The Future of US Alliances in Asia: US-Japan-ROK Alliance Dialogue

A Conference Report

Carl Baker
Rapporteur

Issues & Insights
Vol. 10-No. 24

Tokyo, Japan
October 2010

Pacific Forum CSIS

Based in Honolulu, the Pacific Forum CSIS (www.pacforum.org) operates as the autonomous Asia-Pacific arm of the Center for Strategic and International Studies in Washington, DC. The Forum's programs encompass current and emerging political, security, economic, business, and oceans policy issues through analysis and dialogue undertaken with the region's leaders in the academic, government, and corporate areas. Founded in 1975, it collaborates with a broad network of research institutes from around the Pacific Rim, drawing on Asian perspectives and disseminating project findings and recommendations to opinion leaders, governments, and members of the public throughout the region.

Table of Contents

Page

Executive Summary v

US-Japan-ROK Alliance Dialogue 1

Conference Agenda and Participant List 11

Acknowledgements

The Pacific Forum CSIS thanks the MacArthur Foundation for its generous financial support for the project to examine the prospects for the US alliances in Asia. Additionally, we are grateful to the many security specialists who took time out of their busy schedules to join us in Tokyo to discuss and share their ideas about the US-ROK and US-Japan alliances and the prospects for improved trilateral cooperation.

The views expressed here do not necessarily represent the views of the respective governments or the group of conference participants as whole.

Executive Summary

Scholars and policy analysts from the United States, Japan, and South Korea met in Tokyo Aug. 12, 2010 to discuss the security environment in Northeast Asia and opportunities for enhanced cooperation among US alliance partners in Northeast Asia and beyond. Throughout the discussions, the changing status of China as a rising power in the region and the increasing unpredictability of North Korea shaped threat perceptions while the difficult and contested history between Korea and Japan moderated expectations for increased trilateral cooperation among alliance partners. While trilateral cooperation among the allies in Northeast Asia remains an attractive prospect, care must be taken to avoid creating the perception that its purpose is to "encircle" China.

Improving trilateral cooperation among alliance partners in Northeast Asia will require the development of an institutional framework beyond the bilateral alliances to sustain dialogue through the low points, especially in the Japan-ROK component of the relationship. While there is general agreement that improving trilateral cooperation on regional and global issues would be mutually beneficial, there has been little bilateral coordination between Japan and South Korea. The obvious recommendation is to improve trilateral coordination through an institutionalized mechanism such as the Trilateral Coordinating Group (TCOG), which was established as part of the coordination mechanism for the Agreed Framework.

The fact is that trilateral cooperation among the US, Japan, and South Korea will remain largely based on a mutually perceived threat from North Korea and, to a lesser extent, as a hedge against a rising Chinese military capability and Beijing's increased assertiveness, especially in regional waters surrounding both Korea and Japan. This sentiment is strongly expressed by Japan and the US, even if for different reasons. For South Korea, its perceptions are filtered through the lens of inter-Korean relations. If US-Japan-South Korea trilateral cooperation is to improve in any significant way, there has to be a conscious effort on the part of both the media and politicians in Japan and South Korea to control emotions and avoid using underlying tensions for short-term political gain.

There was general agreement that cooperation on nontraditional security threats can play an important role in both demonstrating the strength of trilateral cooperation and showing that this cooperation can be done in a non-threatening manner. Areas such as nonproliferation, humanitarian assistance and disaster relief, and maritime security seem to be the areas with the greatest potential.

US-Japan-ROK Alliance Dialogue
Dialogue Report

Carl Baker
Rapporteur

Scholars and policy analysts from the United States, Japan, and South Korea, all participating in their private capacity, met in Tokyo Aug. 12, 2010 to discuss the current security environment in Northeast Asia and opportunities for enhanced cooperation – prospects for realization of the "virtual alliance" – among US alliance partners in Northeast Asia and beyond. The participation of Pacific Forum CSIS Young Leaders helped give this dialogue insight into the perceptions of the younger generation.

Throughout the discussions, the changing status of China as a rising power in the region and the increasing unpredictability of North Korea shaped threat perceptions while the difficult and contested history between Korea and Japan moderated expectations for increased trilateral cooperation among alliance partners. Ultimately, it was clear that the idea of trilateral cooperation among the allies in Northeast Asia remains an attractive prospect, but that does not mean that the cooperation should focus on China as a threat. Rather, the suggestion is that cooperation in regional and global security issues, which tend to be focused on non-traditional security issues, would serve as a basis for alleviating China's fear of encirclement and promote a more inclusive approach to security throughout the region. Nevertheless, cooperation will continue to be hampered by stumbling blocks and pitfalls that will result in tentative progress at best.

The most significant lacuna for improving trilateral cooperation among alliance partners in Northeast Asia is the lack of an institutional framework beyond the bilateral alliances that would sustain dialogue through the low points, especially in the Japan-ROK component of the relationship. Nostalgic recollection of the high points that occurred in the 1980s and the 1990s when there were brief periods of enhanced cooperation in response to specific situations highlighted the potential for rapid improvement. Meanwhile, the low points in relations tend to be punctuated by politicians who seem willing to use past enmities or nationalist sentiments for short-term political gains. An institutionalized trilateral coordinating mechanism could help mitigate these negative influences.

China's growing influence on the region

The defining feature of the discussion on China's influence on the alliances and trilateral relations among the US, Japan, and South Korea was the meaning of and reasons for what appeared to be an increasing assertiveness by Beijing. China's strong reaction to recent US-ROK joint naval exercises in the aftermath of the sinking by the ROK navy corvette *Cheonan* and more generally its display of naval capabilities and assertion of territorial claims throughout the region were interpreted as signs of growing

confidence that was attributed to a perception in China that the power gap between it and the US is shrinking. China's demand for maritime sovereignty under the guise of territorial integrity and the US demand for access to all international waters including exclusive economic zones under the guise freedom of navigation is emerging as a focus of disagreement between the two powers. China's diplomatic assertiveness coupled with the buildup of the Chinese PLA Navy has left many analysts with an uneasy feeling about China's long-term maritime strategy in the region.

The most pessimistic characterization was the argument that a power shift is emerging and China is moving from a strategy of power projection (P2) to one of anti-access (A2) as it becomes more assertive and confident in its role as a maritime power. Proponents note that China previously had shown interest in demonstrating an ability to project its naval capability beyond the "so-called" first island chain, which is usually described as a line through the Kurile Islands, Japan, the Ryukyu Islands, Taiwan, the Philippines, and Indonesia (Borneo to Natuna Besar); now it has gone that and has become combative in its power projection throughout the entire region as far out as the perimeter. Evidence offered included recent harassment of US ships in the South China Sea, demands that the US limit its involvement in planned exercises in the Yellow Sea, and confrontations between Japanese and Chinese ships in the area near the Ryuku Islands. In the past, China was satisfied to simply show its capacity to reach these areas with its naval assets.

Another disconcerting aspect of recent Chinese behavior has been its reluctance to join in condemning North Korea for the sinking of the *Cheonan.* Described by some as acting like North Korea's "defense attorney," China has refused to accept the findings of the Joint Civilian-Military Investigation Group, which concluded that the ship "was sunk as the result of an external underwater explosion caused by a torpedo made in North Korea." This has increased suspicion of China's long-term intentions regarding the Korean Peninsula, raised questions about China's commitment to regional stability, and led to calls by some to increase the cost to China for its shielding of North Korea from having to accept the consequences for its actions.

Equally significant is China's status as an emerging power. This also impacts on bilateral alliances and trilateral relations among the US, Japan, and the ROK. Does China act like a world power? Can it? What norms does it follow as it seeks to set the global security agenda? These questions emerged in discussion of China's growing regional and global role. While some talk about the emergence of a US-China G2, most analysts agreed that it is not likely, with several suggesting that Beijing does not see itself as ready and still in the process of pursuing great power status. This is partly due to its comfort with acting as the "spokesperson" for the "underdeveloped" world on global issues, including climate change, technology transfer, and trade. But China also remains inward looking and insecure in its status as an emerging global leader. And indeed, on issues such as territorial claims and support for North Korea, China's actions also been characterized as immature, lacking nuance and demonstrating insecurity. As one participant pointed out, if a nation is going engage in setting rules, it must be prepared to live by them as well.

It was suggested that China faces a dilemma: given Western dominance in defining global norms, Beijing's assumption of an assertive role would tie it too closely to the West's agenda. But there is a dilemma for the US and its alliance partners, too: none of them wants to designate China as a threat or a full-fledged partner, mostly because of uncertainties reflected in China's mixed signals – its talk of peaceful intentions while continuing a military buildup and increasing assertiveness in territorial claims, economic and trade relations. The use of the term "core national interests" in reference to the South China Sea, Yellow Sea, and even access to energy resources have created real concern. Until recently, the term was reserved for territorial integrity and almost exclusively used in reference to Taiwan and Tibet. This leaves the US and its allies struggling to cooperate where possible and hedging on issues where China is viewed as a threat to the regional status quo. It is a difficult policy to implement with any consistency and coherence.

Clearly, analysts are struggling to determine the intent behind China's military modernization program. Some believe it is too early to characterize China as a threat because Beijing is trying to define it role in regional relations. But while it is important to evaluate the implications of this growing military capability, there will always be ambiguity and distrust. Equally important: no matter how it is perceived, China cannot be stopped from becoming more influential. So, the best alternative for the US, Japan, and ROK is to engage China while hedging against the worst-case scenario of a military confrontation. If engagement and security cooperation with China is the desired outcome, then one analyst offered the following seven recommendations:

- Engage the Chinese in military diplomacy;
- Explore ways to coordinate with China on nontraditional security issues;
- The US in particular should reinforce relations with countries in the region and develop a plan to persuade international public opinion regarding its view of freedom of navigation;
- The US should accept and ratify the provisions of the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea;
- Work to improve relations with countries where China is seeking naval installations to increase transparency and avoid zero-sum situations where countries feel that they have to make distinct choices about security alignment;
- Prepare for Chinese naval expansion and be vigilant to prevent China from establishing a strong anti-access capability – Taiwan is important in this context;
- Prepare for additional challenges to US freedom of navigation exercises and confrontations similar to those experienced with the *USS Impeccable* in the South China Sea.

These recommendations are premised on the notion that all three countries must accept a moderately assertive China. However, it also means that trilateral coordination becomes even more important as Chinese assertiveness increases. While each country wants China to become a true partner, each perceives unique difficulties in that process since each country has a multifaceted relationship with China. For Japan, the emergence of a so-called G2 between the US and China is problematic because Tokyo's role as the

primary partner of the US would be reduced and its postwar self-restraint would leave its hands tied as it tries to deal with a rising China. Meanwhile, the longstanding enmity between Japan and China also contributes to Japan's isolation in the region. South Korea is constrained by its reluctance to treat Japan as full security partner, its geographic proximity to China, and its increasing reliance on trade with China. The US needs the cooperation of both Japan and South Korea to sustain its military presence in the region.

Even though there was a sense among participants that the US must respond to China by maintaining its military superiority, there was agreement that the most desirable solution was for China to recognize the value of regional cooperation. This outcome could be "encouraged" by a closely coordinated policy effort by the US, Japan, and South Korea. To this end, the three should call China out when it violates international norms on issues such as freedom of navigation; remind China of its 2002 declaration on the South China Sea, and discouraged support for odious regimes in the name of non-interference and regional stability. One specific suggestion was to increase the cost to Beijing of shielding North Korea. Meanwhile, there should be a concerted effort to remind China that it needs markets for its goods and friendly neighbors to sustain its economic growth; in other words, China doesn't hold all the economic cards. More positively, China should be encouraged to participate in areas where the four countries share interests such as nonproliferation and anti-piracy, and all three countries should promote maritime confidence building and joint understandings with China. A maritime code of conduct, improved communications mechanisms, and even a risk reduction center would help.

North Korea: the common threat or the key to better cooperation?

North Korea is often characterized as both a threat and a likely object of trilateral cooperation among the US, Japan, and South Korea. Perceptions of North Korea have shifted within each country and are influenced by the policies of the current governments. While some of these shifts can be attributed to the vagaries of democratic elections, the fact that North Korea remains an enigma wrapped in a mystery has contributed to the tendency among policymakers to be puzzled by its behavior and led to frequent calls for policy reviews that seem to result as much from their own uncertainty than any shift in North Korean behavior.

Perhaps the greatest shift in recent years has occurred in South Korea. Comparing attitudes among South Koreans between 2005 and 2009, a Korea Institute for National Unification survey found that while 52 percent viewed North Koreans as "brothers" in 2005, by 2009 that percentage had dropped to 40 percent. Meanwhile, the percentage of South Koreans that saw North Korea as an "enemy" rose from 15 percent to 40 percent over that same period. While these survey results have likely been influenced by the shift in ROK government policy toward the North, perceptions have certainly changed. Similarly, South Koreans also see the Northern military threat differently. While South Koreans have been aware of the DPRK's conventional and nuclear capabilities for several years, the *Cheonan* incident has raised awareness of the North as an "asymmetric threat."

While South Koreans remain reluctant to contemplate the use of military force against the North, this shift in attitudes does present an opportunity for improved alliance relations and increased security cooperation with Japan. Perhaps the biggest question in the current context is how long South Korea will insist that it can't resume negotiations with the North until it receives an apology for the *Cheonan* incident. After all, as many are quick to point out, the South is still waiting for an official apology for incidents in the 1980s that have been attributed to the North.

For Japan, the primary threat from North Korea is its nuclear and missile capabilities. There are three scenarios in which Japan perceives itself as being vulnerable to an attack by North Korean missiles. First, and characterized as the most likely, would be in a military-diplomatic use of force with the objective of bringing Japan back to the bargaining table or to force diplomatic concessions. This would most likely a small number of North Korean missile launches at or near Japan while seeking to limit damage to avoid serious escalation. In a second scenario, North Korea would launch missiles against Japan to prevent US involvement in a second Korean War. This would most likely have North Korea launch a number of missiles to discourage Japan from supporting any US initiative to engage in military combat against the North. The third, and least likely scenario, would be a suicidal attack by a desperate leadership in Pyongyang that is determined to leave a legacy in Korean history. This would involve an all-out attack on Japan, including WMD capabilities. This scenario is Japan's worst fear.

Japan has responded to the North Korean threat both militarily and through diplomatic actions. Militarily, the focus has been on the development of a missile defense system that is integrated with that of the US along with a more robust civil defense system. The defense establishment has also used the North Korean threat as a basis for reorganizing the Japan Defense Agency as it becomes the Defense Ministry. Diplomatically, there have been intermittent efforts to normalize relations with the DPRK, although the current policy is to first resolve the issue of Japanese abductees believed to be held in North Korea before normalization can occur. Of course, even if the issue of the abductees is resolved, there remains the longstanding demand by North Korea for wartime reparations from Japan and the fact that Japan will continue to see the North Korean missile capability as a serious existential threat as long as North Korea refuses to give up its so-called nuclear deterrent capability.

The US remains largely focused on North Korean proliferation activities. Its responses have emphasized sanctions and monitoring North Korean trade to prevent the spread of fissile materials and conventional military hardware to other countries and international terrorists. The current strategy of "strategic patience" has shifted the emphasis to the demand for denuclearization. However, in recent months concerns over nonproliferation have increased, leading to renewed calls for dialogue with the North.

So, while all three countries agree on the ultimate importance of a denuclearized Korean Peninsula, separate concerns and the goals associated with them have become impediments to cooperation. Coupled with still different agendas pursued by the two other members of the Six-Party Talks (China and Russia), it has been very difficult to

wrestle the initiative from North Korea. By raising tensions among the other parties, Pyongyang has been able to control the agenda and the pace of progress in resolving the conflict on the peninsula. This has left the North with the impression that it can outwait everyone else. As long as the other parties do not respond to the North's provocations, this is unlikely to change.

One area of agreement among the three countries is that no one is currently interested in resuming the Six-Party Talks – at least not until North Korea gives signals that it is making a serious commitment to denuclearize. Given this stalemate, there is some concern whether the three countries are doing enough to deter North Korea. Of course, this raises the question of *what* should be deterred – an all-out attack, escalation of tensions, improving its nuclear capability, or proliferation activities? Japan is especially concerned that North Korean actions show that Pyongyang is increasingly confident, which can be partly attributed to China's support for the regime in the DPRK.

Following the *Cheonan* incident, there are worries that North Korea has been able to drive a wedge between China and Russia and the US, Japan, and ROK. The challenge is to find a way to halt that process and make it clear to Pyongyang that it will be isolated as long as it refuses to give up its nuclear programs. Skeptics insist that a "five-party" process can't succeed as long as China remains overly concerned about regional security and North Korean reaction to further isolation. Pursuit by the three countries of a "five-party" initiative would force China to openly choose between its neighbor and its partners and deny Beijing a mechanism that provides plausible deniability for making that choice as it seeks to maintain its role as the chair for the Six-Party Talks.

Recognizing the importance of coordinated action among the three countries and the role played by China as the primary supporter of North Korean intransigence, the obvious and least controversial recommendation is to improve trilateral coordination through an institutionalized mechanism such as the Trilateral Coordinating Group (TCOG), which was established in the 1990s as part of the coordination mechanism for the Agreed Framework. However, there is recognition that while TCOG was useful for coordinating positions among the three on issues specifically related to the North Korean nuclear program, its scope should be broadened. Thus, while this reformulated trilateral group should pressure China to encourage North Korea to rejoin the dialogue on denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula, it should go beyond this somewhat narrow agenda. One way of achieving this is to promote security cooperation on nontraditional security issues by inviting both China and Russia to participate in planning in a wide range of areas, including Proliferation Security Initiative exercises and contingency planning for disaster response and peacekeeping. This would help institutionalize trilateral cooperation and encourage other countries in the region to join in to avoid being excluded from future cooperative security mechanisms.

ROK-Japan: Getting past apologies

Despite decades of effort and talk of a virtual alliance, the ROK-Japan relationship remains the weak link in the triangular security relationship between the US,

Japan, and South Korea. Ironically, as early as the 1980s, after the downing of KAL007 by the Soviet Union, Japan and South Korea closely coordinated military activity during the recovery operation. Similarly, in the euphoria of the early 1990s following the end of the Cold War, Japan and South Korea collaborated closely and had preliminary track-one discussions on contingency planning in anticipation of a collapse in North Korea at which operational and intelligence staffs worked closely together. In addition, there have been numerous student and military-to-military exchanges over the years. Yet, the security link between them remains tenuous despite general recognition of shared interests and values.

There are two compelling reasons for Japan and South Korea to seek improved bilateral security relations in the near to medium term. First, better relations would serve as a hedge against China. While both countries openly rely on their alliances with the US in this context, improved bilateral relations would also serve that same purpose and reduce the likelihood of any country in the region misunderstanding the commitment of the allies to enhanced trilateral cooperation. Second, better relations would allow them to take advantage of their shared economic interests and similar democratic institutions.

The *Cheonan* incident is evidence that China has changed its behavior – in the words of one South Korean, it acts like a rich neighbor with a "fat wallet and stiff neck." At the same time, there is a growing sentiment in South Korea that Japanese apologies have been helpful in removing the "scars of history," but it is time for Japan to show its remorse for the past through actions. As US Ambassador to Japan John Roos visited the Hiroshima peace shrine, perhaps Japan can make a similar gesture in Korea. It is time to move forward in the bilateral relationship. The Japanese response is that reconciliation has to be a two-way street. As long as Korea remains emotional and continually demands Japanese action while refusing to acknowledge Japanese sensitivities, progress will be difficult.

There was agreement that both sides will have to take action to overcome the long history of animosity. Recommendations for strengthening the bilateral relationship in the near to medium term include: promotion of a free trade agreement, enhanced security cooperation on planning for civil unrest or collapse in North Korea through a TCOG-like coordinating mechanism, and educating the next generation of leaders in both countries to be sensitive to historical obstacles and help mitigate misunderstandings. Finally, and perhaps most important in the short term, politicians on both sides should avoid tapping into the divisive emotional energy that exists for short-term political gain.

Despite general agreement that bilateral cooperation between Japan and South Korea is essential in the emerging security landscape in Northeast Asia and the values the two countries share should make cooperation relatively easy, discussion quickly revealed pent up emotions on both sides. The Yasukuni Shrine remains a major source of misunderstanding. Japanese tend to couch discussion of the shrine in terms of separation of church and state; Koreans seem unable to acknowledge the shrine's sanctity as long as the remains of "war criminals" are on the grounds. Similarly, while Koreans justify emotional outbursts such as the recent throwing of a brick at the Japanese ambassador in Seoul by referring to historical injustice, Japanese insist Koreans have to control their

emotions. This prompts us to conclude that trilateral cooperation among the US, Japan, and the ROK will be easier to accomplish than bilateral relations among Tokyo and Seoul and trilateral relations can facilitate bilateral relations as the US can act as intermediary.

Trilateral cooperation

While it is easy to agree that trilateral cooperation among the US, Japan, and South Korea is in the interest of all three countries, it is useful to probe the basic rationale for cooperation and its modalities. Three basic and somewhat overlapping rationales for cooperation were identified: common security threats, common interests, and common identities. The relative importance of each depends on the analyst's analytical framework. At out meeting, the focus was on the existential threat from North Korea and the potential threat posed by a rising China. While it was recognized that there are common interests among the three, especially when it comes to promoting a market economy and a stable security environment in the region, these are probably not as compelling as the perception of a common threat in terms of encouraging enhanced cooperation. In fact, there seems to be more potential for trilateral economic cooperation among South Korea, Japan, and China. Evidence for this is seen in the role the three played in establishing the Chiang Mai Initiative, nascent discussions on a free trade agreement, and the creation of a trilateral summit among them. A common identity among the US, South Korea, and Japan also seems to be a relatively weak basis for promoting cooperation: while the three often state that they share the values of promoting democracy and open market economies, there is little evidence that these values have served as the basis for multilateral cooperation. Again, the two Asian allies seem more comfortable and willing to pursue a common identity with other East Asian countries than with the US. This suggests that, for at least the foreseeable future, military cooperation will remain ***the*** cornerstone for enhanced trilateral cooperation.

The most effective cooperation among the US, Japan, and South Korea has been primarily on a bilateral basis between the US and its partner and focused on traditional security in the form of military-to-military cooperation and oriented toward perceived security threats. Logically, then, it seems the best approach to increased trilateral cooperation is to build on existing mechanisms while seeking ways to improve the bilateral relationship between Seoul and Tokyo while promoting commonalities (e.g. commitment to democracy, free markets, and human rights) among the three in anticipation of extending these mechanisms to new areas of cooperation, such as nontraditional security issues in East Asia.

This observation reinforces the earlier suggestion that the TCOG with a broadened agenda would be the best vehicle to promote trilateral cooperation. Success in this effort requires a more formal structure and staff to deal with emerging issues. An immediate issue to be addressed by the group is gaining a better understanding of China's approach to the Korean Peninsula and beginning planning for North Korea collapse scenarios. In the longer term, the mechanism could be used for trilateral coordination on regional and global issues. This is particularly important given the expansion of US-

South Korea relations laid out in the US-ROK Joint Vision Statement and the broadening of US-Japan relations as articulated in US-Japan Joint Declaration on Security.

But while there is general agreement that improving trilateral cooperation on regional and global issues would be mutually beneficial, the sad truth is there has been much less bilateral coordination than expected given the expansive statements on enhanced cooperation that have been articulated by all sides. For Japan, a large part of the problem is its reluctance to engage in security cooperation beyond its own self-defense. More generally, there is sentiment in all three countries that alliance relationships do not offer a significant basis for multilateral cooperation at the regional or global level. This is especially true when the potential for trilateral cooperation is weighed against a general lack of particular common interests and a common identity among the three countries.

In conclusion, trilateral cooperation among the US, Japan, and South Korea will remain largely based on a mutually perceived threat from North Korea and, to a lesser extent, as a hedge against a rising Chinese military capability and Beijing's increased assertiveness, especially in regional waters surrounding both Korea and Japan. If US-Japan-South Korea trilateral cooperation is to improve in any significant way, there has to be a conscious effort on the part of both the media and politicians in Japan and South Korea to control emotions and avoid using underlying tensions for short-term political gain. Meanwhile, it is also important to show China that increased trilateral cooperation among the three does not represent a threat to its own interests, that it is not aimed at China. This will be difficult given the mutually shared threat perception that serves as the "glue" for trilateral cooperation. One area where improved trilateral cooperation could be practiced immediately is preparation for the Nuclear Security Summit scheduled to be held in Seoul in 2012. This reinforces the conclusion that cooperation on nontraditional security threats can play an important role in both demonstrating the strength of trilateral cooperation and showing that this cooperation can be done in a non-threatening manner.

PACIFIC FORUM CSIS

US-Japan-ROK Trilateral Dialogue

Shoyu Kaikan ◆ Tokyo
August 12, 2010

AGENDA

Thursday, August 12

9:00AM **Opening Remarks**

9:15AM **Session 1: Views on China**
China's rise is a key factor in the emergence of East Asia as an engine of growth in the world economy. Meanwhile China often claims the US alliances with Japan and ROK are remnants of the Cold War. Should we view China as primarily a threat or a partner? How do we balance the two roles? Does China's naval presence represent a public good for the region? What is the best way to deal with China's growing naval presence in the region?

Presenters: Bonnie Glaser
Hwang Jaeho
Matake Kamiya

10:45AM Break

11:00AM **Session 2: Japan-ROK Relations**
While there has been talk for a long time about a "virtual alliance" among the US, Japan, and the ROK, the link between Japan and the ROK has remained relatively weak. Why? What can be done about it? What can be done to mitigate the effects of bilateral tension on trilateral cooperation?

Presenters: Noboru Yamaguchi
Lee Sang-hyun

12:30PM Lunch

1:45PM **Session 3: Views on North Korea**
There is a general recognition that North Korea represents both a common threat and an opportunity for enhanced cooperation among the US, ROK, and Japan. Yet, there are differences in perceptions regarding the North. Why is the North considered to be a threat? What is the best response to the threat? What are the primary opportunities for cooperation in dealing with the North?

Presenter: Lee Seok-soo
Narushige Michishita
Kevin Shepard

3:00PM Break

3:15PM **Session 4: Trilateral Cooperation**

This session will focus on the prospects for enhanced trilateral cooperation. What areas are most open to trilateral cooperation? What are the best opportunities for trilateral cooperation at the regional level? Global? What are most appropriate mechanisms for trilateral cooperation?

Presenters: Kim Young-ho
Evans Revere

5:00PM Meeting adjourns

7:00PM Closing dinner

PACIFIC FORUM CSIS

US-Japan-ROK Trilateral Dialogue

Shoyu Kaikan ◆ Tokyo
August 12, 2010

US Participants

Carl BAKER
Director of Programs
Pacific Forum CSIS

Ralph COSSA
President, Pacific Forum CSIS

Ken GAUSE
Research Analyst
Center for Naval Analyses

Bonnie S. GLASER
Senior Fellow
Freeman Chair in China Studies
Center for Strategic and International Studies

Brent HASHIMOTO
Alliance Focus Group
US Pacific Command

Weston S. KONISHI
Associate Director of Asia-Pacific Studies
Institute for Foreign Policy Analysis

Andrew L. OROS
Associate Professor of Political Science and International Studies
Chair, Division of Social Sciences
Washington College

Evans J.R. REVERE
Former President and CEO
The Korea Society

Scott SNYDER
Director, Center for U.S. Korea Policy
Asia Foundation

Drew THOMPSON
Director of China Studies and Starr Senior Fellow, The Nixon Center

Japanese Participants

Matake KAMIYA
Professor, National Defense Academy

Yoichi KATO
Former Bureau Chief of the American General Bureau, *Asahi Shimbun*

Narushige MICHISHITA
Associate Professor
National Graduate Institute for Policy Studies

Masataka NAKAUCHI
Researcher
Research Institute for Peace and Security

Masashi NISHIHARA
President
Research Institute for Peace and Security

Noboru YAMAGUCHI
Professor, National Defense Academy

Seiichiro TAKAGI
Professor, Aoyama Gakuin University

Korean Participants

HWANG Jaeho
Associate Professor
Hankuk University of Foreign Studies

KIM Young-ho
Assistant Professor
Korea National Defense University

LEE Sang-hyun
Senior Researcher, Sejong Institute

LEE Seok-soo
Associate Professor
Korean National Defense University