U.S. Congress, general public, and allies on the importance of nuclear deterrence; advance pragmatic arms control and non-proliferation initiatives; and enhancement of strategic stability with potential adversaries, such as Russia and China.

Chapter Two features Hirofumi Tosaki of the Japan Institute of International Affairs who addresses the U.S. NPR of 2018 and the withdrawal of the U.S. from the INF Treaty, and Japan's positions. Tosaki elaborates on the necessity of pursuing arms control and addresses challenges, such as China's refusal to accept substantive nuclear arms control and nuclear weapons reductions. He concludes that the uncertaity of the international system has seriously disrupted the nuclear order due to power transition, multipolarization of nuclear relations, and diversification of deterrence systems. Nuclear-armed states have become increasingly interested in maintaining and strengthening their nuclear deterrence capabilities but substantially less interested in arms control to enable regulation, reduction, and/or elimination of their military powers, including nuclear weapons.

In Chapter Three, John Rydqvist discusses the strategic balance in Europe in the post INF-era. The Russian violation and subsequent abrogation of such a key Cold War-era nuclear arms control treaty is a symptom of the turbulence experienced by European security. Wars of aggression fought by Russia since 2008 onward are a fundamental root cause. Therefore, superior Russian land forces with direct land access to eastern European allies and partners is a key military challenge. As such, continued build-up of dual use, non-INF compliant delivery systems, such as nuclear capable ones, for use in Europe is a pressing problem. In this regard, a new set of limitations on nuclear forces in Europe can be achieved only through a comprehensive approach that addresses political and military problems at the same time. Thus, the transatlantic community should formulate compromises that will enable it to further enhance multi-domain deterrence. Only from a position of strength can Russia then be convinced to work toward a new formula for strategic stability that considers caps on non-strategic nuclear forces.

Chapter Four highlights Naomi Koizumi of NDA, who analyzes the debate among Russian military analysts on the issue of strategic deterrence. In terms of strategic nuclear deterrence, Koizumi notes that Russia perceives the U.S. missile defense system as a major threat, which defeats the strategic parity between the two parties. This notion explains Russia's efforts to develop new offensive weapons that can evade the defensive system of the U.S. Furthermore, in terms of a large-scale regional war, she asserts that the Russians are unlikely to lower its nuclear threshold. Rather, the political and military leadership is shifting its emphasis to "non-nuclear deterrence," which currently includes non-military measures. Military analysts are relatively aware of Russia's inferiority in networking and conventional weapons in terms of local conflicts. Thus, such analysts are critical of the "non-nuclear deterrence" doctrine, which was newly introduced in the 2014 Military Doctrine. As a result, they cannot shift from the limited nuclear use option on the one hand and tend to increase their dependence on non-military measures that are comparatively reliable, such as cyberattacks, on the other hand.

In Chapter Five, Masahiro Kurita of The National Institute of Defense Studies (NIDS) assesses the emerging risks for strategic stability in nuclear South Asia. Kurita points out that a key question is whether the strategic stability of the competitive relations between India and Pakistan and between India and China should be maintained. The chapter then highlights certain risks that may threaten the overall stability of these relations in the short- to mid-term future, such as the stability–instability paradox and evolution of India's countermeasures, developments in Pakistani and Indian nuclear postures, and potential discovery of the stability–instability paradox in the China–India dyad. Kurita asserts that the extent to which such risks will lead to serious consequences is dependent on the political atmosphere surrounding the security relations between the three countries. The scenario, however, is not a source of relief. In fact, it is relatively the opposite of relief as the China–India relations are gradually worsening, whereas the India–Pakistan political connection is currently at its lowest point since the end of the 2001–2002 crisis. Hence, risks to the strategic stability in South Asia should be monitored. Appropriate engagements by the international community are also required, especially in the crisis management field.

Chapter Six features Johan Englund of FOI as he examines the current issues that are the subjects of debates among Chinese strategists regarding China's nuclear posture. Furthermore, he discusses the impact on the Sino–Indian security dynamics. He deems that China is likely to adhere to its formal no-first-use (NFU) pledge in the near future. However, China is expected to acquire capabilities relevant to war fighting doctrines and may unofficially undertake adjustments to its nuclear posture in the long-term. This tendency may lead to serious implications for the security dynamics in South Asia in general and the Chinese-Indian security relations in particular. In summary, Englund states that, in the short-term, the general and structural nuclear stability between China and India is in check despite the burden of significant rivalry on the sources of such bilateral instability. However, in the medium- and long-term, potential doctrinal changes in minimum deterrence and NFUs (albeit informal) combined with uncertain regional

security dynamics and increased capability of nuclear forces may trigger the China–Indian nuclear rivalry to become more precarious.

In Chapter Seven, Hideya Kurata of NDA explores the duality of North Korea's nuclear posture and demonstrates how the relocation plan of the United States Forces Korea in the wake of the 9-11 terrorist attacks in 2001 necessitated the DPRK to extend the range of its counterforce projectiles to reach receding targets. He points out that accuracy becomes a sacrificial component when targets of counterforce projectiles recede. Accuracy, however, increases vulnerability to interception by the low-tier missile defense of the U.S. and the Republic of Korea (ROK). To avoid the "accuracy–vulnerability paradox," Kurata examines North Korea's initial escalation ladders in its war strategy.

Jerker Hellström of FOI (current Director of the Swedish Center for China Studies) presents the Chinese perspectives on North Korea's nuclear posture after the two summits in Singapore and Hanoi in Chapter Eight. Hellström argues that a major divide exists between the Chinese and American views of North Korea's nuclear program, including China's acceptance of the peaceful development of nuclear energy of the DPRK, which the U.S. did not accept. Moreover, Chinese scholars are mainly influenced by the fact that China, in contrast to the U.S., values stability more than denuclearization. In addition, Hellström explains the Chinese notions of "denuclearization" and the direct implications of the nuclear ambitions of the DPRK for China.

Finally, Chapter Nine presents Takeshi Watanabe of the NIDS, who reviews several issues, such as coercion, and perceptions among civilians. He examines the quest of the incumbent government of ROK for greater autonomy from the alliance by reconciling with North Korea. He offers the conclusion that the decision-making of a nation targeted by coercion should involve the perceptions and political objectives of civilians. As the incumbent governments in the U.S. and ROK are seeking autonomy from alliances on the basis of improving legitimacy through adherence to the objectives of civilians, the nuclear coercion imposed by North Korea is becoming increasingly effective.

CHAPTER 1

Assessing the 2018 U.S. Nuclear Posture Review?

Frank A. Rose

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In February 2018, the Trump administration released the Nuclear Posture Review (NPR), which seeks to ensure that the United States will continue to maintain a safe, secure, and effective deterrent that protects the U.S. homeland, assures allies, and above all, deters adversaries. The review largely achieves these goals. However, it's uncertain whether or not the administration can use the document to build a sustainable bipartisan consensus on nuclear policy. The president's controversial public statements and the hefty price tag of the strategic nuclear modernization program represent key challenges to fostering and maintaining that consensus.

The administration's chances of sustaining a consensus may improve if it is able to calibrate its public messages on nuclear weapons; effectively engage Congress, the general public, and allies on the importance of nuclear deterrence; advance pragmatic arms control and non-proliferation initiatives; enhance strategic stability with potential adversaries such as Russia and China; and put in place effective oversight mechanisms to address cost concerns associated with the strategic nuclear modernization program.

INTRODUCTION

"Nuclear Posture Review signals new arms race."[1]
"An arm race toward global instability."[2]
"The time is 2 minutes to nuclear midnight."[3]

[1] Katrina vanden Heuvel, "The Nuclear Posture Review Signals a New Arms Race," *The Nation*, February 13, 2018, https://www.thenation.com/article/the-nuclear-posture-review-signals-a-new- arm s-race (accessed December 18, 2020).
[2] Omar Lamari, "An Arms Race Toward Global Instability," *Forbes,* February 20, 2018, https://www. forbes.com/sites/stratfor/2018/02/20/an-arms-race-toward-global-instability/#7324cb25b62 (access- ed December 18, 2020).
[3] Tony Magliano, "The time is 2 minutes to nuclear midnight," *Angelus*, March 2, 2018, https://angelus

Reading these headlines about the recently released Nuclear Posture Review (NPR), you would think that the document is a dramatic break from long-standing U.S. nuclear policy and strategy. As former U.S. Senator Ernest Hollings (D-SC) once said, it's like "chicken licking, the sky is falling."[4] Is the sky really falling? Is the NPR as bad as critics claim? Is the review leading the United States and the world toward a new arms race?

On the contrary, I would argue that the 2018 NPR is fundamentally consistent with long-standing U.S. nuclear policy and strategy, including the Obama administration's 2010 NPR. However, the authors of the 2018 NPR face significant challenges as they seek to move forward with implementation of the review. This paper will discuss some of the key issues in the NPR, note the long-term implementation challenges the review faces, and propose practical recommendations for how the Trump administration might mitigate these challenges.

ASSESSMENT OF THE NPR

THE SECURITY ENVIRONMENT

The NPR's assessment of the current security environment is compelling. It states that "global threat conditions have worsened markedly since the most recent 2010 NPR. … The United States faces a more diverse and advanced nuclear-threat environment than ever before."[5] In particular, the NPR highlights the return of great power competition, especially as it pertains to U.S. relationships with Russia and China. As my colleague Thomas Wright notes in his recent book, *All Measures Short of War: The Contest for the 21st Century and the Future of American Power*, "The United States is in competition with Russia and China for the future of the international order."[6] By the end of the Obama administration, many senior officials, including myself, had come to a similar conclusion.[7]

news.com/content/the-time-is-2-minutes-to-nuclear-midnight (accessed December 18, 2020).
[4] "Did you hear: 38 classic 'Hollings-isms,'" *The Times and Democrat*, December 16, 2004, http://thetandd.com/news/did-you-hear-classic-hollings-isms/article_8327afa8-b598-5930-aeb0-3a09e6d688e4.htm (accessed January 21, 2021).
[5] U.S. Department of Defense, "Nuclear Posture Review 2018," (Arlington, VA: U.S. Department of Defense, February 2018), p. V, https://media.defense.gov/2018/Feb/02/2001872886/-1/-1/1/2018-NUCLEAR-POSTURE -REVIEW-FINAL-REPORT.PDF (accessed January 21, 2021).
[6] Thomas Wright, *All Measures Short of War: The Contest for the 21st Century and the Future of American Power*, (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2017), 189.
[7] "U.S. accuses Russia of dismantling security agreements," *The Financial Times*, March 30, 2016, https://www.ft.com/content/943a8ae0-f62e-11e5-803c-d27c7117d132.

In April 2009, President Obama delivered his seminal speech in Prague outlining his long-term vision for a "world free of nuclear weapons."[8] In actuality, the Prague speech was a nuanced document that carefully balanced deterrence, arms control, and non-proliferation priorities. While the speech laid out the president's long-term vision, Obama also noted that this was unlikely to happen during his lifetime, and that as long as nuclear weapons existed, the United States would maintain a safe, secure, and effective deterrent.[9] The speech was intended to serve as a catalyst to encourage further action on arms reduction and non-proliferation by other nations.

Unfortunately, that did not turn out to be the case. As the 2018 NPR notes:

Despite concerted U.S. efforts to reduce the role of nuclear weapons in international affairs and to negotiate reductions in the number of nuclear weapons, since 2010 no potential adversary has reduced either the role of nuclear weapons in its national security strategy or number of nuclear weapons in the field. Rather, they moved decidedly in the opposite direction.[10]

While the Obama administration made modest progress with Russia on nuclear reductions early in the administration, Russian security elites never bought into Obama's long-term vision. For example, Russia signed the New Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (New START) in 2010 not because it believed in a "world free of nuclear weapons." Rather, New START was fundamentally about maintaining strategic nuclear parity with the United States, capping the number of U.S. nuclear forces, and providing Russia insights into the U.S. strategic nuclear arsenal that it might not have access to without the treaty. Furthermore, Russia has shown little interest in pursuing additional nuclear reductions, especially with regard to non-strategic nuclear weapons, which are not limited by New START, and in which Russia has a large numerical advantage.

CONTINUING THE OBAMA STRATEGIC NUCLEAR MODERNIZATION PROGRAM

Far from being a dramatic departure from previous nuclear policy and strategy, the 2018 NPR essentially ratifies the Obama administration's strategic nuclear modernization

[8] Barack Obama, "Remarks by President Barack Obama in Prague as Delivered," (speech, Prague, Czech Republic, April 5, 2009), https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/remarks-president-barack-obama-prague-delivered (accessed January 21, 2021).
[9] Ibid.
[10] U.S. Department of Defense, "Nuclear Posture Review 2018," 7.

program. Specifically, the NPR recommends moving forward with the Obama administration's strategic modernization program: the Columbia-class ballistic missile submarine (SSBN), the Ground-Based Strategic Deterrent (GBSD), the B-21 bomber, and the Long-Range Stand-Off (LRSO) cruise missile. Though some experts, primarily in the arms control and disarmament community, opposed elements of the Obama modernization program, the program was key to winning Senate advice and consent for New START, and it continues to maintain strong bipartisan support in Congress. These systems enhance strategic stability and are consistent with U.S. arms control obligations and commitments.

ARMS CONTROL AND NON-PROLIFERATION

Many analysts, including myself, were concerned with some of the Trump administration's initial statements regarding arms control and non-proliferation, especially claims that New START was a "bad deal for the United States."[11] Luckily, those concerns have not yet come to pass, and the language on arms control and non-proliferation is largely consistent with the approach taken by previous U.S. administrations. Admittedly, the 2018 NPR does not focus the same level of attention and emphasis on arms control and non-proliferation as the Obama administration's 2010 NPR. However, under the 2018 review, the U.S. will maintain our negative security assurance not to use, or threaten to use, nuclear weapons against a non-nuclear weapons state in compliance with its nuclear non-proliferation obligations;[12] continue to fund the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty Organization, the International Monitoring System, and the International Data Center;[13] remain a party to New START; and continue active

[11] Jonathan Landay and David Rhode, "In call with Putin, Trump denounced Obama-era arms Treaty," *Reuters*, February 9, 2017, https://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-trump-putin/exclusive-in-call-with-putin-trump-denounced-obama-era-nuclear-arms-treaty-sources-idUSKBN15O2A5 (accessed January 21, 2021).

[12] The 2018 NPR caveats this assurance by noting that given the potential of significant non-nuclear strategic attacks, the United States reserves the right to make adjustments to the assurance that may be warranted by the evolution of the threat. The 2010 NPR made a similar caveat with regard to biological weapons, which states: "Given the catastrophic potential of biological weapons and the rapid pace of bio-technology development, the United States reserves the right to make any adjustment in the assurance that may be warranted by the evolution and proliferation of the biological weapons threat and U.S. capacities to counter that threat." See U.S. Department of Defense, "Nuclear Posture Review," (Arlington, VA: U.S. Department of Defense, February 2010), 14, https://dod.defense.gov/Portals/1/features/defenseReviews/NPR/2010_Nuclear_Posture_Review_Report.pdf (accessed February 19, 2021).

[13] However, the NPR makes clear that "the United States will not seek Senate ratification of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty." That said, the U.S. Senate does not ratify treaties, it provides its "advice and consent" to ratification. It is the president who officially ratifies treaties on behalf of the United States.

participation in the International Partnership for Nuclear Disarmament Verification (IPNDV).[14]

Some analysts have criticized the NPR for treating arms control and non-proliferation as an "afterthought." This line of criticism is not entirely fair. Despite its best efforts, the Obama administration was unable to make any further progress on arms reductions during its second term in office. Moreover, it is unlikely that any new U.S. administration—Democrat or Republican—would have been in a position to make significant progress on arms control given the current security environment, and Russia's violation of several arms control agreements.[15] Indeed, a strong argument can be made that the bilateral U.S.-Russia arms reductions process that began in the late 1980s may be at an end, making it imperative to anticipate what a future U.S.-Russia strategic stability framework might look like in the absence of further negotiated reductions.

Critics of the NPR also argue that the document fails to explicitly reference Article VI of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), which calls on signatories "to pursue negotiations in good faith on effective measures relating to cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament."[16] While this is true, the NPR does reference the NPT, stating: "The United States remains committed to nuclear non-proliferation, continues to abide by its obligations under the NPT, and will work to strengthen the NPT regime."[17] Of the four NPRs conducted by the United States since 1994, only one, the Obama administration's 2010 review, specifically references Article VI on the NPT in publicly released documents.[18] The failure to specifically reference Article VI in itself is not a big deal. The more legitimate question is whether the Trump administration feels if it has an obligation to pursue disarmament.

Evaporating support for arms control initiatives by the Republican Party, especially in Congress, is also a cause for concern. If arms control is to have a long-term future, new

[14] U.S. Department of Defense, "Nuclear Posture Review 2018," 71-74.
[15] The United States judges Russia to be in violation of the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty and the Conventional Forces in Europe Treaty. See "Adherence to and Compliance with Arms Control, Nonproliferation, and Disarmament Agreements and Commitments," U.S. Department of State, April 14, 2017,) https://2017-2021.state.gov/2017-report-on-adherence-to-and-compliance-with-arms-control-nonproliferation-and-disarmament-agreements-and-commitments//index.html (accessed February 19, 2021).
[16] The Treaty on the Non-proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, July 1, 1968, https://www.un.org/disarmament/wmd/nuclear/npt/text (accessed February 19, 2021).
[17] U.S. Department of Defense, "Nuclear Posture Review 2018," 70.
[18] The United States has conducted Nuclear Posture Reviews in 1994 (Clinton), 2002 (Bush), 2010 (Obama), 2018 (Trump).

efforts will be required to build a bipartisan consensus in favor of such treaties and agreements that advance U.S. security interests. Better integration of arms control with U.S. deterrence and stability requirements is key to developing this consensus.

In addition, there are several essential national security benefits that arms control provides, which are little appreciated in conservative circles. For example, it's important to acknowledge that while President Obama did not get everything right in the nuclear policy arena, critics should acknowledge that his nuclear policies helped create a bipartisan consensus in favor of strategic nuclear modernization. Specifically, New START played a critical role in building support among congressional Democrats for the strategic nuclear modernization program.

Anti-nuclear feelings run high among the publics in many allied countries, especially in Norway, the Netherlands, Germany, and Japan. Arms control and non-proliferation agreements play an essential role in helping allied governments build domestic political consensus to support nuclear deterrence, especially with regard to hosting U.S. assets on their territory, and procuring dual-capable aircraft.

And finally, as the NPR acknowledges, arms control can complement U.S. defense planning. For example, strategic arms control agreements like New START, by bounding the threat and providing transparency and predictability, have enabled U.S. defense planners to design and deploy with confidence an effective deterrent that can survive a first strike by an adversary.

EXTENDED DETERRENCE

Despite widespread criticism of its management of alliance relationships, the Trump administration's consultations with allies in the context of the NPR stand out as an exception to the rule. Similar to the 2010 NPR, the 2018 NPR established an effective consultation process that enabled allies to provide input and help shape the review. Based on publicly available information, allied governments appear to be satisfied both with the consultative mechanisms and with the document's final conclusions. Such consultation is essential to maintaining alliance cohesion and support.

In a February 2, 2018 statement on the NPR, Japanese Foreign Minister Taro Kono stated: "Japan highly appreciates the latest NPR which clearly articulates the U.S. resolve to ensure the effectiveness of its deterrence and its commitment to providing extended

deterrence to its allies, including Japan."[19] The only negative public comment about the NPR from a senior allied official came from Sigmar Gabriel, German foreign minister at the time the document was released. According to press reports, Gabriel criticized the NPR and called on Europe "to begin new initiatives for arms control and disarmament."[20] However, it is unlikely that Gabriel's views were fully representative of the German government, especially the Chancellery and the Ministry of Defense, which are occupied by members of the center-right Christian Democrat Union (CDU) party.

The NPR devotes significant attention to extended deterrence and recommends several specific actions to enhance U.S. and allied capabilities.[21] These include acquiring the B-21 bomber and LRSO cruise missile, developing a new nuclear-armed sea-launched cruise missile (SLCM), enhancing the readiness and survivability of NATO dual-capable aircraft, and working with allies "to improve our shared understanding of nuclear dangers and corresponding deterrence requirements through continued consultative dialogues."[22] Overall, the NPR is good for extended deterrence.

DECLARATORY POLICY

Similar to the 2010 NPR, the 2018 review states: "The United States would only consider the use of nuclear weapons in extreme circumstances to defend the vital interest of the United States, its allies, and partners."[23] However, unlike the 2010 NPR, the most recent review explicitly defines "extreme circumstances" to include "significant non-nuclear strategic attacks."[24] It's not clear why the Trump administration felt further clarification of U.S. declaratory policy was necessary. Unfortunately, the clarification has fueled a public narrative that the United States is *expanding* the instances when it would use nuclear weapons. This was probably not the intention of the review's authors, but it will require senior administration officials to constantly address the issue. It is a self-inflicted wound that will likely fester for some time and provide propaganda fodder for Russia.

[19] "Release of the Nuclear Posture Review: Statement of Foreign Minister Taro Kono," Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan, February 2, 2018, https://www. mofa.go.jp/press/release/press4e_001893. html (February 19, 2021).
[20] "Nuclear weapons: Germany's Sigmar Gabriel calls on Europe to lead disarmament push," *Deutsche Welle,* February 24, 2018, http://www.dw.com/en/nuclear-weapons-germanys-sigmar-gabriel-calls-on-europe-to-lead-disarmament-push/a-42449629 (accessed January 25, 2021).
[21] U.S. Department of Defense, "Nuclear Posture Review 2018," 34-37.
[22] Ibid., 37.
[23] Ibid., 21.
[24] Ibid., 21.

NEW LOW-YIELD NUCLEAR CAPABILITIES

The NPR recommends that the United States "pursue select supplements" to the Obama administration's strategic nuclear modernization program to "enhance the flexibility and responsiveness of U.S. nuclear forces."[25] These supplements include developing a new low-yield warhead for the D-5 submarine-launched ballistic missile (SLBM) and a new SLCM deployed on attack submarines and surface ships. Several analysts have argued that these supplemental capabilities will lower the threshold for nuclear use. However, the United States currently deploys several low-yield nuclear weapons in its arsenal (e.g., the B-61 gravity bomb and the air-launched cruise missile) and was modernizing its low-yield capabilities under the Obama administration's program of record (e.g., B-61-12, LRSO). Therefore, it's difficult to imagine how introducing a modified D-5 warhead or a new SLCM is going to "lower the threshold" for nuclear use. If the United States needed to employ a low-yield nuclear option today, it could do so.

The key question is not whether these new capabilities will "lower the threshold for nuclear use," but whether additional lower yield capabilities—beyond the B-61-12 and LRSO—are needed to maintain effective deterrence against Russia and others. From my perspective, as long as the United States moves forward with deployment of the B-61-12 gravity bomb and the LRSO cruise missile, that should be sufficient to deter the threat from Russia's non-strategic nuclear forces and other potential adversaries.

However, of the two supplemental capabilities the NPR proposes, a strong case can be made for developing a new nuclear-armed SLCM as a complement to the B-61-12 and LRSO. Such a capability could serve as a hedge against longer-term advances in anti-submarine warfare capabilities, as this would increase the number of nuclear-armed submarines; [26] provide a treaty-compliant response to Russia's violation of the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty; and enhance extended deterrence, especially with Japan and the Republic of Korea, by providing a prompt response option. Japan was initially concerned by the retirement of the Tomahawk Land Attack Missile-Nuclear (TLAM-N) SLCM in 2010, and Japanese officials have generally welcomed U.S. plans to reintroduce this capability.

A decision to proceed with the development of a nuclear-armed SLCM will face two key challenges. First, it is unclear where the administration will find the additional resources to pay for the new system. However, developing a sea-based version of the LRSO might

[25] Ibid., 52.
[26] The NPR does not rule out also deploying nuclear-armed SLCMs on surface vessels.

be an affordable option. Second, the U.S. Navy has traditionally been ambivalent about deploying nuclear-armed systems on surface vessels and attack submarines. The Obama administration's decision in the 2010 NPR to retire the TLAM-N nuclear-armed cruise missile was, in large part, driven by the Navy's reluctance to fund and sustain the program.

I find the case for the low-yield D-5 warhead to be less compelling and question whether there truly is a "gap" in our theater-level deterrence posture in Europe, as the NPR claims. On the other hand, I am also uncertain that placing a low-yield warhead on the D-5 missile would undermine stability and increase the chances of miscalculation, as some have claimed. For example, the United Kingdom has deployed low-yield warheads on it SSBNs for over a decade,[27] and few experts have claimed that this deployment has undermined stability.[28]

RUSSIAN VS. CHINESE NUCLEAR DOCTRINE

There is no doubt that China represents a potential threat to the United States and its allies. Nevertheless, it is not fully clear why the NPR lumps China in with Russia in the nuclear context, given that their approaches to nuclear weapons policy differ significantly. First, though China has been actively modernizing its strategic nuclear forces over a decade (e.g., deployment of mobile intercontinental-range ballistic missiles and ballistic missile submarines), and its nuclear forces have certainly become more survivable, there's no evidence that it seeks to move beyond a "minimum deterrent" force or pursue nuclear parity with the United States. Second, Russia has made numerous nuclear threats against other countries, while China has not. To the contrary, China continues to maintain its "no first use" of nuclear weapons policy.

The primary challenge from China is its attempt to tilt the balance of power in the Western Pacific in its favor through a major conventional force build-up and development of anti-access, area denial and "asymmetric" capabilities (e.g., counter-space, cyber). While it is imperative that the United States continue to deter China's nuclear forces, its primary concern should be focused on countering China's efforts to gain conventional superiority in the Western Pacific.

---

[27] Austin Long, "Discrimination Details Matter Clarifying Argument About Low-Yield Nuclear Warhead," *War on the Rocks*, February 16, 2018, https://warontherocks.com/2018/02/discrimination-details-matter-clarifying-argument-low-yield-nuclear-warheads (accessed January 25, 2021).

[28] For a more detailed discussion of the issues associated with deploying low-yield warheads on SSBNs, see Franklin C. Miller, "Addressing Fears About The Nuclear Posture Review and Limited Nuclear Use," *War on the Rocks*, February 28, 2018, https://warontherocks.com/2018/02/addressing-fears-nuclear-posture-review-limited-nuclear-use (accessed January 25, 2021).

GROUND-LAUNCHED CRUISE MISSILES (GLCM)

The NPR also recommends that the United States "commence INF Treaty-compliant research and development by reviewing military concepts for conventional, ground-launched, intermediate-range missile defenses" in response to Russia's violation on the INF Treaty.[29] As I noted in testimony before the House Strategic Forces Subcommittee in March 2017,[30] the challenge with conducting research and developing a new GLCM is that once the system is developed, where would it be deployed? For example, public protests in reaction to NATO's decision to deploy intermediate-range ballistic missiles and GLCMs in Europe in the 1980s almost broke the alliance. In addition, the recent decision to deploy the Terminal High Altitude Area Defense (THAAD) missile defense system in the Republic of Korea has been highly controversial.[31] Given the political challenges associated with basing GLCMs on foreign territory, it would be wiser to invest those funds into developing a conventional variant of the LRSO or a new SLCM. Air- and sea-launched systems would not require the United States to negotiate basing rights with host nations and could meet military requirements. Either approach would have the added benefit of being INF Treaty-compliant, while a U.S. GLCM would be as treaty non-compliant as the Russian GLCM.[32]

IMPLEMENTATION CHALLENGES

PRESIDENT TRUMP'S PUBLIC STATEMENTS ON NUCLEAR WEAPONS

There are two key issues that will fundamentally impact the Trump administration's ability to implement the NPR over the long term: President's Trump's personal rhetoric on nuclear policy and the affordability of the strategic nuclear modernization program. Unlike previous presidents who used careful language when discussing nuclear weapons, President Trump has taken a different approach, using inflammatory language to describe his approach to nuclear policy. Some of his more controversial statements include:

[29] U.S. Department of Defense, "Nuclear Posture Review 2018," 10.
[30] Frank A. Rose, "Consequences and Context for Russia's Violations of the INF Treaty," (testimony before the House Armed Services Committee, Subcommittee on Strategic Forces, Washington, DC, March 30, 2017), http://docs.house.gov/meetings/FA/FA18/20170330/105811/HHRG-115-FA18-Wstate-RoseF-20170330.pdf (accessed January 25, 2021).
[31] "THAAD Controversy Threatens Bumpy Ties with US," *Chosunilbo*, May 2, 2017, http//english.chosun.com/site/data/html_dir/2017/05/02/2017050201313.html (accessed January 25, 2021).
[32] Research and development of INF-range systems is permitted under the INF Treaty, but flight testing and deployment is not.

- "Let it be an arms race;"[33]
- "… we will have no choice but to totally destroy North Korea. Rocket Man is on a suicide mission for himself and for his regime. The United States is ready, willing and able;"[34] and
- "I too have a Nuclear Button, but it is a much bigger & more powerful one than his, and my Button works!"[35]

Conversely, senior Trump administration officials have generally been thoughtful and restrained in their public statements on nuclear policy. However, make no mistake, the president's statements are impacting the administration's ability to effectively articulate its message on the NPR, and have the potential to undermine the current bipartisan consensus in favor of strategic nuclear modernization.

For example, in the U.S. domestic political context, mainstream congressional Democrats are beginning to take a more skeptical view on nuclear weapons issues, largely in reaction to President Trump. The Trump administration should view this as a potential warning sign. At the same time, Democrats need to acknowledge, as the Council on Foreign Relations' Max Boot writes, "Trump won't be president forever."[36] Therefore, they should be careful about allowing their reactions to Trump to prompt them to "make long-term decisions that will undercut the nuclear deterrent commanded by his successors."[37]

Loose talk regarding nuclear weapons could also damage our deterrence relationships with allies. As noted previously, nuclear weapons are deeply unpopular with the publics in many allied countries. Certain allied governments struggle to maintain a domestic political consensus in favor of nuclear deterrence. President Trump's public statements have made an already difficult task even harder.

---

[33] Carrie Dann, "Donald Trump on Nukes: Let it be an arms race," *NBC News*, December 23, 2016, https://www.nbcnews.com/politics/politics-news/trump-nukes-let-it-be-arms-race-n699526 (accessed January 25, 2021).
[34] Ali Vatali, "Trump Threatens to 'Totally Destroy' North Korea in First U.N. Speech," *NBC News*, September 19, 2017, https://www.nbcnews.com/politics/white-house/trump-un-north-korean-leader-suicide-mission-n802596 (accessed January 25, 2021).
[35] "Trump to Kim: My nuclear button is 'bigger and more powerful,'" *BBC*, January 3, 2018, http://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-42549687 (accessed January 25, 2021).
[36] Max Boot, "Trump won't be president forever. Nuclear policy shouldn't pretend he will," *The Washington Post,* February 8, 2018, https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/global- opinions/trump-wont-be-president-forever-nuclear-policy-shouldnt-pretend-he-will/2018/02/08/6eba8a98-0cd6-11e8-880-372e2047c935_story.html?utm_term=.88a0f7ab2957 (accessed January 25, 2021).
[37] Ibid.

Why should the United States really care what our allies think? The response to this question is simple: The United States needs its allies' support to effectively deter and defend itself from strategic threats. For example, the upgraded early warning radars in Greenland and the United Kingdom provide early warning against strategic missile attack, and directly support the missile defense of the United States; the two forward-deployed radars based in Japan support regional and U.S. homeland missile defense; and the relay ground stations and other communications facilities around the world directly support U.S. nuclear command and control systems. Fundamentally, the security of the U.S. homeland is intricately linked with the security of its allies. Therefore, it is critical that the United States remain attuned to allied concerns, especially their unique domestic political situations, and avoid loose rhetoric that inflames alliance relations.

AFFORDABILITY OF THE STRATEGIC NUCLEAR MODERNIZATION PROGRAM

The second long-term challenge for NPR implementation deals with the issue of the strategic nuclear modernization program's affordability. While Trump administration officials have generally sought to downplay the costs associated with the strategic nuclear modernization program, there are legitimate concerns as to whether the modernization program outlined in the NPR can be executed within projected defense budgets.

For example, the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) estimates that the Obama administration's program of record would have cost at least $1.2 trillion over 30 years.[38] At a recent panel discussion at the Center for Strategic and International Studies in Washington, DC, Secretary of the Navy Richard Spencer was more candid about the costs. According to press reports, he noted that the cost of the Columbia-class submarine "will make your eyes water. Columbia will be a $100 billion program for its lifetime. … I think we have to have big discussions about it."[39] Though defense budgets are scheduled to increase in fiscal years 2018 and 2019, President Trump's own budget projections show defense spending flat-lining in fiscal year 2020. In addition, with the modernization program in its early phases, the costs of the program will almost certainly grow as the systems mature. Therefore, it's imperative that effective oversight mechanisms are put in

[38] Congressional Budget Office, "Approaches for Managing the Costs of U.S. Nuclear Forces, 2017 to 2046," (Washington, DC: Congressional Budget Office, October 2017), https://www.cbo.gov/system /files/115th-congress-2017-2018/reports/53211-nuclearforces.pdf (accessed January 25, 2021).
[39] Travis J. Tritten, "Costs of new nuclear sub is 'eye watering,' Navy secretary says," *The Washington Examiner*, March 12, 2018, https://www.washingtonexaminer.com/policy/defense-national- security /cost-of-new-nuclear-subs-is-eye-watering-navy-secretary-says (accessed February 19, 2021) .

place to ensure that the programs are delivered on time and within budget. It will also require sustained funding for the program by Congress.

CONCLUSION

In summary, the Trump administration has developed an NPR that is responsive to the threats faced by the United States and its allies. However, it's uncertain whether or not the administration can use the document to build a sustainable consensus on nuclear policy. Both the president's controversial public statements and the hefty price tag of the strategic nuclear modernization program represent key challenges to fostering and maintaining that consensus. However, the Trump administration's chances of success will improve if it is able to calibrate its public messages; effectively engage the U.S. Congress, general public, and allies on the importance of nuclear deterrence; advance pragmatic arms control and non-proliferation initiatives; and enhance strategic stability with potential adversaries such as Russia and China.

A previous version of this paper was originally published as "Is the 2018 Nuclear Posture Review as bad as the critics claim it is?", Brooking Institution, April 2018, https://www.brookings.edu/research/is-the-2018-nuclear-posture-review-as-bad-as-the-critics-claim-it-is (accessed January 25, 2021).

CHAPTER 2

Regional Deterrence and Nuclear Arms Control: A Japanese Perspective

Hirofumi Tosaki

INTRODUCTION

In the latter half of the 2010s, nuclear deterrence relations and nuclear arms control have become increasingly unstable and uncertain. Meanwhile, the Trump administration's Nuclear Posture Review in 2018 (2018 NPR) and its withdrawal from the Intermediate-range Nuclear Force (INF) Treaty in August 2019 have significant implications for the security policies of Japan, especially extended deterrence provided by the United States.

The U.S. current nuclear posture reflects its threat perception that it faces the most serious strategic environment since the end of the Cold War. For instance, the 2018 NPR clearly stated,

> [G]lobal threat conditions have worsened markedly since the most recent, 2010 NPR. There now exist an unprecedented range and mix of threats, including major conventional, chemical, biological, nuclear, space, and cyber threats, and violent non-state actors. International relations are volatile. Russia and China are contesting the international norms and order we have worked with our allies, partners, and members of the international community to build and sustain. Some regions are marked by persistent disorder that appears likely to continue and possibly intensify. These developments have produced increased uncertainty and risk, demanding a renewed seriousness of purpose in deterring threats and assuring allies and partners.[1]

In particular, the U.S. unfavorable evaluation of China and Russia stands out in the 2018 NPR. While the NPRs of the past three administrations implied the preservation of their

[1] U.S. Department of Defense, *Nuclear Posture Review*, February 2018, p. 2.

nuclear deterrence posture vis-à-vis China and Russia, they, at least seemingly, emphasized that they were not its adversaries. On the other hand, the Trump administration assessed, "Since 2010 we have seen the return of Great Power competition. To varying degrees, Russia and China have made clear they seek to substantially revise the post–Cold War international order and norms of behavior."[2] The current great power competition under the ongoing power transition has also triggered geopolitical competitions in Asia, Europe, and the Middle East. In the relative decline of U.S. power, China and Russia have taken this opportunity to expand their sphere of influence and/or modify the existing regional order, with implicit or explicit nuclear coercion, and the United States and its allies have struggled to maintain the status quo. In addition, various disputes/conflicts in these regions, including territorial issues, have reemerged and escalated, which further complicated regional as well as global security situations.

To address these great power/geopolitical competitions, the countries involved have increased their reliance on, and reaffirmed the roles of, nuclear deterrence, and situations surrounding nuclear deterrence relations and arms control has become more diverse, complicated, and unstable than ever. During the Cold War, most nuclear issues ultimately converged to the bipolar U.S.–Soviet relation. After the Cold War, most of these issues have decentralized and attenuated their degree of linkage with the global nuclear order: the risk of a regional nuclear exchange escalating into a global nuclear war has decreased, but the concern is an increase in the risk of a limited or regional nuclear war because of the great powers' weakening control on regional actors. In addition, dealing with nuclear issues has become more complicated since it should thoroughly consider each region's unique dynamics and logic as well as the highly asymmetric nature of countries' capabilities, interests, and resolves on nuclear deterrence.

Northeast Asia, where Japan is located, is the region with the highest threat level: China, Russia, and the United States, which are engaged in a great power competition, are all directly involved in security issues in this region; North Korea violates the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty (NPT), and possesses nuclear weapons; Japan and South Korea are provided with U.S. extended nuclear deterrence; and security relations among these countries under nuclear deterrence are multiple, complicated and unstable. This article examines the implications of the U.S. nuclear policies under the 2018 NPR and its withdrawal from the INF Treaty for Japan's security, particularly the extended deterrence

[2] Ibid., p. 6.

it provides Japan as well as nuclear arms control in Northeast Asia under a thick nuclear shadow.

1. The U.S. 2018 NRP, Withdrawal From the INF Treaty, and Japan's Positions

(1) U.S. Policy Changes

The concrete nuclear policies as well as basic principles in the 2018 NPR reflects much more continuity than change.[3] With regard to regional deterrence, following the 2002 and 2010 NPRs, the 2018 NPR articulates that U.S. deterrence consists of not only nuclear but also conventional forces, including missile defenses, and applies "a tailored approach to effectively deter across a spectrum of adversaries, threats, and contexts." On the other hand, significant changes from the previous NPR presented in the 2018 NPR are to bolster non-strategic nuclear options and to imply a negative attitude toward nuclear arms control, both of which reflect the ongoing great power/geopolitical competitions in the latter half of the 2010s.

As for nuclear forces that constitute tailored deterrence for regional issues, the 2010 NPR aimed to "[r]etain the capability to forward-deploy U.S. nuclear weapons on tactical fighter-bombers [or dual-capable aircraft (DCA)] . . . and heavy bombers."[4] The 2010 NPR further mentioned the U.S. decision to retire the TLAM-Ns, or the nuclear-equipped sea-launched cruise missiles (SLCMs) by 2013. The Obama administration argued that heavy bombers and DCA "can be visibly forward deployed, thereby signaling U.S. resolve and commitment in crisis."[5] However, since these capabilities are not deployed in Northeast Asia—owing to a lack of readiness or promptness—there were concerns about the credibility and effectiveness of U.S. nuclear deterrence vis-à-vis regional rivalries.

On the other hand, the 2018 NPR states, "[To] enhance the flexibility and range of its tailored deterrence options . . . in the near-term, the United States will modify a small

[3] See, for instance, John R. Harvey, Franklin C. Miller, Keith B. Payne and Bradley H. Roberts, "Continuity and Change in U.S. Nuclear Policy," *Real Clear Defense*, February 7, 2018, https://www.realcleardefense.com/articles/2018/02/07/continuity_and_change_in_us_nuclear_policy_113025.html (accessed January 13, 2021).
[4] 2010 NPR, p. 14.
[5] Ibid., p. 24.

number of existing SLBM warheads to provide a low-yield option, and in the longer term, pursue a modern nuclear-armed [SLCM]."[6] The 2018 NPR indicates that introduction of these new capabilities is required as a primary response to Russia, which is likely to possess the option of a limited use of nuclear weapons to "escalate to de-escalate," demonstrating their determination to engage a nuclear war for preserving its national interest by detonating a small number of nuclear weapons, and has been suspected to acquire and deploy 9M729 ground-launched cruise missiles (GLCMs) in violation of the INF Treaty. However, given that China and North Korea deploy a large number of ground-based medium- and intermediate-range missiles (GBIRs), the U.S. acquisition of new nuclear capabilities will also have important implications in Northeast Asia.

According to a report by the U.S.–China Economic and Security Review Commission published in February 2019, China possesses more than 2,000 missiles, 95% of which are GBIRs (of which about 400–600 have a range of 1,000 km or more) prohibited under the INF Treaty.[7] Nearly all these missiles can carry nuclear or conventional warheads. Among these missiles, the DF-21 (range: 1,800 km) and the DF-26 (range: 3,000 km) can reach Japan and Guam, respectively, and their derivative types are considered to have anti–ship strike capability. China's GBIRs constitute one of the core weapon systems in its Anti-Access/Area Denial (A2/AD) strategy against the United States, and they pose a serious threat to Japan's security as well. North Korea has also strived to numerically and qualitatively strengthen its ballistic missiles, including the No-dong (range: 1,300 km), which covers the whole of Japan, and the Hwasong-12 (range: 4,500 km), which can reach Guam.

In the meantime, the 2018 NPR implies that the Trump administration would not be proactive in promoting nuclear arms control as a measure to enhance its national security: "The United States remains willing to engage in a prudent arms control agenda. We are prepared to consider arms control opportunities that return parties to compliance, predictability, and transparency, and remain receptive to future arms control negotiations if conditions permit and the potential outcome improves the security of the United States,

[6] 2018 NPR, p. 54.
[7] Jacob Stokes, "China's Missile Program and U.S. Withdrawal from the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty," Staff Research Report, U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission, February 4, 2018, p. 3, https://www.uscc.gov/sites/default/files/Research/China%20and%20INF_0.pdf (accessed January 13, 2021).

its allies, and partners."[8] This position partly reflects the perception that "[d]espite concerted U.S. efforts to reduce the role of nuclear weapons in international affairs and to negotiate reductions in the number of nuclear weapons, since 2010 no potential adversary has reduced either the role of nuclear weapons in its national security strategy or the number of nuclear weapons it fields. Rather, they have moved decidedly in the opposite direction."[9]

Since the Cold War era, one of the Washington's most important objectives in nuclear arms control is to institutionally ensure strategic stability with major nuclear powers while maintaining nuclear deterrence. However, the 2018 NPR does not necessarily emphasize even the importance of strategic stability with Russia or China. This is also evident in the Trump administration's attitude toward arms control.

While the United States has officially called attention to Russia's noncompliance with the INF Treaty since 2014, President Trump suddenly announced his intention to withdraw from the treaty in October 2018. The United States formally notified Russia and other states parties of the withdrawal in February 2019, which entered into effect in August 2. The reasons for withdrawing from the treaty by the United States included not just Russia's noncompliance but also the need to establish a multilateral treaty on controlling GBIRs that especially included China, which is not a party to the INF Treaty and possesses hundreds of such missiles. Soon after the termination of the INF Treaty, U.S. Defense Secretary Mark Esper said, "[W]e would like to deploy a capability sooner rather than later . . . I would prefer months."[10] In addition, the United States conducted a flight test of the conventional GLCM on August 20.

(2) JAPAN'S REACTIONS

Soon after the 2018 NPR was publicized, Japanese Foreign Minister Taro Kono said, "Japan highly appreciates the latest NPR which clearly articulates the U.S. resolve to ensure the *effectiveness* of its deterrence and its *commitment* to providing extended deterrence to its allies including Japan" (emphasis added).[11] The 2018 NPR states, "The

[8] 2018 NPR, p. 74.
[9] 2018 NPR, p. 7.
[10] "US to Deploy New Missiles in Asia 'Sooner Rather Than Later,'" *DW*, August 3, 2019, https://www.dw.com/en/us-to-deploy-new-missiles-in-asia-sooner-rather-than-later/a-49878171 (accessed January 13, 2021).
[11] "The Release of the U.S. Nuclear Posture Review (NPR): Statement by Foreign Minister Taro

United States has extended nuclear deterrence commitments that assure European, Asian, and Pacific allies. The United States will ensure the credibility and effectiveness of those commitments."[12]

In Northeast Asia, the security environment has been steadily eroding, aggravated by the regional nuclear powers' modernization of their nuclear arsenals. Meanwhile, before his inauguration, President Trump often questioned the importance of alliances for U.S. national security and suggested reducing U.S. commitments to its allies, including Japan. Therefore, the abovementioned passage in the 2018 NPR on alliance commitment, to some extent, alleviated the allies' worries.

It could be argued that the 2018 NPR just reiterated the U.S. commitments made by previous administrations. However, significance of reiteration and reaffirmation in U.S. strategic documents, including the NPR, should not be underestimated, especially in light of the current security environment. Furthermore, the 2018 NPR mentions the phrase "extended *nuclear* deterrence" eight times (excerpt from its executive summary), which was not used in the 2010 NPR. This can be interpreted as the Trump administration's intention, in its emphasis of a nuclear aspect of extended deterrence, to send a clear message that the United States will not hesitate to use nuclear deterrent to defend its allies, thereby bolstering both deterrence against potential adversaries and reassurance to its allies.

For effective and credible (extended) nuclear deterrence, it is vital to have appropriate employment policies and nuclear forces as enablers. However, Tokyo has not clarified its position regarding, for instance, the U.S. introduction of new nuclear capabilities in the 2018 NPR. Japan's reaction to the U.S. withdrawal from the INF Treaty was also ambiguous. When the United States sent its notice of withdrawal, Chief Cabinet Secretary Yoshihide Suga said, "We understand the U.S. awareness of problems that led it to announce it will halt its obligations under the treaty . . . As the treaty has played a historic role in arms control and reduction, it is undesirable that the treaty be ended."[13]

Kono," February 3, 2019, https://www.mofa.go.jp/press/release/press4e_001893.html (accessed January 13, 2021).

[12] 2018 NPR, p. 22.

[13] "Japan Reluctantly Endorses 'Undesirable' U.S. Exit from INF Nuclear Arms Pact with Russia," *Kyodo*, February 4, 2019, https://www.japantimes.co.jp/news/2019/02/04/national/politics- diplomacy/japan-reluctantly-endorses-undesirable-u-s-exit-inf-nuclear-arms-pact-russia/#.XWnoV5P7RnY/ (accessed January 13, 2021).

When the U.S. withdrawal entered into effect, Secretary Suga reiterated the abovementioned position and added that it was necessary to consider a situation where countries that are not parties to the INF Treaty have developed and deployed GBIRs and that it is also essential to thoroughly discuss a modality of arms control in East Asia, which includes enhancing transparency.[14]

Such ambiguous positions were derived from a complicated situation which Japan needs to contemplate. Tokyo did not treat the U.S. withdrawal as a countermeasure against Russia's noncompliance with the INF Treaty. The U.S. deployment of GBIRs would also strengthen its (extended) deterrence in Northeast Asia. In addition, it is imperative to consider alliance management in light of a security situation where Japan needs to be strongly aligned with the United States. At the same time, Japan, as a country that has suffered from atomic bombings and advocated nuclear disarmament, could not express its overwhelming support for the termination of a historic nuclear arms control treaty.

2. Bolstering Deterrence and its Challenges

(1) Potential Effectiveness

The United States and its allies have raised concerns that their regional nuclear adversaries would attempt to conduct early and limited use of nuclear weapons in regional conflicts to offset U.S. superiority in conventional forces, deter U.S. intervention and escalation, and force the United States to terminate conflict on terms favorable to them. In the 2010 NPR, the United States allocated heavy bombers and DCAs as regional nuclear deterrent components. However, there is considerable apprehension whether these nuclear forces could be effectively operated in A2/AD environments and perceived as sufficient deterrents in Northeast Asia. The United States does not deploy nuclear weapons in this region, and heavy bombers from the Andersen Air Force Base (Guam) would take several hours to reach the region, making it less responsive than missile forces. In addition, its adversaries' GBIR attacks could disable its air force bases in Northeast Asia and Guam. Furthermore, deployment of U.S. nuclear forces in Japan or South Korea is neither highly realistic nor effective from strategic (including vulnerability due to proximity to potential adversaries) and political

[14] "Press Conference by the Chief Cabinet Secretary," August 2, 2019, https://japan.kantei.go.jp/tyoukanpress/201908/2_a.html (accessed January 13, 2021) (in Japanese).

(including Japan's antinuclear sentiment and its three non-nuclear principles) viewpoints.

Under such situations, the introduction of nuclear SLCMs as well as low-yield nuclear warheads for SLBMs in the 2018 NPR is expected to bolster U.S. regional nuclear deterrence to enable rapid and precise strikes, limit collateral damage, increase survivability, add U.S. escalatory options, and avoid deployment to its allies' territories.

A strong criticism against the 2018 NPR is that U.S. adoption of the low-yield, limited nuclear attack option would lower the threshold of using nuclear weapons. However, proponents argue that such an option aims to prevent adversaries' nuclear attacks or, if it fails, restore deterrence by preparing a nuclear posture that includes capabilities and employment policies, which could impose greater caution and restraint on adversaries. Compared with the United States, its regional adversaries often have stronger interest and resolve regarding the use of nuclear weapons (which affects deterrence strength). The U.S. introduction of the low-yield, limited nuclear attack option could fill the deterrence gap derived from the imbalance of interests and resolve by adding capabilities, thereby bolstering deterrence effectiveness and credibility in regional contingencies.

Regarding the roles of conventional GBIRs, which the United States seeks to introduce in the Indo-Pacific region after the termination of the INF Treaty, Indo-Pacific Commander Philip Davidson said in April 2018, "[T]he absence of the INF Treaty would provide additional options to counter China's existing missile capabilities, complicate adversary decision making, and impose costs by forcing adversaries to spend money on expensive missile defense systems."[15] Eric Sayers, Adjunct Senior Fellow of the Center for a New American Security, also pointed out that the treaty's advantages include:[16]

- providing offensive conventional strike capabilities with less expensive but larger quantities than sea- or air-launched missiles and enabling air and maritime forces to prioritize other missions such as anti-surface, submarine, and air warfare missions;
- holding China's interior at risk and imposing cost to protect its military assets and

[15] Alex Hollings, "Trump Backing out of the INF Treaty Removes a Significant Chinese Advantage," *NewsRep*, February 4, 2019, https://thenewsrep.com/113610/trump-backing-out-of-the-inf-treaty-removes-a-significant-chinese-strategic-advantage (accessed January 13, 2021).

[16] Eric Sayers, "The Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty and the Future of the Indo-Pacific Military Balance," *War on the Rock*, February 13, 2018, https://warontherocks.com/2018/02/asia-inf (accessed January 13, 2021).

infrastructures.

- complicating China's military planning by presenting an offensive capability that can be deployed at locations across the first-island chain and beyond; and
- offering new opportunities for cooperation with allies and partners.

Tokyo highly evaluated the Obama administration's nuclear posture from the perspective of extended deterrence commitment and reassurance, especially because Japan and the United States launched the Extended Deterrence Dialogues; U.S. conventional forces, including missile defense, were properly included in its regional security architecture; and Washington reaffirmed that it would not adopt a countervalue strategy or a no-first-use policy. On the other hand, some viewed that the regional deterrence policies, including the retirement of the TLAM-Ns, were inhibitory and were concerned about whether heavy bombers and DCA alone would be sufficient to deter would-be adversaries in Northeast Asia. In that sense, Japan could consider that nuclear posture under the Trump administration would help improve extended deterrence by taking measures to introduce additional regional-level nuclear and conventional deterrents.

(2) CHALLENGES

On the other hand, there is considerable opposition to such nuclear policies under the Trump administration. For example, opponents argue that the effectiveness of extended (nuclear) deterrence, as well as the United States' and its allies' security, could be rather undermined if U.S. deployment of "new capabilities"—that is, low-yield SLBMs, nuclear SLCMs, and GBIRs—provokes the acceleration of its adversaries' nuclear buildup or adoption of a more aggressive nuclear posture. In addition, as Brad Roberts suggested, testing one's resolve to use nuclear weapons is a risky strategy because of a higher risk of overreactions, bluffs, miscalculations, and misperceptions, which would lead to a failure of deterrence or escalation control.[17] One cannot help but question the extent to which the United States and its allies could expect their adversaries to be prudent with nuclear weapons.

It is also unclear whether limited and non-strategic use of SLBMs, which are highly valuable assets and have been primarily used in missions for strategic and/or retaliatory

[17] Brad Roberts, *The Case for U.S. Nuclear Weapons in the 21st Century* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2016), pp. 77-78.

nuclear attacks on an adversary's mainland, would be a realistic option for the United States. For example, such strikes by SLBMs would trigger an unexpected adversary's nuclear escalation since the adversary cannot recognize the yield of nuclear warheads mounted on the SLBMs until their detonation. Also, China and Russia, depending on the capabilities of their early warning systems, might misunderstand or misperceive such nuclear attacks as a part of strategic operations. In addition, the question remains whether the United States would actually decide to launch just one or a few SLBMs from SSBNs for a limited purpose, risking detection and attack by an adversary's anti-submarine warfare forces. As for nuclear SLCMs, senior Pentagon officials have indicated that it would take around 10 years to introduce them. In the meantime, regardless of the security environment in Northeast Asia, there is the possibility that a plan involving nuclear SLCMs would be cancelled.

Regarding GBIRs, first, conventional GLCMs would have limited effectiveness against hardened targets (including underground facilities) and mobile missiles, and is considered practical for use as an anti-ship weapon. U.S. introduction of IRBMs would take 7–10 years, which might also be cancelled during this period as in the case of nuclear SLCMs.

Second, it would not be easy to find U.S. allies which are suitable for and would accept GBIR deployment.[18] Japan would be one such candidate for Northeast Asia deployment because of its stable domestic politics and close alliance with the United States, as well as its location—a moderate distance (more than 1,000 km) from China and North Korea. However, U.S. deployment would face opposition, especially by residents near the deployment site. Debates on deployment might cause a rift in the alliance.

Third, the vulnerability of GBIRs cannot be ignored. Mounting them on mobile launchers could reduce their vulnerability. However, their effectiveness would be reduced when they are deployed in small countries such as Japan—particularly the Nansei islands where anti-ship cruise missiles would be deployed—because of a lack of strategic depth. Constructing underground or tunneling facilities for missiles to protect other missiles and related assets, as North Korea has intensively done, requires considerable time and cost.

[18] Meanwhile, the 2018 NPR proposed the development of a low-yield SLBMs and SLCM because they "will not require or rely on host nation support to provide deterrent effect." 2018 NPR, pp. 54-55.

Deploying GBIRs only in times of crisis would also face the challenge of ensuring sufficient emergency deployment capabilities in an A2/AD environment.

The fourth question is whether there are any alternatives. Whereas land-based missiles are superior in terms of reliability and responsiveness in a crisis situation, submarine-based missiles are highly survivable, and air-launched missiles can be operated flexibly. Tokyo and Washington need to make careful strategic calculations regarding what capabilities are required for their deterrence, whether the U.S. existing assets cannot serve the roles that GBIRs are expected to play, or whether deploying GBIRs in Northeast Asia would actually be the cost-effective option. Regarding these points, U.S. Vice-Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Paul Selva stated in 2017, "[W]ith respect to whether or not we use the INF Treaty as a reason to say targets inside China might not be held at risk I think is a bridge too far. I believe we can assert that the deployment of missile systems on aircraft and ships allow us to hold those targets at risk."[19] In addition, Japan and the United States should carefully assess the impact of countermeasures that potential adversaries would take against U.S. GBIR deployment in Northeast Asia. Fu Cong, director general of the arms control department of China's foreign ministry, warned, "China will not stand idly by and be forced to take countermeasures should the U.S. deploy intermediate-range ground-based missiles this part of the world."[20]

Lastly, the implications of deploying GBIRs for crisis stability should be contemplated. During the Cold War, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) was determined to deploy U.S. INFs to increase deterrence despite the possibility of decreasing crisis stability as it faced the threat of the Soviet bloc's massive invasion of Western Europe. On the other hand, in a situation where Japan does not face at least a similar threat, Japan should carefully assess a possible trade-off between deterrence improvement and the deterioration of strategic stability through GBIR deployment.

[19] General Paul Selva, Vice-Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, statement before the Senate Armed Services Committee, July 18, 2017.
[20] "China Vows 'Countermeasures' If U.S. Deploys Intermediate-Range Missiles to Asia," https://www.reuters.com/article/us-china-usa-defence-idUSKCN1UW044 (accessed February 8, 2021).

3. Possibilities and Challenges in Arms Control

(1) Necessity of Arms Control

As status quo powers, Japan and the United States need to improve deterrence to counter attempts to alter the status quo or revise the existing international and regional order by undisguised powers. At the same time, they should simultaneously explore promoting arms control to maintain stable deterrence relations with China and Russia, whose revisionist acts may not be just offense-oriented, in which they expand their respective spheres of interest and capitalize on the U.S. relative decline, but also, to some extent, defense-oriented, in which they secure their regimes based on their perception derived from their history of repeated invasions. Addressing them solely through military powers might excessively provoke their defensive stance, lead to more aggressive policies, and result in a serious security dilemma. Besides reacting offensively vis-à-vis China and Russia, it is also necessary to prepare an "exit" for them, including nuclear arms control, to mitigate their inherent fears.

During the Cold War, former U.S. president Ronald Reagan advocated "peace through strength" in the confrontation with the Soviet Union and actively pursued a buildup of strategic nuclear forces and promotion of the Strategic Defense Initiative. At the same time, he explored strategic stability with the Soviet Union through nuclear arms control. From the outset of his inauguration, President Reagan proposed drastic U.S.–Soviet nuclear weapons reductions under intrusive verification and finalized the INF Treaty in 1987. He also advanced the negotiations on the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START), which was signed in 1991 by his predecessor. The bilateral nuclear arms control talks certainly helped the two superpower rivals move toward the end of the Cold War without escalating into an armed conflict.

Unlike the bipolar Cold War era, multiple nuclear powers with different national and nuclear capabilities are now competing in various regions. Since such a complicated strategic environment undoubtedly places a heavy burden on stabilization efforts through arms control, prudence is required when pursuing "peace through strength." In multipolar nuclear relations where a security trilemma[21] would easily arise—behavior

[21] Linton Brooks and Mira Rapp-Hooper, "Extended Deterrence, Assurance, and Reassurance in the Pacifc during the Second Nuclear Age," Ashley J. Tellis, Abraham M. Denmark, and Travis Tanner, eds., *Strategic Asia 2013-14: Asia in the Second Nuclear Age*, National Bureau of Asia Research,

of Country A vis-à-vis Country B unintentionally affects Country C, resulting in a complex spiral—the role of nuclear arms control in addressing the negative aspect of "peace through strength" is growing.

Particularly important for Japan's security is bringing China into the framework of substantial nuclear arms control. Since announcing its intention to withdraw from the INF Treaty in October 2018, the United States has repeatedly called on China and Russia to discuss the establishment of a new framework to replace the treaty. In December 2018, President Trump also tweeted, "I am certain that, at some time in the future, President Xi and I, together with President Putin of Russia, will start talking about a meaningful halt to what has become a major and uncontrollable arms race. The U.S. spent 716 Billion Dollars this year. Crazy!" However, U.S. withdrawal from the INF Treaty and the subsequent GBIR development seem less likely to lead to a trilateral or global agreement among China, Russia, and the United States to reduce or eliminate GBIRs as a new "double-track decision."[22]

(2) Difficulties In Pursuing Arms Control

Among the five nuclear-weapon states (NWS) under the NPT, only China has not accepted any substantive nuclear arms control, including nuclear weapons reductions. Beijing has argued that "[s]tates possessing the largest nuclear arsenals . . . should take the lead in substantially reducing those nuclear arsenals,"[23] and when conditions are ripe, other NWS should join multilateral talks on nuclear disarmament. Regarding the INF Treaty, China's foreign ministry spokesperson Geng Shuang clearly said, "The multilateralization of the INF Treaty involves a series of complex issues covering political, military and legal fields, which draws concerns from many countries. China opposes the multilateralization of this treaty."[24] China also opposed Japanese Foreign Minister Kono's suggestion to create a new multilateral structure for replacing the INF

2013, pp. 292-293.

[22] The original "double-track decision" was agreed by the NATO in December 1979, in which the United States would deploy the INF unless the Soviet Union deploying SS-20 IRBMs did not accept negotiations on an INF Treaty.

[23] NPT/CONF.2020/PC.II/WP.32, April 19, 2018.

[24] "Foreign Ministry Spokesperson Geng Shuang's Remarks on the US Suspending INF Treaty Obligations and Beginning Withdrawal Process," Ministry of Foreign Affairs of China, February 2, 2019,https://www.fmprc.gov.cn/mfa_eng/xwfw_665399/s2510_665401/2535_665405/t1635268.shtml (accessed January 13, 2021).

Treaty by the five NWS, arguing, "If the agreement becomes multilateral, this will influence a whole range of complex political, military and legal issues . . . The Chinese side does not give its consent."[25]

With regard to the U.S. proposal for martializing the INF Treaty, Shen Dingli, Professor of Fudan University argued that the United States is seeking to prevent China and other countries from enhancing GBIRs to maintain its regional hegemony while these countries intend to mitigate the challenge in East Asia posed by the United States.[26] Gregory Kulacki, China Project Manager of the Union of Concerned Scientists, also pointed out that "[i]f the United States were serious about wanting China to join the INF Treaty, it would be talking with Chinese arms controllers about changes the United States might be willing to make in exchange for surrendering what Chinese military planners see as one of their most valuable military capabilities. There is no indication such a discussion has ever taken place."[27]

In addition to China's opposition to joining arms control on substantive reductions with the United States and Russia, structural aspects of the international security situation also complicate the promotion of arms control. The ongoing power transition is a dynamic and highly uncertain process in which policy developments of the involved countries are likely to fluctuate along with changes in the balance of power; a security trilemma would easily arise, resulting in an unintended scale of tensions and/or arms race; and convergence of interests among the concerned countries, which is essential to develop arms control, is less likely achieved. Moreover, multipolar nuclear relations raise the possibility that incentives to strengthen nuclear forces might continue until a reliable mutual deterrence is achieved in all potential hostile combinations.[28]

The fact that the current focus of arms control is GBIRs also adds to the complexity. The

---

[25] "China Does Not Support Creation of New Multilateral Deal Replacing INF Treaty," *Sputnik*, July 31, 2019, https://sputniknews.com/world/201907301076404441-beijing-says-does-not-support-creation-of-new-multilateral-deal-replacing-inf-treaty (accessed January 13, 2021).

[26] Shen Dingli, "What the Post-INF Treaty World will be Like," *China Daily*, February 21, 2019, http://global.chinadaily.com.cn/a/201902/21/WS5c6dea76a3106c65c34ea76e.html/ (accessed January 13, 2021).

[27] Gregory Kulacki, "Don't Scapegoat China for Killing the INF Treaty. Ask It to Join," Union of Concerned Scientists, February 6, 2019, https://allthingsnuclear.org/gkulacki/dont-scapegoat-china-for-killing-the-inf-treaty-ask-it-to-join (accessed January 13, 2021).

[28] James J. Wirtz, "Beyond Bipolarity: Prospects for Nuclear Stability after the Cold War," Paul, Harknett and Wirtz, eds., *The Absolute Weapon Revisited*, pp. 150-151.

purpose of the 1987 INF Treaty was to maintain U.S.–Soviet strategic stability by reducing and eliminating the possibility of using INFs in European theater, the main battlefield of the Cold War, as well as escalating to a full-scale nuclear war.

On the other hand, the current situation surrounding GBIRs is much more complicated since countries that have them are located in several regions and constitute a complex web of security relations. Their security interests regarding GBIRs are diverse, which reflect differences in their acquired capabilities (such as type, number, and range). In addition, some of them also possess or seek to acquire sea- and air-launched missiles and/or ballistic missile defense (BMD) systems. The INF Treaty's "prohibition of land-based ballistic and cruise missiles with a range of 500 to 5,500 km" could be agreed only in the context of the U.S.–Soviet strategic relation during the Cold War. It is difficult to assume what range, types, and numbers of missiles could be subject to restriction or prohibition under a global post-INF Treaty.

Building a regional arms control on GBIRs also faces difficult challenges. The first is reaching an agreement on military balance among the countries involved in regional security issues because of asymmetry in their military capabilities. A calculation of balance is intractable in a regional security which countries outside the region—usually the United States—are involved because the superiority or inferiority of military forces that can be projected to the region, rather than the overall capabilities of each country involved, determines the outcome of deterrence and the crisis.[29] In particular, the extent to which countries outside the region allocate their capabilities to the region, including those to be built up in a crisis situation, have a significant impact on the regional military balance.

Second, the balance of interests and resolve has a decisive impact on regional deterrence relations. In this respect, a country outside the region is likely inferior to regional countries and would seek to complement these asymmetries by bolstering its capabilities. Complicated calculations of balances regarding capabilities, interests, and resolves in regional security make arms control difficult to establish.

Third, the involvement of China, Russia, and the United States in security issues in

[29] Paul Huth and Brice Russet, "Deterrence Failure and Crisis Escalation," *International Study Quarterly*, Vol. 32, No. 1, March 1988, pp. 29-45.

several regions would increase the possibility of an inter-regional security trilemma. In this situation, arms control measures that can be implemented in Region A but cannot be done in Region B is less likely to be accepted by countries involved in both regional security issues for fear of a negative impact of Region A's arms control to Region B's security.

(3) Possible Arms Control In which China Participates

Tong Zhao, Senior Fellow of the Carnegie–Tsinghua Center for Global Policy, noted that U.S. and Chinese experts need to "find different means to build common understanding about how to mitigate risks from gaps in the security perceptions." Furthermore, he argues, [T]he era of relying on the US-Russia bilateral arms control structure is at its end . . . As China becomes a top-tier military power, its fast-growing force projection capabilities will meet with increasing international pressure and resistance. It is time for Beijing to think strategically about how to best defend its long-term security interests sustainably: is pursuing cooperative arms control better than simply accumulating military power? As a rising power aspiring to shape international norms and principles, China can no longer follow the lead of others.[30]

China's growing confidence in its power could increase the possibility that it will formulate and implement more aggressive foreign/security policies and attempt to revise the existing international order. On the other hand, as its military capabilities increase, China—whose nuclear and conventional forces have been inferior to those of the United States and Russia and which has accordingly been quite passive about participating in U.S.- and Russian-led nuclear arms control efforts that may fix their relative advantage—might gain more confidence in taking part in arms control discussions and negotiations. Tong Zhao also concluded that "China . . . perceives itself as possessing a uniquely superior military capability in [GBIR] and seems relatively confident in its long-term potential to outcompete the United States in a post-INF world."[31] Such confidence might be a clue to getting China to participate in future arms control.

---

[30] Tong Zhao, "Why China Is Worried About the End of the INF Treaty," Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, November 7, 2018, https://carnegietsinghua.org/2018/11/07/why-china-is-worried-about-end-of-inf-treaty-pub-77669 (accessed January 18, 2021).

[31] Tong Zhao, "An Inquiry into the NPT and Nuclear Disarmament," Testimony, U.K. House of Lords, February 12, 2019, https://carnegietsinghua.org/2019/02/12/inquiry-into-npt-and-nuclear-disarmament-pub-78574 (accessed January 18, 2021).

As mentioned above, the numerical control and reduction of GBIRs is not expected to be achieved at least in the near future. One serious concern is that relying more on GBIRs would decrease crisis stability by increasing the incentive for first use. Besides GBIRs, sea- and air-launched cruise missiles (SLCMs/ALCMs) and BMD also have significant implications for regional security. The best way to reduce and/or constrain the negative impacts of such offensive and defensive capabilities on regional stability and security is a pressing issue for China as well. Primary consideration should be given to discussions among states involved in Northeast Asian security on such topics as the overall security environment, the need for missiles and BMD, the risks posed by these capabilities to strategic stability, and the role of arms control to mitigate destabilization. Covering the region's strategic and security issues in these discussions would provide China with a greater incentive to participate.

To prevent the unintended escalation of tensions or crises or the inadvertent use of nuclear weapons, a layer of confidence-building measures, as well as reliable crisis management methods, including communication channels, should be established between rivalries. Improved transparency regarding the number of missiles possessed, their ranges, the warheads they carry, their deployment locations, and the doctrines regarding their use—all issues of direct relevance to the region's security—should also be pursued to diminish mutual distrust and misunderstanding. The involved countries, in light of their varying capabilities, may adopt an approach to implement mutual, equitable, but different measures; for instance, China could endeavor to increase transparency regarding GBIRs while Japan would do the same for BMD.[32]

Furthermore, measures such as setting upper limits on the capability and number of such missiles and restricting their deployment locations could be considered. From a Japanese security standpoint, it is conceivable that China would be required to clearly distinguish between intermediate-range missiles that carry nuclear warheads and those that use conventional warheads, and at least not to deploy GBIRs carrying nuclear warheads in areas within Japan's range. Needless to say, in denuclearization talks, North Korea should agree on the abolition of not only long-range missiles, but also medium-range missiles.

[32] Lewis A. Dunn, "Exploring the Role of U.S.-China Mutual and Cooperative Strategic Restraint," Lewis A. Dunn, ed., *Building toward a Stable and Cooperative Long-Term U.S.-China Strategic Relationship*, Science Applications International Corporation, The Pacific Forum CSIS, and China Arms Control and Disarmament Association, December 2012, p. 75.

CONCLUSION

According to William Walker, Emeritus Professor of the University of St Andrews, the nuclear order has been composed of complementary cooperative systems of systems of deterrence and abstinence.[33] The nuclear order has been seriously disturbed by the uncertain future of the international system because of the power transition, the multipolarization of nuclear relations, and the diversification of deterrence systems. Faced with intense great power/geopolitical competitions, nuclear-armed states have increased interest in maintaining and strengthening their nuclear deterrence capabilities, and they are also becoming much less interested in arms control to allow for regulation, reduction, and/or elimination of their military powers, including nuclear weapons. The international system's fluidity and its security relations makes it difficult to reach an agreement on a modality of arms control for the next generation.

To reconstruct the arms control architecture, it is essential to find solutions to the conundrums of addressing weapons system asymmetries as well as the different interests and resolves among the countries involved in great power/geopolitical competitions. This will undoubtedly require significant time and effort. Meanwhile, the unstable transition is likely to continue. For now, to prevent international and regional security from destabilizing further and resorting to the use of nuclear weapons, the involved countries would need to find a minimum common interest to avoid a further deterioration of the nuclear situation and to gain more time to realize further progress in arms control.[34] Cooperation on the minimum efforts that can be made during the transition period to reduce the risk of nuclear weapons use and to limit nuclear destabilization will also be an important basis for future progress. Any efforts to pursue "post-INF Treaty" arms control for GBIRs and related weapons systems could not only reduce the risks of nuclear weapon/missile use but also serve as a first step toward a nuclear arms control architecture for the next generation. This is a crucial policy agenda item that Japan should actively address.

---

[33] William Walker, "Nuclear Order and Disorder," *International Affairs*, Vol. 76, No. 4, October 2000, p. 706-707.

[34] Harold Brown, "New Nuclear Realities," *Washington Quarterly*, Vol.31, No.1, Winter 2007-2008, p.18; James M. Acton, "Bombs Away? Being Realistic about Deep Nuclear Reductions," *Washington Quarterly*, Vol.35, No.2, Spring 2012, pp.49-50; Robert Legvold, "Managing the New Cold War," *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 93, No. 4, July/August 2014, pp. 82-84.

CHAPTER 3

Nuclear Dilemmas in Europe : Nuclear Deterrence and Strategic Stability post-INF

John Rydqvist

In August 2019 a key arms control treaty affecting European stability and security was absolved. The demise of the bilateral US–Soviet/Russian Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty highlights the ongoing erosion of Cold War arms control regimes, which in turn is the result of the drastically deteriorating European security environment. Russian armed aggression and the use of its military instruments of power to achieve territorial and political gains is the fundamental problem in Europe.

The INF termination had been long in the making. As early as 2014, the US government publicly announced that the "Russian Federation is in violation of its obligations under the INF Treaty not to possess, produce, or flight-test" INF-range missiles.[1] Attempts to convince Russia to return to treaty compliance yielded no results. Absent any progress in negotiations, the Trump administration in early 2019 decided to withdraw from the treaty.

Initially the decision was met with criticism from arms control proponents. Some observers perceived it as a way for arms control skeptics in the Trump administration to further their principled agenda and worried that New START, scheduled to expire in 2021, might not be extended or superseded by a new strategic arms control treaty. Others contended that the United States should have postponed its INF withdrawal until 2020. In the mean time one last effort should be made to convince Russia to return to treaty compliance. Finally, there were those who irrespective of blame feared that without caps on missiles in Europe, a new nuclear arms race would follow, one that would severely destabilize the European security order and increase the risk of nuclear war.

[1] *Adherence to and Compliance with Arms Control, Non Proliferation, and Disarmament Agreements and Commitments*, Department of State, July 2014, p. 8 URL: https://2009-2017.state.gov/documents/organization/230108.pdf (accessed February 09, 2021).

Most Western countries and the NATO alliance soon came to support the US decision. A treaty only adhered to by one party is after all pointless, even counterproductive, to uphold. Experts also warned that arms control, for the sake of it, is not a viable component of a reshaped and stable security architecture in Europe. The fundamental antagonism in Europe has a strong political component. Military and political dimensions of security therefor cannot be decoupled. Any move that would seem to legitimize aggressive Russian behavior would be detrimental to the security of Europeans.

In this situation the questions is what are necessary steps to achieve strategic stability in post-INF Europe.

BACKGROUND

Signed by Ronald Reagan and Mikhail Gorbachev in 1987 after more than a decade of arms buildup, escalating nuclear tension, and cross-Atlantic negotiations the INF treaty was a major political and military step.[2] The so-called Euromissile crisis that predated INF had been triggered by the Soviet introduction of the new SS-20 missiles in the second half of the 1970s. The SS-20 missiles targeted Europe but not the United States. American strategists initially considered its strategic nuclear arsenal sufficient to counter the new missile. However, nuclear balance was always a political affair as much as a military one. The Soviet continental nuclear superiority afforded by the SS-20, exasperated NATO allies' fears of nuclear decoupling. Most notably this view was advanced in the landmark 1977 speech held by German chancellor Helmut Schmidt. In the absence of parity in Europe, the Warsaw pact could coerce and attack Europe without posing a direct threat to the United States. Washington, the fear was, might refrain from a strategic nuclear response to the Soviet use of theater nuclear weapons in Europe and leave the Europeans to fend for themselves.[3]

After 2 years of alliance discussions, NATO in 1979 agreed on a dual-track response. The alliance would introduce nuclear-armed intermediate-range Pershing II ballistic missiles

[2] Daryl Kimball, "The Intermediate Range Nuclear Forces Treaty (INF) at a Glance," *Arms Control Association*, August, (2019) URL: https://www.armscontrol.org/factsheets/INFtreaty (accessed February 09, 2021).
[3] Helmut Schmidt, "The 1977 Alastair Buchan memorial lecture," *Survival*, Jan./Feb. 1978, p. 3.

and ground-launched cruise missiles (GLCMs).[4] If the Soviets agreed to an arms control accord banning all ground-launched missiles with a range between 500 and 5,500 km, NATO would refrain from these deployments. However, the Kremlin's reluctance to remove all SS-20s triggered NATO to proceed with missile placements starting in 1983, forcing the Soviets' negotiation hand.[5]

THE ROAD TO INF-BREECH

During the 2000s, Russia undertook a consorted modernization of its nuclear arsenal. Among the new systems being developed was a ground launched cruise missile in breach of the INF. Reminiscent of the arrival of the INF treaty, its passing is part of a greater dynamic of change that reaches beyond the question of medium-range nuclear forces in Europe.

Starting in the early 2000s, the Kremlin leadership began convincing itself that the West was not honoring the intent and purpose of agreements underpinning post-Cold War détente. NATO was expanding eastward and intruding, as it was were, into what Russia saw as its legitimate sphere of influence. Wariness about Western intentions was exacerbated by the financial, industrial, material, and personnel weaknesses of Russian and its armed forces.[6] Grave inferiority in conventional military strength and a lack of long-range precision-strike capability were particularly problematic.

Nuclear parity with the United States was the only instrument that ensured Russia's continued status as a global power. Likewise, it was the one fundamental capability ensuring effective deterrence. As it turns out, Moscow also had an edge in theater nuclear capability. By the late 1990s, nuclear drawdowns in the West had led to deep reductions in the number of non-strategic weapons. Russia, by contrast, had retained much of its inventory. The resulting capability gap was an important regional deterrent because it offset Western conventional superiority. It also gave Russia the potential of dominating the escalatory dynamics in high-end regional war, at the threshold of nuclear use.

Europe was not the only challenge for Russia. INF-range missile proliferation in Asia has also been of increasing concern to the Russian armed forces. China, unrestrained by the

[4] Björn Hagelin, "Swords into Daggers, the origins of the SS-20 missiles," *Bulletin of Peace Proposals*, Vol. 15 No. 4, 1984, pp. 341–353.
[5] *Soviet Strategy To Derail US INF Deployment—An Intelligence Assessment*, Director of Intelligence, February 1983, CIA Historical Review Program, Released as Sanitized, 1999.
[6] Jan leijonhielm et al. (2009*) Russian Military Capability in a Ten-Year Perspective: Ambitions and Challenges in 2008*, FOI-R—2759--SE, Stockholm, p. 24.

INF, has continued to develop and field a variety of short- and medium-range ground-launched missiles with conventional and nuclear warhead options.

An indication of the Russian strategic approach was the explicit interest in leaving the INF exhibited between 2004 and 2006. In October 2007 Vladimir Putin at an ongoing two-plus-two Defense and Foreign Ministerial meeting in Moscow also expressed a desire to expand the INF to more countries.[7] If not, it would consider leaving the treaty.[8] Defense Minister Sergei Ivanov even suggested mutual termination of the INF on these grounds. At the time, the George W Bush administration refused to consider such moves.[9]

RUSSIAN MISSILES

As Russian prospects for alleviating the strategic conventional gap anytime soon were low, retaining an edge in theatre nuclear capabilities became a priority early on. In the mid-1990s, Russia had started the modernization of INF-compliant systems, such as the CH-102 long-range dual-capable air-launched cruise missile. However, progress was slow. Air-launched missiles also relied on a flotilla of medium Tu-22 and heavy Tu-160 bombers Russia was hard-pressed to operate, and maintain, let alone modernize.[10] New, survivable and more cost efficient ground-launched systems would be required to retain non-strategic nuclear superiority in the long run. The planned 2001 termination of the INF verification regime, combined with lack of Western attention during a decade of anti-terrorist wars, provided Russia with an opportunity to covertly develop the necessary systems.[11]

---

[7] Taylor: *Ukraine: Read-out of Moscow Two-Plus-Two Meeting Provided*, U.S. Embassy, Kyiv, October 23, 2007, URL: https://search.wikileaks.org/plusd/cables/07KYIV2673_a.html (accessed February 09, 2021).

[8] Luke Harding: "We will dump treaty, Putin warns," *The Guardian*, October 13, 2007, URL: https://www.theguardian.com/world/2007/oct/13/russia.international (accessed February 09, 2021)

[9] *Adherence to and Compliance with Arms Control, Non Proliferation, and Disarmament Agreements and Commitments*, Department of State, August 2019, p. 11–20, URL: https://www.state.g.,ov/wp-content/uploads/2019/08/Compliance-Report-2019-August-19-Unclassified-Final.pdf (accessed February 09, 2021).

[10] Carolina Vendil et al. (2012) *Russian Military Capability in a Ten-Year Perspective 2011*, FOI-R—3474—SE, Stockholm, p. 145.

[11] Darya Dolzikova (2019), "The Role of Verification in the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty Dispute," *RUSI Commentary*, January 15, URL: https://www.rusi.org/commentary/role-verification-intermediate-range-nuclear-forces-treaty-dispute (accessed February 09, 2021).

Until recently, there was some confusion about the actual nature of Russia's treaty violation.

At first, public speculation centered on the dual-capable (conventional and nuclear) Iskander short-range ballistic missile (the 9M723 or Iskander-M) or the 9M728 Iskander-K ground launched cruise missile (GLCM)). In February 2017, the *New York Times*, citing Trump administration officials, reported that the noncompliant system was another GLCM, known as the 9M729 (NATO designation SSC-8) with an estimated range of around 2,500 km.[12] By this time, Russia had tested and begun fielded the system.[13] Russia, for its part denied and continues to deny any treaty violation. Instead, it has accused the United States of breaching the INF by installing Aegis Ashore missile defense systems in Bulgaria and Poland. The missiles, Russia claims, could be converted for use against ground targets, an accusation most observers attach little merit to and the United States denies, although the vertical launch system could be viewed as a problem if paired with other missile types.[14]

While the US grievance regarding the lapse of the INF rightly focused on the development and fielding of the treaty-breaking GLCM 9M729, other problems compound the challenges Europe faces from Russia's short-, medium-, and intermediate-range nuclear capable missiles. It has been speculated that the Iskander-M SRBM has a range in excess of the treaty's upper limit of 500 km.[15] Another concern is the development and introduction of a two stage MIRV-ed ballistic missile, the RS-26 Rubezh. Corresponding to the SS-20, which in its time evolved from a three-stage ICBM, the two-stage RS-26 was developed using technology from the three-stage RS-24 Yars ICBM.[16] A first test of the RS-26 conducted in 2012 at a range of 5,800 km. It reportedly employed a light-

[12] Michael R. Gordon (2017), "Russia Deploys Missile, Violating Treaty and Challenging Trump", *The New York Times*, February 14.
[13] *Adherence to and Compliance with Arms Control, Non Proliferation, and Disarmament Agreements and Commitments*, Department of State, August 2019, p. 11–20, URL: https://www.state.g.,ov/wp-content/uploads/2019/08/Compliance-Report-2019-August-19-Unclassified-Final.pdf (accessed February 09, 2021).
[14] https://thebulletin.org/2019/02/russia-may-have-violated-the-inf-treaty-heres-how-the-united-state ss-appears-to-have-done-the-same (accessed February 09, 2021).
[15] Stefan Forss: Russian Operational-Tactical Iskander Missile System, National Defence University Department of Strategic and Defence Studies, Series 4, Working Paper No. 42, 2012, URL: https://ww w.doria.fi/bitstream/handle/10024/84362/StratL4_42w.pdf?sequence=1 (accessed February 09, 2021).
[16] Stefan Forss: Intermediate Range Missiles—Back to the 70's, Kungliga Krigsvetenskapsakademin, April 28, 2017, URL: https://kkrva.se/intermediate-range-missiles-back-to-the-1970s/ (accessed February 09, 2021).

weight warhead. On the merits of this test, the RS-26 was defined as a strategic system according to provisions in the New START agreement. Three consecutive tests were reportedly conducted at ranges of 2,000 km and with heavier payloads, possibly several warheads (MIRV).[17] If correct Russia could be said to have used provisions in New START to build an INF-range system. As of late 2019 it is unclear whether the RS-26 has been deployed, but its existence gives Russia an ability to quickly proceed with the deployment of a modern intermediate-range missile that would threaten Europe the same way the SS-20 did.

CONTEMPORARY RUSSIAN STRATEGY

Assessments about current Russian thinking on theater nuclear use is obscured and somewhat confused by a contradictory declaratory policy. The current US administration suggests that Russia's armed forces have an "escalate-to-de-escalate" strategy for offensive first strikes to de-escalate a conflict.[18] Other experts argue that Russia's nuclear arsenal remains more of a defensive deterrent and that strategies for offensive first use are not explicitly articulated.[19]

Assessments about the nuclear posture of Russia hinges on what overarching strategic and military objectives Moscow prioritizes. Defending its wider geopolitical, strategic, and economic interests, while at the same time ensuring political and military flexibility to further those same interests is a core principle for Russia. It seeks to do so from a position of military strength. Deterring attacks against Russian territory, that of its allies, and against other key national interests is of primary importance. Checking NATO's ability to further expand eastward is another.

A key element in strengthening regional deterrence while at the same time enhancing strategic flexibility is the ability to quickly fight, win, and terminate limited wars, such as that against Crimea, on terms favorable to Russia. Should Russia see a future need to wage war against a NATO country in Eastern Europe, there are some essential capabilities necessary. Ideally, Russia would be able to dissuade or limit the response of the NATO

[17] *SS-X-31 (RS-26 Rubezh)*, Missile Threat, CSIS, October 22, 2018, URL:]https://missilethreat.csis.missile/ss-x-31-rs-26-rubezh/ (accessed February 09, 2021).
[18] NPR 2018.
[19] Oliger.

alliance in ways that allow a quick and decisive victory.[20] If the NATO response is quick and strong enough to threaten the success of its military campaign, Russia needs the ability to escalate the war in a tailored way. Such escalation should allow it to prevail against NATO and achieve its war aims, while at the same time preventing escalation to major war.

This is where the combination of strong conventional capabilities and regional nuclear forces play a key role. Theater nuclear capabilities may be used to deny an opponent from escalating the war, by threatening limited use against a range of targets such as airfields and deeply buried, hardened targets. Russia has spent considerable resources on the improvement of its conventional precision-strike capabilities and if key strategic target could be eliminated using conventional precision-strike assets Russia is likely to choose such options first.[21] But such conventional capabilities are likely limited in comparison to that of the West and may not be able to effectively attack all target types. The versatile and scalable theatre nuclear options of Russia serve as a strategic reserve should there be a drawn-out conflict. The combination of Russian conventional ground force superiority in its near abroad, growing conventional strike capabilities, and numerical superiority in theater nuclear capabilities thus provides Russia with a greater number of choices and graded escalatory capabilities in relation to that of the West. In other words, its theater nuclear forces are a key asset in achieving escalation dominance. This integration of nuclear and non-nuclear assets is emphasized in Russia's doctrinal plans and strategic culture.[22]

WESTERN OPTIONS IN A POST-INF ENVIRONMENT

For those European states located in close proximity to Russia, Moscow's embrace of a competitive, multipolar worldview and the revisionist wars of aggression against Ukraine and Georgia represents a critical challenge. Russian actions have long violated agreed-to principles guiding the European security order. Despite attempts to improve relations, Russia has not withdrawn from Ukraine, is acting in opposition to Western interests in

[20] Paul Bernstein, Deborah Ball, *Putin's Russia and U.S. Defense Strategy*, Conference Report, National Defense University, August, (2015).
[21] Dave Johnson (2018), *Russia's Conventional Precision Strike Capabilities, Regional Crisis, and Nuclear Thresholds*, Livermore Papers on Global Security No. 3, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, February, p. 93.
[22] Two examples are: Russian Military Capability 2016, Johnson (2018), *Russia's Conventional Precision Strike Capabilities, Regional Crisis, and Nuclear Thresholds*, Livermore Papers on Global Security No. 3.

the Middle East, and is trying to undermine European cohesion.[23] The deteriorating relationship between Europeans and Russia has increased the risk of war.[24]

Europe has faced challenges of its own. Internal political and economic tensions have been amplified by a strategic schizophrenia on defense-related issues. Terrorism has had an increasing impact on the continental powers, forcing Southern and Western European countries to pay attention to the arc of instability stretching from Western Africa to Afghanistan. Brexit has underlined and expanded the debate on faltering public support for further EU integration. Differing views on how best to interact with Russia divides the European allies and partners. In the short term, transatlantic political cohesion has been undermined by the unpredictable and hostile policies of the Trump administration. While future US abandonment of Europe is improbable, the continued need to shift attention and resources to East Asia in order to manage the Chinese threat is a key driver of US security policy. Europe will therefor by necessity have to accept a greater role and responsibility for its own defense.

Deterrence against Russia is not limited to high-end conflict. The ability to defend against so called hybrid threats is also a necessity. Any Russian campaign will make use of all available instruments of power to achieve objectives.

NATO has come a long way in renewing a capability for the defense of Europe including in the nuclear field. It emphasizes the overall deterrent capabilities available to it and that any use of nuclear weapons against the alliance would "fundamentally alter" the nature of the conflict. NATO's nuclear posture as well as that of its members, however, lacks some of the flexibility Russia posesses. The dual-capable B-61s can draw on an inventory of some 200 nuclear free-fall bombs as opposed to Russia's thousands of theater nuclear weapons. The B-61 delivered by dual-capable F-15 and F-16 fighters. This is a risky business as the air defenses protecting critical targets in Russia are difficult to penetrate, even though the supposed superiority of Russia's A2AD capability has recently been questioned.[25] US B-2 strategic bomber can deliver a version of the B-61 bomb. The dilemma is that the use of this platform might be interpret by Russia as an ongoing strategic attack.

---

[23] Märta Carlsson, Mike Winnerstig, Irreconcilable differences—Analysing the deteriorating US-Russia relationship, FOI-R—4276—SE, Stockholm, May (2016).
[24] Tomas Graham, "Let Russia Be Russia—the case for a more pragmatic approach to Russia," *Foreign Affairs*, Nov./Dec., 2019.
[25] Dalsjö, Berglund, Jonsson, *Bursting the Bubble—Russian A2/AD in the Baltic Sea Region: Capabilities, Countermeasures*, and Implications, FOI-R—4651—SE, Stockholm, March, 2019.

The final nonstrategic nuclear system currently in the US inventory is the AGM-86, a standoff air-launched cruise missile with a reported range of 2,400+ km and variable yield of 5–15 kt. This missile is of a 1980s design. Thus, it may lack adequate accuracy and penetration capability desirable for some contingencies requiring limited nuclear use. Among the West Europeans, France currently may have the most robust theater nuclear option with its modern Rafale dual-capable aircraft and its 600+ km ASMP-A air-launched cruise missile. But France does not participate in NATO nuclear coordination and therefor could not be counted on to dovetail with alliance deterrence and defense efforts in war. In other words, the current US/NATO capabilities are likely less precise, less flexible, and cannot be used with the same discrimination as those in the Russian arsenal. This arguably makes their employment slightly less credible in some conflict scenarios, in turn weakening deterrence against Russia at threshold of nuclear employment.

After two decades of relative neglect, the United States has started taking steps to alleviate its inferior sub-strategic nuclear capabilities in a bid to catch up with Russia. The 2018 Nuclear Posture Review discusses immediate and more long-term measures the United States needs to take. The new F-35 stealth fighter will eventually be dual capable and have the capacity to deliver new, standoff versions of the B-61. The development of a low-yield warhead for the Trident submarine-launched ballistic missile will be completed in a matter of years. A new ship-launched nuclear-capable cruise missile will be built in the medium term. In 2017, the United States awarded contracts for the construction of a new air-launched cruise missile, the LRSO, for its current and future bombers. This cruise missile is scheduled to be deployed by the early 2030s. Once the new B-21 Raider long-range bomber aircraft is fielded in the mid-2020s, theater nuclear capabilities will be further strengthened. Until such time as these assets are deployed, the theater nuclear capability gap will remain.

How can Russia be prevented from exploiting its escalation dominance in the meantime? To some Europeans, a new arms control agreement that removes or limits Russian theater nuclear capabilities would be the preferred option. However, for the reasons discussed earlier, the interest in and incentive for such an accord from the Russian side is weak. Vastly expanded US/NATO garrisons in Eastern and Central Europe could improve conventional deterrence to a level where Russian land grabs and limited wars of aggression would have a low chance of succeeding in the first place. This might offset

some of the advantages its theater nuclear force provide. The question is whether current efforts are sufficient to deter war in the short term. Western reluctance to garrison the East, and Russian sensitivity to permanent deployments in its neighborhood will limit the number of troops and assets permanently stationed there.

Should deterrence fail, limited Russian theater nuclear use needs to be discouraged so that a war can be kept conventional even if strikes against the Russian homeland are necessary. Missile defense systems are a key asset in conflict as it denies an opponent the capability for isolated missile launches, in effect forcing a more robust and more risky nuclear escalation. Dispersal of assets and the hardening of installations are other ways to blunt but not eliminate Russia's theatre level nuclear options.

A quick US buildup of short- and medium-range missiles based on existing inventories or missiles under development is one option. This might involve nuclear arming a Tomahawk missile and forward basing it to Eastern Europe and extending the range, as well as nuclear arming the US Army's precision-strike missile, which is currently being developed.[26] The former was tested from a ground-based platform in August 2019, which was likely a demonstration to Russia of what might come.[27] Rumor has it that the latter will be tested at a range above 500 km in November 2019.

Although responses like this may restore theater nuclear parity to Europe in a shorter time, they are also risky if decoupled with a strategy of restraint. An accelerating nuclear arms race in Europe is not in the interests of either the United States, Russia or the Europeans.

This is where dilemmas associated with China reemerge. Both the United States and Russia have made clear that if China is not drawn into an accord of restraint, it is expanding regional capabilities must be deterred. Thus, finding new formulas that prevent an unchecked arms race while accommodating the US and Russian need to counter China is where most thinking has to be done. In the meantime, Europe will have to brace for increasing nuclear tension and prepare its public and politicians for a possible occurrence of a new version of the Euromissile crisis.

[26] https://breakingdefense.com/2019/10/raytheons-pitch-for-precision-strike-the-post-inf-missile/ (accessed February 09, 2021).
[27] https://www.armscontrol.org/act/2019-04/news/us-test-inf-treaty-range-missiles (accessed February 09, 2021).

CONCLUSION—STRATEGIC STABILITY IN EUROPE AFTER THE INF

A combination of deteriorating political relations and Russia's willingness to use armed aggression in pursuit of political objectives beyond territorial defense has altered the European security landscape. The erosion of Cold War arms control regimes, including the INF, is a result of this wider shift. Stability, Henry Kissinger once wrote, "depends upon the relative satisfaction and the relative dissatisfaction of all the sides."[28] Helmut Schmidt, in his famous 1977 lecture, pointed out that "political and military balance is the prerequisite for our security…and fruitful progress in East–West détente."[29] In an effort to reach a new equilibrium in Europe today, these fundamental principles likely have some merit. However, in a drastically different world, new concepts to enhance strategic stability need to be found.

The fundamental compromise the United States will accept in exchange for a relatively stable and peaceful Europe is to remain a close ally and devote resources to NATO and other partner countries. If Trump-like policies continue to be pursued, the transatlantic partnership may become permanently damaged. Should the United States fail to take steps that reassure the Europeans of its commitment they may be harder-pressed to find alternative security arrangements among themselves. The European compromise is to accept an enhanced role in the defense of the continent and willingness to devote more resources towards comprehensive deterrence.

As the challenge from Russian spans the full conflict spectrum, from subversion and meddling in the political process of other countries to full-blown nuclear war Western efforts must be geared towards building robust multi domain defense capabilities. These capabilities need to be integrated and complementary. For the higher levels of conflict deterrence must be thought of as a continuum, from conventional to nuclear. Multi-domain deterrence is a necessary response to the broad Russian toolbox. Accepting that such an approach necessitates new ways of dealing with arms control is an important part of the European compromise.

Should the trans-Atlantic community fail to firmly commit, coordinate and evolve its defense capabilities, an alternative might be some degree of accommodation vis-à-vis

[28] As quoted in: Jamie Shea: 1979: *The Soviet Union deploys its SS-20 missiles and NATO responds*, NATO Lecture, March (2009).
[29] Helmut Schmidt: "The 1977 Alastair Buchan memorial lecture," *Survival*, Jan./Feb. 1978, p. 3

Russia.[30] For front-line states exposed to Russian coercion and manipulation this would be a serious and detrimental development. Any moves that would seem to legitimize current Russian military behaviour in order to achieve a political deal would deterrence.

Such an approach has little merit in light of recurring initiatives to "reset" political relations with Russia during the last decade. Instead of drawing Russia closer and shaping Moscow's behaviour for the better, the results have been European splintering and further Russian lies. Moscow is unlikely to re-evaluate its perception of and behavior towards the West. Nor is Russia likely to change into a liberal democracy set on promoting the common good. The relations among Russia, Europe, and the United States have "been fundamentally competitive from the moment the United States emerged as a global power."[31] Russia must therefor be forced to accept a new concept for stability. At a minimum, such a concept would involve some new form of arms limitation.

A last important feature of the new world order is that any strategic grand bargain in Europe intimately hinges on China. Thus far, China has refused to consider arms limitations and exhibited reluctance to conduct a genuine strategic dialogue. A post-INF trans-Atlantic approach to Russia therefor must be coupled to a coordinated trans-Atlantic approach towards China in order to achieve strategic stability. This is where Japan and other East Asian partners might play a small, yet important role in informing Europe about the nature of the Chines threat and coordinating with it on how to deal with the broader challenges posed by the rise of China.

[30] Frank A. Rose, Benjamin Bahaney, "Reassuring Allies and Strengthening Strategic Stability."
[31] Tomas Graham, "Let Russia Be Russia—the case for a more pragmatic approach to Russia," *Foreign Affairs*, Nov./Dec., 2019.

CHAPTER 4

Russia's Debate on Strategic Deterrence:

From Strategic Nuclear Deterrence to Hybrid Warfare

Naomi Koizumi

INTRODUCTION

Since Vladimir Putin returned to office in 2012, we have witnessed Russia's militarily assertive behavior more than ever before. Its annexation of Crimea in March 2014 and military intervention in the civil war in Ukraine are cases in point. With Russia's intervention in Ukraine, the United States and the European Union imposed sanctions on Russia, which brought United States–Russia relations to the lowest point since the end of the Cold War. Under these conditions, Russia seems to be making every effort to develop new nuclear weapon types.

What is Putin actually going to do with these newly developed nuclear weapons? Has Russia lowered its nuclear threshold, as has been pointed out by many Western analysts?[1] What role do the "hybrid warfare"[2] operations that Russia allegedly used in Crimea play in its deterrence strategy? This paper aimed to answer these questions by analyzing the debate on "strategic deterrence" currently taking place among Russian military specialists. Strategic deterrence is their unique concept comprising more than nuclear deterrence, as discussed below.

With regard to Russia's recent behavior, just before the presidential election and two months before he entered his fourth term in May 2018, President Putin made his annual, but a bit unusual, address to Russia's parliament.[3] It was unusual as he not only devoted

[1] H.M Kristensen and M. Korda, "Russian nuclear forces, 2019," *the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists,* Vol. 75, No. 2, pp. 4–5.
[2] NATO's web page gives the definition of hybrid threats as follows: "hybrid threats combine military and non-military as well as covert and overt means, including disinformation, cyber-attacks, economic pressure, deployment of irregular armed groups and use of regular forces," https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics_156338.htm (accessed February 8, 2021).
[3] "Poslanie Presidenta Federal'nomu Sobraniiu (Presidential Address to the Federal Assembly),"

one-fourth of his speech to military affairs but also presented to the audience a video footage of some of the nuclear-capable weapons recently developed and deployed by Russia. These include the Sarmat intercontinental ballistic missile; an intercontinental undersea drone (later named Poseidon); a nuclear-powered, long-range cruise missile (later named Plevestnik); the Kinzhal hypersonic air-launched cruise missile; the Avangard hypersonic glide vehicle; and the Peresvet laser combat system.

While Poseidon and Plevestnik had no names yet and were still under development at the time of Putin's address, with many specialists skeptical of their feasibility, Kinzhal and Peresvet had already been deployed. The experimental phase of Sarmat had been completed, and it was scheduled to be deployed in 2020. The development of Avangard had also been completed, and it was announced that the first batch of these vehicles would be deployed in December 2019.[4]

Russia has not only produced nuclear weapons but also demonstrated its intention to use them in military exercises. Russia first incorporated a limited nuclear use scenario into its exercises in the European theater with the Zapad-99, in June 1999, just after the NATO air strikes against Serbia were conducted during the Kosovo conflict. Russia simulated the use of its two Tu-160 heavy bombers with air-launched cruise missiles against the states that were supposed to have started the aggression. Then, Russia repeated the same scenario in the quadrennial Zapad exercises. While Russia has toned down its emphasis on nuclear use since 2013, presumably owing to its emerging confidence in precision-guided weapons and GLONASS, the Russian version of GPS, in the same year, it stirred strong international objections in Europe when it performed a military exercise with nuclear use against Sweden, which is neither a member of NATO nor a nuclear power country. Putin's statement that he thought of a nuclear option in the Crimean operation in 2014 also fueled people's fear.

Around the same time, the United States alleged that Russia had violated the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Force (INF) Treaty by conducting a missile experiment with a longer range than allowed by the treaty. Not seeing much effort on the Russian side to clear up the matter, the United States officially withdrew from the treaty in August 2019.

March 1, 2018, http://kremlin.ru/events/president/news/56957 (accessed February 8, 2021).

[4] "Russia Deploys First Hypersonic Avangard ICBM Missile," *The Moscow Times*, December 27, 2019.

In what follows, first, I summarize what Russian official documents refer to regarding nuclear use in a military contingency. Then, I explore how Russia is currently trying to deter the three types of war, namely, an all-out nuclear war, a large-scale regional war, and local conflicts, by analyzing the debate on strategic deterrence. This paper is based primarily on articles from *Military Thought*, the official organ of the General Staff (GS) of the Russian Federation.

1. RUSSIA'S NUCLEAR POLICY IN OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS

Russia's official documents dealing with the principles of nuclear use include the National Security Concept (later called Strategy) of the Russian Federation drawn up by the Security Council of the Presidential Administration and the Military Doctrine of the Russian Federation by the Ministry of Defense. Both documents go into effect with approval by the president.

(1) THE BEGINNING OF THE 1990S

The first state document published after the dissolution of the Soviet Union was the Military Doctrine approved in 1993.[5] The point that drew the most attention with regard to this document was that it dropped the reference to the nuclear non-first use pledge that the Soviet Union had announced in 1982. This is probably due to the fact that there were no other means but nuclear weapons that Russia could rely on at that time, when the country was in chaos after the collapse of the Soviet Union. Although Russia recognized that the threat of a world war had significantly diminished, the document says that there could be no limited nuclear war.

(2) FROM THE LATTER HALF OF THE 1990S TO THE END OF THE 2000S

The next document was the National Security Concept, which was approved in December 1997.[6] This document states that, although "there is no actual threat of a large-scale

[5] "Osnovnye polozheniia voyennoi doktriny Rossiyskoi Federatsii (The Basic Provisions of the Military Doctrine of the Russian Federation)," *Krasnaia Zvezda*, November 19, 1993, p. 3.
[6] "Kontseptsiia natsional'noi bezopasnosti Rossyiskoi Federatsii (The Concepts of National Security of the Russian Federation)," *Diplomaticheskii vestnik*, No. 2, February 1998, pp. 3–18.

attack in the foreseeable future," Russia will use nuclear weapons "when there emerges a threat against Russia's existence itself as an independent sovereign state." In other words, nuclear weapons are regarded as a last resort. However, during this period, military and civilian security specialists attempted to be more realistic, as NATO had already started to enlarge its membership eastward. In the document published in 1998, the concept "de-escalation" of a conflict by nuclear weapons, which means limited use of nuclear weapons, was introduced, and the debate on the matter began.[7]

The confrontation between the United States and Russia came to a head when NATO launched air strikes against Serbia over the Kosovo conflict in 1999. Then, Putin came into office in May 2000. Shortly before this (January 2000, at that time Putin was still prime minister), a new military doctrine was published, in which Russia made clear its intention of nuclear first and limited use, stating that Russia "will use nuclear weapons even in an enemy's large-scale attack with only conventional weapons." However, the term "de-escalation" was not used here and has never appeared in official documents except for the one published by the Ministry of Defense in 2003, titled "The Urgent Needs of the Development of the Military of the Russian Federation" (often called the Defense White Paper, but this is not an official state document). The document states that Russia will use nuclear weapons for de-escalation in a contingency. Here de-escalation is defined as "the termination of military activities under the conditions acceptable to Russia."[8]

(3) In the 2010s

For several years after the publication of the 2003 Defense White Paper, no new security documents were published due to intensive internal arguments on what threats Russia was facing and how to deal with them. Finally, after Dmitry Medvedev came into office in 2008, a new military doctrine was published in 2010.[9] The document used the same

---

[7] This document, called "The Basis (Concept) of the State Policy of the Russian Federation on the Military Construction in the period until 2005," was not disclosed, but drafted by the National Security Council and authorized by El'tsin in July 1998. Andrei A. Kokoshin, *Strategicheskoe upravlenie* (Strategic Administration), Rosspen, 2003, p. 310.

[8] "Aktual'nye zadachi razvitiia vooruzhennykh sil Rossiiskoi Federatsii (Actual problems of development of the Military Forces of the Russian Federation),"*Krasnaia Zvezda*, October 11, 2003, pp. 3–7.

[9] Voennaia doktrina Rossiyskoi Federatsii (Military Doctrine of the Russian Federation), *Rossiyskaia gazeta*, February 10, 2010.

expression as the 2000 doctrine with regard to nuclear first use,[10] but with much ambiguity, as it also stated that nuclear weapons would be used only when aggression threatened the existence of Russia itself as an independent sovereign state. This was the same as the moderate position that used to be taken in the 1990s denying nuclear first use; thus, many specialists were puzzled about the intentions of the new leadership.

Then, Putin returned to office in 2012 and published a new military doctrine in 2014.[11] This doctrine is a revised version of the 2010 Military Doctrine, and many articles were passed down, including that of nuclear use. Much attention was rather shifted to the introduction of a new concept of "nonnuclear deterrence," which will be discussed later.

In this way, as far as the official statements are concerned, Russia's attitude toward limited nuclear use or a de-escalation strategy seems to have been put on the back burner. Then, what ideas do Russian military specialists have about nuclear use? Next, I will discuss on their debates about strategic deterrence.

2. Debate on Strategic Deterrence

Only in recent years have Western analysts started to pay attention to the debates on "strategic deterrence" among Russian military specialists in Russian professional journals. According to Kristin Ven Bruusgaard, the term was circulated in the 2000s, and it took hold as a deterrence concept in Russia at the beginning of the 2010s.[12] In fact, while a debate on de-escalation (limited nuclear use) took place in the latter half of the 1990s, they started focusing on the broader concept of deterrence, "strategic deterrence," in the 2000s. In official documents, the term was first used in the 2009 National Security Strategy and the 2010 Military Doctrine.

What is strategic deterrence? The official site of the Russian Defense Ministry defines this term as follows:

"Strategic deterrence is a unified system of nonmilitary and military means taken

[10] The 2010 Military Doctrine states that Russia "will use nuclear weapons even when an enemy initiates a large-scale attack with only conventional weapons."
[11] Voyennaia doktrina Rossiyskoi Federatsii (Military Doctrine of the Russian Federation), http://www.scrf.gov.ru/security/military/document129 (accessed February 8, 2021).
[12] Kristin Ven Bruusgaard, "Russian Strategic Deterrence," *Survival*, vol. 58, no. 4, August-September 2016, p. 9.

consecutively or simultaneously to deter the military activities, whatever they are, which might cause strategic damage or have such capabilities."[13]

The Russian Defense Ministry states that strategic deterrence differs from traditional deterrence, which is military and political deterrence to prevent aggression or a threat, in the following respects: the former is carried out in both peacetime and in a time of emergency, not only to prevent armed conflict with an enemy but also to hold/contain them at a limited level even after the failure of deterrence.[14]

In other words, strategic deterrence will be undertaken (1) both in peacetime and for de-escalation of military conflict and (2) by using both military and nonmilitary means. Bruusgaard thinks that as a result of attempting strategic deterrence, Russia's nuclear threshold has been increased, contrary to common belief, as Russia has more options to depend on other than nuclear weapons and so has become less reliant on them so far.[15] However, Dmitry Adamsky says that Russia is trying to construct a cross-domain coercion system, "orchestrating nonnuclear, informational, and nuclear influence within a unified program for the sake of coercion (both to deter and to compel)."[16] I do not think that Russia has been that successful in adapting to the currently developing changes in the strategic environment.

In the following section, I will discuss what Russian military specialists are debating on with regard to strategic deterrence, how they try to deal with actual threats in their deterrence system, and the challenges they are facing. By mainly considering the journal published by the Russian GS, I sum up their thinking on deterrence at each of the three levels of war: an all-out nuclear war, a large-scale war, and a local military conflict. At each level, how they define deterrence, how they construct a posture, and finally what

---

[13] Ministry of Defense of the Russian Federation, http://encyclopedia.mil.ru/encyclopedia/dictionary/details.htm?id=14206@morfDictionary (accessed February 8, 2021).
[14] Ibid.
[15] Bruusgaard, "Russian Strategic Deterrence," p.19. Bruusgaard does not think that more options for Russia means that it has discarded its nuclear first-use policy. Kristin Ven Bruusgaard, "The Myth of Russia's Lowered Nuclear Threshold," War on the Rocks, September 22, 2017, https://warontherocks.com/2017/09/the-myth-of-russias-lowered-nuclear-threshold (accessed February 8, 2021).
[16] Dmitry (Dima) Adamsky, "Cross-Domain Coercion: The Current Russian Art of Strategy," IFRI Security Studies Center, Proliferation Papers 54, November 2015, https://www.ifri.org/sites/default/files/atoms/files/pp54adamsky.pdf (accessed February 8, 2021), p. 37. See also Dmitry Adamsky, "Nuclear Incoherence: Deterrence Theory and Non-Strategic Nuclear Weapons in Russia," *The Journal of Strategic Studies*, 2014, Vol. 37, No. 1, pp. 91–134.

problems they feel in practice will be addressed in turn.

(1) AN ALL-OUT NUCLEAR WAR

As a deterrent for an all-out nuclear war, that is, a "way of persuading the adversary that it does not pay to use force trying to achieve his military and political objectives," Russia thinks this is the catastrophic consequence of nuclear retaliation.[17] This is strategic nuclear deterrence, which occupies a central place also within strategic deterrence.

As the Soviet Union always felt inferior to the United States in terms of nuclear forces, it constantly attempted hard to catch up with the United States and achieve nuclear parity with it. Under these conditions, their aim was for a long time not to lose, even if they were not able to win. Therefore, in the first half of the 1960s, they prepared for the first use of their strategic nuclear weapons. With technological development in long-range missile-warning radar systems and the early-warning satellites in the mid-1970s, they began to rely on what they call a counterattack and a retaliatory counterattack (launch-on-warning and launch-under-attack, respectively) as well as a pure retaliatory attack (a second strike).[18]

It has since been confirmed that in addition to these postures, the Soviets had conceived and then abandoned what is called the Dead Hand, or the Perimeter system, by which all remaining missiles could be automatically launched even after the nuclear control center and political and military leaders had all been destroyed.[19] Currently, a retaliatory counterattack and a pure retaliatory attack remain as Russia's central nuclear options.

In the debate on strategic deterrence among military specialists, there seems to be a common understanding in this field, and a negligible disagreement is observed. They share the perception that with the limitations on deployable nuclear weapons imposed by START I (Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty) and New START, and newly deployed

---

[17] V. I. Polegaev and V. V. Alferov, "Nonnuclear Deterrence in the Strategic Deterrence System," *Military Thought*, No. 3, 2015, p. 9.
[18] Vladimir Dvorkin, "Sderzhivanie i strategicheskaia stabil'nost' (Deterrence and Strategic Stabiliry)," A. Arbarov and V. Dvorkin eds., *Yadrnaia perezagruzka: Cokrashchenie i nerasprostranenie vooruzhenii (Nuclear Reloading: Reduction and Nonproliferation of Armament)*, Moscow Carnegie Center, ROSSPEN, Moscow, 2011, p. 28; Alexei Arbatov, "Understanding the US-Russia Nuclear Schism," *Survival*, vol.59, no.2, 2017, pp. 44.
[19] David E. Hoffman, *The Dead Hand: The Untold Story of the Cold War Arms Race and Its Dangerous Legacy*, Anchor Books, A Division of Random House, Inc., New York, 2009, pp.150–154.

missile defense systems of the United States, they face a much higher probability that their strategic nuclear weapons would be neutralized, and they would suffer from an enemy's attack that would leave them disarmed, thus requiring them to urgently deal with this challenge. These concerns surely led to the development of new nuclear-capable weapon systems, which was introduced by President Putin in his annual address in 2018. They all fit for the strategic offensive system to evade US missile defense systems.

Putin's way of dealing with this new challenge is termed asymmetrical and inexpensive reaction to it, and in the same way as Mikhail Gorbachev responded to the SDI (Strategic Defense Initiative) program announced by President Reagan in the 1980s. In the Gorbachev era, numerous new projects related to strategic offensive weapons against SDI were proposed, as well as the Soviet version of the SDI program, but most of these were never built because they failed to win budgetary approval.[20] Then, after the announcement of the US unilateral withdrawal from the ABM (Anti-Ballistic Missile)Treaty in 2001, some of these ideas were revived. Putin mentioned in his 2018 annual address that Avangard was tested for the first time in 2004, soon after the formal abolishment of the ABM Treaty in 2002.

(2) A LARGE-SCALE REGIONAL WAR

It is assumed that the result of escalation from local conflicts is a large-scale regional war and that an appropriate deterrent should be the threat of ruinous results from nuclear preemptive use[21].

This is so-called de-escalation, and as previously mentioned, nuclear preemptive use was formally adopted in the 2000 Military Doctrine. However, we must also remember that in the Soviet era, the military strategy was based on a surprise attack by conventional weapons and strategic nuclear deterrence. They had no limited nuclear war options. Thus, it must have not been easy to operationalize limited nuclear war scenarios.

What kind of debates, then, are currently going on within the Russian military? First, as mentioned above, both the 2010 and 2014 Military Doctrine give the impression that they seem to reject nuclear preemption. President Putin, in his annual address in 2018,

[20] Hoffman, *The Dead Hand*, p.220 and p.527 (note 29).
[21] Polegaev and Alferov, "Nonnuclear Deterrence in the Strategic Deterrence System," p. 9.

deliberately referred to this doctrinal principle on nuclear use. It appears that military specialists are not happy with this policy orientation. One article says that an ambiguous prescription like this would ruin Russia's chances to make strategic initiatives and doom it to fail.[22]

Another article concerns when and how to decide on nuclear use. The authors point out the Russian military's lack of criteria for getting across the nuclear threshold. To make a legitimate decision on nuclear use in response to an act of aggression with conventional weapons, a comprehensive estimate of the actual damage suffered and anticipated damage would be essential. However, due to the lack of a reliable information-gathering system, they claim that it is in fact impossible to make such a decision.[23] They assert that the current and anticipated damage assessment system (CADAS) is to be developed.

These arguments suggest that the Russian military has not been very successful in the development of a command-and-control system for limited nuclear use.

(3) Local Conflicts

A deterrent for local military conflicts is assumed to be the threat of unbearable damage a retaliatory strike would likely inflict on the aggressor.[24]

As mentioned above, a new concept, "nonnuclear deterrence," was introduced into the 2014 Military Doctrine. The nonnuclear deterrence system is defined as "the complex system of foreign policy, military and military technical measures in order to prevent with nonnuclear means aggression against the Russian Federation." It is worth noting that nonnuclear deterrence includes nonmilitary measures and military means. Until the 2000s, nonnuclear deterrent meant conventional precision-guided weapons.[25]

This new concept was proposed in an article written by the former chief of the general staff (CGS), Mikhail Baluevskii and published immediately before the announcement of

---

[22] Ibid.
[23] O. Yu. Aksyonov, Yu. N. Tretyakov, Ye. N. Filin, "Basic Principles of a System to Assess Current and Anticipated Damage to Key Strategic Deterrence System Elements," *Military Thought*, No.3, 2015, p. 45.
[24] Polegaev and Alferov, "Nonnuclear Deterrence in the Strategic Deterrence System," p. 9.
[25] V.V. Korobushin, "Russia's Strategic Deterrence: Security Functions and Development Prospects," *Military Thought*, Vo. 14, no. 3, 2005, p. 14.

the new military doctrine. He argues that nuclear weapons are effective in preventing a nuclear war and a large-scale regional war but not for de-escalating local conflicts or domestic military conflicts. In such cases, nonnuclear deterrence should be applied.[26]

A year earlier, in January 2013, the current CGS, Mikhail Gerasimov, made a speech ,in which he stated that in a modern war, the rules had totally changed, seemingly having in mind a network-centric warfare (NCW), adopted by the US Military in the 2000s, and asymmetrical measures, such as special task forces, the employment of local dissident groups, and informational warfare. He made this speech at the general meeting of the Academy of Military Science, which was his first speech as CGS,[27] His predecessor, Nikolai Makarov was promoted unusually from department head of weapons and equipment of the GS and started the recent radical military reform with the then-minister of defense, Anatoliy Serdyukov. Makarov is a man of distinction with broad knowledge of the most up-to-date weapon systems and military theory, thus he bitterly criticized the old-fashioned Russian Academy of Military Science, and then his relationship with the Academy remarkably soured. The newly appointed Gerasimov, trying to improve the relationship between the GS and the Academy, called on the Academy to pursue active research on modern warfare using asymmetrical measures.

Because the speech sounded like prior notice of the Russian hybrid operation in Crimea in March 2014, it has come to be called the "Gerasimov Doctrine." However, the idea behind it seems to be that of Makarov. In fact, the Russian troops deployed in Crimea, called "little green men," have turned out to be special operation forces (SOF) created by Makarov and were first deployed in the field at that time.[28] We also know that massive cyberattacks were carried out on Ukrainian governmental institutions before and during the Russian operation. If the origin of the Russian operation in the cyber domain was the one made against Estonia in 2007, such an operation was no longer unfamiliar to Russia in 2013.

---

[26] Yurii Baluevskii, "Novye smysly voennoi doktriny (The New Meanings of the Military Doctrine)," *Voenno-promyshlennyi kur'er*, No.42(560), December 12, 2014, https://www.vpk- news.ru/sites/default /files/pdf/VPK_42_560.pdf (accessed February 8, 2021).

[27] Valerii Gerasimov, "Tsennost' nauki v predvidenii (The Value of Science in Prediction)," *Voennno-Promyshlennyi kur'er*, No. 8 (476), February 27, 2013, https://www.vpk- news. ru/sites/ default/ files/ pdf/VPK_08_476.pdf (accessed February 8, 2021).

[28] Colby Howard, Ruslan Pukhov, eds., *Brothers Armed: Military Aspects of the Crisis in Ukraine* (2nd.ed.), Centre for Analysis of Strategies and Technologies (CAST), 2015, Kindle, No.2371/8081.

However, a coherent "hybrid warfare" operation seems to remain a challenge to the Russian military. Responding to Gerasimov's call, an article titled "New-Generation War" (NGW) appeared in the journal.[29] According to the authors, months before the start of an NGW, aggressor states will employ various nonmilitary measures, such as information warfare and cyberattacks. Then, hours before the start of the conflict, there will be a massive attack by electronic warfare (EW) technologies to inflict an "electronic knockdown." Following large-scale reconnaissance and subversive missions, an aerospace operation in the NCW environment will be started. A growing number of Russian military theorists regard the "overwhelming superiority of either of the warring sides in military technology as a hallmark of NGWs."[30]

Therefore, the authors state that in order "not to repeat a historical error, the Russian military must prepare for fighting a NGW *in the middle- and longer term*"[31] (emphasis added). They conclude the article by criticizing the official nonnuclear deterrence policy, saying that "a nation which takes an oath supporting a defensive doctrine might get the short straw when encountering a surprise attack by the aggressor."[32]

Another article is more candid. The authors say that the argument for nonnuclear deterrence is empty rhetoric and even dangerous, as nonnuclear deterrence against conventional attacks is only possible when the aggressor has limited aims. In such a case, deterrence could be effective with appropriate forces and conventional weapons, neither of which is available to Russia yet. They do not forget to add that behind these arguments, there must be a desire to reduce the military budget.[33] They also suggest that it is not nonnuclear deterrence that Russia needs right now but nuclear deterrence and nonnuclear rapid reaction forces (SOF).[34]

CONCLUSION

I can point out the following from my observations of the debates among Russian military

---

[29] S. G. Chekinov, S. A. Bogdanov, "The Nature and Content of a New-Generation War," *Military Thought*, No.4, 2013, pp. 16–22.
[30] Chekinov and Bogdanov, ibid., p. 21. See also A. L. Khryapin, D. A. Kalinkin, V. V. Matvichuk, "Strategic Deterrence against the U.S. Global ABM System and Prompt Global Strike Capabilities," *Military Thought,* No. 1, 2015, p. 3.
[31] Chekinov and Bogdanov, "The Nature and Content of a New-Generation War," p. 23.
[32] Ibid.
[33] Polegayev and Alferov, "Nonnuclear Deterrence in the Strategic Deterrence System," p. 14.
[34] Ibid.

analysts:

1) In terms of strategic nuclear deterrence, Russia perceives the US missile defense system as a major threat destroying the strategic parity between the two parties and has made a huge effort to develop new offensive weapons that could diminish the power of the defensive system. Putin proudly announced part of their efforts; however, Russia thinks that it is reacting to the American initiatives, not being an initiator of this new round of the arms race.

2) In terms of a large-scale regional war, the construction of a nuclear operating system for de-escalating local and regional conflicts, which was introduced in the 1990s, seems to still be underway. Thus, it is not likely that the Russians would be willing to lower the nuclear threshold. Rather the political and military leadership has started to shift its emphasis to "nonnuclear deterrence," which includes nonmilitary measures at this time.

3) With regard to local conflicts, the Russian military has been analyzing what they call a "NGW" in the Middle East and Europe, considering the NCW system adopted by the US Military in the 2000s and the nonmilitary measures, such as cyberattacks. Russian military analysts know well the inferiority of the Russian side in networking and conventional weapons, especially precision-guided weapons; therefore, they are critical of the "nonnuclear deterrence" doctrine newly introduced in the 2014 Military Doctrine. As a result, on the one hand, they cannot shift away from the limited nuclear use option, and, on the other hand, they tend to further depend on nonmilitary measures that are comparatively easy for them to rely on, such as cyberattacks[35].

Through the Russian debates on strategic deterrence, we have observed that Russian efforts to adapt their deterrence posture to the emerging military environment have not had much success. Russian military analysts are overtly critical of the doctrinal direction taken by the politico-military leadership. Now, we are seeing not a coherent deterrence strategy being built but a sign of frustration of the military theorists facing a dilemma

[35] However, some Russian military specialists argue that comprehensive employment of various nonmilitary measures has only been explored "superficially and inconclusively." D. A. Pavlov, A. N. Belsky, O. V. Klimenko, "Military Security of the Russian Federation: How It Can Be Maintained Today," *Military Thought*, No.1, 2015, p. 22.

between the official policy line, and budget constraints as well as a technological lag.

CHAPTER 5

Strategic Stability in Changing Nuclear South Asia: Emerging Risks

Masahiro Kurita

INTRODUCTION

In the two decades after the overt nuclearization of South Asia in 1998, nuclear deterrence relations between India and Pakistan witnessed many notable events and trends which attracted international attention. The first five years saw two serious military crises which, according to observers, had the potential risk of nuclear escalation. Although the rest of the 2000s saw no such spectacular confrontations, Pakistan continued its proxy war against India, including the 2008 Mumbai terror attacks, and both Delhi and Islamabad steadily built up their respective nuclear arsenals. Then, around 2010, two trends started to garner attention: their shifting nuclear postures and intensified reciprocal cross-border shelling.

Related to these developments, what should be noted here is the increasing shadow of another important power in the South Asian nuclear environment—China. A nuclear threat to India since the 1960s and once actively supported Pakistan's nuclear ambitions, China has become increasingly relevant to regional geopolitics because of its worsening relations with India and Pakistan's increased reliance on China against the backdrop of Pakistan's deteriorating relations with the United States. However, the more Beijing is involved in South Asian geopolitics, the more complicated the nuclear security environment in the region.

Against this background, there is growing interest in South Asian nuclear issues. Undoubtedly, among these issues, a paramount question is: Can the strategic stability of the two competitive relations, Indo–Pakistan and Sino–Indian, be maintained? In considering this question, we must identify risks that may threaten the overall stability of these relations. Hence, this article attempts to highlight such risks, albeit not exhaustively, which can be featured in the short- to midterm future: the stability–instability paradox

and evolution of India's countermeasures, developments in Pakistani and Indian nuclear postures, and the potential discovery of the stability–instability paradox in the China–India dyad.

THE STABILITY INSTABILITY PARADOX AND EVOLUTION OF INDIA'S COUNTERMEASURES

Nuclear scholars have widely regarded the India–Pakistan relation since the covert nuclearization of both countries in the late 1980s as a typical example of the stability–instability paradox. This concept, which is attributed to Glenn H. Snyder, a renowned deterrence theorist during the Cold War, posits that strategic stability based on mutual nuclear deterrence facilitates instability at the lower levels of the escalation ladder.[1] Within the South Asian context, the paradox has been invoked to explain Pakistan's continuing proxy war against India—materially supporting insurgency and terrorism in the state of Jammu and Kashmir (J&K) and in mainland India—even after the two countries acquired nuclear weapons, and to point out how nuclear deterrence works in favor of Islamabad. The logic goes that nuclear weapons have facilitated the conventionally inferior Pakistan's proxy war against India, by making it impossible for India to retaliate using its superior conventional military strength for fear of nuclear escalation, to an extent inconceivable in the prenuclear era.[2] This explanation has become widely supported, bolstered by the 1999 Kargil conflict, the 2001 parliamentary raid by militants allegedly linked with Pakistan's intelligence, and the 2008 Mumbai terror attacks.[3]

While many scholars have regarded Pakistan's proxy war under the paradox as one of the major threats to the India–Pakistan strategic stability, evaluating how much Pakistan has actually benefited from its nuclear deterrence this way is difficult. Simply put, this refers

[1] Glenn H. Snyder, "The Balance of Power and the Balance of Terror," in Paul Seabury ed., *The Balance of Power*, Chandler, 1965, p. 199.
[2] This detailed logic of the paradox applicable to South Asia was first elaborated by Professor S. Paul Kapur. See S. Paul Kapur, *Dangerous Deterrent: Nuclear Weapons Proliferation and Conflict in South Asia*, Stanford University Press, 2007, pp. 34-55.
[3] For instance, Dinshaw Mistry, "Complexity of Deterrence among New Nuclear States: The India-Pakistan Case," in T.V. Paul, Patrick M. Morgan, and James J. Wirtz, eds., *Complex Deterrence: Strategy in the Global Age*, The University of Chicago Press, 2009, pp. 183-203; Rajesh M. Basrur, "Two Decades of Minimum Deterrence in South Asia: A Comparative Framework," in Bhumitra Chakma, ed., *The Politics of Nuclear Weapons in South Asia*, Ashgate, 2011, pp. 20-22; Bhumitra Chakma, *South Asia's Nuclear Security*, Routledge, 2015, pp. 36-57; Saira Khan, *Nuclear Weapons and Conflict Transformation*, Routledge, 2009, pp. 100-114.

to the extent to which Pakistan has intensified its support to anti-India terrorism precisely because of its confidence on nuclear deterrence in reality.[4] Still, at least it can be said that modalities of interactions between India and Pakistan at the lower level—largely the subconventional level—has not been monolithic in the past three decades. The level of violence in J&K, the main victim of Pakistan's support for anti-India insurgency and terrorism, surged right after their covert nuclearization at the end of the 1980s and then nosedived in the mid-1990s, followed by a temporary increase at the turn of the century to an extent slightly below the first peak and another significant decrease. While the law-and-order situation in J&K is said to have worsened since 2016, it remains completely different from the condition in the mid-1990s and early 2000s.[5] Moreover, while India, until the early 2000s, has been largely overwhelmed by Pakistan's offensive at the subconventional level, since the inauguration of the Modi administration in 2014, Delhi has become increasingly willing to exercise various lower-level countermeasures.

The evolution of such countermeasures by India should be highlighted here. It has been traumatic for the Indian security establishment that, in the wake of the December 2001 parliamentary raid by Pakistan-backed militants, Delhi could effectively do nothing. Although it attempted coercive diplomacy against Pakistan by mobilizing and deploying hundreds of thousands of troops along the border, India could neither elicit Pakistan's compliance nor implement military actions. This experience led to the announcement of the Indian Army's ambitious but never-implemented solution in 2004, the Cold Start limited conventional war doctrine, which was designed to punish Pakistan for its serious terror attacks to an extent that does not cross the redline of Islamabad's nuclear use.

However, what is more important here is another line of solutions which India has actually implemented: lower-level countermeasures, as mentioned above, exercised mainly at the subconventional level.[6] The Modi administration (2014–present) has shown little reluctance in exercising these options. For instance, one cause of cross-border shelling intensification in Kashmir since around the mid-2010s is India's renewed policy, led by National Security Advisor Ajit Doval, to respond to the shelling from the other side with

[4] The author suggested that the actual benefits for Pakistan was rather limited in the following book: *Kaku no Risuku to Chiki Hunso: Indo Pakisutan Hunso no Kiki to Antei* [Nuclear Risk and Regional Conflict: Crises and Stability in the India Pakistan Conflict], Keiso Shobo, 2018, pp. 55-112.
[5] Based on the statistics in annual reports of Indian Ministry of Home Affairs, which can be accessed at https://mha.gov.in/documents/annual-reports (accessed January 13, 2021).
[6] For the Cold Start doctrine, see Walter C. Ladwig III, "A Cold Start for Hot Wars?: The Indian Army's New Limited War Doctrine," *International Security*, Vol. 32, No. 3, Winter 2007/2008, pp. 164-165.

"full force."[7] In response to a Pakistan-backed militant group's serious terror attack on an army base in Uri, J&K, in September 2016, the Modi government authorized special-force raids across the Line of Control against terrorist camps in the Pakistan-administered Kashmir. While similar raids had been reportedly conducted, this was the first time that Delhi publicly announced it, sending a strong message to Islamabad and the international community.[8] Then, in the aftermath of another serious terror attack against security forces in Pulwama, J&K, in February 2019, India resorted to limited aerial attacks against terrorist camps in Pakistan's mainland for the first time since the 1971 India-Pakistan War While such a development seems natural given India's long-standing frustration with Pakistan's unabated proxy war and the Modi government's hawkish foreign policy stance, it entails a serious risk. Traditionally, India's countermeasures against Pakistan's proxy war focused on domestic counterterror and counterinsurgency efforts, and Delhi was largely reluctant to militarily punish Islamabad for its terrorist and insurgent support.[9] The Modi government altered the course and has gradually upped the ante by escalating its responses, from intensifying cross-border shelling to conducting aerial attacks against Pakistan. However, this policy evolution may have put India in a reputational commitment trap: whenever a serious terror attack occurs, Delhi feels significant pressure to take a response stronger than, or at least equivalent to, the last response in terms of meeting domestic expectations and maintaining the external credibility of India's strong security policy. It should be remembered that the "last response" has already reached the level of airstrikes though India described it as a "nonmilitary preemptive action."[10] This process can eventually lead to a more serious direct military confrontation between the two countries.

It can also be said that it is this kind of danger that can restrain Pakistan's misdeeds. However, the stronger India's response becomes, the higher the pressure faced by Pakistan's security establishment to make a counter-response because of its own reputational concerns. Moreover, even if Pakistan shows some restraint because of such a danger, it does not have complete reign over militants operating in J&K and mainland India. These anti-India militant groups can act on their own will, and antiunion insurgency in J&K has involved elements of indigenous movement, driven by grievances of local

[7] "The Man behind India's Policy Shift: NSA Ajit Doval," *Times of India*, September 30, 2016.
[8] Karthika Sasikumar, "India's Surgical Strikes: Response to Strategic Imperatives," *The Round Table*, Vol. 108, No. 2, 2019, p. 164.
[9] Navnita Chadha Behera, *Demystifying Kashmir*¸ Brookings Institution Press, 2006, p. 69.
[10] "MEA Statement on IAF's 'Non-military Pre-emptive Action' in Pakistan's Balakot Differentiates it from Surgical Strike of September 2016," *Firstpost*, February 26, 2019.

people.[11] Hence, it is conceivable that a serious terror incident that even Pakistan does not want would occur, and then India makes a retaliatory move against Pakistan strong enough to force Islamabad to respond, which sets off an escalation process. Based on the above, not only Pakistan's continuing proxy war but also India's evolving countermeasures can be seriously detrimental to strategic stability in South Asia.

DEVELOPMENTS IN PAKISTAN'S NUCLEAR POSTURES

Developments in both countries' nuclear postures also deserve attention. The implications of Pakistan's force and doctrinal developments have already been well discussed, but it is still worth mentioning here. Since the first test flight of the Nasr 60 km tactical ballistic missile in 2011, seemingly configured to deliver tactical/battlefield nuclear weapons (TNWs), Pakistan has been regarded as shifting toward a strategy similar to NATO's flexible response during the Cold War.[12] This move was caused by India's pursuance of the aforementioned limited conventional war option, Cold Start, which can be exercised even under mutual nuclear deterrence by exploiting the credibility problem of Pakistan's strategic deterrence. This means it would be irrational for Pakistan to respond to such limited aggression with strategic nuclear weapons, which would inevitably trigger India's massive nuclear counterattacks. However, if Pakistan has tactical-cum-limited nuclear options such as small-yield weapons against India's armored forces in a battlefield within its own territory, it can credibly threaten nuclear responses to India's limited conventional aggression. It is irrational, this time, for India to respond to Pakistan's limited nuclear use with its strategic weapons since it will invite a similar retaliation from the latter. Pakistan is said to intend to use TNWs in this manner and thereby enhance deterrence.[13] After the first test of the Nasr, Pakistan proceeded further in this direction by developing and inducting several short-range ballistic and cruise missiles suitable for tactical roles and enunciating the doctrine of "full-spectrum deterrence" albeit along with its traditional "credible minimum deterrence."[14]

---

[11] Sumit Ganguly and Devin T. Hagerty, *Fearful Symmetry: India-Pakistan Crises in the Shadow of Nuclear Weapons*, University of Washington Press, 2005, p. 87.
[12] Vipin Narang, *Nuclear Strategy in the Modern Era: Regional Powers and International Conflict*, Princeton University Press, 2014, pp. 77-78.
[13] Rodney W. Jones, "Pakistan's Answer to Cold Start?," *Friday Times*, May 13-19, 2011; Bruno Tertrais, "Pakistan's Nuclear and WMD Programmes: Status, Evolution and Risks," *Non Proliferation Papers*, No. 19, July 2012, p. 5, https://www.sipri.org/sites/default/files/EUNPC_no-19.pdf (accessed January 13, 2021).
[14] Inter-Services Public Relations (ISPR), Press Release, No. PR133/2013-ISPR, September 5, 2013, https://www.ispr.gov.pk/press-release-detail.php?id=2361 (accessed January 13, 2021).

This development has raised serious concern from outside observers and even the U.S. government, as it effectively meant lowering the nuclear threshold and making nuclear use more likely.[15] Islamabad will be tempted to use TNWs early in its confrontation with Delhi if Pakistan is convinced that it can one-sidedly repulse India's conventional onslaught with its TNWs without inviting India's strategic nuclear response. Moreover, such a targeting strategy can lead to a large and diverse arsenal, which seems to be confirmed by Pakistan's expansion of its weapons-grade plutonium production capabilities since the mid-2000s. Some analysts opined that Pakistan's estimated warhead count could reach up to 250 in 2025.[16] It is also pointed out that TNWs are inherently susceptible to inadvertent or accidental use or theft by illegal elements.[17]

On the other hand, certain parties have pointed out that such a trajectory of Pakistan's nuclear posture is still not evident.[18] As mentioned above, Pakistani military planners should be attracted to the idea of early nuclear use if they believe they can successfully repulse India's advancing conventional forces using TNWs without inviting an escalation to an all-out nuclear exchange―that is, fighting and winning a limited nuclear war. However, Pakistan must face several difficulties in utilizing TNWs in this manner, including the limited military utility of TNWs in physically stopping advancing armored columns and the complexity of controlling an undesirable escalation.[19] These challenges

---

[15] David J. Karl, "Pakistan's Evolving Nuclear Weapon Posture," *The Nonproliferation Review*, Vol. 21, Nos. 3-4, 2014, p. 320; Monika Chansoria, "Pakistan's Tactical Nukes Threaten Stability in South Asia," *Foreign Policy*, May 5, 2014; Evan Braden Montgomery and Eric S. Edelman, "Rethinking Stability in South Asia: India, Pakistan, and the Competition for Escalation Dominance," *Journal of Strategic Studies*, Vol. 38, Nos. 1-2, pp. 160-161, 171; "Press Briefing by Press Secretary Josh Earnest, 4/4/16," The White House, April 4, 2016, https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2016/04/04/press-briefing-press-secretary-josh-earnest-4416 (accessed January 13, 2021).

[16] Hans M. Kristensen and Robert S. Norris, "Pakistan's Nuclear Forces, 2018," *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, Vol. 74, No. 5, 2018, p. 348.

[17] Toby Dalton and George Perkovich, *India's Nuclear Options and Escalation Dominance*, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, May 2016, p. 3, http://carnegieendowment.org/files/CP_273_India_Nuclear_Final.pdf (accessed January 13, 2021); Jonas Schneider, "A Nuclear Deal for Pakistan?," *CSS Analyses in Security Policy*, No. 187, March 2016, pp. 2-3, https://css.ethz.ch/content/dam/ethz/special-interest/gess/cis/center-for-securities-studies/pdfs/CSSAnalyse-187-EN.pdf(accessed January 13, 2021).

[18] For example, see Christopher Clary, "The Future of Pakistan's Nuclear Weapons Program," in Ashley Tellis, Abraham M. Denmark, and Travis Tanner, eds., *Strategic Asia 2013-14: Asia in the Second Nuclear Age*, The National Bureau of Asia Research, 2013, p. 153; Sadia Tasleem and Toby Dalton, "Nuclear Emulation: Pakistan's Nuclear Trajectory," *The Washington Quarterly*, Vol. 41, No. 4, 2019, pp. 146-150.

[19] A.H. Nayyar and Zia Mian, "The Limited Military Utility of Pakistan's Battlefield Use of Nuclear Weapons in Response to Large Scale Indian Conventional Attack," *Pakistan Security Research Unit Brief*, No. 61, November 11, 2010, p. 4, https://eacpe.org/content/uploads/2014/05/Battlefield-Nuclear

and the resulting doubts on the military effectiveness of Pakistan's TNWs have repeatedly been raised by India's strategic community.[20] What is puzzling is that, notwithstanding the prevalence of such an understanding at the other side of the border, Pakistani officials and experts hardly elaborate how they can effectively fight and win a controlled nuclear war using TNWs. Rather, they emphasize that their TNWs and the doctrine of full-spectrum deterrence are not configured for warfighting but for deterrence, sometimes insisting that what ensures deterrence is the risk of uncontrollable escalation generated by these seemingly more usable weapons.[21] There is also no suggestion that Pakistan has actually reorganized its operational strategy for nuclear warfighting.[22]

The destabilizing effects of TNWs can be mitigated if they are configured not as a warfighting instrument but as an equivalent of France's "pre-strategic" weapons during the Cold War. In this configuration, TNWs are employed as a "warning shot" in a conventional war to signal the user's desperation and imminence of its use of strategic nuclear weapons rather than to offset conventional imbalance and fight a calibrated nuclear war.[23] However, early use of "pre-strategic" TNWs cannot be an attractive option since they are one step away from the "last resort" strategic response and are not configured to make the battlefield situation favorable in a meaningful way. Meanwhile, it

-Weapons.pdf; Ryan W. French, "Pakistan's Tactical Nuclear Weapons: Implications for Strategic Stability in South Asia," *Luce.nt: A Journal of National Security Studies*, Vol. 6, No. 1, Winter 2015, p. 13; Toby Dalton and George Perkovich, *India's Nuclear Options and Escalation Dominance*, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, May 2016, p. 27, http://carnegieendowment.org/files/CP_273_India_Nuclear_Final.pdf (accessed January 13, 2021); Peter R. Lavoy and Stephan A. Smith, "The Risk of Inadvertent Nuclear Use between India and Pakistan," *Strategic Insight*, Vol. 2, No. 2, February 2003, http://calhoun.nps.edu/bitstream/handle/10945/25461/The_Risk_of_Inadvertent_Nuclear_Use_Between_India_and_Pakistan.pdf (accessed January 13, 2021).

[20] Shivshankar Menon, *Choices: Inside the Making of India's Foreign Policy*, Brookings Institution Press, 2016, p. 111; Gurmeet Kanwal, "Pakistan's Tactical Nuclear Warheads and India's Nuclear Doctrine," *IDSA Issue Brief*, September 22, 2016, pp. 4-5, http://www.idsa.in/system/files/issuebrief/hib_pakistan-tactical-nuclear-india-nuclear-doctrine.pdf (accessed January 13, 2021).; Surya Bhanu Rai, "Have Pakistan's Tactical Nuclear Weapons (TNWs) Served its Policy of Full Spectrum Deterrence?," *CLAWS Issue Brief*, No. 75, March 2016, p. 4, https://www.claws.in/publication/have-pakistans-tactical-nuclear-weapons-tnws-served-its-policy-of-full-spectrum-deterrence/.

[21] Adil Sultan, "NCA's 'Full Spectrum' Response," *The Express Tribune*, November 7, 2013; Feroz Khan, *Eating Grass: The Making of the Pakistani Bomb*, Stanford University Press, 2012, pp. 395-396; Zahir Kazmi, "Nothing Tactical about Nuclear Weapons," *The Express Tribune*, May 17, 2014; Qasim Qureshi, *Deterrence Stability in South Asia*, paper presented to US-Pakistan Strategic Partnership: A Track II Dialogue, Phuket, Thailand, September 18-19, 2011, Naval Postgraduate School, September 2011, p. 5, https://www.hsdl.org/?view&did=709864.

[22] Mansoor Ahmed, "Pakistan's Tactical Nuclear Weapons and Their Impact on Stability," *Regional Insight*, June 30, 2016, http://carnegieendowment.org/2016/06/30/pakistan-s-tactical-nuclear-weapons-and-their-impact-on-stability-pub-63911 (accessed January 13, 2021).

[23] Avery Goldstein, *Deterrence and Security in the 21st Century: China, Britain, France, and the Enduring Legacy of the Nuclear Revolution*, Stanford University Press, 2000, p. 201.

does not require a large tactical nuclear arsenal necessary for warfighting.[24] According to Sadia Tasleem of Quaid-i-Azam University and Toby Dalton of Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, the lack of clarity over the deployment and targeting policy of TNWs suggests that Pakistan has not found a way to enhance its deterrence credibility with this weapon system in the face of the inherent challenges to employing them.[25] If Islamabad follows the Paris precedent and avoids a nuclear warfighting posture, the destabilizing effects of TNWs will not be as serious. Their choice on this respect will inevitably have significant implications on the overall India–Pakistan deterrence stability.

DEVELOPMENTS IN INDIA'S NUCLEAR POSTURES

India's nuclear posture is also said to be moving in another dangerous direction. In 2017, American scholar Vipin Narang of Massachusetts Institute of Technology raised the possibility of India's shift from its traditional assured retaliation posture, which centers on the no-first-use (NFU) pledge and the principle of credible minimum deterrence, toward a preemptive counterforce first-strike option, similar with the damage limitation strategy in the Cold War era.[26] According to Narang, this option would be exercised when, for example, India detects Pakistan's move to introduce TNWs into the battlefield. In presenting this idea, along with India's weapon developments suited to the option—multiple independently targetable reentry vehicles, missile defenses, and accurate missiles—he cited a few novel and important notes from former national security advisor Shivshankar Menon's book, *Choices*: (1) there are some "gray areas" in India's NFU policy, such as the situation in which it is certain that an adversary is about to use nuclear weapons against India; (2) the initial logical posture was (not is) countervalue targeting; and (3) Pakistan's use of tactical nuclear weapons may trigger India's "comprehensive first strike."[27] In a 2019 article, Narang, with Christopher Clary of Albany University, concluded more explicitly that India has been intentionally pursuing preemptive counterforce strike options to destroy Pakistan's strategic deterrence, thereby neutralizing its strategy to leverage the nuclear shield to engage in the anti-India proxy war.[28]

---

[24] Ibid.
[25] Tasleem and Dalton, "Nuclear Emulation," pp. 149-150.
[26] "NUKEFEST2017 Hot Takes: Potential Indian Nuclear First Use?," South Asian Voices, March 21, 2017, https://southasianvoices.org/sav-dc-nukefest2017-potential-indian-nuclear-first-use (accessed January 21, 2021).
[27] The original texts of Menon's these remarks can be found in Menon, *Choices*, pp. 108, 110, 117.
[28] Christopher Clary and Vipin Narang, "India's Counterforce Temptations: Strategic Dilemmas, Doctrine, and Capabilities," *International Security*, Vol. 43, No. 4, Winter 2018/19, pp. 7-52.

This argument has provoked resentment and rebuttal from India's strategic community, asserting that India was not abrogating its NFU commitment.[29] However, it seems not so unlikely, at least in the future, for India to shift its nuclear posture in that direction. In August 2019, Rajnath Singh, India's incumbent defense minister, stated that whether India's NFU policy will be maintained "in future depends on circumstances."[30] Moreover, even the concept of counterforce is not an anathema for India's nuclear thinking.

This means not only that counterforce is not ruled out in India's official doctrine but also that it is implicated in the country's massive retaliation policy. Before Narang's suggestion stirred controversy, the center of debate within India's strategic circle was whether to revise the massive retaliation principle of the official doctrine. There were (and are) calls for the introduction of limited nuclear use options by revising the principle, as a threat of massive nuclear counterattacks against any types of the adversary's first use is supposed to be incredible against Pakistan's tactical nuclear use, which is supported by its strategic deterrent.[31] However, to date, there is nothing to suggest that this debate has led to an actual revision of the doctrine. While various reasons can be cited for this, the idea of limited nuclear use is not consistent with the notion of an inherently uncontrollable nuclear war, which has been prevalent in India's strategic thinking.[32] On the other hand, proponents of maintaining the massive retaliation policy have insisted that India should show its willingness to retaliate massively even against a tactical/limited nuclear attack.[33]

---

[29] For example, Arun Sahgal, "India's Nuclear Doctrine is Robust and Requires No Review," *DPG Policy Note*, Vol. 2, Issue 3, March 24, 2017, http://www.delhipolicygroup.org/up loads_dpg/publicati on_file/dpg-policy-note-vol-ii-issue-3-indias-nuclear-doctrine-is-robust-and-requires-no-review-104 1.pdf (accessed January 13, 2021); Dhruva Jaishankar, "Decoding India's Nuclear Status," *The Wire*, April 3, 2017.

[30] "'No First Use' Nuclear Policy Depends on Circumstances: Rajnath Singh," *The Hindu*, August 16, 2019.

[31] For example, P.R. Chari, "India's Nuclear Doctrine: Stirrings of Change," Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, June 4, 2014, http://carnegieendowment.org/2014/06/04/india-s-nuclear-doctrine-stirrings-of-change-pub-55789 (accessed January 13, 2021); Gurmeet Kanwal, "India's Nuclear Doctrine: Reviewing NFU and Massive Retaliation," Institute of Peace and Conflict Studies, January 7, 2015, http://www.ipcs.org/comm_select.php?articleNo=4798. (accessed January 13, 2021).

[32] It has been mentioned repeatedly by India's strategic thinkers. For instance, Vijay Shankar, "Jihadi Aggression and Nuclear Deterrence," *The Strategist*, September 15, 2015, http://www.ipcs.org/comm_ select.php?articleNo=4912 (accessed January 13, 2021); Jayant Prasad, "For a Clear Nuclear Doctrine," *The Hindu*, May 6, 2014; P.R. Chari, *Nuclear Crisis, Escalation Control, and Deterrence in South Asia*, Stimson Center, August 2003, p. 9, https://www.stimson.org/wp-content/files/file- attachments/ escalation_chari_1_1.pdf/.

[33] Satish Chandra, "Revisiting India's Nuclear Doctrine: Is It Necessary?," *IDSA Issue Brief*, April 30, 2014, p. 5, http://www.idsa.in/system/files/ib_nucleardoctrine.pdf; Debalina Ghoshal, "The Case against Tactical Nuclear Weapons in India," *Delhi Policy Group Issue Brief*, August 2015, p. 8, http://www.delhipolicygroup.com/uploads/publication_file/1088_The_Case_Against_Tactical_Nucle

A counterforce element in India's existing nuclear policy can be found within this debate. In 2013, then–National Security Advisory Board chairman Shyam Saran delivered a speech which was typical of the signaling recommended by proponents of massive retaliation. It mentioned India's will to engage in massive retaliation regardless of "the label on a nuclear weapon used for attacking India," along with the notion that a nuclear war is uncontrollable and a warning that Pakistan should not "assume otherwise."[34] Although this threat apparently lacks credibility, it would not be the case if India can convince Pakistan that India truly believes in the uncontrollability of nuclear warfare. Supposing that even a single limited nuclear use inevitably leads to a strategic nuclear exchange, a proportional response to Pakistan's tactical use would be meaningless in terms of escalation control; such a response cannot be a way to prevent an all-out nuclear war. Rather, it can be relatively reasonable for India to respond to Pakistan's initial limited nuclear use—or a sign of use—with massive retaliation aiming to destroy Pakistan's strategic retaliatory nuclear capabilities and command-and-control architectures because it has no other option to avoid the damage caused by a strategic nuclear exchange with Pakistan. Balraj Nagal, a former commander of India's strategic force, cited the following merits of massive retaliation: "prevent[s] further damage to India's economic and population centers," "prevent[s] further strikes on own nuclear forces," and "decapitate[s] adversary leadership to prevent further nuclear exchange."[35]

Combined with the fact that the massive retaliation principle has not been revised and Saran's speech is regarded as semiofficial in nature, this point suggests that a counterforce element has already been built in India's existing massive retaliation policy.[36] If this is the case, then India's shift toward the option suggested by Narang is all the more probable. Another question is whether India can achieve the necessary capabilities to successfully neutralize Pakistan's strategic forces in preemption, and Narang himself is skeptical.[37]

---

ar_Weapons_in_India.pdf (accessed January 13, 2021).; Manpreet Sethi, "Responding to Pakistan's Tactical Nuclear Weapons: A Strategy for India," *IPCS Debate*, January 18, 2014, http://www.ipcs.org/comm_select.php?articleNo=4263 (accessed February 8, 2021).

[34] Shyam Saran, *Is India's Nuclear Deterrence Credible?*, April 24, 2013, p. 16, http://www.armscontrolwonk.com/files/2013/05/Final-Is-Indias-Nuclear-Deterrent-Credible-rev1-2-1-3.pdf (accessed January 13, 2021).

[35] B.S. Nagal, "Checks and Balances," *Force*, June 2014, http://forceindia.net/guest-column/guest-column-b-s-nagal/checks-and-balances (accessed January 13, 2021).

[36] For the nature of Saran's 2013 speech, see Arka Biswas, "Incredibility of India's Massive Retaliation: An Appraisal on Capability, Cost, and Intention," *Comparative Strategy*, Vol. 36, No. 5, 2017, p. 446.

[37] Narang, "India's Counterforce Temptations," pp. 40-47.

Nevertheless, as he points out, even though such capabilities are unattainable, the existence of a discussion about the option can introduce first-strike instability and an impetus for an arms race into India–Pakistan deterrence relations in the following way.[38] India's potential counterforce option is supposed to be implemented when it detects a sign of Pakistan's tactical nuclear use, to neutralize not Pakistan's TNWs but its reserve strategic forces. However, if Pakistan knows India's intention, Islamabad will feel a strong pressure to "go first"—and massively so—to avoid being disarmed instead of resorting to tactical nuclear use. In turn, knowing such a Pakistani mind-set may further drive India's policymakers to a first strike to avoid exposure to Pakistan's massive nuclear attack. This is the typical dynamic of the first-strike instability discussed in the Cold War era, which may also encourage a nuclear arms race in peacetime.

This can have serious destabilizing effects even beyond Delhi's control because it is essentially an action–reaction phenomenon. Regardless of what India is able and willing to do in reality, Pakistan will take precautionary measures not only because of the worst-case assumption prevalent in security policymaking but also the unobservability of India's doctrinal shift: Delhi does not need to revise its declared doctrine to adopt a preemptive counterforce option, given Menon's "gray area" suggestion.[39] This can be a serious source of instability between the two countries.

Potential "Discovery" of The Stability Instability Paradox in the China India Dyad

The last one is the possibility that the "less nuclear" nature of China–India relations will change. Compared with other nuclear rivalries, especially between the neighboring India and Pakistan, Sino–India relations are notable in that its nuclear deterrence dimension is far less salient in their overall bilateral relations. This is all the more noteworthy since their state of nuclear deterrence lacks military stability because of significant imbalances in their retaliatory forces: while China has secured an enough second-strike capability against India, India's equivalent capability remains rudimentary. Theoretically, such asymmetry is supposed to cause intense and dangerous interactions at the nuclear level, including nuclear coercion by the superior side leveraging its nuclear superiority or

[38] Clary and Narang, "India's Counterforce Temptation," pp. 9, 39; Vipin Narang, "India's Nuclear Strategy Twenty Years Later: From Reluctance to Maturation," *India Review*, Vol. 17, No. 1, 2018, pp. 167, 172-174.
[39] Ibid.

desperate efforts by the weaker side to catch up and reduce vulnerabilities. Nevertheless, these interactions have largely been absent in China–India relations though India has slowly made catch-up efforts.

This reality can be attributed to the stability of their overall bilateral relations, which have been maintained by various factors. For instance, while their relations has a confrontational aspect caused by several thorny issues such as border dispute, it also remains firmly rooted in cooperative elements such as economic interdependence and cooperation to achieve a multipolar international order. Border dispute, the most serious bilateral issue between the two countries, is long-standing and intractable, but the remoteness of the disputed areas from their political and economic centers makes it unlikely that skirmishes in those areas would escalate into a major conflict.[40] Because of these factors, China–India relations are inherently not prone to involve the use or threat of military force. Furthermore, the stable conventional force balance in border areas and a series of confidence building measures have prevented a local armed clash from occurring and escalating into a major confrontation even though both countries have recently intensified reconnaissance activities in border areas to assert their territorial claims.[41] Against these backdrops, nuclear weapons, the ultimate form of military force, have kept a low profile in their overall relations. This has led to their relative insensitivity to their militarily unstable state of nuclear deterrence, which could have otherwise triggered off China's nuclear coercion leveraging its superior position or India's desperate effort to catch up and reduce its vulnerabilities. India's nuclear development has been driven by China as a nuclear-armed threat, but its pace has been slow, and the Chinese threat perceived by India in this context has been politico-strategic in nature.[42]

Nevertheless, even under this arrangement, there is one possible risk which may change their insensitivity toward implications of their militarily unstable deterrence relations: the discovery of the stability–instability paradox. This refers to the possibility that either side comes to perceive a linkage between nuclear deterrence and the other side's attempts to

[40] Vipin Narang, *Policy Q&A: China-India Nuclear Relations*, The National Bureau of Asian Research, October 2014, p. 3, https://www.nbr.org/publication/china-india-nuclear-relations (accessed January 13, 2021).
[41] For the detailed discussions about the conventional force balance in border areas, see Narang, *Nuclear Strategy in the Modern Era*, pp. 111-112; Verghese Koithara, *Managing India's Nuclear Forces*, Brookings Institution Press, 2012, p. 201.
[42] This perception is explained in Manjeet S. Pardesi, "China's Nuclear Forces and Their Significance to India," *The Nonproliferation Review*, Vol. 21, Nos. 3-4, 2014, pp. 337-354.

alter the status quo at lower levels of the escalation ladder.[43] This does not mean that either China or India will actually intensify its lower-level probing or provocation relying on nuclear deterrence. Rather, either country may come to believe that the other side is doing so—exploiting the paradox. The idea of the stability–instability paradox has been so powerful and widely applied in contemporary security debates, even beyond South Asia. Moreover, in the neighboring India–Pakistan relations, it has become conventional wisdom that Pakistan has been using this paradox against India to the extent that the latter would be inclined toward preemptive counterforce options intended to neutralize Pakistan's strategic nuclear deterrent—a necessary condition for the paradox. Against such a background, it is conceivable that if one side intensifies probing or provocation at the subconventional level to slightly change the status quo, the other side would interpret it as another manifestation of the paradox regardless of whether such behaviors are actually linked with nuclear deterrence in the decision-making process of the former. If this happens, Beijing and Delhi would likely heighten their sensitivity to the state and implications of their militarily unstable nuclear deterrence.

This scenario can be conceived in two ways. The first is that India heightens its concern on the insufficiency of its nuclear capabilities and embarks on intensive efforts to catch up, driven by the perception of a link existing between the increasingly provocative and bold conducts of Chinese reconnaissance troops in border areas and Chinese nuclear superiority. Not only can India's such moves incite a serious nuclear arms race, but it can also introduce first-strike instability when, though currently not so likely, a serious military crisis occurs between Delhi and Beijing. The other scenario is that China, convinced of a linkage between India's intensifying activities in border areas and its acquisition of Agni V, India's first credible strike option against China's strategic centers, seeks counterforce capabilities so that it can remove the necessary condition of the paradox—India's still-nascent strategic deterrent. This is the same pathway India is said to be treading against Pakistan. Given the aforementioned nature of their overall bilateral relations, the chances of Beijing taking this course is not so high. However, India may still be strongly concerned about a first strike from China based on its worst-case assumption and tries to expand its nuclear forces rapidly regardless of what China really intends to do.

[43] This author discussed this issue more extensively in the following article: "China-India Relationship and Nuclear Deterrence," *NIDS Journal of Defense and Security*, No. 19, December 2018, pp. 59-61.

These are hypothetical scenarios, and currently there is almost no sign of the stability–instability paradox discourse gaining credence in China–India deterrence relations. Nevertheless, three factors that may facilitate discourses on the paradox should be mentioned here. First, the political climate between the two capitals has worsened, albeit gradually, and their reciprocal reconnaissance activities in border areas has intensified since the latter half of the 2000s, which occasionally led to incidents outside the traditional modalities of their conducts, that is, serious standoffs between border troops. Second, from Beijing's perspective, India's impending operationalization of Agni V missiles means that Delhi has become more confident on its capability to deter China. Third, if India is contemplating counterforce options to counter Pakistan's strategy to exploit the paradox, it will inevitably deepen India's thinking on the general implications of nuclear (im)balance. Bearing these in mind, it cannot be ruled out that discourses on the paradox will emerge in the near future in China–India relations, especially when their political relations worsens further.

CONCLUSION

These four risks are not uniform in terms of their probability of occurrence and their potential impact on strategic stability in South Asia. Still, what can be said through all these observations is that South Asia may be entering a new, risky age of nuclear competition. Except for the one brought about by Pakistan's TNWs, these risks can largely be regarded as newly emerging.

The extent to which these risks would cause serious consequences depends on the political atmosphere surrounding security relations among the three countries. This is not a source of relief. Besides the gradual worsening of China–India relations, the India–Pakistan political relationship is currently at its lowest point in at least two decades. The Modi administration's move to abrogate the special status of J&K in India's constitution and turn it into two union territories suggests that Delhi has abandoned its constructive engagement with Pakistan, which it sought until early 2016.

The evolution of the risks to South Asian strategic stability against this backdrop must be monitored. Proper engagements by the international community would also be required, especially in the crisis management field.

(Drafted on August 31, 2019)

CHAPTER 6

China's Nuclear Policy and Sino–Indian Relations in the Nuclear Realm

Johan Englund

INTRODUCTION

China's nuclear modernization has attracted increasing attention from scholars and policymakers.[1] As China has undertaken extensive military modernization, the country's nuclear and conventional arsenals have also witnessed an expansion in scope and enhancement in capabilities. While China's nuclear arsenal remains smaller and more uncomplicated compared with those of the United States and Russia, the force is increasing in number and variety.[2]

The People's Liberation Army Rocket Force's (PLARF) growing nuclear deterrence capacity provides Beijing with increased flexibility in the deployment and the targeting capability of its nuclear forces. China can pose a credible threat to undermine deterrence posed by its adversaries.[3] With regard to this, the way Beijing formulates and exerts its nuclear strategy and posture entails significant implications for the security dynamics in the Asia-Pacific in general and for its immediate neighbors in particular.

Indeed, there have been active debates among Chinese scholars and former People's Liberation Army (PLA) officers on potential adjustments and revisions of China's no-first-use (NFU) pledge and overarching nuclear posture.[4] Debates have been related to the stance China has assumed with regard to the upholding of minimum deterrence and its NFU pledge. An important part of this concerns the adoption of a strategic early-warning system that China seeks to improve, which has stirred up speculations on whether

[1] Kampani, Gaurav. (2014) p. 5.
[2] Kristensen, Hans M. and Norris, Robert S. (2018) p. 289.
[3] The International Institute for Strategic Studies (2017a) p. 113.
[4] Kurata, Hideya (2019) p. 7.

China is moving to a launch-on-warning posture. If this were the case, this might compromise China's NFU pledge.

Although China's official line is that it is sticking to its NFU pledge, these debates combined with the Chinese nuclear modernization trajectory raise questions about China's nuclear stance. What are the elements being discussed with regard to China's nuclear position? Moreover, what is the impact of these debates and the modernization of its nuclear arsenal on China's surrounding security environment, in particular for Sino–Indian security dynamics?

Although the United States remains as China's principal threat, which the Chinese nuclear forces are designed to defend against, the nuclear dimension of the Indian security threat is increasingly dawning on China. As for India, Indian nuclear analysts openly refer to China as one of the two main threats, along with Pakistan, for which the Indian nuclear arsenal has been developed.

In light of these developments, this chapter examines the ongoing issues being debated by Chinese strategists with regard to China's current nuclear posture. In addition, it analyzes how this may impact on the relations between China and India in the nuclear realm.

CHINA'S NUCLEAR WEAPON POSTURE

China's efforts to develop nuclear weapons started in the mid-1950s in response to what it perceived as nuclear coercion or nuclear blackmail from the United States and later from the Soviet Union.[5] As a newly founded republic, the People's Republic of China (PRC) felt compelled to develop nuclear weapons to secure its survival and safety against neighboring threats.[6] As a result, the rapid development of nuclear weapons led to China's first successful test of an atomic bomb in 1964.

Having produced nuclear weapons, Chinese leaders immediately declared its nuclear policy, in which two guiding principles for its nuclear arsenal have been consistent: 1)

[5] Xu Weidi (2016) pp. 22–23.
[6] Ibid. p. 22.

The weapons are to be deployed only for the purpose of defense, and 2) China will not be the first country to use nuclear weapons at any time or under any circumstances.[7] The Chinese government published its nuclear strategy for the first time in a 2006 White Paper titled "China's National Defense in 2006."[8] Since then, China has been consistent in its general standpoint on its nuclear arsenal. The major features in China's nuclear strategy include the following:[9]

- China has implemented a self-defense nuclear strategy.
- Its fundamental goal is to deter other countries from using or threatening to use nuclear weapons against China.
- Any nuclear attack by other countries against China would lead to China's retaliatory counterattack in self-defense.
- China has committed itself to not being the first country to use nuclear weapons at any time or under any circumstances.
- China has committed itself unconditionally to not using or threatening to use nuclear weapons against nonnuclear-weapon states or nuclear-weapon-free zones.
- China supports the principles of the limited development of nuclear weapons and the building of a lean and effective nuclear force.
- China has never and will never enter into a nuclear arms race with any other country.

Thus, the bedrock of China's nuclear doctrine primarily rests on China's posture of upholding minimum deterrence and committing to the NFU pledge. China's stance on minimum deterrence indicates that the central objective of its nuclear arsenal is to maintain a minimum and effective deterrence capability. This involves the buildup of a nuclear force that can survive a nuclear strike from any adversary and then be capable of returning a second strike against the enemy. In other words, it involves the ability to have a sufficient number of survivable and retaliatory nuclear weapons that can first "weather the storm" and then maintain sufficient capacity to launch a second strike against the

[7] Xia Liping (2015) p. 168.
[8] Ministry of National Defense The People Republic of China (2006).
[9] Ministry of National Defense The People Republic of China (2006); Xia Liping (2015) pp. 173–174.

attacker, strong enough to inflict unacceptable damage on the enemy.[10] This second strike from China would not require precise accuracy to target the attacker's nuclear arsenal, a so-called counterforce attack. The requirement is rather to hold sufficient capacity to execute a counter-value attack, that is, to attack and create damage to the original attacker's population and industrial centers.[11] Thus, China's evolving missile capacity may allow for a Chinese counterforce attack. The issue therefore becomes what China's standards of sufficiency are in terms of its ability to survive a first strike from an enemy and launch a counterattack. With regard to this, its declared status is to build a nuclear force and capacity that is lean and effective.[12] Hence, at least publicly, Beijing has maintained this stated form of minimum deterrence.

China's promise to adhere to NFU constitutes a cornerstone of its nuclear policy. Beijing was the first nuclear-weapon state to make an official pledge "to not use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against nonnuclear-weapon states or nuclear-weapon-free zones."[13] China has committed itself to not being the first country to use nuclear weapons at any time or under any circumstances. In the Chinese context of the NFU policy, the concept of NFU entails that "it only requires that an enemy does not employ nuclear weapons for China to also not employ them."[14] Consequently, in principle, this indicates that a nuclear attack against Chinese conventional assets would be defined as first use, whereas an attack against a Chinese nuclear system using conventional means would be excluded from that definition.[15] In other words, it is the weapon employed and not the assets being attacked that defines the concept of first use.

FORTHCOMING CHANGES IN CHINA'S NUCLEAR POSTURE?

Since its successful test of an atomic bomb in 1964, China has been highly consistent in remaining committed to its nuclear policy. Beijing has repeatedly reaffirmed the central tenets of its nuclear policy *via* official statements and policy documents, in which the NFU pledge and adherence to having a limited number of nuclear arsenals are emphasized,

[10] Teng Jianqun (2016) p. 3.; Grinter, Lawrence E. (2013) p. 4.
[11] Grinter (2013) p. 4.
[12] Heginbotham et al. (2017) p. 1.
[13] The State Council of the People's Republic of China (2015).
[14] China Strategic Missile Force Encyclopedia, cited in Heginbotham et al. (2017) p. 19.
[15] Heginbotham et al. (2017) p. 19.

though developed through the prism of being lean and effective in its deterrence.[16] As stated in the 2015 defense White Paper, the Chinese leadership has reiterated its stance on the use of nuclear weapon: "China has always pursued the policy of NFU of nuclear weapons and adhered to a self-defensive nuclear strategy that is defensive in nature."[17]

China is unlikely to formally abandon these policy doctrines. However, the recent years have seen an increasing debate among Chinese scholars and strategists with regard to adjustments to and interpretations of the NFU pledge and the minimum deterrence posture.

Concerning China's approach to minimum deterrence, China's military modernization has resulted in a significantly improved and capable nuclear arsenal, which in turn has provided China with new strategic options to its deterrence force. However, compared with nuclear peers, such as the United States and Russia, the Chinese nuclear arsenal remains limited. China is estimated to maintain a stockpile of approximately 280 nuclear warheads, which can be delivered by around 130 land-based and 48 sea-based ballistic missiles, as well as by bombers.[18] However, this stockpile is expected to grow over the coming decade, as China has increased its number of warheads and strategic missiles.[19] Its nuclear forces have shifted from being principally centered around intermediate- and medium-range missiles to becoming a force relying on intercontinental and medium-range nuclear systems.[20]

These improved capabilities, which provide the country enhanced striking power and survivability, may influence China's nuclear policy and deployment strategies. New strategic options can influence the thoughts on targeting, as its missiles are increasingly accurate. This has led to a debate within the Chinese security community with regard to whether China should continue on the path of minimum deterrence or adopt a limited deterrence posture.[21] A minimum deterrence posture entails "the ability to conduct undifferentiated attacks against counter-value targets, a small and finite arsenal, and relatively unsophisticated command and control," whereas a limited deterrence posture

[16] Ibid. p. 19.
[17] The State Council of the People's Republic of China (2015).
[18] Kristensen and Norris (2018) pp. 289–290.
[19] Ibid. pp. 289–290.
[20] Heginbotham et al. (2017).
[21] Kampani (2014) p.15.

implies "limited war fighting capability to inflict costly damage on the adversary at every rung on the escalation ladder, thus denying the adversary victory in a nuclear war."[22] The adoption of a limited deterrence posture requires larger and more sophisticated nuclear weapons. The reasons for the growing preference among Chinese security analysts and military strategists for assuming a limited deterrence posture are threefold: 1) holding only minimal capabilities is perceived as making China vulnerable to a preemptive attack; 2) the use of counter-value targeting is regarded as insufficient for ensuring deterrence and controlling escalation; and 3) successful deterrence is achieved by China when it signals the ability and willingness to engage in a nuclear war.[23]

As for the debates on adjustments in the NFU policy, views among many Chinese strategists and scholars reflect a growing belief that the current NFU posture reduces the credibility of China's nuclear arsenal. The discussions focus on when and under what circumstances a Chinese nuclear strike is considered possible, not only after having received a hostile first strike but also with respect to a situation in which Beijing deems itself to be under the threat of such a strike.[24] Chinese scholars and strategists have discussed whether China should modify its unconditional NFU pledge and, rather, put some conditions on it.[25] It has been argued that the threshold for a nuclear strike can be legitimately lowered—and thus China exempted from its NFU pledge—in certain situations and for strategic targets in China. These certain circumstances may include when Beijing deems that it is under threat by a conventional attack on its nuclear facilities or their command and control systems, on vital strategic targets or against economic and political centers, and in the event of a situation in which there is a sustained and protracted escalation of war that would compromise national security.[26] In addition to this, other examples could include cases in which the Chinese leadership perceives that serious threats to territorial or national sovereignty are at play, such as declared Taiwanese independence or if faced with regime change.[27]

These potential exceptions for the legitimization of a nuclear strike together with the ongoing nuclear modernization render China's nuclear posture more ambiguous. This

[22] Ibid. p.16.
[23] Ibid. p.16.
[24] Xia Liping (2016).
[25] Heginbotham et al. (2017) p.21; Xia Liping (2016).
[26] Hui Zhang (2010) p.146; Xia Liping (2016); Termine (2018); Heginbotham et al. (2017).
[27] Hui Zhang (2010); Lowsen (2018).

ambiguity also encompasses the new technologies and dual systems deployed by China for both conventional and nuclear forces, such as satellites, C4 infrastructure, and submarines.[28] Because any attack that would potentially cause damage to these systems could be viewed by Beijing as a threat to the country's retaliatory ability, the threshold for China to launch a nuclear retaliatory strike may become lower and thus blur the distinction between conventional and nuclear wars.

However, Beijing has formally continued to reaffirm its NFU pledge. Recently, in a 2019 defense White Paper, it was reiterated that "China is always committed to a nuclear policy of NFU of nuclear weapons at any time and under any circumstances, and not using or threatening to use nuclear weapons against nonnuclear-weapon states or nuclear-weapon-free zones unconditionally."[29]

In a 2015 defense White Paper, China stated for the first time that Beijing aimed to "improve strategic early-warning" for its nuclear forces.[30] The mention of improving strategic early-warning capabilities was less explicit in relation to its nuclear force in the 2019 defense White Paper, though it remained. There has been a long-running debate on the possibility of China developing a strategic early-warning capability for its nuclear arsenal. One interpretation holds that this development would allow for the buildup of a system that tracks the launch of an enemy's missile coming toward its territory, which enables an own quick nuclear retaliation; thus, it is called "launching on warning."[31]

A launch-on-warning posture would indeed enhance China's overall capabilities in terms of deterrence and survivability but also involve more risks. Factors such as false alarms and the uncertainty of whether the incoming missiles are armed with nuclear or conventional warheads leave decision makers with small margins when making quick and critical decisions. This also poses risks of compromising China's commitment to NFU. Moreover, a launch-on-warning may entail that missiles are mated with warheads, thus increasing the risk of accidental launches.[32] Of course, as stated by the scholar Tong Zhao, Beijing's interest in improving its capabilities in strategic early-warning may also rather

[28] Johnson (2017); Termine (2018).
[29] Ministry of National Defense in the People's Republic of China (2019).
[30] The State Council of the People's Republic of China (2015).
[31] Tong Zhao (2015).
[32] Ibid. (2015).

rest on the strive for enhancing missile defense capability or just developing its overall strategic warning system, such as strategic warnings based on well-grounded assessments of adversaries' military preparation and mobilization activities.[33]

Thus, in the near future, China is likely to stick to its formal NFU pledge. Nonetheless, at the same time, the country is also expected to acquire capabilities relevant to war fighting doctrines and may undertake adjustments, as it has increasingly discussed and reinterpreted its nuclear policies for a wide range of purposes. Its policies depend, to a large extent, on China's relations with the United States, but regional dynamics also have a significant impact. This is being played out more and more in two directions. In the event of a revised Chinese nuclear posture reminiscent of war doctrine (ambiguous threshold for use and targeting, adoption of launch-on-warning nuclear posture, and so on), this would indeed pose a challenge to the military balance in the Asian region, in particular China's role vis-à-vis India and the dynamics in South Asia.

China and India in South Asia

China is located in an environment with highly complex security dynamics, involving numerous overlapping and ongoing security considerations playing out simultaneously. Thus, security issues, such as the tense relationship between Pakistan and India, may therefore influence China's security interests and its nuclear posture.[34]

Looking more closely at China's security dynamics with India, Beijing has, for a long time, downplayed the Indian threat in the nuclear realm. Following India's first nuclear test above ground in 1998, the Indian leadership explicitly proclaimed that they had pursued the nuclear path in direct response to the perceived threat from Pakistan and China.[35] Yet, Chinese representatives dismissed this claim, explaining that it considered the Sino–Indian border dispute an issue of the past and that the Indian claim was a cover-up for its true intentions of state prestige and to seek legitimacy for its nuclear status among domestic and international audiences. Furthermore, Beijing chose to convey regret

[33] Ibid. (2015).
[34] Heginbotham et al. (2017) pp. 69–71.
[35] Tellis, Ashley J. (2015) p. 3.

and concern for the harm that India may have brought to the global movement toward nuclear nonproliferation and disarmament.[36]

China's confident posture against India rests on the view that its nuclear and technological capabilities are superior to those of India, at the same time as both countries have committed to NFU doctrines.[37] Moreover, China is unwilling to accept Indian nuclear parity, which has its origin in historical and cultural sources.[38] Hence, although Chinese strategists and scholars acknowledge that India's nuclear weapons were developed with China as a threat factor in mind, this consideration has not received reciprocal attention from the Chinese side. To this end, there has been a well-anchored perception in China that India and China would never engage in a full-scale war, whether nuclear or conventional.[39]

However, India has been clear about its threat perception. Indian nuclear analysts openly refer to Pakistan and China as India's two primary sources of threats for which the Indian nuclear arsenal is designed.[40] India's nuclear modernization program has placed increased emphasis on China, as the deterrent against Pakistan is overall adequate, while the deterrence gap in relation to China remains considerable.[41] The PLA has a nuclear force that is increasingly alarming to India. The Chinese army possesses ballistic missiles capable of targeting India, of which the launching sites in China's Qinghai province and Xinjiang have the capacity to reach India's northern areas.[42] In addition, China's intercontinental ballistic missiles could reach India from anywhere in China, and China's ability to deploy sea-based missiles in the Indian Ocean and land-based missiles in the border region in Tibet causes great worries for India.[43] Hence, India views the development Chinese nuclear force with wary eyes, harboring deep suspicions of China's unconditional NFU pledge and minimum deterrence posture.

[36] Turner Haynes, Susan (2016) p. 42.
[37] Yang, Xiaoping (2016).
[38] Yang (2016); Heginbotham et al. (2017) p. 85.
[39] Yang (2016).
[40] Tellis (2015) p.3.; Pradhan, SD (2018).
[41] Tellis (2015) p.3.
[42] The International Institute for Strategic Studies (2017b) pp. 67–68.
[43] Ibid. pp. 67–68.

However, China's threat perception of India has recently started to somewhat change. Although not the primary driver for China's nuclear force development and policies, the development of Indian nuclear forces has begun to garner increased attention from Chinese strategists and assumed more importance in Beijing's strategic contemplations.[44] India has been expanding and modernizing its nuclear capabilities, whereas important Chinese targets are already within reach for Indian ballistic missiles. Moreover, the unstable nuclear relationship between India and Pakistan has challenged India's NFU pledge.[45] On the other side of this, India's emerging strategic partnership with the United States has also prompted China to more carefully observe India's intentions. Thus, any signs of a shift in New Delhi in its nuclear doctrine may also have a decisive impact on the posture adopted by Beijing.

Indeed, there has been a subtle change of tone in statements from Beijing responding to India's missile tests. For instance, in the wake of the 2012 missile test of the Agni V, China merely reacted by acknowledging that Beijing and New Delhi were cooperative partners rather than rivals. However, after the fourth Agni V test in 2016, Beijing's rhetoric was significantly more hostile, describing it as a violation of United Nations Security Council regulations and calling for clarification of India's "intentions" with the tests.[46] Furthermore, in the third edition of China's *Science of Military Strategy* (2013), India's nuclear weapon development is described as "particularly rapid," whereas China's White Paper of that same year states that "China's armed forces … make overall and coordinated plans to promote military preparedness in all strategic directions."[47]

Thus, the expanding nuclear forces of both countries are increasingly having a mutual impact on each other. Even though China's nuclear force is primarily designed with defense against the United States in mind, it also has a consequent impact on the Indian nuclear strategy. As for China, India's rapid nuclear development holds the potential to become a more important factor for Chinese nuclear strategy, particularly if India takes steps toward reevaluating its NFU doctrine and develops nuclear capabilities aimed at war fighting. Moreover, adding to the uncertainty is that the rise and expansion of a new and neighboring nuclear power is a somewhat new situation for Beijing, which thus presents a challenge to Beijing on how to properly respond to the Indian nuclear posture.

---

[44] Heginbotham et al. (2017) p. 82.
[45] Miglani, Sanjeev (2019).
[46] Gupta, Rukmani (2018).
[47] Heginbotham et al. (2017) p. 82.

As a result, this entails spillover effects in Pakistan, which in turn create an interconnected reciprocal security dilemma in South Asia. While the Chinese nuclear force expands and puts pressure on the Indian nuclear structure to expand itself, this Indian expansion thereby puts pressure on Pakistan to follow the same path. However, on the other side of the coin, Pakistan's adoption of a nuclear war fighting posture prompts India to adjust its retaliation strategy in the direction of a more flexible approach, which then seeds the breeding ground for Beijing to further its nuclear advancements with an eye on India. Hence, a three-way nuclear arms security dilemma is possibly at play, although with various motivations among the involved countries. From the Chinese side, the driver for its nuclear modernization has been primarily directed toward the United States and its allies. In this calculation, India has mostly been viewed at as being on the sidelines. By providing nuclear assistance to Pakistan, Beijing has sought to dissipate India's strategic attention but has, in the meantime, exacerbated New Delhi's security dilemma. For India, its unsettled border dispute with China, deep-rooted distrust of China, and Chinese assistance to Pakistan constitute major concerns and fears of Chinese nuclear blackmail.[48] Thus, for India, it seems that the immediate nuclear threat originates from Pakistan, whereas the establishment of security in India views China as the long-term threat.

China and India: Factors Related to Stability and Instability

Looking at the Sino–Indian relationship, it is of interest to identify the sources of stability and instability, thus enabling us to evaluate the risk of these two Asian giants ending up in a nuclear standoff. The question simmers around the extent to which the two countries' declared NFU positions can be trusted in the event of a conflict, given the significant trust deficit. Indeed, China and India have issues contributing to the unease in this bilateral relationship. The areas of potential friction include the unsettled border dispute, the security domains of the sea lines of communication (SLOC) and the maritime rivalry in the Indian Ocean, and India's relationship with the United States, as well as China's relationship with Pakistan and its deepening of ties with other South Asian states.

Thus, there are important sources of instability that can negatively affect the bilateral security relationship. These are as follows:

[48] Kampani (2014) p. 11.

- The Sino–Indian border dispute is still unresolved. This is creating a deep mutual distrust and thus exacerbating the risk for further conflict.[49]
- Both countries are engaged in other relationships that frustrate the Sino–Indian bilateral relationship. China is a close friend of Pakistan, whereas India pursues cooperative defense relations with both the United States and Japan. These partnerships are divisive in nature as they exacerbate mutual suspicions.[50]
- There is an increasing competition between the two giants in the maritime area. Both countries have improved their navies and have strategic interests in each other's adjoining seas.[51]
- Mutual distrust is further worsened by the lack of a clearly defined line of actual control (LAC) that separates the troops of the two countries. This has led to friction between the two sides and created fertile ground for further confrontations.[52]
- Chinese and Indian nuclear forces have witnessed significant technological improvements in their nuclear arsenal. This development raises the question as to whether their current restricted postures can remain so for a much longer time. The enhancement of sea-based nuclear deterrence on submarines and the addition of mobile missile systems will have an impact on the readiness of each country's nuclear forces.[53] As a result, there are risks of more uncertainty in the area of nuclear stability.
- China's reluctance to acknowledge India as a nuclear actor has resulted in a lack of nuclear dialogue between the two sides. China has previously not considered India a nuclear threat and hence not had an interest in pursuing this path. For other reasons, Beijing has likewise refrained from engaging in these talks, as it is unwilling to signal approval of India's nuclear status while also being worried that such talks may be of concern for Pakistan.[54] Nonetheless, the absence of a nuclear dialogue is a source of instability in the case of escalated conflict between the two countries.

[49] Basrur, Rajesh (2018) p. 4.
[50] Ibid. (2018) pp. 4–5.
[51] Basrur (2018) p. 5.
[52] Ibid. (2018) p. 5.
[53] Kampani (2014) p. 24; Tong Zhao (2015).
[54] Tong Zhao (2015).

However, despite these sources of uneasiness and instability, there are also factors of stability that would lower the risk of a nuclear confrontation between China and India. These factors constitute significant restraints on the Sino–Indian nuclear rivalry. These factors are as follows:

- Although the significance and essence of the Sino–Indian rivalry is alarming, the territorial concerns are still considered to be "minor adjustments." That is, the territorial area is not considered to be in their strategic heartland and may not be within the realm of a conflict that triggers the use of nuclear weapons. Likewise, the security of the SLOCs and the ongoing security assistance provided to third countries are indeed serious disputes creating significant differences between the two countries. Nevertheless, these issues do not really threaten the existential security of either state, thus making it a condition that can contribute to keeping nuclear weapons away from the front lines.[55]
- Structural factors, such as the vast geographic magnitude of the two countries and their large populations, may also restrain the inclination to use its nuclear arsenal. The geographical vastness of the two countries provides them with a strategic depth as protection in the event of invasion by a conventional army. In other words, countries with large territories can, to a certain extent, afford to temporarily sacrifice some space for a time if they are facing losses and defeat. Contrarily, a smaller state may face an existential security threat to its territory at an earlier stage and must thus employ the nuclear threat earlier to prevent defeat.[56]
- Both China and India formally uphold an NFU posture. This is likely to have a positive impact on the nuclear stability between the two adversaries, as it allows for non-war fighting doctrines and thereby having warheads de-mated. The clear benefit of this mutually held position is that it reduces the likelihood of accidental nuclear launches as it decreases the risks in the event of a false alarm and time-limited decision-making.[57]
- The militaries of both countries have exerted pressure on their leadership to change their respective country's current NFU policies and move toward a more limited deterrence posture. However, civilian leaders on both sides seemingly

[55] Kampani (2014) p. 23; The National Bureau of Asian Research (2014).
[56] Kampani (2014) p. 23.
[57] Ibid. (2014) p. 23.

hold strong veto power regarding any nuclear doctrinal changes, suggesting that any shifts in nuclear posture will be a slow process.[58]

CONCLUDING REMARKS

There is generally deterrence stability between China and India. To this end, the overall institutional and structural nuclear stability is in check. However, the relationship also suffers from elements of crisis instability at the same time. Although these elements may not strike at the heart of the existential security for either country, the sources of stability, such as being cautious and conducting high-level economic exchanges, do not eliminate the existing strategic risks and conflicts.

Nevertheless, even though the relationship between China and India is burdened by significant rivalry, nuclear competition is not at the center of this rivalry, thus making the Chinese–Indian nuclear competition rather stable, at least in the short term. The stabilizing factors exert an influence in pacifying the elements that can cause an unpredictable situation. However, there are medium- and long-term sources of instability on the horizon, such as potential doctrinal changes in minimum deterrence and NFUs (although not formally), as well as the possible development of launch-on-warning postures. Added to these uncertainties, the complicated trilateral security dynamics with Pakistan can also act as a spoiler in the development of Sino–Indian nuclear relations. In combination with more capable nuclear forces, these factors should not be underestimated and may make the China–India nuclear rivalry increasingly more precarious.

REFERENCES

- Basrur, Rajesh (2018) "India and China: A Gathering Nuclear Storm?" *ORF Issue Brief*. URL: https://www.orfonline.org/research/42563-india-and-china-a-gathering-nuclear-storm/, No. 248, July.
- Grinter, Lawrence E (2013) "Chinese Nuclear Doctrine, Weapons and Policies", *Pacific Focus*, XXVIII, No. 1, April. p. 1–16. URL: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/pafo.12002.
- Gupta, Rukmani (2018) "India and China–Time for a Dialogue on Nuclear Security?" IDSA Comment, April 19. URL: https://idsa.in/idsacomments/india-and-china-time-for-a-dialogue-on-nuclear-security-rgupta-190418.
- Haynes, Susan Turner (2016) "China's Nuclear Threat Perceptions", *Strategic Studies Quarterly*, 10, No. 2. p. 25–62.

[58] Ibid. (2014) p. 23.

- Heginbotham, Eric, Chase, Michael S., Heim, Jacob L., Lin, Bonny, Cozad, Mark, Morris, Lyle J., Twomey, Christopher P., Morgan, Forrest E., Nixon, Michael, Garafola, Cristina L., and Berkowitz, Samuel K. (2017) "China's Evolving Nuclear Deterrent: Major Drivers and Issues for the United States", *RAND Corporation*, 2017.
- Hui Zhang (2010) "China's Perspective on a Nuclear Free World", *The Washington Quarterly*, 33, No. 2. p. 139–155, April 2010. URL: https://www.researchgate.net/publica cation/ 232824225_China's_Perspective_on_A_Nuclear-Free_World (accessed Februray 09,2019).
- International Institute For Strategic Studies (2017a) "Chapter Eight: Managing the Asia-Pacific's Nuclear Dynamics," *Asia-Pacific Regional Security Assessment* 2017*,* June 2017.
- International Institute for Strategic Studies (2017b) "Chapter Five: India's Evolving Strategic Re4sponse to China," *Asia-Pacific Regional Security Assessment* 2017*,* June 2017.
- Johnson, James (2017) "China's Evolving Approach to Nuclear War-Fighting" *The Diplomat*," November 22, 2017. URL: https://thediplomat.com/2017/11/chinas-evolving -approach-to-nuclear-war-fighting (accessed February 09, 2021).
- Kampani, Gaurav (2014) "China–India Nuclear Rivalry in the "Second Nuclear Age," *IFS Insights*", November 2014 URL: https://fhs.brage.unit.no/fhs--xmlui/bitstream/hand le/11250/226454/Insight2014_3.pdf, 3.
- Kristensen, Hans M. and Norris, Robert S. (2018) "Chinese Nuclear Forces, 2018" *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, 74, No. 4. p. 289–295. URL: https://www.tandfonline. com/doi/pdf/10.1080/00963402.2018.1486620?needAccess=true (accessed February 09, 2021).
- Kurata, Hideya (2019) "Kim Jong-un's Nuclear Posture under Transformation: The Source of North Korea's Counterforce Compulsion," in (eds) Kurata,Hideya and Hellström, Jerker" 2019) "*North Korea's Security Threats Reexamined"*, Global Security Seminar Series No. 2, NDA-FOI Joint Seminar. March 2019. Center for Global Security, National Defense Academy: Yokosuka Japan.
- Lowsen, Ben (2018) "Is China Abandoning Its "No First Use" Nuclear Policy?," *The Diplomat*, March 21, 2018. URL: https://thediplomat.com/2018/03/is-china-abandoning-its-no-first-use-nuclear-policy/.
- Miglani, Sanjeev (2019) "India Says Committed to "No First Use" of Nuclear Weapons for Now," *Reuters*, August 16, 2019. URL: https://www.reuters.com/article/us-india-nuclear-idUSKCN1V613F (accessed February 09, 2021).
-Ministry of National Defense of The People'S Republic of China (2019) "China's National Defense in the New Era", July 2019. URL: http://eng.mod.gov.cn/news/2019-07/24/content_4846443.htm/ (accessed January 28, 2021).
-Pradhan, SD "Growing Chinese Nuclear Arsenal: Is China Changing Its Doctrine?," (2018), *The Times of India*, July 31, 2018. URL: https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/ blogs/ChanakyaCode/growing-chinese-nuclear-arsenal-is-china-changing-its-doctrine/ (accessed January 28, 2021).
-Teng Jianqun (2016) "China's Nuclear Deterrence in the Asian and Global Contexts," *Regional Insight Carnegie Endowment for International Peace*, June 30, 2016. URL: https://carnegieendowment.org/2016/06/30/china-s-nuclear-deterrence-in-asian-and-glo bal-contexts-pub-63965/ (accessed January 28, 2021).

Tellis, Ashley J (2015) "China, India and Pakistan–Growing Nuclear Capabilities With No End in Sight," *Congressional Testimony at Strategic Forces Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee*, February 25, 2015. URL: https://carnegieendowment.org/2015/02/25/china-india-and-pakistan-growing-nuclear-capabilities-with-no-end-in-sight/i2.xz Carnegie Endowment for International Peace/ (accessed January 28, 2021).
-Termine, Lorenzo (2018) "The Evolution of Chinese Nuclear Doctrine: Updating or Overhauling?," RealClear Defense, March 16, 2018. URL:https://www.realcleardefense.com/articles/2018/03/16/the_evolution_of_chinese_nuclear_doctrine_updating_or_overhauling_113207.html/ (accessed January 28, 2021).
-International Institute for Strategic Studies (2017a) "Chapter Eight: Managing the Asia-Pacific's Nuclear Dynamics," *Asia-Pacific Regional Security Assessment* 2017*,* June 2017.
-International Institute for Strategic Studies (2017b) "Chapter Five: India's Evolving Strategic Re4sponse to China," *Asia-Pacific Regional Security Assessment* 2017*,* June 2017.
- *The National* Bureau of Asian Research National Bureau of Asian Research, October (2014) "China–India Nuclear Relations: Interview With Vipin Narang," URL: https://www.nbr.org/publication/china-india-nuclear-relations/ (accessed January 28, 2021).
-The State Council of the People's Republic of China (2015) "China's Military Strategy (Full Text)", May 2015. URL:http://english.www.gov.cn/archive/white_paper/2015/05/27/content_281475115610833.htm/ (accessed January 28, 2021).
-Tong Zhao (2015) "Strategic Warning and China's Nuclear Posture," *The Diplomat*, May 28, 2015. URL: https://thediplomat.com/2015/05/strategic-warning-and-chinas-nuclear-posture/ (accessed January 28, 2021).
- Xia Liping (2015) "On China's Nuclear Doctrine,"*Journal of China and International Affairs*, Vol. 3, No. 1." URL: https://journals.aau.dk/index.php/jcir/article/view/1151/972, 2015.
- Xia Liping (2016) "China's Nuclear Doctrine: Debates and Evolution," *Regional Insight Carnegie Endowment for International Peace*, June 2016. URL: https://carnegieendowment.org/2016/06/30/china-s-nuclear-doctrine-debates-and-evolution-pub-63967 (accessed Februay 09, 2021).
- Xu Weidi (2016) "China's Security Environment and the Role of Nuclear Weapons," iIn Li Bin and Tong Zhao (eds.) *Understanding Chinese Nuclear Thinking*. URL: https://carnegieendowment.org/files/ChineseNuclearThinking_Final.pdf, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Washington.
- Xiaoping Yang (2016) "China's Perceptions of India as a Nuclear Weapons Power," *Regional Insight Carnegie Endowment for International Peace*, June 30, 2016.URL: https://carnegieendowment.org/2016/06/30/china-s-perceptions-of-india-as-nuclear-weapons-power-pub-63970 (accessed February 12, 2021).

CHAPTER 7

Escaping from the Accuracy-Vulnerability Paradox: The DPRK's Initial Escalation Ladders in War Strategy

Hideya Kurata

DUALITY OF NUCLEAR POSTURE

In retrospect, North Korean then-First Secretary Kim Jong-un's address delivered at the Plenary Meeting, the Central Committee of the Workers' Party of Korea (WPK) on March 31, 2013 constituted the manifesto of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK)'s nuclear posture under his rule. It was comprised of two sets of nuclear postures: the "War-deterence Strategy," as the Minimum Deterrence of China and India, consisting of No-First Use (NFU) pledge and projectiles; the second posture being the "War Strategy," which consists of the First Use (FU) and projectiles. The duality is also addressed in the Ordinance on "Consolidating Position of Nuclear Weapons State for Self-Defense" adopted in the Supreme People's Assembly on the following day the address was delivered. While Article 5 stipulates, "the DPRK will never use nuclear weapons nor transfer nuclear weapons or nuclear technology under any circumstances unless there is a nuclear threat and nuclear provocation against the DPRK" according to the norms of a Nuclear Weapon State. Article 4 stipulates: "nuclear weapons of the DPRK can be used …to repel invasion or attack from a hostile nuclear weapons state and make retaliatory strikes," failing to limit the means of the invasion or attack to nuclear weapons. It preserved the room for using the nuclear weapons to repel invention or attack from "a hostile nuclear weapons state" using conventional forces[1].

[1] "Joseonminjujuuiinmingonghwagung Choegoinminhoeui Beomnyeong Jawijeong Haekboyugugui Jiwireul Deoung Gonggohi Hal de Daehayeo", *Minju Joseon,* April 2*,* 2013. For the further analysis of the Ordinance, see Hideya Kurata, "Formation and Evolution of Kim Jong Un's "Nuclear Doctrine: The Current State of North Korea's 'Minimum Deterrence' in Comparison", *The Kim Jong Un Regime and the Future Security Environment Surrounding the Korean Peninsula*, Tokyo: The National

Whereas countervalue second strike capabilities are regarded as effective as deterrence from US all-out attacks, it is, not necessarily the case when the war is ignited by armed clashes in the vicinity of the Military Demarcation Line (MDL) or the Northern Limit Line in the Yellow Sea, where indigenous forces of both Koreas are deployed. In the latter warfare, when they are about to escalate, the DPRK might be tempted to lower its nuclear threshold given the overwhelming conventional and nuclear superiority of the US-Republic of Korea (ROK) Combined Forces on the Korean Peninsula. On the European front, this was the exact problem the US and its North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) allies throughout the Cold War era grappled with as deterrence from the Warsaw Treaty Organization (WTO)'s overwhelming conventional forces. NATO's FU option during the era was supposed to be a declaratory measure to deter effectively the WTO's conventional forces[2]. Viewed from Russia, its nuclear doctrine lowered its nuclear threshold by rescinding the NFU pledge after it lost its superiority in conventional forces after the end of the Cold War. In the warfare in Korea, however, it is inapplicable to North Korea to the locally overwhelming conventional forces of the US-ROK Combined Forces.

The newly developed Short-range Ballistic Missiles (SRBMs) as well as the Multiple Launcher of Rockets (MLRs) fired in 2019 are presumed to be the initial level on the escalation ladder on the DPRK's Peninsula "War Strategy." The implication that these projectiles would have also should be explored in the whole of the escalation ladders that would be led to the total war invasion of the DPRK.

ESTIMATED FIRST LADDER TO RECEDING TARGETS

In standard strategic thinking, the weaker party in an alliance can be more daring than it would have been otherwise, provided that it can trust allies to come to its aid in the case of an actual physical conflict[3]. However, the DPRK does not trust China to intervene against the US with nuclear weapons provided that China retains self-imposed NFU and its mainland is not under US nuclear attacks. The DPRK's primary concerns, thus, would be how to deter the US forces in Korea (USFK) from intervening to compartmentalize the armed conflict within indigenous forces. Throughout the Cold War era, the tripwire

Institute for Defense Studies, 2017, pp. 42–43.

[2] McGeorge Bundy, George F. Kennan, Robert S. McNamara, Gerald C. Smith, "Nuclear Weapons and the Atlantic Alliance," *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 60, No. 4 (Spring 1982), pp. 759–761.

[3] Jan Angstrom and Magnus Petersson, "Weak Party Escalation: An Underestimated Strategy for Small States?" *The Journal of Strategic Studies*, Vol. 42, No. 1 (2019), p. 289.

effects provided by the USFK constituted the major components of conventional mutual deterrence on the Korean Peninsula; the combat forces deployed in the vicinity of the MDL and the Commands in trinity—United Nations Command (UNC), Combined Forces Command (CFC) and the USFK Command—were located in the center of Seoul, guaranteeing the US intervention in the event of armed attacks by the DPRK. It is balanced by the DPRK's long-range artillery, which itself deters a US invasion due to its targeting of Seoul. These capabilities were strengthened by the deployment of the *Hwasong-5 (Scud-B)* and *Hwasong-6 (Scud-C)* to cover the southern tip of the Peninsula in the 1980s.

However, the USFK relocation plan, in a wake of the 9–11 terror attacks of 2001, undermined the mutual deterrence composition on the Korean Peninsula. In enhancing "Strategic Flexibilities" of US forces overseas, the strategy of the USFK deploying large-scale ground forces in the vicinity of the MDL was deemed too rigid. In need of being flexible, the Bush administration's relocation plan, furthermore, was echoed by ROK progressive President Roh Mu-hyun's zeal for the ROK armed forces to be more "self-reliant." The US and the ROK agreed in 2007 that the USFK were relocated in stages to Pyongtaek-Osan "Southeast hub"—approximately 80 km south of the capital city, Seoul, for agility and availability off the Peninsula, and Taegu-Busan "Southeast hub"—over 220 km southeast of Seoul for prepositioning and staging of reinforcement units. The original relocation plans were supposed to be promoted in exchange for developing the military capabilities of the ROK armed force to recapture the wartime Operational Control (OPCON) from the Commander of the US-ROK Combined Command (CFC) concurrent with dismantling it. Though the planned OPCON transfer was postponed twice under the conservative the Lee Myung-bak and Park Guen-hye administrations, some of the units were relocated to the southern two hubs and the USFK Command as well as the UNC were relocated to the one of the two hubs, Camp Humphreys in Pyongtaek in late June 2018[4], followed by the agreement that the CFC also finally relocate there after it moved to the ROK's Defense Ministry in early June 2019[5].

[4] "UNC and USFK Open New Headquarters Building, USFK Public Affairs, June 29, 2018", https://www.usfk.mil/Media/News/Article/1563387/unc-and-usfk-open-new-headquarters-building/. For the detail of the USFK relocation plans in conjunction with the OPCON transfer, see Hideya Kurata, "Zaikanbeigun to Shikitaikei no Saikento: 'Senryakudomei 2015' Shusei no Rikigaku", *Kokusaianzenhosho*, Vol. 42, No. 3 (September 2014), pp. 31–47.

[5] *Kukbang Ilbo*, June 4, 2019.

The USFK relocation plan required the KPA to face the need to extend the range of counterforce projectiles to reach the receding targets. As early as 2003, when the Bush administration started to discuss the possible relocation of US bases in the ROK, the KPA Panmunjom Representative told the US that there is no place for the US forces to escape from a strike of the KPA, even if the US relocated its forces to areas south of the River Han in a bid to save the forces from the KPA artillery firing range and create conditions for making a preemptive strike at the DPRK any time[6]. Extended ranges of SRBMs as well as MLRs are in need for enabling the KPA to make strikes to the receding USFK bases and to the ROK's ballistic missiles under the US OPCON at wartime. Accuracy is one of the more important components for counterforce projectiles than explosiveness; however, accuracy sacrifices itself when the counterforce projectiles strike receding targets. Offsetting inaccuracy, the DPRK would deploy in the vicinity of MDL, though it makes them vulnerable to preemptive strikes that the US-ROK Combined Forces would launch. It provides the KPA added need to deploy SRBMs as well as MLRs further north to avoid vulnerability and the advanced technologies to further extend the ranges.

Regarding the SRBM solid-fueled *Toksa* (*KN-02)*, supposed to be deployed in 2008 after its first appearance in the military parade in April of the previous year, its range was initially estimated 100 to 120 km to deter the USFK deployed near the border and it's Command in Seoul[7]. Its range extended to approximately 160 km and it was demonstrated in a March 2013 test that it reached Camp Humphreys in Pyongtaek[8]. The Spokesman for the KPA Panmunjom Representative in July 2017 revealed that long-range artillery consisted of 240 mm rockets and 170 mm self-propelled artillery targeting the capital area of the ROK and tacitly admitted their ranges were short of attacking receding targets. The Spokesman, however, reiterating the statement to the US relocation plan in July 2003 stated that the US "moved its aggressor forces bases in south Korea to the areas south of the River Han to get rid of the striking range of the KPA's long-range artillery strike" while threatening that the USFK were the "primacy targets" of the KPA and they could never escape "the mercilessly annihilating strikes by its long-range artillery, no matter whether they are located in Pyongtaek or in Busan"[9].

---

[6] "Joseoninmingun Panmunjeom Daepyobuaepyo Damhwa", *Minju Joseon,* July 2, 2003; Hideya Kurata, "Nanboku-shuno-kaidan-go no Heiwataisei-juritumondai: Seidotekisochi to Gunjitekisochi no Kosaku", *Kiki no Chosen-hanto*, Keio University Press, 2006, pp. 59–60.

[7] Joseph S. Bermudez, Jr., "KN-02 SRBM", *KPA Journal*, Vol 1, No. 2 (February 2010), pp. 7–13; "North Korea Takes Wraps off KN-2", *Jane's Defence Weekly*, May 9, 2007.

[8] *Joseon Ilbo*, March 16, 2013.

[9] "Joseoninmingun Panmunjeom Daepyobuaepyo Damhwa", *Minju Joseon,* July 15, 2017.

Under the condition that the USFK do not deploy ballistic missiles to reach Pyongyang, the targets of DPRK's counterforce projectiles include the ROK's ballistic missiles under the US OPCON at wartime. It is worth noting, in this respect that the KPA released the "Crucial Statement" in February 2016 threatened ports in the ROK for reception and staging the US reinforcement units saying, "the US imperialist aggression forces' nuclear-powered submarine North Carolina has already entered Pusan Port…the special operation troops of the US imperialist aggressor forces are finding their way to south Korea one after another to get involved in the operation"[10].

The ROK was allowed to develop 500km-range ballistic missiles, revising the US-ROK Missile Memorandum in 2011. The *Chuje-100* (*KN-09)* was developed by Kim Jong-un's instruction in 2012, the *KN-09* mission is estimated to deter the ROK's ballistic missiles that could reach Pyongyang even they are deployed southward avoiding vulnerability to the DPRK's armed forces[11]. The 300 mm caliber *KN-09* was reported to have over 200km range when first tested in March 2016. Upon the test-fire, furthermore, the Committee for the Peaceful Reunification of Korea, reiterating the KPA's Crucial Statement in the previous month, designated to target the "rear area of the operational theater of the southern part of Korea" [12]. It implies to target the ROK's mobile ballistic missiles *Hyunmoo 2-B* of which range were allowed to extend up to 300 km and the *Hyunmoo-3A* of which range was extended to 500 km were deployed in areas further south in the ROK, decreasing vulnerability to DPRK's armed forces.

To reach Taegu-Busan, another hub of the relocated US bases at the southern tip of the Peninsula, for reception and staging of the US forces out of the Peninsula at wartime, the DPRK's counterforce projectiles need extended range. When DPRK conducted the *Hwasong-10 (Musudan)* test-fire in June 2016, the KWP's official organ *Rodong Sinmun* reported that the test-fire was conducted with shortened range to make preemptive strikes to the ports and airports in South Korea for introducing the US "imperialist's" nuclear

---

[10] "Joseoninmingunchoegosaryeongbu Jungdaeseongmyeong," *Minju Joseon,* February 23, 2016. For the details of the "Crucial Statement", see, Hideya Kurata, "Kita-chosen no Kaku-taisei niokeru Tainan-kankei: Esukareshon Dominansu no Kansei", *Chosen-hantou no Sogoteki Bunseki to Nihon no Anzenhosho*, Tokyo: Nihon Kokusaimondai Kenkyusho, 2017, p. 87.

[11] Bonsajeongchibodoban, "Gyeongaehaneun Gimjeongeundongjikkeseo Sinhyeongdaegugyeong bangsaposihyeomsagyeogeul Jidohasiyeotda", *Rodong Sinmun*, March 4, 2016.

[12] "Uriui Gyeonggoga Binmari Aniraneungeoseun Mijewa Bakgeunhaeyeokdoui Bichanhan Jong mari Geudaero Boyeojuge Doelgeosida: Jogukpyeonghwatongirwiwonhoe Jungdaebodo", *Rodong Sinmun,* March 24, 2016; see also, Kurata, "Kita-chosen no Kaku-taisei niokeru Tainan-kankei", p. 86.

projectiles. It also carried the map entitled "Strategic Forces Plan for Fire Attack" showing Busan and Ulsan, the ports and the harbors for reception and staging the US forces as targets[13].

However, the DPRK must run a risk of inviting US nuclear retaliations when it uses the nuclear weapons first to the US bases in the ROK. The conventional counterforce projectiles were in need to deter and prevent the US from intervention. In this respect, the statement of the Spokesman for the Korea Asia-Pacific Peace Committee immediately after the nuclear test in September 2017 is worth noting. It stated that the DPRK did not develop the nuclear weapons and went so far as possessing H-bombs to deal with South Korea and the DPRK's armed forces. Also, people were well prepared to deal with "south Korea *without nuclear weapons* and strategic ballistic missiles (emphasis added)"[14]. It implied the conventional counterforce projectiles were under development to extend the range to reach at the southern tip of the Peninsula dispensing with nuclear weapons.

IRREGULAR TRAJECTORIES AND SATURATION ATTACKS

Stretched distance between launching points and targets would decrease accuracy, which would require technological advancement. Enhanced accuracy yields, however, increases vulnerability to interceptions: the deployed Terminal High Altitude Area Defense (THAAD) Missile systems in Southeastern Seong-ju, for the defense of the US bases, the PATRIOT Advanced Capability (PAC)-3 and the Korea Air Missile Defense (KAMD) are comparatively significantly better at intercepting the DPRK's counterforce projectiles with enhanced accuracy over the countervalue projectiles with no designated targets. The DPRK's counterforce projectiles fall into the "Accuracy-Vulnerability Paradox." Even slipping through the domain that the THAAD missile are assigned—approximately 40 to 150 km, the counterforce projectiles must sneak through the low-tier domain of the PAC-3 Cost Reduction Initiative (CRI)—below than approximately 15 km apogee and PAC-3

---

[13] Bonsajeongchibodoban, "Gyeongaehaneun Gimjeongeundongjikkeseo Joseoninmingunjeollyeok gun Hwaseongpobyeongbudaeui Tandoroketeubalsahullyeoneul Jidohayeotda", *Rodong Sinmun,* June 20, 2016; see also, Kurata, "Kita-chosen no Kaku-taisei niokeru Tainankankei", p. 87. In the following month, the KPA Panmunjom Representative spotted Kimhae and Taegu airports as the targets in addition to the Pusan and Ulsan ("Migugeun Hyungakan Namjoseonyeonggugangjeomgi doreul Pogihago Dangjang Jesogullo Doragaya Handa:Joseoninmingunpanmunjeomdaepyobu Debyeonin Damhwa", *Rodong Sinmun,* July 20, 2016.

[14] "Joseon Asiataepyeongyangwiwonhoe Daebyeonin Seongmyeong", *Minju Joseon,* September 8, 2017.

Missile Segment Enhancement (to be deployed after 2021)—lower than the approximately 30 km apogee, in addition to the KAMD Medium-range Surface-to-Air Missile M-SAM *Cheongung*— lower than approximately the 15 km apogee and the Long-range Surface-to-Air Missile L-SAM *Cheongung II* (to be deployed after 2020)—lower than approximately the 60 km apogee.

The SRBM codenamed *KN-23*, estimated to be modeled after the Russian 9K720 (SSC-8)—the *Iskander-M* unit—appeared first in the military parade in February 2018—that can alter its flight path after the boost phase, would be one of the workable projectiles to escape from the "Accuracy-Vulnerability Paradox" with altered trajectories to circumvent interception by US anti-ballistic missiles. The *KN-23*, moreover, is reported to be capable of making course corrections when they are guided by satellite-navigations. Such accuracy allows them to destroy targets dependably when armed with conventional warheads.[15] The projectiles tested first in the "strike drills" under Kim Jong-un's supervision mid-April 2019 were called *new-type tactical guided weapons* with *peculiar mode of guiding flight* (emphasis added) in official organs, implying the revised *KN-23*[16]. The tests conducted under this nominal designation on May 4th and 9th that followed on July 25th and August 6th was also supposed to be demonstrations of the same projectiles[17]. Besides gliding at an apogee of approximately 37 km slipping through the US THAAD domain[18], the *KN-23* attempted to circumvent low-tier interceptions of the US and the ROK's missile defense by its irregular trajectories.

---

[15] Michael Elleman, "North Korea's Newest Ballistic Missile: A Preliminary Assessment, May 8, 2019", https://www.38north.org/2019/05/melleman050819/.

[16] Bonsajeongchibodoban, "Gyeongaehaneun Choegoryeongdoja Gimjeongeundongjikkeseo Sinhye ongjeonsuryudomugisagyeoksiheomeul Jidohasiyeotda", *Rodong Sinmun,* April 18, 2019; see also, Bak Siyeong, "Haengmuryeong Wanseong Seoneon Jeonhu Bukanui Wihyeobinsikgwa Tseonhoui Yeokjeont: Wiheomgamsueseo Wiheomhoepiro", *Kukbang Yongu,* Volume 62 Number 1 (March 2019).

[17] For the report of the "strike drills" in frontline are and eastern front and western front on May 4th, see,"Gimjeongeunwiwonjang Jeonyeon Min Dongbujeonseonbangeobudaedeurui Hwaryeoktagyeoku llyeon Jido", *Minju Joseon*, May 5, 2019. It refereed to the "tactical guided weapons" implying the *KN-23.* Though the "strike drills" in frontline and western front on May 9th did not referred to the projectile ("Gimjeongeunwiwonjang Jeonyeon Min Seobujeonseonbangeobudaedeurui Hwaryeokta gyeokullyeon Jido", *Minju Joseon*, May 10, 2019), the drills were supposed to include the *KN-23* test-fire. See, Gabriel Dominguez and Neil Gibson, "North Korea Resumes Missile Firings", *Janes Defence Weekly*, May 13, 2019, p.4. Regarding the test on August 6th, see, "Gyeongaehaneun Choegoryeongdoja Gimjeongeundongjikkeseo Sinhyeongjeonsuryudotan Wiryeoksiwibalsareul Chamgwanhasiyeotda"*, Minju Joseon,* August 7, 2019.

[18] "KN-23 | Missile Threat", https:missilethreat.csis.org/missile/kn23.

As designated in the KPA's "Crucial Statement," the ROK bases are also targets of the *KN-23*. The policy research director at the Institute for American Studies of the DPRK's Ministry of Foreign Affairs released a statement indicating that the ROK Cheongju Air Base was included in its targets when it introduced the US F-23 stealth fighters in mid-July 2019, declaring that the DPRK had no choice but to develop and test the special armaments[19]. It immediately followed the demonstration of the *new-type tactical guided weapon* (emphasis added) under Kim Jong-un's instruction on July 25th. The projectile is reported to be featured with low-altitude gliding and leaping flight orbit of the tactical guided missile, attempting to circumvent the missile defense under the KAMD.[20]

Yet, the *KN-23* with high accuracy is less effective for neutralizing mobile targets, such as the ROK's ballistic missiles *Hyunmoo.* Reversed "Accuracy-Vulnerability Paradox" of counterforce projectiles; inaccuracy yields decreased vulnerability, would work for counterforce projectiles to the mobile targets. The MLRs first tested on July 31st, followed by August 2nd, would also suit to escape from it. Inherently, MLRs, including the *KN-09*, are the projectiles best suited to compensating low accuracy with saturation attacks. Whereas the *KN-09* was used during the "large-caliber long-range multiple rocket launchers" in the "strike drill" on May 4th, concurrently with the *KN-23*,[21] the projectiles called "*newly developed* large-caliber multiple launch *guided* ordnance rocket system" (emphasis added) was subsequently tested on July 31[22] and the test was conducted with the device to "track changing capability" on August 2nd.[23] It indicates that the projectiles tested on July 31st and August 2nd are the upgraded *KN-09*, equipped with Global Positioning Systems receivers more advanced than before[24]. Rockets, by definition, are

---

[19] "Joseonoemuseong Migugyeonguso Siljang Namjoseondanggugui Jeontugibanim Binan", *Minju Joseon,* July 12, 2019.
[20] "Gimjeongeunwiwonjang Sinhyeongjeonsuryudomugi Wiryeoksiwisagyeogeul Jojikjido", *Minju Joseon,* July 26, 2019.
[21] Regarding the fire drill on May 4th, it was reported to accompany with the test to "estimate and inspect the operating ability and the accuracy of striking duty performance of large-caliber long-range multiple rocket launchers as well." See, "Gimjeongeunwiwonjang Jeonyeon Min Dongbujeonseonban geobudaedeurui Hwaryeoktagyeokullyeon Jido", *Minju Joseon*, May 5, 2019.
[22] "Gimjeongeunwiwonjang sinhyeongdaegugyeongjojongbangsaposiheomsagyeogeul Jido", *Minju Joseon,* August 1, 2019; see also, Peter Felstead and Gabriel Dominguez, "Kim Jong-un Continues to Let His Missiles Do the Talking," *Janes Defence Weekly*, August 21, 2019, p. 6.
[23] "Gyeongaehaneun Choegoryeongdoja Gimjeongeundongjikkeseo Sinhyeongdaegugyeongjojong bangsaposiheomsagyeogeul Ttodasi Jidohasiyeotda", *Minju Joseon,* August 3, 2019.
[24] Kim Jong-un reportedly supervised a test-fire of "the new-type ground-to-sea cruise rocket" in early June in 2017, when the test-fire verified specification including "mobility in various flying course and accuracy of target sensing and guidance by the complex guided head and identification ability and sharp transition to attitude at the time of advance into the target" (Gyeongaehaneun Choegoryeongdoja Gimjeongeundongjikkeseo Sinhyeongdaegugyeongjojongbangsaposiheomsagyeogeul Ttodasi Jidoha

not equipped with guidance system, however, the DPRK's MLRs approach to missiles with elemental guidance, bolstering utilities of attacking the mobile targets.

Moreover, the projectiles—what the DPRK called "new weapon"—that were tested on August 10th and 16th, 2019, superficially resembled the US MGM-140 Army Tactical Missile System (ATACMS). The codenamed *KN-24* is observed to replace the aged and liquid-fueled *Hwasong-5* /*Hwasong-6* and makes a non-parabolic trajectory[25], though the DPRK's official communications did not suggest that they were equipped with guidance systems unlike the upgraded *KN-09*[26]. No matter its increased accuracy, it should be noted that the *KN-24*—as well as *KN-23* is armed with warheads containing submunitions[27]. It rather is suited to neutralizing the mobile targets, the ROK's new series of ballistic missiles, the *Hyunmoo*. The effectiveness to neutralize them would be augmented when it mounts increased brisance. The "*newly developed super-large* multiple rocket launchers" (emphasis added) tested on August 24th, September 10th, October 31st, and November 28th, 2019, would represent this effectiveness. Though the codenamed *KN-25* is estimated to have four fixed rear fins and four moving forward fins for guidance, it is equipped with 600 mm caliber four-tube wheeled transporter-erector-launcher, demonstrating roughly doubled the brisance of single munitions of the *KN-09* with 300 mm.[28] Upon the test-fire on October 31st, it was broadcast that the projectile was verified… to "totally destroy with super-power the *group* target of the enemy and designated target *area* by surprise strike of the weapon system of super-large multiple rocket launchers (emphasis added)"[29].

UNBRIDGING AND BRIDGING TO THE SECOND ESCALATION LADDERS

The DPRK's intensive test-fires of the SRBMs as well as MLRs, attributed to Kim Jong-

siyeotda", *Minju Joseon,* June 9, 2019. The technologies of radars and GPS for the cruise missiles may have been converted to upgrade the *KN-09*.

[25] Michael Elleman, "North Korea's New Short-Range Missiles: A Technical Evaluation, October 9, 2019", https: www.38north.org/2020/03/melleman0325020/.

[26] "Gyeongaehaneun Choegoryeongdoja Gimjeongeundongjikkeseo Sae Mugi Siheomsagyeogeul Jidohayeotda", *Minju Joseon*, August 11, 2019; "Joseollodongdangui Hyeonmyeonghan Ryeongdo Arae Jawijeokgukbangnyeokganghwaeseo Sabyeonjeoguiuireul Gajin Saeroun Seonggwadeure Ryeonieo Changjo: Gyeongaehaneun Choegoryeongdoja Gimjeongeundongjikkeseo Sae Mugi Siheomsagyeogeul Ttodasi Jidohayeotda", *Rodong Sinmun*, August 17, 2019.

[27] Elleman, "North Korea's New Short-Range Missiles".

[28] Michael Elleman, "North Korea's Recent KN-25 Launches New Short-Range Missiles", https//www.38north.org/2020/03/melleman030620/.

[29] "Joseonminjujuuiinmingonghwagung Gukbanggwahagwon Chodaehyeongbangsaposiheomsagye ong Jinhaeng", *Minju Joseon,* November 1, 2019.

un's unilateral declaration in his speech at the 3rd Plenary Meeting of the 7th Central Committee of the WKP on April 21, 2018 that "No nuclear tests, *intermediate*-range, or intercontinental ballistic rocket tests are necessary for the DPRK" (emphasis added),[30] leaving the room for test-fires of SRBMs. Inasmuch as then US President Donald Trump said that the DPRK side secured a halt of all missiles and of all nuclear tests at the press conference following the summit talks with Kim Jong-un[31], it is unlikely that Kim Jong-un daringly canceled out the room for test-firing SRBMs contrary to his speech given above. Regarding the *KN-23,* in light of its irregular non-parabolic trajectories, the DPRK intended to be excluded from the UN Security Council resolutions banning the test-fires of the ballistic missiles regardless of ranges.

It was hinted, however that buildup of the counterforce projectiles verified in 2019 was laid out by the WKP. Upon the first test-fire of the *KN-23* in April 2019, Kim Jong-un was reported to say, "the field of national defense science has waged a dynamic struggle for attaining core research goals set forth by the Party at the 8th Conference of Munitions Industry and thus conducted brisk activities for developing our own style weapon system, which embodies four elements."[32] It was on December 12, 2017 when the 8th Conference of Munition Industry was convened, dating back before Kim Jong-un launched on the summit talks with both Presidents of the ROK and the US. While the report at the 8th Conference of Munition Industry by Thae Jong-su, Politburo member and Vice-chairman of the Central Committee of the WPK focused on the accomplishments of Intercontinental Ballistic Missiles, the "New-type High-Thrust Engine," the two hydrogen-bomb tests and the test-fires of the *Hwasong-14 (KN-20)* twice in July and the *Hwasong-15 (KN-22)* in November 2017, respectively honoring "March 18 Revolution," "July 4 Revolution,"

---

[30] The "intermediate-range" ballistic "rocket" referred in Kim Jong-un's speech, in English version of the Korea Central News Agency (KCNA) was originally the "intermediate-long range (Jungjanggeori)" in the Korean text. The DPRK, failing to designate the range by distance, classifies the IRBMs have two categories: "intermediate (Junggeori)" targeting Japan and "intermediate-long (Jungjanggeori)" targeting Guam. Regarding the English and Korean texts of Kim Jong-un's speech, see respectively, "Third Plenary Meeting of Seventh C.C., WPK Held in Presence of Kim Jong Un," KCNA, April 21, 2018, http//www.kcna.index-e.htm, and "Joseollodongdang Jungangwiwonhoe Je7gi Je3cha Jeonwonhoeui Jinhaeng: Joseollodongdang Gimjeongeunwi Wonjangdongjikkeseo Byeongjilloseonui Widaehan Seungnireul Gungjinopi Cheonmyeonhasigo Dangui Saeroun Jeollyakjeongnoseoneul Jesihasiyeotda", *Rodong Sinmun,* April 21, 2018. Further in details, see, Hideya Kurata, "Synchronizing Two Asymmetrical Deals: The Panmunjeom Declaration and the US-DPRK Joint Statement from Japan's Perspective", *The Korean Journal of Security Affairs*, Volume 23 Number 2 (December 2018), pp. 38–39.

[31] "Press Conference by President Trump, Foreign Policy, Issued on June 12, 2018, Capella Hotel, Singapore", https//www.whitehouse.g.,ov/briefings-statements/press-conference-president-trump/.

[32] Bonsajeongchibodoban, "Gyeongaehaneun Choegoryeongdoja Gimjeongeundongjikkeseo Sinhyeongjeonsuryudomugisagyeoksiheomeul Jidohasiyeotda", *Rodong Sinmun,* April 18, 2019.

"July 28 Victory," and "Great November 29 Victory" at the opening ceremony of the Conference,[33] the report of the closing ceremony referred that Kim Jong-un gave the "theoretical and scientific instructions" to directions and methods of rockets industries[34], suggesting that SRBMs were also discussed in the Conference. It must be related to what Kim Jong-un said upon the first test-fire of the *KN-23* in April 2019, "core research goals set forth by the Party at the 8th Conference of Munition Industry"[35].

Counterforce projectiles, as the initial escalation ladders, are to deescalate the local deterring the US intervention in case of armed clashes between indigenous forces. Limited explosiveness should be sufficient to compartmentalize the conflict within the indigenous forces, making the USFK to hesitate to intervene; use of nuclear weapons would rather invite US nuclear retaliation. Instead of limited explosiveness, accuracy is an indispensable component of counterforce projectiles, even in neutralizing mobile ballistic missiles of the ROK's new series of the *Hyunmoo*. As described, the *KN-23* with irregular trajectories attempt to escape from the "Accuracy-Vulnerability Paradox" to attack fixed bases, the *KN-24* and the *KN-25* attempted to escape from the reverse Paradox with saturation attacks compensating comparative inaccuracy when targeting mobile targets.

In case the initial escalation ladder fails to compartmentalize conflicts within indigenous forces, the DPRK must be prepared for intervention of the US forces off the Peninsula. To deter these forces from using for combat operation in Korea, the DPRK needs counterforce capabilities to the US bases in Japan (USFJ) as well as Andersen Air Base in Guam. However, the degree of destructive power of the conventional warhead is inversely proportional to the distance to the targets. DPRK counterforce capabilities therefore need extraordinarily powerful conventional warheads to neutralize their

---

[33] "Jawijeong Gukbangnyeokganghwaui Ryeoksae Teukgihal Seungnigwa Yeonggwangui Daehoe, Gyeongaehaneun Choegoryeongdoja Gimjeongeundongjireul Mosigo Je8cha Gunsugongeopdaehoe Seongdaehi Gaemak", *Rodong Sinmun,* December 12, 2017.

[34] "Widaehan Byeonjinui Gichinopi Juchejeokgukbanggongeopbaljeonui Choejeonseonggireul Yeoreonagaja Je8cha Gunsugongeopdaehoe Paemang Gyeongaehaneun Choegoryeongdoja Gimjeongeundongjikkeseo Daehoeeseo Ryeoksajeogin Gyeolloneul Hasiyeotda", *Rodong Sinmun,* December 13, 2017.

[35] Upon the test-test of the *KN-24* on August 16, Kim Jong-un was also reported to stress to make all-out efforts to perfectly uphold the Party's line when he called on the fields of the national defense scientific research and the projectiles industry. See, "Joseollodongdangui Hyeonmyeonghan Ryeong do Arae Jawijeokgukbangnyeokganghwaeseo Sabyeonjeoguiuireul Gajin Saeroun Seonggwadeure Ryeonieo Changjo: Gyeongaehaneun Choegoryeongdoja Gimjeongeundongjikkeseo Sae Mugi Siheomsagyeogeul Ttodasi Jidohayeotda", *Rodong Sinmun*, August 17, 2019.

objectives: the USJF over 1000 km and Andersen Air Base over 3000 km distant from the Peninsula. Under such circumstances the DPRK had to demonstrate nuclear explosiveness and accuracy in the intensive test-fires of ballistic missiles in 2016-17[36].

It should be recalled again, in this respect that the KPA's "Crucial Statement" in February 2016 threatened, "if the enemies persist in their foolish military actions…the DPRK will stage the *second* striking operation to totally *eliminate its very source*" (emphasis added), implying that the US bases off the Peninsula would be designated as the targets of the second strikes. In light of nuclear explosiveness as well as accuracy were demonstrated in 2016–17, the DPRK would threaten to make second strikes with nuclear weapons to the US bases off the Peninsula after the initial escalation ladders failed to deescalate the armed clashes. Besides, in case the USFJ are used for the combat operations in Korea the DPRK's nuclear strikes to them amounts to be the FU as the USFJ where no nuclear weapon is deployed. *Rodong Sinmun* carried an article endorsing this, "should a war occur on the Korean Peninsula, Japan, the bases for the US logistic, combating and staging, would be the *first* to be covered by radioactive clouds (emphasis added)[37]. Second escalation ladders would be further followed by the menace of countervalue strikes to the US mainland.

While the Minimum Deterrence with NFU remains one of the facets in DPRK's nuclear posturing in the "War-deterring Strategy," the room for FU that is left falls in the realm of the deterrence to the US bases off the Peninsula in the "War Strategy" Kim Jong-un referred to in his speech of March 2013. It is presumed that the latter consists of the escalation ladders from local armed clashes on the Korean Peninsula to the total war involving Japan and the US, the counterforce capabilities demonstrated in 2019 are not isolated, incorporated in the initial part of the entire escalation ladders of the "War Strategy." The signed commentary *Rodong Sinmun* carried in the midst of the series of the projectile's tests in summer 2019 is worth noting in this regard. While demonstrating, "the powerful defense capabilities and war deterrence" without referring to nuclear deterrence," it honored the "March 18 Revolution" and "July 4 Revolution" as well[38].

---

[36] See, Hideya Kurata, "Kim Jong-un's Nuclear Posture under Transformation: The Source of North Korea's Counterforce Compulsion," Hideya Kurata and Jerker Hellström (eds.), *North Korea's Security Threats Reexamined,* Yokosuka: National Defense Academy, 2019, pp. 16–17.
[37] Lee Hyeon-do, "Seuseuro Pamyeoreul Jaechokaneun Mumohan Mangdong", *Rodong Sinmun,* May 2*,* 2017.
[38] Myeong Juhyeok, "Gangnyeokan Jawijeokgukbangnyeogi Isseo Uriui Seungnineun Hwakjeongjeogida", *Rodong Sinmun,* August 31, 2019.

CHAPTER 8

North Korea's Nuclear Posture after the Summit Meetings: A View from China

Jerker Hellström

In early March 2018, South Korean National Security Adviser Chong Eui-yung traveled to the United States to relay to President Donald Trump an invitation from Kim Jong Un to jointly conduct the first summit ever between two leaders of the U.S. and North Korea, which Trump accepted almost immediately. In 2017, when North Korea conducted more missile tests than in any previous year, such a meeting would have been impossible. This is a reminder that, in matters concerning the DPRK, one should never rule out the unthinkable.

This commentary is focused on North Korea's nuclear posture after the two summits in Singapore and Hanoi, from a Chinese perspective. It is based on writings and statements by leading Chinese scholars who focus on China's relations with the U.S. and North Korea, and on the North Korean nuclear issue in particular. As China is unarguably a crucial actor in Korean peninsula dynamics, it is important to understand the deliberations of Chinese observers and policymakers on North Korea's nuclear and ballistic missile programs.

U.S.-CHINA DIVERGENCE ON THE DPRK

There is a major divide between Chinese and American views of the North Korean nuclear program.[1] According to Yang Xiyu, Senior Fellow at the Chinese Institute of International Studies (CIIS), China has accepted the concept of the DPRK's peaceful development of nuclear energy, while the U.S. has not. Another major discrepancy noted

[1] 杨希雨 [Yang Xiyu], 朝鲜核问题与中国的对朝政策 [The North Korean Nuclear Issue and China's North Korea Policy],《现代国际关系》 [*Contemporary International Relations*] 2017, Vol. 1.

by Yang is that China will not agree to any action that threatens stability in the region, valuing stability over denuclearization. The U.S., in contrast, prioritizes denuclearization.

Professor Yan Xuetong, Dean of the Institute of International Relations at Tsinghua University, suggests that China could potentially decide to accept North Korea as a nuclear state with which it maintains friendly bilateral relations, on the condition that this would contribute to maintaining peace on the Korean peninsula.[2] Yan argues that China faces a simple choice between a nuclear North Korea with nuclear weapons that does not have a hostile relationship with China, and a nuclear North Korea with nuclear weapons that does have a hostile relationship with China.

Chinese scholars regard the lack of trust between the U.S. and the DPRK as the principal obstacle to progress. Moreover, they assert that the U.S. is strongly prejudiced against North Korea. Most American scholars consider the summit as a capitulation to Pyongyang, meaning it will be difficult to achieve a balanced dialog and to reach reciprocal, concrete results. Both leaders face domestic pressure to deliver substantive progress.

Meanwhile, there is a clear Chinese lack of trust in American Korea policy and its underlying motivations. Several scholars argue that Washington favors regime change in the DPRK, as well as containment of China, with the end goal of expanding U.S. influence in the region. As such, U.S. non-proliferation efforts are understood by some Chinese scholars as merely a pretext for replacing the regime in Pyongyang with one that will not oppose U.S. interests. Moreover, the Chinese academic debate often refers to a U.S. "double standard"; while Washington opposes DPRK nuclear ambitions, it "turns a blind eye" to those of Israel and India.

ON THE ISSUE OF DENUCLEARIZATION

In order to understand China's DPRK policy, it is vital to grasp the analysis among Chinese scholars on matters of denuclearization.

[2] 周晓加 [Zhou Xiaojia] 朝鲜核问题与中国学者的观点 [The North Korean nuclear issue and views among Chinese scholars] 《和平与发展》[*Peace and Development*] 2017, Vol. 3.

On the one hand, North Korea is widely perceived among Chinese scholars as a de facto nuclear state. As the DPRK has little interest in giving up its recent nuclear progress, prospects for (unilateral) North Korean denuclearization are low, if not nonexistent. Indeed, Pyongyang has added the development of nuclear weapons to its constitution and national development plans.

Professor Li Limin of the University of International Relations in Beijing asserts that the DPRK has never had the intention of abandoning its nuclear weapons program. Its participation in the six-party talks and other dialogs were merely motivated by an effort to buy time and advance with the *byungjin* policy of parallel economic and nuclear development that is, catching up both economically and militarily.[3]

While China is under no illusion that North Korea will abolish its nuclear arsenal unilaterally, denuclearization of the Korean peninsula remains one of the pillars of China's DPRK policy. Importantly, however, the Chinese understanding of the denuclearization issue involves both North Korea and the U.S. Not only does North Korea remain convinced that nuclear weapons are present in the ROK, but Pyongyang also sees a nuclear threat from U.S. extended deterrence to the ROK and Japan. Thus, the end of extended deterrence may not be enough for Kim to consider the U.S. to no longer be a threat. His ultimate goal may be global nuclear disarmament, including U.S. denuclearization.

According to Cao Xin (曹辛), Adjunct Fellow of the Charhar Institute in Beijing, a prerequisite for denuclearization is that the U.S. and the DPRK first negotiate a peace regime. Without peace, it would be nearly impossible for Kim Jong Un to justify the elimination of nuclear weapons to his Party, the military, and the North Korean people.[4]

Yan Xuetong notes that there is an inherent conflict between China's goal of "denuclearization of the Korean peninsula" on the one hand, and "peace on the Korean

[3] 林利民 [Lin Limin] 朝鲜核问题的战略本质: 反扩散还是地缘政治博弈? [The strategic nature of the North Korean nuclear issue: non-proliferation or geopolitical game?]《现代国际关系》[Contemporary International Relations] 2018, Vol. 2.

[4] 曹辛 [Cao Xin] 二次"特金会"黄了：中国对朝核必须确立"底线思维" [As the second "Trump-Kim Summit" falls through, China must establish a "bottom line mindset" on the North Korean nuclear issue], FT 中文网, March 1, 2019. URL: https://www.ftchinese.com/ story/001081677?archive (accessed February 5, 2021).

peninsula" on the other. According to Yan, China is able to safeguard peace on the peninsula, but has no ability to pressure Pyongyang into giving up its nuclear weapons.

ON MINIMUM DETERRENCE/NO-FIRST USE

Although the DPRK has pledged a no-first use policy, it is important to note that the regime has also threatened preemptive use of nuclear weapons. That said, Yang Xiyu of CIIS asserts that, despite North Korea having stated on several occasions that it is ready to conduct a preemptive nuclear strike against the U.S., it has no intention of engaging in nuclear war. Rather, it views its nuclear capabilities as a shield and strategic lever.

It is presumed that Pyongyang's goal is to prevent the U.S. and its allies from attacking North Korea and attempting to overthrow the regime. Several Chinese scholars posit that the North Korean regime also seeks to force Washington to take the Kim regime seriously, to treat it as an equal, and to reverse its hostile North Korea policy.

DIRECT IMPLICATIONS FOR CHINA

Some Chinese scholars argue that China's delivery of strategic supplies (e.g., hard currency and commodities) to North Korea is not primarily intended to keep the regime from collapsing–which is otherwise accepted as conventional wisdom. Rather, by supporting the DPRK, the Chinese government is attempting to persuade Pyongyang to not strike South Korea. Hence, China is the primary guarantor of North Korea not becoming hostile. The Kim regime is well aware that China would intervene should it attack South Korea.

According to Cao Xin of the Charhar Institute, China's role in Korean denuclearization is pivotal, and this must be acknowledged. Moreover, Cao recommends that China adopt baseline thinking in regard to denuclearization.

At the same time, Cao and his fellow Chinese Korea watchers argue that denuclearization is of great and direct interest for China as a neighbor and ally of the DPRK; a nuclear-armed North Korea undermines China's national security interests. They argue that China should handle the issue as a matter of national security. In geopolitical terms, North

Korea's nuclear program affects the border regions in Northeastern China. Chinese scholars also argue that there is a risk of proliferation in the region, which could be used as a pretext against China.

As the U.S. and the DPRK have failed—at two summits—to agree on the terms for denuclearization, many scholars are convinced that China will have to play an increasingly important role. China's policies will significantly shape the Korean denuclearization dynamics —its progress, speed, and direction. Chinese academics argue that the U.S. leverages the DPRK nuclear issue to contain China and restrict its room to maneuver, while strengthening its own ability to control its Japanese and South Korean allies.

CHINESE SCHOLARS ON THE WAY FORWARD

China's Korea watchers believe that the Korean nuclear issue is a question for North Korea and the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) to manage that it should be resolved within the UNSC framework, and that China should promote this agenda within the Security Council.

Moreover, they argue that China should keep in close contact with the other four permanent members of the UNSC and provide them with its independent timetable and roadmap for Korean denuclearization, as well as seek assurances from the DPRK and U.S.to agree on a timetable for denuclearization and an end-of-war agreement.

China is a signatory of the armistice and has diplomatic relations with both Washington and Pyongyang. Hence, in the mind of Chinese analysts, China is the only country that can mediate an agreement to end the war.

CHAPTER 9

South Korean Civilians' Political Domain behind Coercion: A Chance for Autonomy from Alliances

Takeshi Watanabe

INTRODUCTION

Coercion is not a kind of warfare in which destroying military capabilities preludes the coercer's imposition of their will on their target. Instead of warfare between professional militaries, the long-standing option to directly inflict violence on civilians involves the coercer making the targeted nation obey.[1] Therefore, the way targeted civilians, rather than professionals, view the coercer's threats is a critical factor in deciding whether the nation should accept what is being demanded of it. Civilian politics within the targeted nation would be an indispensable part of the coercion process.

On January 10, 2018, in proclaiming his mediatory role in U.S.–North Korea relations, President Moon Jae-in of the Republic of Korea (ROK, or South Korea) declared, "I will take a step forward along with the people in an effort to help create an everyday life that is peaceful and safe, and with no worry over war."[2] This statement was clearly a quick response to the New Year's address by Kim Jong-un, the Supreme Leader of North Korea and the Chairman of the Worker's Party of Korea Central Committee, which called for beginning North–South talks to avoid "the holocaust of a nuclear war"[3] following the

[1] Thomas Schelling, *Arms and Influence*, revised edition (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008), 21-23; Todd S. Sechser and Matthew Fuhrmann, *Nuclear Weapons and Coercive Diplomacy*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017), p. 28.

[2] Republic of Korea (ROK) Presidential Office, *Moon Jae-in Taedongryong Yonsor Mun Jip* [The Speeches of President Moon Jae-in], (Seoul: Office of Presidential Secretary, 2018), vol. 1, no. 2, p. 199; Republic of Korea Presidential Office, "Opening Remarks by President Moon Jae-in at the New Year Press Conference," January 10, 2018, http:// english1.president.go.kr/ BriefingSpeeches/Speeches/21 (accessed January 21, 2001).

[3] "Kim Jong Un Makes New Year Address," *Korea Central News Agency*, January 1, 2018.

series of nuclear and missile tests in the past two years. Although President Moon mentioned "war" instead of "*nuclear* war," the "concern over war," which legitimized President Moon's acceptance of North Korea's demand for a discussion, was due to a series of nuclear-related tests. Eventually, President Moon and President Donald Trump suspended the major military exercises of the U.S.–ROK alliance, such as Ulchi Freedom Guardian. In such nuclear diplomacy, North Korea achieved one goal.

This process should question the conventional argument that coercion depends on one's credibility of using force.[4] Nuclear capabilities were not a reliable aspect of North Korea's forces in warfare, as they are underdeveloped; thus, President Moon's "worry over war" was not based on the objective assessment of the likelihood of nuclear war. The arbitrary decision, which pertained to whether the fear of a nuclear crisis was a good enough reason to start negotiations, was in favor of the coercer.

Those who were directly targeted by the coercer were not military professionals who objectively evaluate such a reputation but rather civilians engaging in politics. From a political perspective, weakening the alliance improves autonomy,[5] which is an important source of a nation's legitimacy, especially considering its modern history of foreign interventions. This paper examines the incumbent ROK government's pursuit of autonomy in competing with conservatives who—as an important factor of obedience to the coercer—have played a leading role in sustaining the alliance.

POLITICAL RESPONSIBILITY IN NATIONAL SECURITY

While North Korea's nuclear capabilities could become more dangerous in the future, this does not mean the country could immediately use nuclear weapons against the U.S.–ROK alliance. Chairman Kim's remarks, which emphasized a possible "nuclear holocaust," exploited the subjective image of the country's abysmal nuclear power, which is clearly ill-prepared for warfare. Such underdeveloped nuclear facilities led President Moon to accept Kim Jong-un's demand to suspend the U.S.–ROK combined exercises.

The classical distinction of objective and political responsibilities is critical to

[4] Sechser and Fuhrmann, Nuclear Weapons and Coercive Diplomacy, pp. 45-46.
[5] James Morrow, "Arms versus allies: trade-offs in the search for security," *International Organization*, 47 (2), 1993, pp. 213-217.

understanding the factors that diminish the coercer's credibility. This distinction refers to the possibility that the targeted nation's leadership requires professional apparatuses to accept its subjective credibility evaluation for domestic political purposes.

Carl Friedrich separated governmental organs' objective, politically neutral responsibility of following predetermined rules or standards from the subjective duties of arbitrary selection, among possible alternatives.[6] This distinction became the basis for Samuel Huntington's concept of objective and subjective military control.[7] Subjective control implies that the national leadership controls its national security apparatuses for its subjective responsibility. Because subjective responsibility involves political power struggles for adopting alternatives,[8] subjective control reflects the leadership's attempt to use professional organs to sustain the competition among political powers. The political purpose of controlling the organs disagrees with objective control, in which leadership intends to let these apparatuses focus on fulfilling objective, nonpolitical duties.

Evaluating the credibility of using force is a professional duty of the military, or intelligence organizations, when managing outside threats. The usual coercion theory assumes that, without credible threats, the targeted nation has no reason to do something it does not want to do.[9]

Nevertheless, even if the coercer failed to objectively exhibit credibility, civilian political power could express their fear of nuclear war because not only is the civilian's responsibility subjective, but such subjective duty also includes political contests to win the constituency vis-à-vis other civilians. Nuclear fear could expand one side's constituency concerning the arbitrary selection of compromise or confrontation.[10] The

---

[6] Carl Friedrich, "Responsible Government Service under the American Constitution," Commission of Inquiry on Public Service Personnel, *Problems of the American Public Service: Five Monographs on Specific Aspects of Personnel Administration* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1935), pp. 36-37.
[7] Samuel Huntington, *The Soldier and the State: The Theory and Politics of Civil–Military Relations* (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1957), p. 479 n1. I learned from Yasushi Sukegawa, a senior research fellow at National Institute for Defense Studies in Tokyo that Huntington established his civilian control concept based on Carl Friedrich's administrative concept of subjective and objective responsibility.
[8] Friedrich, "Responsible Government Service under the American Constitution," 36; Huntington, *The Soldier and the State,* p. 80.
[9] Sechser and Fuhrmann, *Nuclear Weapons and Coercive Diplomacy,* pp.45-16; Robert Art and Kelly Greenhill, "Coercion: An Analytical Overview," Greenhill and Peter Krause ed., *Coercion: The Power to Hurt in International Politics*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2018), p. 4.
[10] Daniel Byman and Matthew Waxman, *The Dynamics of Coercion: American Foreign Policy and the Limits of Military Might*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), pp. 65-68.

targeted leadership's emphasis on peacefully eliminating "worry over war" leads to an effect that benefits the side that prefers conceding to the coercer. Coercion, which directly threatens civilians, commences through the political process among targeted civilians.[11] Incidentally, compliance to the coercer's demand to avoid alliances could be a rationale for civilian decision-makers because weakening alliances strengthens one's autonomy from the ally—an important source of political legitimacy. The security–autonomy trade-off[12] means that the coercer, by demanding to weaken alliances for peace, can provide a chance for targeted civilians to internalize the rationale to achieve the nation's autonomy, in competing with the opposition that preferred such alliances to reject coercion.

Advocating greater autonomy by reconciling with North Korea, President Moon attempted to enlarge his liberal constituency vis-à-vis conservatives sustaining the existing alliance. This approach was evident in his address for the commemoration of the March First Independence Movement, which resisted Japan's colonial rule in 1919, celebrating the nation's struggle for autonomy.

First, the president called for national unity to heal the social division created by past conservatives who tortured "reds," namely progressives, who were accused of siding with the communist North. National unity in this case virtually means minimizing the nation's conservatives who oppose President Moon. The following are citations from his address.[13]

- Wiping out the vestiges of pro-Japanese collaborators is a long-overdue undertaking. Only when we contemplate past wrongdoings can we move toward the future together.
- Hostility between the left and the right and ideological stigmas were tools used by Japanese imperialists to drive a wedge between us.

Even in the liberated homeland, those who used to serve as police officers during Japanese colonial rule painted independence activists as Reds and tortured them. Many people were

[11] Byman and Waxman, *The Dynamics of Coercion*, pp. 48-49.
[12] Morrow, "Arms versus allies."
[13] ROK Presidential Office, *Moon Jae-in Taedongryong Yonsor Mun Jip*, (Seoul: Office of Presidential Secretary, 2019), vol. 2 no. 2, pp. 258-263; Republic of Korea Presidential Office, "Address by President Moon Jae-in on 100th March First Independence Movement Day," March 1, 2019, http://english1.president.go.kr/BriefingSpeeches/Speeches/128 (accessed January 18, 2021).

labeled Reds and thus sacrificed. Their relatives and bereaved families had to live ill-fated lives under social stigmas. This address clearly defines "pro-Japanese collaborators" as those who sustained the ROK's previous anticommunist regimes. Their political power was largely succeeded by conservative groups opposing President Moon.

Second, the president linked the agenda of "wiping out the vestiges of pro-Japanese collaborators," who eventually became anticommunist conservatives, with the need for a reconciliatory policy toward North Korea.

- The 38th parallel drawn through our minds will disappear altogether once the ideological hostility that caused internal rifts are removed. When we discard feelings of aversion and hatred toward others, our internal liberation will be completed. Only then will a new century be able to begin in a genuine sense.
- The coming 100 years will differ from the past in quality. We will push ahead with a bold transition toward a new Korean Peninsula regime and prepare for unification. The new Korean Peninsula regime refers to the order of the coming century in which we will take on a leading role. Working together with the people and with North Korea as well, we will create a new order of peace and cooperation. The new Korean Peninsula regime is a new community of peace and cooperation that will end confrontations and conflicts.
- On the basis of the spirit of the March First Independence Movement and national unity, I will strive to foster this new Korean Peninsula regime.

These remarks imply that promoting reconciliation between the two Koreas, divided by the "38th parallel," denies the role of conservatives who have confronted North Korea. Third, following this notion, President Moon legitimized the initiative of establishing the "new Korean Peninsula regime" by proclaiming it as the basis for achieving greater autonomy. He said that the "regime refers to the order of the coming century in which we will take on a leading role." The so-called opportunity to realize autonomy cemented his policy to avoid a confrontation with conservatives.

President Moon's idea that compromising with North Korea would lead to the nation's greater autonomy echoed the stance of the coercer, Kim Jong-un, in initiating requests for talks to avoid Korean entrapment into the U.S. military strategy on January 1, 2018. Chairman Kim stressed the necessity to prevent "a nuclear war forced by the outside

forces," namely U.S. forces, as the reason for starting North–South discussions.[14] Should the U.S.–ROK alliance cause nuclear fear, the two-year-long nuclear missile crisis would confirm the rationale of denying the conservative preference of the alliance. Kim Jong-un gave President Moon the opportunity to achieve strong self-reliance, which people had long desired.

MOON'S POLITICAL CONFLICT WITH THE MILITARY

Prior to complying with North Korea's demand to suspend the U.S.–ROK joint military exercises, the Moon administration accepted China's directive to follow the "three noes" policy, under which South Korea would refrain from improving missile defense cooperation with the United States and Japan.[15] This policy states that the ROK would not join the U.S. missile defense system, develop the U.S.–Japan–ROK trilateral cooperation into a military alliance, or make additional deployments of its terminal high-altitude area defense (THAAD) system.

From a realist perspective, both moves seem consistent with the buck-passing of growing threats from North Korea to the United States and Japan. If two buck-catchers could manage stronger threats without South Korea's support, it would be the most cost-effective way for South Korea to leave such threats to the two nations. Nevertheless, neither the United States nor Japan can become the buck-catcher for South Korea. If South Korea wants to buck-pass some burdens, reflected in the joint exercises within its territory, to the United States, the U.S. ally has to invite more U.S. troops to replace the roles of the ROK military, which is not the case. With respect to the "three noes" policy, Japan cannot replace missile defense capabilities within the ROK territory. Furthermore, the United States can hardly bring missile defense assets to replace South Korean roles because, under the "three noes" policy, South Korea would have to refrain from additional deployments of its core assets such as the THAAD system. Thus, the rationality of the external security policy cannot explain South Korea's reluctance toward the United States

[14] "Kim Jong Un Makes New Year Address," *Korea Central News Agency*, January 1, 2018.
[15] ROK National Assembly, *Foreign Affairs and Unification Committee Record*, 2017 audit session, October 30, 2017, pp. 6-7; PRC Foreign Ministry, "Foreign Ministry Spokesperson Hua Chunying's Regular Press Conference," October 31, 2017; PRC Foreign Ministry, "Zhong Han Shuangfang Jiu Zhong Han Guanxi Deng Jinxing Goutong [China and South Korea Improves Communication on China-South Korea Relations]," October 31, 2017; ROK FM, Hanchung Kwanke Keson Kwanryon Yangkookkan Hyopui Kyorkwa [The Conclusion of the Talks Regarding Improvement of ROK-China Relations]," October 31, 2017.

and the trilateral security cooperation.

Instead, the Moon administration's policy, which resulted in compliance with demands to avoid the alliance, involved domestic contests with conservatives. The military, a major professional apparatus that assumed direct responsibility to manage North Korea, was one of the conservative political powers inclined to confront the coercer. The Moon administration's political control of the conservative military was seen in the Panmunjom Declaration on April 27, 2018, in which the president expressed agreement with Chairman Kim.

The joint declaration stated, "South and North Korea agreed to devise a practical scheme to turn the areas around the Northern Limit Line in the West Sea into a maritime peace zone in order to prevent accidental military clashes and guarantee safe fishing activities." The "maritime peace zone" and a fishery zone in the "West Sea"—the Yellow Sea off the Korean Peninsula's west coast, where the two Korean navies clashed until recent years—intend to effectively eliminate the North–South division in the sea. It was highly likely that the maritime zones, agreed upon by President Moon, would deny the long-standing policy of his nation's military to prevent North Korean forces from crossing the Northern Limited Line (NLL) in the sea.

Protecting the NLL as the maritime border was an arbitrary decision by the ROK military (i.e., political position). Although the United Nations Command drew the NLL to prevent the U.S.–ROK side from going north beyond the line, the ROK armed forces conversely defined the NLL as the maritime border against the North's attempt to go south.[16] While the U.S. Defense Secretary has urged "the North to accept the practical value of, and abide by, the Northern Limited Line"—along with the ROK Defense Minister—since 2011,[17] U.S. support has been about the "practical value," which falls short of supporting the legal basis of the NLL. If the South Korean government seeks a North Korean policy denying the military's political stance, it faces conflict with the military as a power seeking the

[16] Narushige Michishita, *North Korea's Military-Diplomatic Campaigns, 1966-2008*, (London: Routledge, 2009) pp. 52-64.

[17] Joint Communiqué, The 43rd U.S.-ROK Security Consultative Meeting, October 28, 2011, sec. 5; Joint Communiqué, The 44th U.S.-ROK Security Consultative Meeting, October 24, 2012, sec. 5; Joint Communiqué, The 45th ROK-U.S. Security Consultative Meeting, October 2, 2013, sec. 5; Joint Communiqué, The 46th ROK-U.S. Security Consultative Meeting, October 23, 2014, sec. 5; 47th ROK-U.S. Joint Communiqué, November 1, 2015, sec. 5; Joint Communiqué of the 48th U.S.-ROK Security Consultative Meeting, October 20, 2016; Joint Communiqué of the 49th ROK-U.S. Security Consultative Meeting, October 28, 2017, sec. 4.

conservative political goal of protecting the maritime area south of the NLL.

The ROK Defense Ministry has been aware that the maritime peace zone and a pilot joint fishing zone, which first appeared in the official North–South agreement at the second summit meeting of 2007 under the progressive Roh Moo-hyun administration (2003–2008), reflected North Korea's strategy to eliminate the NLL. The critical condition for the ROK military's acceptance of the establishment of these zones was that the zones follow the "principle of containing the same area on the both sides" of the NLL.[18] This principle, which sustained the NLL as the baseline of the peace zone, was required for the ROK military to prevent North Korea's attempt to use the zones to dismiss the line. Under President Roh, the ROK Ministry repeatedly advocated this principle after the summit meeting joint declaration ended when North Korea's confrontational attitude returned and the definition of the maritime peace zone failed.[19]

President Moon, as a high-ranking official of the Roh administration who witnessed North Korea's unyielding stand to deny the legitimacy of the NLL, was probably conscious about entering into a political collusion with the military when he, once again, agreed to establish the maritime peace zone at the Panmunjom Declaration of the third inter-Korean summit. Despite North Korea's rejection of the principle for sustaining the NLL, the Moon administration pushed its Defense Ministry to make the military accord to define the zone of easing maritime tension with their North counterparts. As a result, the implementation agreement for the August 2018 Panmunjom Declaration between the two militaries did not use the NLL as the baseline for drawing the zone in the Yellow Sea, where both sides were required to take measures to stop confrontation, including ceasing

[18] ROK Ministry of National Defense, "Panmunjom Sonon Ihengur Uihan Gunsabunya Hapuiso Hesor Jyaryo [The Explanatory Document on the Agreement on the Implementation of the Historic Panmunjom Declaration in the Military Domain]," September 19, 2018, p. 17.

[19] Hideya Kurata, "'2.13goui' go no Heiwataisei Jyuritu Mondai: Kitachousen no Ninshiki ni Okeru Toujisharon to Tetuduki ron (The Peace Regime Question after the '2.13 agreement': The Theories of Defining Parties and Procedures in North Korea's Understanding)," the Japan Institute of International Affairs, *Kitachousen Taisei eno Jyuusouteki Apurouchi: Seiji, Keizai, Gaikou, Shakai* (Layered Approach to Understanding the North Korean Regime: Politics, Economy, Foreign Policy and Society), (Tokyo: The Japan Institute of International Affairs, 2011), pp. 22-23, 27-29; National Institute for Defense Studies, *East Asian Strategic Review 2019* (Tokyo: National Institute for Defense Studies, 2019), pp. 84-86; Takeshi Watanabe, "Moon jein Seiken no Taigaikankei ni Okeru Seigun Kankei Youin [The Factor of Civilian-Military Relations behind the Moon Jae-in Administration's External Policy]," Japan Institute of International Affairs, *"Fukakujitu Seino Jidai" no Chousen Hantou to Nihon no Anzen Hoshou* [The Korean Peninsula and Japan's Security in an "Uncertain Era"], (Tokyo: Japan Institute for International Affairs, 2019).

"all live-fire and maritime maneuver exercises" or installing "covers on the barrels of coastal artilleries and ship guns."[20] The ROK Defense Minister, admitting that the military failed to define the area to confirm the NLL's legitimacy, explained that the agreed maritime area should be regarded as a threat-reduction zone rather than an area inclusive of equal-size zones north and south of the NLL.[21] Unless required by South Korea's Presidential Office, it was highly unlikely that the ROK military accepted such an accord.

While the ROK military repeatedly referred to the area of easing maritime tension as the "buffer zone,"[22] neither North Korea nor South Korea's Presidential Office adopted the term. The only exception was its mention in one page of the Moon administration's official website for the North–South summit meetings, immediately after the implementation agreement, which may have been drafted by the Defense Ministry.[23] Indeed, and strangely, the agreement separated the section to define the area for reducing North–South tensions from the portion describing the "maritime peace zone," which was originally supposed to be established for the same purpose. The ROK military's naming of the "buffer zone," which clearly distinguished the area from the "maritime peace zone," strongly suggested that South Korea's military was the actor demanding the separation. By separating these sections, the military might have narrowly prevented the progressive-leaning "maritime peace zone" from becoming an agreed concept that the two Koreas' top leaders can use to directly deny the NLL. The implementation agreement in the military domain, which defined the area of easing maritime tension, left the "maritime peace zone" undefined.

[20] The Agreement on the Implementation of the Historic Panmunjom Declaration in the Military Domain, art. 1, sec. 2.
[21] ROK National Assembly Office, Records of the National Assembly Plenary Session, 364th National Assembly Session (Minutes of Regular and Extraordinary Sessions), October 1, 2018, 60; National Institute for Defense Studies, *East Asian Strategic Review 2019*, (Tokyo: National Institute for Defense Studies), pp. 84-85.
[22] ROK National Assembly Office, Records of the National Assembly Plenary Session, 364th National Assembly Session (Minutes of Regular and Extraordinary Sessions), October 1, 2018, 60; ROK Ministry of National Defense, "Panmunjom Sonon Ihengur Uihan Gunsabunya Hapuiso Hesor Jyaryo," p. 8.
[23] ROK Inter-Korean Summit Preparation Committee, "Nampuk Irche e Jokdae Hengui Jonmyon Chungji Koro [South and North Korea Agreed to Terminate All Aggressions]," August 19, 2018, http://koreasummit.kr/Newsroom/News/316 (accessed January 28, 2021).

SHOWING CAPABILITY STRENGTHENS POLITICAL POWER

The direct clashes between the North and South Korean militaries had been centered on the NLL in the Yellow Sea since the 1990s because of the reinforcement of the U.S.–ROK combined forces on the ground near the Military Demarcation Line.[24] The NLL, which North Korea had frequently challenged with force, became a symbol for South Korea's conservatives to confront such a strategy. Without improving its political power against the conservatives, the progressive government would find it difficult to press the military to accept the "buffer" zone, which virtually dismissed the NLL.

The progressives' achievement against the confrontation-inclined conservatives followed Kim Jong-un's call for peace talks in January 2018. This move by North Korea allowed the president to claim the responsibility of promoting self-reliance from the United States and depending on peaceful relations with North Korea. Even though Koreans have a long-cherished desire to achieve autonomy from other powers, such as the United States or Japan, the only alternatives are the government's assumed abilities. Thus, such abilities are a critical driving force for political competition in selecting options.[25] Those who attempt to improve their competitive edge in political contests will focus on convincing people that they can do what they claim by taking control of the government. The North Korean leader's call for an inter-Korean cooperation to prevent "a nuclear war forced by the outside forces" was a necessary condition for President Moon to convince the people that his political agenda for autonomy deserved their support.

President Moon was conscious that the people's confidence in his agenda is critical for improving his progressive power. In the address preluding South Korea's decision to end the Japan–ROK General Security of Military Information Agreement (GSOMIA), which was required to secure backup forces for U.S.–ROK combined operations from the U.S.–Japan alliance, President Moon urged people to unite under his reconciliatory policy, following his remark hoping that skeptics of the government's promotion of talks with North Korea "face up to the reality" when the discussions continue.[26]

---

[24] Narushige Michishita, *North Korea's Military-Diplomatic Campaigns*, pp. 193-194.
[25] Elmer Eric Schattschneider, *The Semi-Sovereign People: A Realist's View of Democracy in America,* (Boston: Wadsworth, 1975), p. 12.
[26] ROK Presidential Office, "Address by President Moon Jae-in on Korea's 74th Liberation Day," August 15, 2019, http://english1.president.go.kr/BriefingSpeeches/Speeches/638 (accessed January 18, 2021).

President Moon showed further self-reliance by terminating the GSOMIA, and the stance in his address soon became similar to that of the Roh administration, with regard to the U.S.–ROK alliance's role in great power politics. In 2003, after the United States proposed "strategic flexibility," which would allow U.S. Forces Korea (USFK) to operate beyond the peninsula,[27] a presidential committee of Roh Moo-hyun published the regional security initiative for the nation to serve as a "bridge" for maritime and land powers, citing the potential contests between the United States and China.[28] By advocating to act as a "bridge," the Roh administration had the ability to keep the nation from forming an alliance with the United States in its conflict with China. Later, President Roh called for an initiative to define South Korea as the region's "balancer," stressing that he would never dismiss people's concerns over the nation's entrapment into the USFK's strategic flexibility.[29] Similarly, President Moon's address, shortly before ending the GSOMIA, highlighted the nation's ability to be self-reliant by introducing the idea of being "a bridge" among great powers.[30]

The president's address officially celebrated the day of the nation's liberation from Japan's colonial rule, condemning what he called "Japan's unwarranted export restrictions." Nevertheless, his consistency with the past administration's policy of legitimizing neutrality in regional security strongly suggested that he used his dispute with Japan to encourage the progressive power to seek self-reliance from the region's U.S.-led security architecture. The president took the responsibility of achieving autonomy by stressing that Koreans can now build "a nation that cannot be shaken," a long sought-after dream since the end of Japanese rule. The "bridge" initiative was one of the objectives for creating a self-reliant nation.[31]

To prove its claim of being capable of achieving the people's long-cherished self-reliance, leadership was required to show that the military seriously followed this agenda. The

[27] ROK Ministry of Foreign Affairs and National Security Committee, "Chonryakchok Yuyonsong Gwanryon Sormyong Jyaryo [Explanatory Document on Strategic Flexibility]" January 22, 2006.
[28] ROK Presidential Committee on Northeast Asian Business Hub, "Pyonghwa wa Ponyong e Dongpuka Sidea Kusang: Bijyon gwa Chonryak [The Initiative on the Northeast Asian Era of Peace and Prosperity: Vision and Strategy]," August 13, 2004, p. 7, 9.
[29] ROK President Roh Moo-hyun, speaking for the 53rd Commencement and Commissioning Ceremony of the Korea Air Force Academy, on March 8, 2005, ROK Presidential Office, *Roh Moo-hyun Taedongryong Yonsor Mun Jip* [The Speeches of President Roh Moo-hyun], (Seoul: Office of Presidential Secretary, 2006) vol. 3, 80.
[30] ROK Presidential Office, "Address by President Moon Jae-in on Korea's 74th Liberation Day."
[31] Ibid.

Moon administration's objectives on "uncertain threats" or "potential threats," referring to future threats other than North Korea,[32] were installed into the military's strategic documents during its continuous talks with North Korea in 2018. According to President Moon's statement regarding "defense reform," the ROK military had to "manage the current threats from North Korea and, at the same time, the armed forces is required to prepare the diversity of uncertain threats" by reforming its military posture, which depends on "quantity."[33] The large scale of the army has been vital in the military's central role in ground operations in the U.S.–ROK combined forces against North Korea, which also depended on massive land power. By demanding that the military transform away from a confrontational posture against North Korea, President Moon prioritized future threats aside from North Korea.

The Defense Ministry, under all three administrations—Kim Dae-jung (1998–2003), Roh Moo-hyun, and Moon Jae-in, who held summit meetings with North Korea—underlined "uncertain threats" or "potential threats"[34] while the conservative Lee Myung-bak (2008–2013) and Park Geun-hye administrations (2013–2017) did not prioritize such an objective in their own version of defense reform.[35] *The ROK Defense Budget for the*

[32] ROK President Moon Jae-in, speaking for the Annual Meeting of Major ROK Military Commanders 2018, on July 27, 2018, ROK Presidential Office, *Moon Jae-in Taedongryong Yonsor Mun Jip* [The Speeches of President Moon Jae-in], (Seoul: Office of Presidential Secretary, 2019), vol. 2, no. 1, p. 209, 211; ROK Ministry of National Defense, "Kookmin gwa Hamke Pyonghwa rur Mandunun Kanghan Kookbang [National Defense for Making Peace with Citizens]," Report for the President, December 20, 2018, p. 6; ROK Ministry of National Defense, "21seki Sonjin Jyonge Kookbangnur Uihan Kookbang Kaehyok 2020 an [Defense Reform 2020 Plan for Advanced and Edgy National Defense in 21st Century]," August 13, 2005, p. 5; ROK Ministry of National Defense, *Mire rur Tebihanun Hankook e Kookbangpi 2001* [The ROK Defense Budget for the Future 2001], (Seoul: Ministry of National Defense, 2001), p. 22.

[33] ROK President Moon Jae-in, speaking for the Annual Meeting of Major ROK Military Commanders 2018, on July 27, 2018, *Moon Jae-in Taedongryong Yonsor Mun Jip*, vol. 2, no.1, p. 211; My following article previously argued the relations between "uncertain threats" and the political intention of liberal governments to politically compete with the army which has played the central role in managing North Korean threats. Takeshi Watanabe, "Moon jein Seiken no Taigaikankei ni Okeru Seigun Kankei Youin."

[34] ROK Ministry of National Defense, "21seki Sonjin Jyonge Kookbangnur Uihan Kookbang Kaehyok 2020 an," p. 5; ROK Ministry of National Defense, "Kookmin gwa Hamke Pyonghwa rur Mandunun Kanghan Kookbang, p. 6; ROK Presidential Office, "2018 Jongun Jyuyo Jiuigwan Hweui Modoo Baron."

[35] ROK Ministry of National Defense, "Kookbang Keahyok Kibon Kaehwek (2014-2030) [Basic Plan for Defense Reform, 2014-2030]," March 3, 2014, pp. 3-5; "'Kookbang Keahyok Sinsokhi Kaehwekdero Heya,' Puk Dopar Tebi Uri Gun Dundun, Kanghan Yajyonkun Pyonmo Kungjyong Pyongka, Lee Myung-bak Taedongryong Jyuyo Jiuigwan Kyokryo Ochan [President Lee Myung-bak Said "We Need to Promote the Defense Reform Swiftly as Planned," Praising Our Military's Increasing Strength against North Korea's Local Provocations]," *Kookbang Ilbo,* May 9, 2011.

Future in 2001, a year after the first North–South summit by President Kim Dae-jung, showed statistics that clearly indicated the expectation of declining North Korean threats and increasing uncertain threats without an objective basis. According to the document, the future could see local conflicts with surrounding nations other than North Korea.[36] This was a clear contrast to the defense reform under the Lee government, which noted that the military had to assign high priority to existing threats, namely North Korea, rather than potential threats in a deterrence posture.[37]

The Moon government's direction for the military, shifting its focus away from the U.S.–ROK combined operations, likely resulted in a confrontation with another regional U.S. ally, Japan, instead of China, which competes with the United States. On December 21, 2018, Japan's Defense Ministry published that an ROK naval vessel directed its fire-control radar at a Japanese P-1 patrol aircraft.[38] In response, the ROK Defense Ministry demanded that Japan present absolute proof, insisting that another Japanese patrol aircraft, a P-3C, adopted a "dangerous" maneuver on the ROK naval ship.[39] Concerning this issue, the ROK Defense Minister stated "there are shortfalls in the standard measures to prevent accidental crash with other forces."[40] This statement was similar to a part of the Defense Ministry's annual report to President Moon, which explained the necessity to prepare for "potential threats." The annual report said, regarding "potential threats," that "the ROK military will actively respond" to surrounding nations, in the sea and air, while "considering to establish the measures to prevent accidental clash" with them.[41]

Even though it is unclear who decided to direct the radar to the Japanese P-1 aircraft, in the dispute following the incident, the Moon administration used the Defense Ministry to

---

[36] ROK Ministry of National Defense, *Mire rur Tebihanun Hankook e Kookbangpi 2001*, p. 22.
[37] ROK Ministry of National Defense, "Kookbang Keahyok 307 Kaehwek Buriping [Briefing on Defense Reform 307 Plan]," March 8, 2011.
[38] Japan Ministry of Defense, "Regarding the incident of an ROK naval vessel directing its fire-control radar at an MSDF patrol aircraft," December 21, 2018, https://www.mod.go.jp/e/d_act/radar/2018/12/22a.html (accessed February 05, 2021) Japan Ministry of Defense, "MOD's final statement regarding the incident of an ROK naval vessel directing its fire-control radar at an MSDF patrol aircraft," January 21, 2019, https://warp.da.ndl.go.jp/info:ndljp/pid/11591426/www.mod.go.jp/e/d_act/radar/pdf/final_01.pdf (accessed February 05, 2021) Japan Ministry of Defense, "Reference Materials," January 21. 2019, https://warp.da.ndl.go.jp/info:ndljp/pid/11591426/www.mod.go.jp/e/d_act/radar/pdf/final_03.pdf (accessed February 05, 2021).
[39] "Il Chokaeki Kunchop Uihyoppiheng Myonbekhan Dobar [Dangerous Maneuver of a Japan's Patrol Aircraft Represent its Clear Provocation]," *Kookbang ilbo*, January 24, 2019.
[40] Ibid.
[41] ROK Ministry of National Defense, "Kookmin gwa Hamke Pyonghwa rur Mandunun Kanghan Kookbang," p. 6.

prove the government's ability to stand strongly against another U.S. ally in the region—Japan. While the defense reform included policies to secure "political neutrality," such as dismantling the Defense Security Command, which had been accused of actions against progressives,[42] the military might be controlled for contributing to the progressive power instead of political neutrality.

After beginning inter-Korean talks, as North Korea demanded, the Moon administration adopted policies such as the suspension of the U.S.–ROK joint military exercises, entered a dispute with Japan's defense forces which share the alliance, and ended the GESOMIA with Japan, which was necessary to sustain the region's U.S. operations. The ROK government consistently claimed that it was capable of achieving stronger autonomy from the alliance by controlling its military's stance on the United States and Japan

CONCLUSION

Since coercion is a strategy to directly influence civilians, who are political actors, the targeted nation's decision-making when responding to such coercion involves political objectives for civilians. If the coercer's objective was to decouple the alliance, the strategy would become more effective when the targeted leadership preferred autonomy to alliance for improving legitimacy. Kim Jong-un provided both the U.S. and ROK presidents a chance to claim their capability of avoiding an alliance. President Moon's emphasis on the necessity to eliminate "worry over war" echoed President Trump's remarks regarding legitimizing his policy preference away from a stronger alliance, stating, "If I had not been elected president of the United States, we would right now, in my opinion, be in a major war with North Korea with potentially millions of people killed."[43] Without the credibility of using nuclear force, North Korea's nuclear coercion worked for the two targeted leaderships, which seek autonomy, a political interest that is consistent with its demands.

---

[42] ROK Presidential Office, "Kimusa Kaejhyok Kwanryon Moon Jae-in Taedongryong Jsisahang Parpyo [Announcement of President Moon' Jae-in's Directions regarding the Reform of Defense Security Command]," August 3, 2018, https://www1.president.go.kr/articles/3973; ROK Ministry of Defense, "Gun Jyongchijyok Jungrip Jinjyonghan Gunin Yuksong e Kiban [The Military's Political Neutrality is a Basis for Raising True Military Professionals]," August 2, 2018; ROK President Moon Jae-in, speaking for the Annual Meeting of Major ROK Military Commanders 2018, on July 27, 2018, *Moon Jae-in Taedongryong Yonsor Mun Jip*, vol.2, no.1, p. 212.

[43] US Whitehouse, "Remarks by President Trump in State of the Union Address," February 5, 2019, https://trumpwhitehouse.archives.gov/briefings-statements/remarks-president-trump-state-union-address-2 (accessed February 5, 2021).

CONTRIBUTORS

Frank A. Rose
Senior fellow and Co-director, Center for Security, Strategy, and Technology in the Foreign Policy Program, The Brookings Institution, former Assistant Secretary of State for Arms Control, Verification, and Compliance.

Hirofumi Tosaki
Senior Research fellow, Center for Disarmament, Science and Technology, The Japan Institute of International Affairs.

John Rydqvist
Deputy Research Director, FOI.

Naomi Koizumi
Former Associate Professor, Department of International Relations, NDA.

Masahiro Kurita
Research Fellow, Regional Studies Department, National Institute for Defense Studies.

Johan Englund
Analyst, Asia and Middle East Program, FOI.

Hideya Kurata
Professor/Director, Department of International Relations, Center for Global Security, NDA.

Jerker Hellström
Director, Swedish Center for China Studies, former Deputy Research Director, FOI.

Takeshi Watanabe
Senior Research fellow, Regional Studies Department, National Institute for Defense Studies.

GLOBAL SECURITY SEMINAR SERIES

Global Security Seminar Series is published occasionally by the Center for Global Security. The Center designs series of international seminars and other independent seminars. This series consists of the working papers of these seminars. The views expressed in this publication are solely of the authors, and do not necessarily represent those of the institutions or governments of the authors.

CENTER FOR GLOBAL SECURITY
National Defense Academy, Japan Ministry of Defense