www.irbas.academyirmbr.com
International Review of Basic and Applied Sciences
October 2021
Vol. 9 Issue.4

US Rebalancing Policy & Rise of China

FAIZA BASHIR
Assistant Professor at the Department of Political Science,
Islamia College, University Peshawar, Pakistan.
Email: faiza@icp.edu.pk

TABASSUM MAJEED
Lecturer at the Department of Political Science,
Islamia College, University Peshawar, Pakistan.
Email: tabassumajeed@icp.edu.pk

Abstract

This paper excavates the US Asia-Pacific policy considering the realist theories. It contends and validates that transition in international politics is bringing change in power distribution among states. Hence, bringing tangible shift in the US foreign policy. The US is now more focused in containing Chinese influence in the Asia-Pacific for which the US is seeking cooperation of regional states. This paper examines the strategic shift in the US policy and her new strategy of forming alliances with regional states; its increasing military presence in the region and improving relations with the regional powers in the changing security, economic and diplomatic regional scenario. To counter the US restraining strategy, China employed the policy of 'economic diplomacy' for which it has started number of economic corridors under 'One Belt One Road.'

Keywords: *Realist Theories, Rebalancing Policy, Asia-Pacific, Containment.*

Introduction

In the second half of 2011, the US President paid an official visit to Australia where he articulated a strategic shift in the US policy towards Asia-Pacific, the policy that was colloquially designated as 'the Pivot to Asia' latter on renamed as 'Rebalancing.' The title of the policy was transformed since the word 'Pivot' reflects impermanency. 'Rebalance' reflects US retrenchment in Middle-East, Europe and other part, and paying more focus on Asia-Pacific. Early in the same year, Pentagon published 'Strategic Guidance' paper that inscribed Asia-Pacific and Persian Gulf as the US two strategic urgencies. The US President explained rationale behind the policy as 'Here we see the future.'[1] This strategic shift in the US policy raised the eyebrows of many of the European allies. The US policy of 'Pivot to Asia' raised the question of the European relevance to Pacific region. The policy not only catches the eyes of many but also triggered a reconsideration and reconstitution of European strategic policies towards Asia-Pacific.

American's vision explained to Asian allies was that the US involvement in Asia-Pacific rests on the desire of peace, stability and economic prosperity of the entire region. Republican and Democratic parties with the support of Congress kept its links intact with Asia-Pacific by means of alliances, trade and immigration. Some have erroneously designated 'Pivot' as the US returns to Asia, but the truth is the US had never

[1] "Remarks By President Obama to the Australian Parliament," The White House (Office of the Press Secretary), November 17, 2011, https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2011/11/17/remarks-president-obama-australian-parliament.

departed. Nevertheless, at present, the United States is more determined and has deep engrossment in the region.

The US being a key regional player with mammoth military, diplomatic and economic power dreads that rising powers like China may threaten its regional hegemony. This is the reason why US is pursuing the policy of containment of Chinese influence, justifying its Asian pivot.

This paper tries to develop understanding about the US 'Rebalancing' policy and tries to explore the cause that brought tangible shift in US foreign policy. It argues that Chinese growing economic and military strength and increasing influence in the region poses a serious challenge to the US hegemonic status. The paper also tries to explore the strategy devised by China to counter 'Rebalancing' policy. To realize these objectives, the paper is divided into six parts. The first section is an introductory part. In the second section the paper tries to explain 'Rebalancing' policy considering the Realist theories. The third section explicates the objectives of the policy while fourth section is about the Chinese rejoinder to the US strategic shift. The last section concludes the whole debate.

Realist Theories and US Pivot

The US 'Rebalancing' policy seems to be illustrating the classical realist propositions of security dilemma, since the realist theory has strong impacts on reality. Realism being a dominant paradigm of international relations theory, underscores the inevitable strength of existing forces and emphasizes that being a rational actor states should accept and adapt herself to these forces.[2] It comprises four propositions, in the first-place global politics lacks hierarchical political rule. States survives in anarchy and pursue a policy of self-help to ensure their security.[3] Secondly, states are the primary actors and the main concern of international discourses as it affects and get affected by world politics.[4] However, the primary focus of realism is great powers as they control and architect global politics and can be a cause of lethal wars. Thirdly, on the stage of international politics the states promote their national interest and try to secure maximum resources. The prime objective of every state is its survival for which they try to increase their relative strength, consequently, leading to security dilemma.

However, Neo-Realists also known as Structural Realists pays more focus on the structure of international system unlike the Classical Realists focusing more on human nature. To structural realist it is structure of international system that is more important than the strategies of states, and it is the structure of international system that determines the state behavior.[5]

To the structural realists bi-polar system is steadier in comparison to multi-polar system as in bi-polar system there are fair chances of internal balancing since alliance with other great power is out of question [6], thus lessening the instances of war between two great powers.

To structural realists the structure of international system forces the states to seek security. However, structural realists are divided on the question that whether the security seeking states merely want to

[2] Carr, Edward Hallett, and Michael Cox, *The Twenty Years' Crisis, 1919-1939: An Introduction to the Study of International Relations.* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2001).
[3] Kenneth N. Waltz, *Theory of International Politics* (Reading, Mass: Addison-Wesley, 1979).
[4] John J. Mearsheimer, *Structural Realism." In International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity.* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013).
[5] Joseph K. Clifton, "Disputed Theory and Security Policy: Responding to the "Rise of China," 2011, http://www.bing.com/cr?IG=335B7285A51A413A918F3D7F20F60654&CID=3BE8C912CE6D607B1191C3BBCF6B6109&rd=1&h=NAxMQknQZf9CGvM6WjiszyHXWSyJ3djnezA3377RTEY&v=1&r=http%3a%2f%2fscholarship.claremont.edu%2fcgi%2fviewcontent.cgi%3farticle%3d1164%26context%3dcmc_theses&p=DevEx,5050.1.
[6] Kenneth N. Waltz, *Theory of International Politics*.

survive or want to secure maximum relative power. Defensive realists signify the thoughts of Kenneth Waltz while the Offensive realists signify the thoughts of John Mearsheimer.[7]

The defensive realists are of the view that it is inappropriate for any state to pursue hegemony. In their view states should not seek power rather they should pursue what in Kenneth Waltz's words is 'appropriate amount of power.'[8] Defensive realists argued that if a state pursue hegemony balancing takes place. Precisely, the other powerful state might form military alliances against the aiming hegemon leaving her less secure.[9]

Offensive realists like defensive realists too believe that it is the structure of the international system that forces the state to acquire power but they draw different conclusion, to them state ultimate objective is to pursue hegemony.[10]

To sum up, the offensive and defensive realists diverge on the question of amount of power a state should acquire. To offensive realist state should maximize power while defensive realist argues that offense-defense balance can help a state to acquire security.

The present US approach towards Asia-Pacific seems to be the continuation of Cold War policy as US is forming alliances with the Asia-Pacific states to contain rising influence of China. US endeavor to involve India in Afghanistan, and encouraging its regional allies to 'bandwagon' is the practice of realist theory. The issue that divides the structural realist reflected on the debate of amount of power a state should acquire? To defensive realists like Kenneth Waltz, states should not maximize their part of world power, else it would be reckless for their survival.

Offensive realists like John Mearsheimer believe that states should maximize their power and if conditions are favorable, and pursue hegemony.[11] As far as US pivot is concerned it can be seen through the lens of offensive and defensive realism, because Stephen Walt, a defensive realist sees the power relocation in the region as he holds that China and US can synchronize unperturbed by means of balancing, nevertheless, the chances of their face-off remain high. However, to offensive realist like Mearsheimer, both the powers pursue hegemony in the Asia-Pacific that may culminates into a conflict.

To Walt, if the same pattern of power struggle continues between US and China, the interest of China will augment with the amplification of its power and it will contract its muscles to protect and proliferate its influence. To him China cognizant of its dependence on the imported raw material and export of finished goods, will try to make a point that no state will abnegate their access to the raw material and market on which growth of China rests. Consequently, China will find itself in a position to challenge the position of US in Asia. Simultaneously, China will make efforts to marginalize US role in the region. All these efforts no doubt will increase security risks.[12]

[7] Stephen Van Evera, *Causes of War: Power and the Roots of Conflict.* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1999); Kenneth N. Waltz, *Man, the State and War: A Theoretical Analysis* (New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 2001).
[8] John H. Herz, ""Idealist Internationalism and the Security Dilemma," *World Politics* 02, no. 02 (1950): 157–80.
[9] Kenneth N. Waltz, "The Origin of War in Neorealist Theory," in *The Origin and Prevention of Major Wars* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989).
[10] John J. Mearsheimer, *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics* (New York: W. W. Norton, 2014).
[11] John J. Mearsheimer, *Structural Realism." In International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity.*
[12] Michael Richardson, "China's Thirst for Oil and Gas," The Sydney Morning Herald, June 17, 2012, https://www.smh.com.au/politics/federal/chinas-thirst-for-oil-and-gas-20120617-20hwj.html.

Understanding Pivot to Asia

The term 'Pivot to Asia' refer to procedure where a global entity pays more focus and apportions more resources to Asia, diversify links with Asian states and develop more consistent policy for Asia.[13]

The former US Secretary of State Hillary Clinton in 2011 in an article of Journal of Foreign Policy illustrated the bases for what would to be known as the US 'Pivot to Asia' later on designated as 'Rebalancing' policy. She held that such reconfiguration was need of the time, and a crucial task before US policy planners in the approaching years will be based on amplified security, diplomatic, economic links with Asia-Pacific states.[14] As the realist assumptions contends that there is anarchy in this world and in the absence of restraining authority the state adopt the policy of self-help and for its survival and to ensure its security enters into alliance with other states. In the same manner, the 'rebalancing' policy is being based on developing relations with the states like Japan, South Korea and Australia, while ameliorating relation with the states like Vietnam, and Singapore. The installation of the US military resources topped the list of priorities.[15]

This policy demands US diplomatic, economic and security involvement in the entire region. The policy intended to reassure the US allies and other states that United States is not busted after a long tiring war in Afghanistan and is not going to keep herself aloof of the Asia-Pacific affairs. This time the US has adopted a policy of containment of Chinese influence in the region. The 'Rebalancing' policy is thus multidimensional and broader in nature. Following are the three constituent of 'Rebalancing' policy.
Security Aspect: transformation in the US defense strategy signifies relevance of security factor for sustaining global hegemony. Realizing this fact, the US has shifted her military presence from other regions to the Asia-Pacific. Therefore, we can see installation of US military sources in Australia, Philippine and other parts of the region.

Financial Aspect: economic diplomacy is another aspect of 'Rebalancing' policy. In order to realize its goals, the idea of Trans Pacific Partnership (TPP) has been put forwarded that comprise eleven regional states minus China. Additionally, the size of aid to the states of Pacific region has also been increased.

Diplomatic Aspect: the "Rebalancing' policy has also witnessed the US high level official involvement in Asia-Pacific by using diplomatic channels. The intent behind extensive US engagement is reinforcement of strategic partnership, involvement in multilateral institutions, monitoring antagonism with China and development of confidence among the regional states to develop cooperation.[16]

Objectives of Rebalancing Policy

United States made hard efforts to emphasize that 'Pivot to Asia' is not pursued with the spirit of alignment policy but China seems not be convinced by US claim rather they viewed this policy as the continuation of containment policy pursued by the US in the late 1940s to contain the creeping influence of former Soviet Union.[17] The important constituents of the 'Rebalancing' policy are military, diplomacy and economy and Obama administration has developed the policy for achieving certain objectives. In first place it was widely sensed in United States that Asia has become less secure and the US Asian allies like Japan and Southeast

[13] Gideon Rachman, "Obama's Asia Policy Is Distracted and Ambiguous," *Financial Times*, April 21, 2014, https://www.ft.com/content/bfe9c506-c4c7-11e3-8dd4-00144feabdc0.
[14] Hillary. Clinton, "America's Pacific Century.," Foreign Policy, October 11, 2011, http://foreignpolicy.com/2011/10/11/americas-pacific-century/.
[15] "Secretary of Defense Speech (Press Operations)," United States Department of Defense, January 24, 2013, http://archive.defense.gov/speeches/speech.aspx?speechid=1746.
[16] Robert G. Sutter, Michael E. Brown, and Timothy J. A. Adamson, "Balancing Acts: The U.S. Rebalance and Asia-Pacific Stability," August 2013, https://www2.gwu.edu/~sigur/assets/docs/BalancingActs_Compiled1.pdf.
[17] George F. Kennan, "The Sources of Soviet Conduct," *Foreign Affairs* 25, no. 04 (1947): 852.

Asia were calling for greater American presence for restoring peace and security of the region. For more than a decade, a common perception developed in East Asian states that United Stated neglected their region and attached more significance to Middle East and Afghanistan simultaneously with the issue of terrorism, that caused growing insecurity in Pacific region. However, the issues of concern for the regional states are North Korean designs, Maritime security and the phenomenal rise of China.

Secondly, the 'Rebalancing' policy can be viewed as a rejoinder to China's increasing economic and political influence in Pacific region. Therefore, 'Rebalancing' policy is like a cue to China that America is not going to revoke its security arrangements in Asia.[18] The maritime boundaries issue between China and its neighbors like Japan, Philippine (have signed security treaty with the US) and Vietnam are destabilizing the region, prompting Japanese think tank to reconfigure its foreign policy towards the Pacific. Third, bearing in mind the economic downswing since 2008, East Asia is expected to be an economic hub and global economic system, justifying Unites States' increasing military presence in the region. Also, since 2010, United States is ardently supporting the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) in Pacific region.[19] The TPP comprise 12 regional states excluding China, thus challenging Chinese economic power in the region and also serving as economic wing of 'Rebalancing' policy.[20]

Lastly, the 'Rebalancing' strategy is strong indication of transformation in the US security urgencies; particularly when since long the US Asian allies were feeling abandoned and were apprehensive that the US has revoked its security pledges. Since the announcement of 'Rebalancing' policy number of events like Libyan crises, rise of ISIS, and the Crimean/Ukrainian issue distracted the US focus from its policies towards Asia-Pacific.[21]

Following the same course like his predecessor the seating President Donald Trump on December 31, 2018, signed the 'Asia Reassurance Initiative Act (ARIA), which exhibit US loud and blunt support and commitment to Indo-Pacific region. The signing of this very act came at the time when the dynamics of Asia are folding and unfolding many opportunities along with the challenges to the US. To many analysts this act of US is hostile and dismaying that is directed against China.

Trump signing of ARIA, is the exposition of the reassurance of US commitment to Asia as done by his predecessor. The fresh legislation is the part of the US long term strategic policy about the peninsula. The legislation is well planned security and diplomatic tactic to roll back Chinese influence in Asia-Pacific also dubbed as Indo-Pacific by policy planners in United States.[22] Similarly, ARIA enabled him to design a long term compendious strategic policy for Indo-Pacific region. ARIA provided an opportunity to the US to advance its interests in Indo-Pacific region by establishing a partnership with the regional powers to address the problems associated with the rise of China.[23] ARIA would act a deterrent against the challenges exhaling from China. Additionally, US plans to keep check on North Korean uranium enrichment strategy and monitor counterterrorism in Southeast Asia.

---

[18] Robert S. Ross, "The Problem With the Pivot," Foreign Affairs, December 2012, https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/asia/2012-11-01/problem-pivot.

[19] Will Moreland et al., "For Every Action…" The American Pivot to Asia and Fragmented European Responses," Brookings, January 27, 2016, https://www.brookings.edu/research/for-every-action-the-american-pivot-to-asia-and-fragmented-european-responses/.

[20] Shawn Donnan, "U.S., Japan and 10 Countries Strike Pacific Trade Deal," *Financial Times*, October 5, 2015; Cochrane Joe, "'Indonesia to Decide on Joining Trans-Pacific Partnership," *The New York Times*, October 25, 2015.

[21] Will Moreland et al., "For Every Action…" The American Pivot to Asia and Fragmented European Responses."

[22] Benjamin Lee, "Trump's First 100 Days in Asia," The Diplomat, April 28, 2017, https://thediplomat.com/2017/04/trumps-first-100-days-in-asia/.

[23] Lee.

Rationale behind the US Policy Shift

The markets of Asia-Pacific seem to be important for US finished goods and natural resources. In its preparation of combating strategy against regional power i.e., China; the US has introduced 'Air-Sea Battle' combat concept.[24] Since the last two decades, developments in international politics transformed international political system from uni-polarity to bi-polarity or multi-polarity and in this crucial time the recent development happened in the form of Indo-US strategic partnership. US status of sole super power has been challenged by the emerging regional powers i.e., India and China where Russia has emerged as the leading regional power.

Following four reasons can be attributed, forcing the US to focus its attention on Asia-Pacific. The very first reason is change in diplomatic and strategic urgencies as most of US forces are departing from Afghanistan and Iraq. The second reason could be the calls for cut in budget because of the shun policies that may hurt the country's economy. The third reason catching the eyes of United States could be the increasing economic and military significance of the region. The last and perhaps the most significant factor is containment of China.[25]

Rise of China & US Rebalancing Policy

Being unchecked since very long time, Chine got the opportunity to resurge as the regional power thus challenging regional and international order maintained since World War-II. By 2013, China uncontested with the help of small states proclaimed an Air Defense Identification Zone (ADIZ) unilaterally in East China Sea, and after sometime captured the disputed South China Sea and maintained her presence militarily.

The submissive response of the international community made Chinese leadership to believe that it can achieve its goals without much defiance. Consequently, its invasive entrée and military exercise around Taiwan via Bashi and Miyako strait become intermittent and set a platform for it to aggravate its presence in Africa and Europe, and started making its presence more felt in Central and Latin America and South Asia. In many instances, China has used "economic diplomacy" as a tactic to bring small states in her orbit and has used debt forgiveness policy to procure real estate. In few cases, China has financed or even built naval projects as well.[26]

Forced by these maritime conflicts and response by the stakeholders, China is not having amicable relations with regional states as these states see the emerging China as likely to enforce it will in the regional territorial matters and on lieu of its economics leverage will marginalize their choices. As a rejoinder these states have sought the US support which have hinted China that the former (US) has devised a policy to insulate and contain China. Simultaneously, Chinese neighboring countries have reinforced their security ties with each other and with the US beside the fact that they have extended trade and investment with China.[27]

---

[24] Brig. Gen. Masud Jamil, "Impact of US Rebalancing Strategy on Asia Pacific," 2013, http://www.cdsndu.org/userfiles/file/00001/00001-20141231084839/4%E7%BE%8E%E5%9B%BD%E2%80%9C%E5%86%8D%E5%B9%B3%E8%A1%A1%E2%80%9D%E6%88%98%E7%95%A5%E5%AF%B9%E4%BA%9A%E5%A4%AA%E5%9C%B0%E5%8C%BA%E7%9A%84%E5%BD%B1%E5%93%8D-%E8%8B%B1.pdf.

[25] Khalid Chandio, "US Rebalancing Policy towards Asia," IPRI Review, May 30, 2016, http://www.ipripak.org/us-rebalancing-policy-towards-asia/#sthash.FygJJwCX.dpuf.

[26] J. Michael Cole, "The True 'Pivot to Asia' Is Here," Text, The National Interest, October 23, 2018, https://nationalinterest.org/feature/true-pivot-asia-here-34172.

[27] Jeffrey A. Bader, "U.S. Policy: Balancing in Asia, and Rebalancing to Asia," *Brookings* (blog), September 23, 2014, https://www.brookings.edu/research/u-s-policy-balancing-in-asia-and-rebalancing-to-asia/.

United States without the leadership of whom any effective policy to contain Chinese expansionism is not possible is feeling the urgency by re-engaging in Asia/Indo-Pacific region where the diminishing influence of China are felt. In this regard, United States has assumed the role of freedom of navigation patrols (FONOPs) in South China Sea, where it would difficult to dislocate Chinese influence unless and until US with the support of regional allies attack the military structure erected by China as result of their harmonized and tactical efforts. FONOPs also includes US allies like Australia, France, UK and Japan as they had shipped submarine to the area after World War-II. Weak response of international community over number of issues like Russian aggression against Georgia, Crimea and parts of Ukraine, Syria crossing red line marked by ex-US president Obama and Chines laggard seizing of South China Sea, indicated to China that Western democracies are incapable of protecting world order.[28] However, to contain the expanding influence of China Obama administration has adopted a policy of rebalancing towards Asia-Pacific accrediting more priority and political, security and economic resources to the region owing to region's dynamism and prospects for United States.

China's Response & Counter Strategy

The crucial component of the success of rebalancing policy depends on how it architects and influences tactical thought process of China and Sino-US relations. Till now the question remained unanswered-though China has contracted its muscles but at the same time it acted consciously so that it may not enter into direct encounter with the US and its allies. Conclusively, China's counterbalancing seems to have conflagrated the contesting components in Sino-US relations- a tendency that may in long run sabotage the relations between the two states.

Though the non-clarity of Chinese tactical thinking and decision making muddled the scenario for external power to comprehend the reason behind Chinese activities, the Chinese proclamation and conduct since the initiation of rebalancing indicates that rebalancing has corroborated China's anteceding concerns regarding sieging and containment.

Though statements made by Chinese Foreign Minister are not accrediting pivot a cutthroat attitude, it is too evident that pundits in China have developed the realist approach to the game of politics in Asia-Pacific. In order to counter the US 'Rebalancing' policy, Beijing has devised strategy of 'March West.' This policy demands China to shift its focus from East Asia to Central Asia and Middle East, the region wherefrom the US is departing. The US Asia-Pacific strategy is primarily based on security side since the US wished to have extensive naval presence in the region by 2020.[29] On the other side China counter strategy is primarily based on economic side and number of economic corridors launched under 'One Belt One Road' is substantiation of this fact.

China to counter TPP has mustered in 21 countries to join Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank (AIIB) and has pledge for US $ 50 billion as startup capital. Chinese President has also proclaimed to provide US $ 40 billion for the furtherance of his vision 'Neo Silk Road' and shore up the economic ties among the regional states.[30] The structural realists are mainly concerned with structure of international system in general and power distribution in particular. It is important to note that international politics is passing through transitional period since power is relocating from West to East where China can be seen as the principal variable. Chinese and Asian unremitting economic growth coupled with the slump of Western economy serving as a catalyst in the course of power relocation.

[28] Cole, "The True 'Pivot to Asia' Is Here."
[29] Samuel Ramani, "Interview: Joseph Nye Author and Political Scientist Joseph Nye on China and the U.S. Rebalance to Asia.," The Diplomat, June 10, 2015, http://thediplomat.com/2015/06/interview-joseph-nye/.
[30] Simon Denyer, "China Promotes 'Asia-Pacific Dream' to Counter US Pivot," *Washington Post*, November 11, 2014.

To be successful in its economic diplomacy, China is not in a mood to be in conflict with any regional state. China is also enjoying the fruits of friendship with Pakistan. The seating government in India is continuously in confrontation with Pakistan thus paving the way for China to uninterruptedly concentrate on East Asia. Also, it is Pakistan that is providing entrée to China to the Indian Ocean via Gwadar port.

To Mearsheimer, the rise of China would not be peaceful that will lead to strategic competition between China and the US.[31] He contends that China would pursue hegemony and will throw US out of Asia. Because of the security risks China would try to have leading position in Asia thus asking for a security competition between US and China.[32] Additionally, China would try to get hold of Asia and will pumped it up to Southeast and Central Asia.[33]

However, Michael Swaine analyzes Chinese response to rebalancing through different lens. Michael Swaine has analyzed the Chinese response to rebalancing from three different sections of its population. The statements issued at *official level* include rhetoric that appreciate US positive role in Asia-Pacific. Still Chinese officials hold that the US must respect the concerns and interests of countries of Asia-Pacific along with that of China that substantiates that Chinese support to the US is not unconditional. The Chinses official who are critic of US, mostly talk about US Air-Sea Battle Concept and criticize US engagement in South China Sea dispute.

The *statement that are related with the government and armed forces* overtly criticize US rebalancing policy by declaring it as an effort of the US to marginalize the influence of China and preserve its regional hegemony. US involvement in the region and interaction with its allies is understood as building up of anti-China nexus.

However, some of the *analysts* in China are of the view that US rebalancing cannot be contemplated as threat to Chinese regional interests as Asia is large enough so that both the powers can coexist and thrive. While some other analysts regard rebalancing policy as US effort to maintain its dominant position and contain Chinese influence.[34]

While certainly it is quite difficult for an outside analyst to associate any of Chinese action with that of its reaction to rebalancing policy, because the Chinese action could have occurred for any reason. Nonetheless, Chinese actions happening in the environs of US rebalancing can somehow be associated with it. In this regard, China has published its first defense white paper unfolding Chinese military strategy, thus codifying the changing role of China as naval power, and laying emphasis on high-seas, which is quite consistent with the offensive realist as China is showcasing its military strength which is challenging the US regional hegemony.[35] China in order to test the US loyalty to Taiwan and to controvert Japan, has devised anti-access and inflight demurrer (A2/AD) military tactics. These tactics are also concerned to check the potentials of US air and naval forces in East Asia and Pacific region.[36] Additionally, China has challenged the undisputed standing of the US as the world leading power by presenting itself as an alternative to the US and provided a new economic system to marginalize the role of US and its partners. Not only this, but

[31] Rong Chen, "A Critical Analysis of the US 'Pivot' towards Asia-Pacific: How Realistic Is Neo-Realism?" *The Quarterly Journal* 12, no. 3 (Summer 2013): 39–62.
[32] John W. H Denton, "Ambitious China Need Not Be an Emerging Problem," Business Council of Australia, December 28, 2010, https://www.bca.com.au/ambitious_china_need_not_be_an_emerging_problem.
[33] Amitav Acharya, "Georgian Crisis: Lessons from Asia," October 7, 2008, http://www.amitavacharya.com/?q=content/georgian-crisis-lessons-asia.
[34] Michael D Swaine, "Chinese Leadership and Elite Responses to the U.S. Pacific Pivot," *Chinese Leadership Monitor*, no. 38 (July 2012): 26.
[35] KEITH JOHNSON, "China's Military Blueprint: Bigger Navy, Bigger Global Role," Foreign Policy, May 26, 2015, http://foreignpolicy.com/2015/05/26/chinas-military-blueprint-bigger-navy-bigger-global-role/.
[36] Dr. Stephen Burgess, "A Pivot to India? The US-India Strategic Partnership & Multipolarity in Asia.," 2013, http://www.usafa.edu/app/uploads/Burgess-A-Pivot-to-India-15-Apr-2014.pdf.

China is challenging the authority of US on multiple fronts like militarizing South China sea, space technology, One Belt One Road Initiative, a race to become master in the field of science and "Made in China" manufacturing mechanism.

Besides this, China dispute in South China sea, and conflict and involvement with US allies and its cohorts in Asia Pacific, is pinpointing that Chinese response to rebalancing is that of mixture of assertiveness and bit conscious. This mixed reaction proposes that Chinese response to rebalancing is still being worked out. Chinese presumed assertive behavior in case of its maritime claim over East and South China Sea can be traced before the initiation of rebalancing policy therefore, cannot exclusively be associated with its response. China senses a strategic momentum to profess its maritime claim having no link to rebalancing no matter if this strategic momentum exasperates tension with Chinese neighbors and invites regional engagement with the US.[37]

Conclusion

Number of questions has been raised by different scholars about the viability of 'Rebalancing' since support is the prerequisite for 'Rebalancing.' Additionally, questions are raised about the implementation of this policy. Other regional happenings like Ukrainian issue and Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS) have also impacts on 'Rebalancing' policy. The US regional partners are more concerned since US leadership has been requisite in Middle East and Europe. In the backwash of Ukrainian issue, there are raising demands for pivot to Europe since many US troops are installed on NATO's eastern borders. Japan, US regional ally, wants the US to resolve her territorial issues not just to maintain its military presence in Pacific region but also to counter Chinese influence.

There are number of unfolding issues that raise questions mark on the US 'Rebalancing' policy e.g., transformation in global politics from bi-polarity to multi-polarity, menace of terrorism, North Korean issue, re-emergence of Russia and Chinese increasing influence. It means that Asian states won't be able to become a part of US counterbalancing strategy. All these issues are pointing towards challenges confronted by the US in establishing hegemony in Asia-Pacific.[38]

Another problem with this strategy is that this policy is military oriented while China is more focused on economic side, while in 2014, US crippling economy witnessed issues like 'shutdown.' Other issues in this regard are; is the US ready to help Japan in resolving her issues with China? Keeping in mind NATO's incompetence in the region, is NATO ready to face powerful China? Would NATO's member like Australia, Japan, Philippine etc. would be able to abide by the organization's role and expected backfire? Since NATO fails in realizing its objective in Afghanistan and left the country without establishing peace, would the countries of Pacific region trust such organization?

The policy appears to be incapable to endure for long term. The economic power balance is also shifting, since the increasing influence of China in Latin America, Africa and Europe posing threat to the US economic objectives. The Chinese mounting economic and political influence is also transforming international values and institutions. The present Sino-US ties has been termed by Chinese scholars as 'Mutually Assured Misperception' (MAM).

Rebalancing policy if analyzed in the context of Sino-US relations it can be said that it is quite natural for US to device a policy of rebalancing to contain increasing influence of China, and increasing significance of Asia-Pacific. Asia Pacific, a region that was dominated by America for a long period of time. US dominant position in Asia Pacific is not insured. Enduring rebalancing and controlling it effects needs

[37] Kaplan, "While US Is Distracted, China Develops Sea Power," *Washington Post*, September 26, 2010.
[38] Brig. Gen. Masud Jamil, "Impact of US Rebalancing Strategy on Asia Pacific."

commitment, time and resource for a long time to come. It also requires US and Chinese conscious efforts so that their engagement may not be overshadowed by contesting components of their bilateral ties.

Rebalancing would not have any positive or negative effects on the nature of Sino-US relations. US dominant position in Asia Pacific would act a catalyst to maintain stability to Asia Pacific as maintained in several decades before. This would allow US to tactfully deal its intricate relationship with China.
While Chinese response to rebalancing policy is based on country specific approach based on the individual value of a country. Change of any kind in bilateral relations determines Chinese behavior rather to indicate it as a response to rebalancing policy. Additionally, China seems to be more determined to make use of diplomatic channels and economic instruments instead of employing military means. Chinese less interest in using military means suggest that it will hardly use it in response to rebalancing.

References

Acharya, Amitav. 2008. "Georgian Crisis: Lessons from Asia." October 7, 2008. http://www.amitavacharya.com/?q=content/georgian-crisis-lessons-asia.

Acharya, Amitav. "Georgian Crisis: Lessons from Asia," October 7, 2008. http://www.amitavacharya.com/?q=content/georgian-crisis-lessons-asia.

Arif Rafiq. "How China and Pakistan Are Beating India in the New Great Game." The National Interest, June 12, 2015. http://nationalinterest.org/feature/how-china-pakistan-are-beating-india-the-new-great-game-13096.

Bader, Jeffrey A. "U.S. Policy: Balancing in Asia, and Rebalancing to Asia." *Brookings* (blog), September 23, 2014. https://www.brookings.edu/research/u-s-policy-balancing-in-asia-and-rebalancing-to-asia/.

Brig. Gen. Masud Jamil. "Impact of US Rebalancing Strategy on Asia Pacific," 2013. http://www.cdsndu.org/userfiles/file/00001/00001-20141231084839/4%E7%BE%8E%E5%9B%BD%E2%80%9C%E5%86%8D%E5%B9%B3%E8%A1%A1%E2%80%9D%E6%88%98%E7%95%A5%E5%AF%B9%E4%BA%9A%E5%A4%AA%E5%9C%B0%E5%8C%BA%E7%9A%84%E5%BD%B1%E5%93%8D-%E8%8B%B1.pdf.

Carr, Edward Hallett, and Michael Cox. *The Twenty Years' Crisis, 1919-1939: An Introduction to the Study of International Relations.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2001.

Chen, Rong. "A Critical Analysis of the US 'Pivot' towards Asia-Pacific: How Realistic Is Neo-Realism?" *The Quarterly Journal* 12, no. 3 (Summer 2013): 39–62.

Cochrane Joe. "'Indonesia to Decide on Joining Trans-Pacific Partnership." *The New York Times*, October 25, 2015.

Cole, J. Michael. "The True 'Pivot to Asia' Is Here." Text. The National Interest, October 23, 2018. https://nationalinterest.org/feature/true-pivot-asia-here-34172.

Denton, John W. H. "Ambitious China Need Not Be an Emerging Problem." Business Council of Australia, December 28, 2010. https://www.bca.com.au/ambitious_china_need_not_be_an_emerging_problem.

Dr. Stephen Burgess. "A Pivot to India? The US-India Strategic Partnership & Multipolarity in Asia.," 2013. http://www.usafa.edu/app/uploads/Burgess-A-Pivot-to-India-15-Apr-2014.pdf.

Farhan Hanif Siddiqi. "America's 'Rebalancing' Strategy: Pakistan's Choices." South Asian Voices, March 9, 2016. https://southasianvoices.org/americas-rebalancing-strategy-pakistans-choices/.

George F. Kennan. "The Sources of Soviet Conduct." *Foreign Affairs* 25, no. 04 (1947): 852.

Gideon Rachman. "Obama's Asia Policy Is Distracted and Ambiguous." *Financial Times*, April 21, 2014. https://www.ft.com/content/bfe9c506-c4c7-11e3-8dd4-00144feabdc0.

Hillary. Clinton. "America's Pacific Century." Foreign Policy, October 11, 2011. http://foreignpolicy.com/2011/10/11/americas-pacific-century/.

John H. Herz. ""Idealist Internationalism and the Security Dilemma." *World Politics* 02, no. 02 (1950): 157–80.

John J. Mearsheimer. *Structural Realism." In International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.

Joseph K. Clifton. "Disputed Theory and Security Policy: Responding to the "Rise of China," 2011. http://www.bing.com/cr?IG=335B7285A51A413A918F3D7F20F60654&CID=3BE8C912CE6D607B1191C3BBCF6B6109&rd=1&h=NAxMQknQZf9CGvM6WjiszyHXWSyJ3djnezA3377RTEY&v=1&r=http%3a%2f%2fscholarship.claremont.edu%2fcgi%2fviewcontent.cgi%3farticle%3d1164%26context%3dcmc_theses&p=DevEx,5050.1.

Keith Johnson. "China's Military Blueprint: Bigger Navy, Bigger Global Role." Foreign Policy, May 26, 2015. http://foreignpolicy.com/2015/05/26/chinas-military-blueprint-bigger-navy-bigger-global-role/.

Kenneth N. Waltz. *Man, the State and War: A Theoretical Analysis*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 2001.

Kenneth W (2001)."The Origin of War in Neorealist Theory." In *The Origin and Prevention of Major Wars*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

Kenneth N. Waltz. (1980). *Theory of International Politics*. Reading, Mass: Addison-Wesley, 1979.

Khalid Chandio. "US Rebalancing Policy towards Asia." IPRI Review, May 30, 2016. http://www.ipripak.org/us-rebalancing-policy-towards-asia/#sthash.FygJJwCX.dpuf.

Lee, Benjamin. "Trump's First 100 Days in Asia." The Diplomat, April 28, 2017. https://thediplomat.com/2017/04/trumps-first-100-days-in-asia/.

Mateen Haider. "Chinese President to Visit Pakistan, Hammer out $ 46-Billion Deal." *Dawn*, April 16, 2015.

Norton (2014). *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*. New York: W. W. Norton, 2014.

Remarks By President Obama to the Australian Parliament." The White House (Office of the Press Secretary), November 17, 2011. https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2011/11/17/remarks-president-obama-australian-parliament.

Richardson, Michael. "China's Thirst for Oil and Gas." The Sydney Morning Herald, June 17, 2012. https://www.smh.com.au/politics/federal/chinas-thirst-for-oil-and-gas-20120617-20hwj.html.

Robert G. Sutter, Michael E. Brown, and Timothy J. A. Adamson. "Balancing Acts: The U.S. Rebalance and Asia-Pacific Stability," August 2013. https://www2.gwu.edu/~sigur/assets/docs/BalancingActs_Compiled1.pdf.

Robert S. Ross. "The Problem With the Pivot." Foreign Affairs, December 2012. https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/asia/2012-11-01/problem-pivot.

Samuel Ramani. "Interview: Joseph Nye Author and Political Scientist Joseph Nye on China and the U.S. Rebalance to Asia." The Diplomat, June 10, 2015. http://thediplomat.com/2015/06/interview-joseph-nye/.

Secretary of Defense Speech (Press Operations)." United States Department of Defense, January 24, 2013. http://archive.defense.gov/speeches/speech.aspx?speechid=1746.

Shawn Donnan. "U.S., Japan and 10 Countries Strike Pacific Trade Deal." *Financial Times*, October 5, 2015.

Simon Denyer. "China Promotes 'Asia-Pacific Dream' to Counter US Pivot." *Washington Post*, November 11, 2014.

Stephen Van Evera. *Causes of War: Power and the Roots of Conflict.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1999.

Will Moreland, Bjørnar Sverdrup-Thygeson, Marc Lanteigne, Ulf Sverdrup, and Thomas Wright. "For Every Action…" The American Pivot to Asia and Fragmented European Responses." Brookings, January 27, 2016. https://www.brookings.edu/research/for-every-action-the-american-pivot-to-asia-and-fragmented-european-responses/.