

A Theoretical Framework for Peace and Cooperation between "Land Powers" and "Sea Powers" -Towards Geostrategic Research of the East Asian Community

LIU Jiang-yong

**Deputy Director & Professor, Institute of International Studies (IIS),
Tsinghua University, Beijing**

Building an East Asian Community is an extremely difficult proposition, especially when it comes to national security. The trend towards "Cold Politics and Warm Economics" (*zhengleng jingre*) has emerged as a catchphrase to describe Asian regional cooperation. Both interdependence and market mechanisms play a significant role in international economics and trade. However, interdependence has also come into conflict with power politics, creating a significant obstacle to security cooperation in Asia. As long as traditional power politics and geostrategy continue to have an effect on some countries' decision-making, it will be difficult to not only build an Asian Security Community but also to integrate the region economically. Consequently, it is essential to create a new geopolitical economic theory as a basis for establishment of an East Asian Community or East Asian Security Community.

Traditional Geostrategic Thought is Outdated

Traditional western geostrategic thought relies upon history and geography as a lens to evaluate the pursuit of hegemony throughout the globe. 19th century "Sea Power Theory" and 20th century "Land Power Theory" posit that the history of mankind is a record of conflicts between land and sea powers. This belief is not supported, however, by the events of history. During both World Wars, conflicts broke out between land powers, as did contests between sea powers. Alliances between land and sea powers also appeared during these wars. Conflict originated from the imperialist contention for colonies and world hegemony, resulting in the failure of the aggressors. Geopolitical factors were nothing more than an excuse for launching wars. For example, in the 1930s, Adolf Hitler proposed a theory called "Lebensraum." The Japanese geostrategy at the time was to ally itself with Germany, to invade China, and to launch the Pacific War. Following World War Two, European integration was based on market mechanisms and interdependence, which had no ties to the principles of traditional power politics and geopolitics.

In Asia-Pacific, however, traditional geostrategy remains the primary basis for the U.S. global strategic approach. Some American experts maintain that the United States should join hands with Japan, Australia and other sea powers to contain China. Some Japanese experts emphasize that as an Asian sea power, Japan should concentrate its national strategy on strengthening the Japan-US Alliance and promoting a loose "Ocean Federation" to contain China and become the "Leader of the Pacific Community." Adherence to these outdated "Land and Sea Power Antagonism Theories" is detrimental to the decision-making of the United States and Japan. Such mistakes could lead to debilitating geostrategic confrontation between China and the United States or China and Japan. Likewise if China were to adopt this "Sea Power Theory" or "Land Power Theory" in its geostrategic thinking and policies to pursue hegemony, it could also harm American or Japanese interests.

Because traditional geostrategy is based on a synthesis of colonialist wars between the 17th and 19th century, its theories aim to explain the pursuit of hegemony from the perspective of geography. However, there remains a lack of theories founded upon the experience of peaceful development and geoeconomic cooperation that has characterized the last 60 years. Therefore, it is imperative to propose a new theory, namely the "Peace and Geostrategic Cooperation between Land and Sea Powers Theory" (PGCT).

First and foremost, facing economic globalization and regional economic integration in the 21st century, it is essential to eliminate colonial era thinking, which maintains that a country's geopolitical interests and resources are guaranteed through military power or invasion of other nations and that the rise of other powers poses a threat. In the modern era, it is unlikely for rising powers to follow the colonialist path and divide up colonies between them. In fact, all of the major powers that have experienced a renaissance in the postwar era have had to engage in some degree of regional integration.

Second, the contemporary trend is not towards "Sea and Land Power Antagonism" but rather towards "Sea and Land Power Cooperation." According to some related statistics, from the 17th century to the 19th century conflicts that broke out over commercial seaways occupied 36 percent of wars during that time period. In the 20th century, the proportion of such conflicts was as low as 3 percent, with a nearly negligible percentage covering the postwar era.

Third, East Asia is comprised of both sea powers and land powers. No matter whether a sea or land power, without cooperation between the two types under PGCT a peaceful and stable international environment is impossible. The very concept of an East Asian Community will be nothing more than empty rhetoric.

Fourth, PGCT not only proposes a subjective ideal but also reveals an objective fact that these countries can obtain mutual benefits in the realm of geoeconomics. In the 21st century, peace and cooperation are the only means of preserving the trend towards prosperity and development.

Fifth, the success of European economic integration has in large part depended upon the tendency towards peaceful integration. This path relies on each European member's intention to peace, such as through the prevention of conflicts through peaceful means, integration through the concept of a "Peaceful Community," and interaction by consultation. In sum, this could be called "Peaceful Multilateralism."

The East Asian Community Needs PGCT

The essence of PGCT is that both land and sea powers should engage in geopolitical and geoeconomic dealings through peaceful means. This approach is conducive to the lasting peace, safety, development and prosperity for the nation, the region and even the world. In brief, the best way to ensure "lasting security" in Asia is PGCT. The basic method of pursuing these theoretical aims is as follows:

- Both land and sea powers should follow the basic principles of peaceful coexistence, mutual non-aggression, mutual non-resorting to the use of force or the threat of force, and non-interference in each other's internal affairs;
- Both land and sea powers should make use of their individual geographic advantages and develop economic and security cooperation based on mutual equality and trust;
- Both land and sea powers should increase mutual openness, providing an hospitable environment for mutual development and cooperation, and for problem-solving through dialogue and coordination;
- Both land and sea powers should strive for harmony, setting up the common goal of peace and cooperation rather than the antagonism of traditional geopolitics;
- Both land and sea powers should not only strive for cooperation with each other, but also for cooperation between land powers, as well as cooperation between sea powers.

PGCT is a central component of the overall trend towards progress. Compared with 20 years ago, there have been at least five prominent changes in the international community: 1) the advent of the information society, 2) the development of economic globalization, 3) the rise of multilateralism, 4) the emergence of non-traditional security problems, and 5) the prominent rise in international status of China and India and

other developing countries, as well as their improved relations with their neighbors. Facing this new construct, China resoundingly proposes a national strategy of peaceful development and the construction of a harmonious world.

PGCT is based on Asian geoeconomic relations. Asia consists of a variety of interlinked countries that could be characterized as sea or land-based powers or both. From the perspective of geoeconomics, these countries can traverse sea, air and rail transportation networks in cultivating high-speed interconnectedness. They can make use of their individual geostrategic advantages to implement regional cooperation in a step-by-step manner by encouraging sub-regional cooperation mechanisms, to expand this transportation network. It is reported that the local governments of China and South Korea are planning to build a ferry linkage between Yantai and Incheon, allowing the train line from Rotterdam to connect with Tokyo. China also plans to construct an oil pipeline from Persian Gulf and India Ocean via Burma. These goals could not be accomplished without PGCT.

PGCT also demonstrates the common interests and complementarities between land and sea powers. Russia and the petroleum exporting countries of the Middle East and Central Asia can export resources to importing countries like China, Japan and Korea through ocean shipping and construction of oil pipelines, which can be developed as a stable and reciprocal net to meet energy demands. According to Russian forecasts, oil exploitation may reach as high as one hundred million annual tons and the amount of natural gas will be 1.05 billion cubic meters in 2020. Russia is also planning to export natural gas to China, Japan and Korea through its pipeline web. In 2020, the proportion of Russia's oil exported to Asian countries is anticipated to increase from 3 to 30 percent and the proportion of natural gas exporting is also expected to increase from 5 to 25 percent.

PGCT aims to guarantee the security of energy channels and to deal with a variety of non-traditional security threats and challenges. Asian land and sea powers both depend upon oil from the Persian Gulf transported via the Malacca strait and both require ocean-shipping access to international trade. National security extends beyond the concept of traditional security. No matter the type of country, it is very hard for a single country to deal with challenges from the field of non-traditional security such as anti-terrorism, the fight against piracy, prevention of transnational crimes, combat of environmental problems, etc. In order to solve these issues effectively, there is nothing else but to develop multinational cooperation.

It is crucial for PGCT to develop "healthy bilateral relations and peaceful multilateralism." The success of ASEAN and its cooperative mechanisms such as ASEAN plus China "10+1" and ASEAN plus China, Japan, and Korea "10+3" are some good examples of PGCT in Asia. As another cooperative mechanism, the Six Party Talks are the best way to accomplish the goal of denuclearization of the Korean peninsula through peaceful dialogue and consultation. In April 2004, Chinese Premier Wen Jiabao attended the China-Pacific Island Countries Economic Development & Cooperation Forum and visited many countries such as Australia, Fiji, New Zealand, and Cambodia, which inaugurated a new phase of PGCT. Chinese President Hu Jintao visited the United States soon after Premier Wen, which also served as a major step towards strengthening PGCT between the two countries. As for the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO), it is an important regional multinational organization of PGCT in Asia. Based on the healthy bilateral and geopolitical relations, the organization, which follows the principle of non-targeting of any third party, is significant to maintaining and enhancing stability, peace, anti-terrorism, and economic and energy cooperation.

In sum, PGCT is not an unrealizable theory. It is based on strategic guidance and policy practice. From a strategic perspective, PGCT is likely to be successful, as it has the long-term potential to avoid the outbreak of world wars. Peace and development is a global strategic issue. PGCT does not pursue the interests of a single country but the common security and development interests of all countries, which has a common value that supersedes different systems and ideologies. Moreover, it is not to be forced upon societies, but rather serves as an effective path towards acquiring security and development interests with the lowest cost. Therefore, responsible leaders throughout the world will find it difficult to reject PGCT.

PGCT and Relations between China, the United States, and Japan

PGCT accomplishes the dual task of avoiding antagonism between land and sea powers, while assuring win-win benefits for both. PGCT is also a sensible direction for the relations between China, America and Japan. History shows that only peace and cooperation is advantageous to all sides. Arbitrarily characterizing other countries as antagonists from a traditional geopolitical perspective will only serve to hurt one's own interests.

Both China and the United States are important economic partners that can make great contributions to PGCT. As a super power located between two oceans, the United States should have been the dominant country of PGCT. Among the factors that prevent the United States from exerting its full influence, the traditional geostrategic perspective is an important one, evidenced by American tendency to consider China and Russia as geostrategic rivals. However, facing more and more non-traditional security pressure, the United States has had to encourage China and Russia as partners in facing common security challenges. Recently, the Pentagon also expressed its agreement with the statement "We need to urge China to become a responsible stakeholder in that system." As for the Taiwan issue, America also considers it in the structure of strategic relations with China. In April 2006, Chinese President Hu Jintao will pay a visit to America, spurring the development of Sino-US relations at the beginning of the 21st century. Notwithstanding many problems existent in Sino-US relations, promotion of PGCT will serve to alleviate antagonism and strengthen cooperation between world powers.

China and Japan should also mutually strive for PGCT, making use of the huge potential advantages of geoeconomic cooperation in Asia. Recently, disregarding the sentiments of people in its neighboring countries, Japanese Prime Minister Koizumi went to pray at the Yasukuni Shrine on numerous occasions. This behavior of "looking backwards" exacerbates historical differences, bringing uncertainty to the future of Japan. In addition, China (including Hong Kong) has been the biggest partner of Japan in business and trade. As a typical sea power, Japan depends on land powers like China, Russia, and countries in the Middle East in many fields such as energy, resource, and markets. Therefore, PGCT is in Japanese national interests. If China and Japan can achieve cooperative exploitation in the controversial area of East China Sea, it will be a precedent in the history of Sino-Japan relations. On the one hand, by obeying the spirit of the *United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (1982)*, the two countries should achieve cooperative exploitation in the controversial area of East China Sea, changing the relationship from conflict to cooperation. On the other hand, it is also a touchstone for testifying whether or not China and Japan can achieve the goal of PGCT.

As for China, implementing PGCT will aid in reducing external anxiety towards the rise of China. The rationale behind the concept of the "China Threat" as held by some American and Japanese experts consists of two parts. The first is anxiety over China's future geostrategic expansion. Implementing PGCT can assist countries in understanding and grasping the direction of Chinese development by strengthening the transparency on Chinese strategic development. The second anxiety is the exaggeration of the development of the Chinese military. In fact, based on rapid economic development and high price index, maintaining double-digit rate increases on the annual defense expenditure is not a threat to its neighboring countries at all. During the period of its rapid economic development from 1961 to 1980, the average increase rate of Japan's defense expenditure was 14.3 percent, which is also a double-digit increase. Therefore, a country's intention is often more important than its military power.

Implementing PGCT will not harm Japan-US relations, nor will it damage or come into conflict with Japanese and U.S. interests. On the contrary, PGCT is a positive direction for the harmonious development of relations between China, America and Japan. PGCT proposes not simply cooperation between land and sea powers, but also peaceful cooperation between like powers, such as the sea powers of Japan and the United States. In the 21st century, whether or not China, the United States, and Japan can achieve peaceful coexistence and strengthen cooperation will be the key to achieving full realization of Peace and Cooperation between "Land Powers" and "Sea Powers."

“海陆和平合作论”

——面向东亚共同体的地缘战略研究

包括安全在内东亚共同体建设是非常不容易的。“政冷经热”倾向在亚洲区域合作方面也有所表现。在经济贸易方面，市场机制和相互依存关系在发挥作用。但是，与此相反，在安全领域，权力政治与相互依存关系彼此对立，成为亚洲安全合作的障碍。只要传统的权力政治和地缘政治学原理继续对一些国家的决策产生影响，不仅亚洲安全共同体难以建立，而且亚洲经济一体化进程也不会顺利。今后要建立亚洲共同体或东亚安全共同体，就需要一种新的地缘政治经济学作为理论基础。

传统的地缘战略思想已经过时

西方传统的地缘战略学，主要是从历史和地理的角度论述如何称霸世界。19世纪的“海权论”和20世纪的“陆权论”，都是把人类历史看成海洋国家与大陆国家对抗的历史。但这并不符合后来的历史事实。在两次世界大战中，既有陆地国家之间的战争，也有海洋国家之间的战争，以及海洋国家与陆地国家的结盟现象。战争的起源是帝国主义国家争夺殖民地和世界霸权，战争的结果是侵略者的彻底失败。地缘政治因素只不过是利用来作为发动战争的借口。例如，20世纪30年代，希特勒便提出过所谓“生存空间论”；日本当时的地缘战略也是与德国结盟，侵略中国并发动太平洋战争。战后，欧洲一体化是在市场机制和相互依存关系的基础上得到推进的，而与传统的权力政治和地缘政治学原理无关。

然而，在亚太地区，至今，传统地缘战略学说仍然是美国制定全球战略的重要依据。美国一些人仍在主张，美国应与日本、澳大利亚等海洋国家联手遏制中国。日本也有人学美国，强调作为海洋国家，日本的国家战略应该是强化日美同盟，促使亚洲海洋国家组成的松散的“海洋联邦”，牵制中国，并使日本成为“太平洋统一体的领导者”。这些过时的“海陆对立论”、不具备普世性的谬论只能误导国家决策，错误导致中美、中日之间产生地缘战略对抗，有害无益。即便是中国，如果接受所谓“海权论”或“陆权论”的地缘战略思想去制定政策，同样可能搞霸权，损害美国或日本的利益。

因为传统地缘战略学说大多是在总结17世纪到19世纪殖民主义战争史的基础上形成的，目的都是从地理的角度论述如何称霸世界的。然而，对战后60年来人类通过地缘经济合作争取和平发展的经验，还缺乏理论概括。这种理论滞后的状况亟待改变。在21世纪的今天，提出海洋国家与大陆国家和平、合作的“海陆和合论”，具有特别重要的现实意义和理论价值。

首先，在21世纪经济全球化和地区经济一体化的大趋势下，正确的地缘战略必须摆脱殖民主义时代思维方式的束缚。所谓殖民主义时代的思维方式，就是为确保本国的地缘政治利益和资源而通过军事力量或战争占领别国领土，并且深信其他大国的崛起必然会对本国造成威胁。但是，在现在的“非殖民主义时代”，被完全瓜分、占领完毕的殖民地由新崛起的大国重新瓜分已不可能。战后实现复兴的大国程度不同地都不能不参与地区一体化进程。

其次，与“海陆对立”相比“海陆和合”才是时代的潮流。据统计，17世纪至19世纪，围绕商业海上通道的战争，占当时战争总数的36%，而20世纪以来，只占3%。战后几乎没有听说有这种战争。

第三、东亚是由海洋国家和陆地国家组成的。无论对海洋国家还是大陆国家，没有“海陆和合”，就没有和平与稳定的国际环境。没有“海陆和合”，建立所谓“东亚共同体”就将是一句空话。

第四，“海陆和合”不仅是一种主观愿望和理念，而且符合海陆国家之间客观存在的地缘经济互补性。在 21 世纪，只有和平与合作，才能为海洋国家和陆地国家带来可持续的共同繁荣与发展。

第五，欧盟经济一体化的成功，在很大程度上是依靠其一体化和平的取向。即，强调以和平手段抑制冲突的发生、一体化中的“不战共同体”思想、协调的相互作用等。这也可以称为“和平的多边主义”。

东亚共同体需要“海陆和合论”

“海陆和合论”的实质，是以和平方式管理和利用好海洋国家和大陆国家之间的地缘关系，以促进本国、本地区和全球的持久和平、安全、发展与繁荣。简而言之，只有依靠“海陆和合论”，才能在亚洲谋求“可持续安全”。其基本内容和追求的目标至少应该包括以下几部分：

——海洋国家与陆地国家和平相处，互不侵犯，互不使用武力和武力威胁，互不干涉内政；

——海洋国家与陆地国家各自发挥自身地缘优势，开展平等互利的经济合作和彼此信赖的安全合作；

——海洋国家与陆地国家相互开放，为对方的发展和彼此合作提供地缘便利条件，通过政治对话与协商解决彼此之间存在的矛盾和问题；

——海洋国家与陆地国家不以海陆划线树敌立友，而以和平、合作为共同目标，争取实现“海陆和谐”；

——海洋国家与陆地国家不仅要努力实现“海陆和合”，还要谋求海洋国家之间的“海海和合”、陆地国家之间的“陆陆和合”。

“海陆和合”是形势发展之必然。与 20 多年前相比，国际社会至少发生了突出的五大变化：一是信息化社会的到来；二是经济全球化的发展；三是多边主义的兴起；四是非传统安全问题的凸显；五是中、印等发展中大国国际地位的明显提高，与周边邻国的关系全面改善。正是在这种新形势下，中国响亮地提出和平发展的国家战略及建立和谐世界的主张。

“海陆和合”是亚洲地缘经济关系决定的。亚洲各国山水相连，既有海洋岛国，又有内陆国家和海陆兼备的国家。有关各国可以利用彼此相邻的地缘经济优势，通过海运、空运和铁路及高速公路网相连接，形成若干次区域经济圈彼此相通的亚洲广域经济圈。据报道，中韩两国地方政府计划在山东烟台和韩国仁川之间建立跨海列车轮渡，使从欧洲鹿特丹开来的火车直接跨海开到日本的东京。中国还将利用地缘经济便利修建经缅甸从波斯湾、印度洋运输石油的进口大通道。要实现这些美好远景，没有“海陆和合”、“陆陆和合”的国际环境是不可想象的。

“海陆和合”体现着陆海国家的共同利益与互补性。亚洲既有中、日、韩等油气资源进口国，也有俄罗斯和位于中东、中亚的诸多产油国，可以通过海运和铺设管道运送能源，建立比较稳定和互利的能源供求网络。俄罗斯预计，2020 年俄东部石油年开采量将达 1 亿吨，天然气达 1050 亿立方米。俄罗斯正计划通过输气管网，向中日韩输送天然气。2020 年，俄对亚洲石油出口的比重有可能从目前的 3% 增至 30%；天然气出口将从目前的 5% 增至 25%。

“海陆和合”是确保海陆能源通道安全，应对非传统安全领域各种威胁和挑战的需要。如今，亚洲陆地国家也需要通过马六甲海峡、波斯湾进口原油，以及利用海运从事国际贸易，海上通道安全已成为海洋国家和陆地国家共同的安全利益。国家安全现已超出传统安全的概

念。无论是海洋国家还是陆地国家，都难以单独应付反恐、打击海盗、防止跨国犯罪、生态环境等诸多非传统安全领域的挑战，而只有通过跨国合作才能有效防范。

“海陆和合”的必由之路是，“良好的双边关系+和平的多边主义”。亚洲“海陆和合”的范例之一是东盟 10 国的成功实践，以及东盟与中国（10+1）、东盟与中日韩（10+3）合作机制的发展。“六方会谈”是通过和平对话实现朝鲜半岛无核化的唯一途径。2006 年 4 月，中国总理温家宝出访澳大利亚、斐济、新西兰、柬埔寨，并出席首届“中国—太平洋岛国经济发展合作论坛”，开创了“海陆和合”的新篇章。继而，中国国家主席胡锦涛访美，又增进了太平洋两岸两个大国的“海陆和合”。上海合作组织是亚洲“陆陆和合”的重要地区多边组织，它是以良好双边关系和地缘关系为基础的，不具有对抗第三国的性质，而对于本地区的和平稳定、联合反恐、经济及能源合作等，具有十分重要的促进作用。

总之，“海陆和合”不是空想，它既具有战略指导性，也具有政策可行性。这是因为，从战略高度看，长时期内世界大战可以避免，“海陆和合”是有希望的；和平与发展是全球性战略问题，“海陆和合论”既符合全球解决这两大问题的战略需要，也符合多数国家政府所追求的目标；“海陆和合论”不是谋求某一国的单方面利益，而是鼓励各国谋求共同的安全与发展利益，具有超越不同社会制度和意识形态的普世性价值；“海陆和合论”不是强加于人的教条，而是人类社会有可能通过最低成本共同获得安全和发展利益的有效途径，因而也将是世界上任何一个理智的、负责任的国家领导人的政治本能所终将难以拒绝的战略选项。

“海陆和合论”与中美日关系

“海陆和合”是避免“海陆对立”、实现“海陆共赢”的必然选择，也是中美、中日关系应取的方向。历史经验反复证明，只有和平、合作才对各方都有利，而那种以海陆划线树敌立友，人为制造“威胁”与“对抗”，到头来只能对本国不利。

中美两国互为重要的经济伙伴，可以为“海陆和合”作出较大贡献。美国是面临东西两洋的世界超级大国，本来可以成为“海陆和合”的主导力量，但妨碍美国发挥作用的因素之一是传统的地缘战略观念。这主要表现在美国仍把中、俄作为地缘战略的竞争对手。另一方面，“9·11”事件以来，非传统安全领域中增大的压力等迫使美国开始鼓励中、俄“在解决共同安全挑战方面充当美国的伙伴”。最近，美国军方也认同“美国的目标是使中国继续作为经济伙伴，并成为负责任的利益相关者”。关于台湾问题，美国也是把它放在中美关系的战略框架内加以权衡的。2006 年 4 月，中国国家主席胡锦涛访问美国，将为 21 世纪初的中美关系注入新的活力。尽管中美之间还有这样那样的问题，但中美互不对抗，加强合作，将特别有利于促进大国间的“海陆和合”。

中日两国只有谋求“海陆和合”，才能充分发挥亚洲地缘经济的巨大潜在优势，造福于中日两国的子孙后代。近年来，日本领导人不顾对邻国人民感情的极大伤害而反复参拜靖国神社，是在“向后看”的表现，制造并加深了日本同邻国的历史观冲突，也给日本的未来带来不确定性。另一方面，目前包括香港在内，中国已成为日本最大的贸易伙伴。日本作为海洋国家，其能源、资源、市场离不开包括中国、俄罗斯、中东国家等在内的陆地国家或海陆兼备的国家。因此，实现“海陆和合”最符合日本的国家利益。中日两国如能通过谈判，实现东海有争议地区油气资源的共同开发，将是中日关系史上的一个创举。两国政府应遵照《联合国海洋法公约》的精神，通过公平原则，化对立为合作，在有争议地区实现共同开发。从相反意义上讲，这也是检验中日能否实现“海陆和合”目标的一块试金石。

中国奉行“海陆和合”的地缘战略，将有利于减少一些人对中国崛起的担忧。目前，美日一些人持有“中国威胁论”主要来自两方面原因：一是由于对中国强大后会不会搞地缘

战略扩张不放心，而“海陆和合论”则可增加中国战略发展前景的透明度和能见度，使有关各国更容易理解和把握中国发展的未来。二是某些人就中国军事力量增长听信了一些夸大之辞。其实，中国在经济增长速度较快、物价涨幅较大情况下，名义上每年保持所谓两位数的国防开支增长率，根本谈不上对邻国构成威胁。实际上，日本在经济高速增长时期，1961年到1980年的20年间，防卫开支年均增幅达14.3%，都在两位数以上。重要的是，不仅要看军事力量，还要看军事战略意图。

“海陆和合”不仅不会冲击日美关系，损害日美的利益，反而可能成为中美日三边关系协调发展的一条出路。因为“海陆和合论”也提倡日美之间的“海海和合”。21世纪，中美、中日之间能否长期和平共处，扩大合作，将成为东亚地区能否实现“海陆和合”的关键。