Przemysław Furgacz

graduated from Jagiellonian University

The Military and Security Aspects of Obama's Pivot to Asia

Introduction

At the end of 2011 and in the beginning of 2012 the White House announced a U.S. strategic pivot towards the Asia-Pacific region in order to ensure, as it was expressed by president Barack Obama in his address to Australian Parliament, that "the United States will play a larger and long-term role in shaping this region and its future". Some signs of change in this respect could have been perceived earlier. Actually, already in 2009 careful observers of U.S. foreign and security policy could have noticed the first signals of Washington's increasing focus on Asia. Just then, in 2009, Barack Obama announced a new policy direction that would henceforth hinge on a "tilt to the East". Moreover, the first foreign visit of the Secretary of State Hillary Clinton was to Asian countries, which was untypical as in the past, newly-appointed Secretaries of State almost always used to choose a European country as a destination for their first foreign visit.

It appears prudent to assume that currently a salient transformation in U.S. foreign and security policy is materializing. What needs to be emphasized are the military and security aspects of this shift. Four military and security aspects of the U.S. pivot to Asia need to be distinguished:

– the rebalance and redeployment of U.S. forces in the West Pacific and East Asia region;

– the creation of the Air-Sea Battle Concept with a view to potential conflict with the People's Liberation Army (PLA);

– the growing counteracting against China's espionage, particularly cyber espionage;

– intensification of bilateral and multilateral military and security cooperation between the U.S. and its partners in the Asia-Pacific, including an increase in diplomatic support for East Asian states being in maritime territorial disputes with China.

The author decided to arrange the article according to the four aspects of the U.S. pivot to Asia, as mentioned above. Content analysis together with general logical methods (deduction, induction) have been employed during the research on the matters raised in the article. This study is an attempt to answer two basic research questions: what the U.S. pivot to Asia means in practice in regards to the U.S. military security policy and how Beijing perceives the U.S. pivot to Asia.

The Rebalance and Redeployment of U.S. Forces to the Asia-Pacific

The navy is the core of the U.S. military rebalance to Asia. The Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Jonathan Greenert, enumerated four principal directions of the U.S. Navy's shift to Asia: deployment of more military assets to Asia and the Western Pacific, basing more units and forces in this part of the world, gaining new military capabilities in the face of specific demands within the Asia-Pacific theater of war and, last but not least, intensifying partnerships and cooperation with U.S. allies in the region (Greenert, 2012). As apart of the pivot to Asia, the White House took steps to gain rights to the deployment of U.S. warships and aircraft in new bases in the Asia-Pacific region. In August 2013, the Philippines and the U.S. commenced talks on increasing the U.S. military presence in the Philippine archipelago. In spite of the fact that details of the negotiations have not been made public, it is known that the Philippine government plans to allow U.S. and Japanese warships to station in maritime bases situated on Philippine territory. Supposedly, American soldiers may return to the Subic Bay Naval Base and Clark Air Base, which had been used by the U.S. military during the Cold War and which the U.S. soldiers had to leave in the 1990s due to social protests. Interestingly, this time protests against the revival of an American military presence in the archipelago also came about. Maybe they were inspired by the PRC's intelligence, however there is no firm evidence supporting this thesis All the states that have maritime territorial disputes with China are searching

for U.S. support. It is especially important for the Philippinesas they have small, underfinanced, backward and obsolete army, navy and air forces that could not by any means settle any dispute with China in Manila's favour. At Manila's request, U.S. maritime patrol P-3 Orion aircraft regularly patrol over the disputed Spratly islands and nearby waters. According to American press, the President of the Philippines, Benigno Aquino, requested these patrols form the White House in 2012. Washington answered positively in regards to this request. Since February 2013, P-3s conduct patrol missions over Ayungin Reef as well, which is situated 106 nautical miles from Palawan Island. Reportedly P-3s are based at Clark Air Base, which suggests that the U.S. forces had moved there secretly before the recent talks had even begun. The Philippine ambassador to the U.S., Jose Cuisia, publicly expressed his view that U.S. military support for his motherland is aimed at preventing potential aggression against the Philippines. Though the word "China" was not spoken in this context, no one has any doubt that the Philippine ambassador had China in his mind as the potential aggressor (Henzel, 2013). Perhaps the most telling sign of U.S. redeployment of forces to the West Pacific are the plans to begin a permanent military presence in Australia. During his visit to Australia in November 2011, President Barack Obama announced that a deal between the U.S. and Australian governments had concluded. The accord will probably lead to an increase in U.S. naval operations off the Australian coasts on its own and in cooperation with the Royal Australian Navy. The expanded U.S. military presence in Australia can and should be interpreted as a demonstration both to China and to U.S. allies in the region that the global superpower is committed to the security of its East Asian allies and treats the growing military power of China very seriously. During the mentioned visit to Australia, the U.S. president announced that for the beginning 250 U.S. Marines will rotationally station in Darwin, Northern Australia, with ultimately 2500 soldiers stationed there. Due to the fact that this is relatively calm part of the world, this announcement has been commonly interpreted as a step against the PRC. However, the significance of Obama's declaration by no means should be exaggerated. Currently there are approximately 40,000 U.S. soldiers station in Japan and 28,500 in the Republic of Korea (Kruczkowska, 2011: 15). In comparison to these numbers, plans for the redeployment of 2500 Marines is more symbolic than a real threat to China. In addition, the U.S. Navy pledged to assign 60% of its warships to the Pacific Fleet by 2020,

compared with the approximately 50% at present. The Pentagon wants to maximize the interoperability of U.S. Armed Forces with its East Asian counterparts. The U.S. military pursues to develop integrated intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance with Japanese, South Korean and Australian armed forces, in particular with their navies and air forces. Even more significant are the White House's plans for a considerable expansion of missile defense systems in East Asia. The Pentagon intends to build up two early-warning X-band missile defense radars. One of these radars will be situated in SouthernJapan and the second radar will be mostlikely situated in the Philippines or, if the Philippine government does not agree the installation of X-band radar on its territory, in some other Southeast Asian state. Officially, these plans are aimed at containing threats coming from North Korean ballistic missiles. Unofficially, these facilities will also be useful for a Taiwan contingency or other military conflict with the Middle Kingdom. As Steven Hildreth, a pundit with the Congressional Research Service, accurately put it: *The focus of our rhetoric is North Korea. The reality is that we're also looking longer term at the elephant in the room, which is China* (Entous and Barnes, 2012). It must be emphasized that one early-warning radar has already been built up in the Aomori Prefecture in northern Japan, so if the Pentagon's plans were to be followed through, the U.S. will have in total three land-based missile-defense radars in East Asia. The government of the PRC firmly objected to the installation of the first X-Band radar in northern Japan, so it seems rational to conclude that it will staunchly oppose the build-up of a second and third radar system as well. Although the U.S. State Department repeatedly assured that the East Asian missile defense is not directed against China, Beijing simply does not believe these claims as it is quite distrustful toward the U.S. and its intentions. Such claims are treated in China as nothing more than diplomatic eyewash. Therefore, the Pentagon's plans have an adverse effect in the form of further antagonizing of Beijing. On its part, Chinese generals fear that thanks to the new early-warning radars the U.S. forces could easily repel any missile strike coming from China, thereby almost completely neutralizing their deterrent potential. Beijing does not squander any opportunity for criticizing any U.S. policy that works towards the containment of China. For example, during the multinational drills code-named Cobra Gold 2012 that took place in January 2012, the PRC government resolutely criticized them, calling them anti-Chinese. Beijing perceives these and similar exercises

unambiguously as directed at China's containment and as unfriendly. Senior Colonel Li Daguang clearly expressed what the PLA thinks of the drills: *[Washington's] effort through the maneuvers is aimed at unifying countries [in the region] around itself [which] runs counter to China's interests in the long term* ('Beijing Calls War Game a Threat', 2012).

Washington also announced that a special radar earmarked for tracking Chinese polar-orbiting satellites, till now situated in the Caribbean island of Antigua, will be moved to Western Australia from 2014. From there it could begin tracking Chinese polar-orbiting satellites sooner and in a much more effective and reliable manner that it could while stationed in Antigua. This radar will not be the only U.S. reconnaissance installation deployed in Western Australia and directed at containing the PRC. The U.S. Air Force is going to deploy a new model of a very advanced and technically sophisticated satellite-watching telescope in a yet unknown location in Western Australia. The crucial task of this telescope will be to monitor geostationary satellites orbiting over the Indian Ocean and Western Pacific. However, this telescope could monitor the satellites of many states, which includes those of India, Pakistan and Iran. However, no one doubts that tracking and observing China's satellites is the crucial task of this device (Perett, 2013). Though the Australian government highlights the civilian advantages of having the abovementioned installations on its territory, mainly the capability to monitor so-called space debris, the decision to deploy these facilities on Australian soil is a sign of the tightening military ties between Australia and the United States. Whatever and however U.S. and Australian diplomats would deny it, both states have a common interest in containing China. By deploying these important installations in Australia, the White House intends to cement bilateral U.S.-Australian security bonds. This action is also a response to the increasing space activities of China, which is manifested in many ways and manners. Many East Asian countries are afraid of the growing military capabilities of Chinaand are increasingly worried that U.S. security guarantees for them could weaken or even completely erode in the face of incoming and inevitable cuts in the U.S. defense budget. There deployment of U.S. forces together with the intensification of U.S. military drills in the region are aimed at calming down U.S. allies. Obama intends to reassure Tokyo, Manila, Canberra, Seoul and other allied capital's that they there are still under the American security umbrella and that their bilateral alliances with the world hegemony still stand on the firm

ground. The then U.S. defense attaché in Australia, General McOwan, remarked that by intensifying U.S. naval operations in Western Pacific waters Washington sends a clear message to Beijing that the U.S. is fully committed to defending regional trade routes against any possible interdiction or disturbance (Barnes, 2011). Becoming a part of Obama's pivot to Asia in 2013, the Department of Defense began a gradual deployment process of additional air force squadrons to air force bases situated within striking range of the Mainland China. The Pentagon intends to have squadrons equipped with all three stealth airplanes revealed to the public, that is the F-22 Raptor and F-35 Lightning II as well as the B-2 Spirit strategic bomber, near the territory of its principal rival to hegemony in East Asia. Some of the planes, especially the B-2s, are to station in the Western Pacific only rotationally. The primary base, which will be beefed up, is Andersen Air Force Base in Guam. Additionally, three attack submarines have been deployed to Guam Naval Base. Former Defense Secretary Leon Panetta declared that the F-22s will also be stationing rotationally on U.S. bases in Japan. Similarly, according to Panetta's claims, newly commissioned F-35s are to be deployed to Iwakuni Air Force Base in Japan, though in 2017 at the earliest. Moreover, the U.S. Air Force Command wants to deploy not only strike aircraft in the Western Pacific, but also support aircraft, that is KC-46 air tankers and P-8 Orion anti-submarine warfare and patrol aircraft. Both planes could be included in the newest equipment in possession of the U.S. Air Force (Axe, 2013). On top of that, six destroyers from the Rota U.S. Naval Base in southern Spain are to be rotationally moved to the Asia-Pacific as well as three amphibious ships that previously used to sail on African and South American bodies of water (Greenert, 2012). Nonetheless, the recent considerable cuts in U.S. defense spending may stall the U.S. rebalance to Asia. Despite assurances by the Obama administration that the cuts in the U.S. defense budget will not be little American commitment to the security of its Asia-Pacific allies, many analysts from both sides of the Pacific Ocean, more or less doubt it. Some East Asian politicians and military personnel have expressed concern about the U.S. defense cuts (Hayashi and Barta, 2013). As a matter of fact, the Pentagon constantly assures that East Asia will continue to get priority over other regions, though it is difficult to take these assurances for granted in the light of continuous U.S. fiscal problems as well as the intensifying and escalating war in Syria. These two factors may substantially influence the U.S. pivot to Asia. The Department

of Defense may be forced to resign from some of its more ambitious Asia-Pacific plans due to lacking financial resources. This of course would be welcomed in China.

The Air-Sea Battle Concept

As two American military experts expressed it: *China is the Voldemort of U.S. military planning* (Yoshihara and Holmes, 2012). By this expression, they meant that the U.S. leaders, military personnel and strategists perceive the Middle Kingdom as the main potential rival of their motherland, as a state with which a military clash in the future, in spite of being unlikely, is not unimaginable. In order to prepare for a possible future armed conflict with the PRC, the U.S. military has worked out a new concept of pursuing war, which has been named the Air-Sea Battle Concept. The Department of Defense fears that the growing potential and capabilities of China's military could in the not so distant future counterbalance the U.S. military might. In the last two-three years, the Air-Sea Battle Concept has become a priority in the Pentagon. The Air-Sea Battle doctrine focuses primarily on devising an effective and credible strategy to defeat the anti-access/area-denial (known also under the abbreviation A2/AD) capabilities achieved by some, not necessarily friendly toward the U.S., states; first and foremost is China and to a lesser degree Iran and North Korea. Beijing has been spending a lot of money and effort on designing, developing and deploying such weapon systems that could make the combined U.S. naval and air operations near the coasts of China and Taiwan extremely risky or even entirely impossible for U.S. warships and airplanes. That is why the Air-Sea Battle Concept is being created. For years the Pentagon assumed that U.S. troops in the Asia-Pacific would be able to operate from relatively safe bases and carriers. In the light of more and more capable Chinese offensive weapons, this assumption is no longer justified and the Department of Defense has come to realize that. American war games proved that even the U.S. technological superiority could not be enough to defeat the PLA in a conflict scenario involving Taiwan, if one takes into consideration the quantitative advantage of China and extremely long American sea lines of communication to the theatre of war. Recent studies have pointed out that projecting naval and air power against a formidable and capable enemy operating from continental bases

in the immediate vicinity of a theatre of war (such as Mainland China) may be extraordinarily difficult and do not guarantee a success (Haddick, 2011). In other words, the increasingly capable military force of China could challenge U.S. naval dominance not only in the East China and South China Seas, but also in the Western Pacific.

The U.S. Department of Defense has been developing the Air-Sea Battle Concept as a doctrinal response to the A2/AD strategy adopted by the PLA. The absolutely key characteristic of the concept mentioned above is a strict coordination of the U.S. Navy and U.S. Air Force efforts, actions and capabilities. The Department of Defense set up a special institution, an Air-Sea Strategy Office, with a task to work on the problem of how to defeat the PLA if a war scenario materializes ('U.S. Military Strategy in the Western Pacific', 2012). Experts of the Air-Sea Strategy Office came to the conclusion that in order to retain a military advantage over the PLA the U.S. military must, among other things, put an emphasis on developing advanced capabilities in undersea warfare. The substantial technological backwardness of the People's Liberation Army Navy in anti-submarine warfare (ASW) is perceived by the U.S. Navy Command as a weak point, which must be taken advantage of during possible conflict. Replacing the obsolete Los Angeles-class submarines and P-3 Orion maritime patrol aircraft with the newly commissioned and advanced Virginia-class submarines and P-8A Poseidon maritime patrol aircraft respectively is a part of Air-Sea Battle (Greenert, 2012). The U.S. Navy plans to improve the capabilities of their capabilities in shooting down advanced anti-ship cruise missiles and anti-ship ballistic missiles. United States. engineers are working hard on producing new better electronic warfare systems. Keeping in mind a possible conflict with the PLA Navy, the U.S. is developing and constructing the Long Range Anti-Ship Missile (LRASM). The American government hopes that this very advanced missile will be better in every respect than its Chinese equivalents. Above all, the LRASM is to have much longer range (Henski, 2012: 72–74).

Chinese Espionage Activities in the United States

The White House is increasingly angry at the miscellaneous espionage activities of China that are directed at U.S. corporations as well as military and government institutions. The problem these espionage activites

against the U.S. has gradually become one of the most relevant issues in their bilateral relations. The Obama administration do not squander any occasion to protest against the intensive spying operations on America by Beijing. Although the most famous espionage scandal in recent years involved a Russian spy network in the U.S., that does not mean that the espionage activities conducted by the PRC is less intensive or less dangerous for U.S. interests. Cases regarding Chinese spies caught red-handed are maybe less spectacular; however, from the point of view of Washington they are by no means less threatening. Much of the Chinese spying activity in the U.S. is directed at collecting technologies, data, information, designs and trade secrets that could support the military modernization of the PRC. This, in turn, is a direct and major threat to U.S. national security. Noshir Gowadia, Chi Tong Kuok, Xian Hongwei, Li Li, Yang Bing, Zhang Zhangwei, Zhang Mingsuan are some of the Chinese spies that had been detected and arrested on U.S. territory in recent years. Some of them caused irreparable damages to U.S. military security, proving how dangerous an opponent the intelligence sector of the PRC is for the FBI. Particularly, the online attacks that have occurred since Barack Obama became the President have gradually become a serious irritant in U.S.-China relations. Not only has the U.S. government charged China with carrying out numerous cyber-attacks, but also Beijing accuses the U.S. intelligence services of committing basically the same activities. The case of the now famous whistleblower Edward Snowden proves that the accusations made by Beijing regarding U.S. Internet spying are not without reason. Washington repeatedly accuses the intelligence agencies of China as being the most active and persistent global perpetrators of industrial espionage. In 2011 a special report regarding this issue was released by the U.S. intelligence community. In the above-mentioned report the PRC together with the Russian Federation was identified as the most aggressive collectors of American data, information and technologies (Gorman, 2011). According to some U.S. counterintelligence officers, the problem of Chinese espionage in the U.S. during the Obama administration has simply got out of control. For instance, in March 2011 Chinese hackers conducted a massive cyber-attack against the U.S. security company RSA. This company is known for providing special Internet encryption services for its clients, among which are many U.S. corporations. The 2011 report of the U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission stated that as a result of the RSA cyber-intrusion, three other U.S. defense companies

had also been targeted by Chinese hackers (Gertz, 2011). *Nihil novi sub sole* onemay say, as U.S. defense contractors regularly report about successful or unsuccessful attempts to break into their internal computer networks. The White House vows that the U.S. intelligence services do not conduct state-sponsored hacking forU.S. corporations as the Chinese do for their own firms. However, in the light of Snowden revelations, the sincerity of Washington regarding these matters could be easily put into question. From the Chinese standpoint, the American protests against their cyber spying are nothing more than a clear duplicity. Pressed by the harmed U.S. firms, the Obama administration decided to beef up its efforts to counter the espionage activities of the PRC in the United States. American cyber security experts claim that the most sophisticated, complicated and formidable cyber spying operations against U.S. targets and interests are carried out by Chinese hackers working for special secret units of the PLA. The Chinese intelligence agencies are perceived by the U.S. counterintelligence as the most skillful in cyber warfare and cyber espionage; therefore, any U.S. actions in the cyber defense sphere may be interpreted as an element of the U.S pivot to Asia. Above all, as a response to these cases of cyber espionage, the Obama administration decided to channel appreciable resources for cyber defense. American corporations are constantly encouraged to install much more sophisticated and expensive detection equipment as well as more secure hardware and software. Additionally, these firms are also encouraged to intensify their cooperation with American counter-intelligence agencies. This year, President Obama signed a special executive order to start creating voluntary standards for U.S. corporations to employ methods that will enhance their cyber-defense capabilities. Reportedly, the new (mostly classified) cyber intelligence policies and strategies are being created. The U.S. Department of Defense released its own strategy for defending key American military computer networks. One of the elements of this strategy is the development of a means to direct U.S. military computer communications into a new system just in case of an enemy successfully penetrating American military networks on a massive scale (Fifield and Menn, 2011). The details of this new system haveof course not been made public. The Obama administration did not even hesitate to threaten China with diplomatic and trade action if corporate espionage involving U.S. firms would not be stopped (Gorman and Favole, 2013). In 2011, the U.S. Deputy Secretary of Defense, William J. Lynn, stated that *the United States reserves*

the right, under the laws of armed conflict, to respond to serious cyber attacks with a proportional and justified military response at the time and place of our choosing (Lynn, 2011). This was a clear signal to China, suggesting that it not exaggerate in its unfriendly cyber activities against the world superpower. In 2013 the White House released a *Strategy to Mitigate the Theftof U.S. Trade Secrets*. The document enumerates and scrupulously describes a multitude of cases of Chinese economic espionage directed at U.S. companies, including prominent Pentagon contractors. The authors of this document named China a persistent collector of U.S. trade secrets.

Cooperation with Asia-Pacific Allies

Intersecting territorial claims in the East and South China Seas have become a second issue, after Taiwan, that could potentially lead to a military confrontation between the U.S. and China. Acting calmly was one of the hints that Deng Xiaoping gave to his political successors. Indeed, Chinese foreign policy was quite calm and careful over the last 25 years. Nevertheless, after 2010 it seems that something has changed in this matter. The most conspicuous aspect of the change in Chinese rhetoric and policy is an increasingly aggressive or even belligerent stance towards territorial disputes in the East and South China Seas. During a meeting between the U.S. Secretary of Defense Chuck Hagel and his Chinese counterpart Chang Wanquan in August 2013, the latter clearly expressed that the People's Republic of China is not going to give up its maritime territorial disputes. Beijing does not intend to renounce its claims to the Senkaku/Diaoyu, Spratly and Paracel Islands. The intersecting claims to these islands by many East Asian states became one of the reasons for the intensification of political tensions in the whole region. Since 2010 more and more U.S. government thoroughly avoided any declarations regarding the disputes that could enrage China, the growing number of incidents, the more assertive Chinesepolicy and the pressure from regional allies has finally made Washington much less reserved than it used to be in the past. Since 2010, U.S. diplomats and government officials have repeatedly expressed their support for Japan, the Philippines and even Vietnam in their territorial disputes with their much bigger neighbor ('ChRL ostrzega USA', 2013). Interestingly, since approximately 2011, a new tone has emerged

in the U.S. diplomatic rhetoric concerning China. As in the past, U.S. politicians like to scold China for violating human rights, turning a blind eye to intellectual-property piracy, unfair trade practices, spying activities, and so on and so forth. However, lately a new "thread" has emerged in their criticism of the Middle Kingdom. Namely, the U.S. diplomats have begun to criticize Mainland China for their excessive claims of maritime sovereignty and for their aggressive steps against smaller and weaker neighbors on disputed bodies of water. For example, during her speech in November 2011 in Hawaii, the now former U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton criticized the Chinese territorial claims in the South China Sea (Johnson, 2011). It is true that the U.S. diplomats still try to pretend to be neutral towards the East Asia maritime territorial disputes, yet as Michael T. Klare (Klare, 2013) accurately noticed in his article published in "The Foreign Affairs" website: *Washington's stance is less neutral than it appears and more geared toward violent conflict than talking it out.* He points out that … *while continuing to profess neutrality, [U.S.] senior officials have expressed dismay over the aggressive actions taken by certain unnamed claimants – easily interpreted as meaning China.* Indeed, a careful observer of the rhetoric used by U.S. diplomats could only agree with this opinion. Therefore, it should not be a surprise for anybody, that neither China, nor its opponents in disputes over contested islands treat the United States as a neutral player. Definitely, the United States is not a neutral, disinterested party in this dispute. Thus this, to a certain extent, is a result of various incidents on the disputed waters that usually, however not always, were provoked by Beijing. Washington supports, though usually subtly and indirectly, its East Asian partners in their maritime disputes with Mainland China. There are many more signs of Obama's tilt to Asia. For instance, in non-military fields the U.S. President took a decision to make his state a member of the East Asia Summit and consequently is opting for Trans-Pacific Partnership. Moreover, within its general and broad aim of containing China, Washington is even reaching out outside the Asia-Pacific region. The U.S. intends to deepen its relationship with India who is treated among the foreign policy elites in Washington as a potential counterweight to China. On top of that, the U.S. has even reached out to Vietnam, a communist dictatorship and former U.S. enemy, as well as Myanmar, another dictatorship closely connected to China. Indonesia has been playing a growing role in U.S. foreign policy in recent years. Since 2010, when Obama made a decision to lift a ban on U.S. military contacts with the Indonesian Kopassus Special Forces, relations

between Jakarta and Washington have improved substantially. The armies, navies and air forces of both states have since begun joint maneuvers and exercises, for instance Garuda Shield in 2011. The governments of both countries are interested in further progress in bilateral security relations. The Indonesian episode in Obama's biography is another favorable factor for tightening ties between these two states.

Conclusions

In the future the People's Liberation Army will only become more powerful than it is today. It is reasonable to assume that the technological gap between the American and Chinese militaries will diminish gradually and not deepen in the coming years. The intensive and successful industrial espionage on the part of the PRC provides an additional argument in support of this claim. Furthermore, the less indebted China could probably let itself spend more money on defense than the heavily indebted United States. American policymakers and military personnel realize these trends well. That is why Americans persist in their efforts to at least inhibit these undesirable (from their viewpoint) processes. In turn, the Chinese on their part endeavor to maximize the cost and risk of U.S. power projection in the Western Pacific and Eastern Asia, in particular in the waters off their motherland.

Obviously, Beijing does not welcome the U.S. Pivot to Asia. On the contrary, Chinese leaders see it as the next step of a U.S. policy aimed at containing China. The military dimension of this renewed American focus on Asia-Pacific especially worries Chinese leaders. Nonetheless, regardless of the opinions and fears of Beijing, the United States government will persevere in its pivot to the Asia-Pacific. The mere fact that that the Trans-Pacific trade currently accounts for over two-thirds of total containerized shipping for the U.S. reveals enough. The next President of the United States will most likely continue the Asia-Pacific policy that the Obama administration has begun. Additionally, in all likelihood the existing contentious issues between the two powers such as cyber spying or the difference of opinions as to the territorial affiliation of the Spratly, Paracel and Senkaku/Diaoyu Islands will not vanish anytime soon. Yet, despite of some (unavoidable) tensions in U.S.-China relations, both Beijing and Washington have been working hard and successfully not to let the disputes get out of control.

References

Axe D. (2013), *Pentagon Preps Stealth Strike Force to Counter China,* "The Wired", December 26, URL: http://www.wired.com/dangerroom/2012/12/pentagon-preps-stealth-force/ [August 30, 2013].

Barnes J.E. (2011), *U.S. to Build Up Military in Australia*, "The Wall Street Journal", November 10, URL: http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970203537304577028490161890480.html [August 27, 2013].

Beijing Calls War Game a Threat (2012), "The Washington Times", February 8, URL: http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2012/feb/8/inside-china-719761130/?page=all [August 30, 2013].

ChRLostrzega USA (2013), August 21, URL: http://www.altair.com.pl/news/view?news_id=11220 [21 August 2013].

Entous A., Barnes J.E. (2012), *U.S. Plans New Asia Missile Defenses,* "The Wall Street Journal", August 23, URL: http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10000872396390444812704577605591629039400.html [August 29, 2013].

FifieldA., Menn J. (2011), *US Prepared for Military Response in Cyberwar,* "The Financial Times", July 14, URL: http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/61b1d2aa-ae34–11e8–8752–00144feabdc0, Authorised=false.html?_i_location=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.ft.com%2Fcms%2Fs%2F0%2F61b1d2aa-ae34–11e8–8752–00144feabdc0.html%3Fsiteedition%3Dintl&siteedition=intl&_i_referer=#axzz2deNamo1k [July 14, 2011].

Greenert J. (2012), *Sea Change,* "Foreign Policy", November 14, URL: www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/11/14/sea_change, [August 31, 2013].

Gertz B. (2011), *China Linked to RSA Attack,* "The Washington Times", November 2, URL: http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2011/nov/2/inside-the-ring-308062640/?page=all [September 1, 2013].

Gorman S. (2011), *China Singled Out for Cyberspying,* "The Wall Street Journal", November 4, URL: http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970203716204577015540198801540.html, [September 1, 2013].

Gorman S., Favole J.A. (2013), *U.S. Up Ante for Spying on Firms,* "The Wall Street Journal, February 21, URL: http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424127887323549204578316413319639782.html [September 1, 2013].

Haddick R. (2011), *This Weak At War: Preparing for the Next Korea War,*"Foreign Policy", December 21, URL: http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2011/12/23/this_week_at_war_preparing_for_the_next_korean_war [August 31, 2013].

Hayashi Y., Barta P. (2013), *Pentagon Cuts Feared Tripping Up Pivot to Asia,* "The Wall Street Journal" May 3, URL: http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424127887324582004578456683694045890.html [August 29, 2013].

JohnsonK. (2011), *Clinton Says 'Center of Gravity' Shifting to Asia-Pacific,*"The Wall Street Journal", November 11, URL: http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970203537304577030582124989756.html [September 1, 2013].

Klare M.T. (2013), *The United States Heads to the South China Sea,* February 21, URL: http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/139023/michael-t-klare/the-united-states-heads-to-the-south-china-sea [August 31, 2013].

Lynn W. J. (2011), *Remarks on the Department of Defense Cyber Strategy*, U.S. Department of Defense, July 14, URL: http://www.defense.gov/speeches/speech.aspx?-speechid=1593 [September 1, 2013].

Perett B. (2013), *Australia Based U.S. Radar To Watch China Launches,* "Aviation Week & Space Technology", March 25, URL: http://www.aviationweek.com/Article.aspx?id=/article-xml/AW_03_25_2013_p33–561203.xml [August 30, 2013].

Rozmowy USA-Filipin w sprawiebaz (2013), August 16, URL: http://www.altair.com.pl/news/view?news_id=11181 [28 August 2013].

U.S. Military Strategy in the Western Pacific (2012), Stratfor, July 10, URL: http://www.stratfor.com/sample/analysis/us-military-strategy-western-pacific [July 15, 2012].

Yoshihara T., Holmes J.R. (2012), *Assymetric Warfare, American Style,* "Proceedings Magazine", U.S. Naval Institute, vol. 138, No. 4, URL: http://www.usni.org/magazines/proceedings/2012–04/asymmetric-warfare-american-style [August 31, 2013].