



**Pyongyang in the Cockpit: Regional Responses to
North Korean Provocations**

PACIFIC FORUM CSIS

YOUNG LEADERS

CGP
The Japan Foundation
Center for Global Partnership

Issues & Insights
Vol. 12 – No. 2

Seoul, Korea
April 2012

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 arenas. 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.

The Young Leaders Program

The Young Leaders Program invites young professionals and graduate students to join Pacific Forum policy dialogues and conferences. The program fosters education in the practical aspects of policy-making, generates an exchange of views between young and seasoned professionals, promotes interaction among younger professionals, and enriches dialogues with generational perspectives for all attendees. Fellows must have a strong background in the area covered by the conference they are attending and an endorsement from respected experts in their field. Supplemental programs in conference host cities and mentoring sessions with senior officials and specialists add to the Young Leader experience. The Young Leaders Program is currently supported by Chevron, the Henry Luce Foundation, the Sasakawa Peace Foundation, the Yuchengco Group, The Asia Foundation, and the Taiwan Foundation for Democracy, with a growing number of universities, institutes, and organizations also helping to sponsor individual participants. For more details, see the Pacific Forum CSIS website, www.pacforum.org, or contact Brad Glosserman, director of the Young Leaders Program, at brad@pacforum.org.

Table of Contents

	Page
Acknowledgements	iv
Introduction	v
Key Findings	1
Scenario Overview	3
Scenario Response	7
Team US	7
Team PRC	10
Team ROK	12
Team Japan	15
Team DPRK	18
 Appendices	
Appendix A: Pre-Conference Team Project	A-1
Appendix B: Pre-Conference Paper	B-1
Appendix C: Conference Description/Agenda.....	C-1
Appendix D: YL Agenda	D-1
Appendix E: YL Participants.....	E-1

Acknowledgements

The Pacific Forum CSIS is very grateful to the Henry Luce Foundation for its support of the Young Leaders program. A special thanks to the Institute for Foreign Affairs and National Security (IFANS) of the Republic of Korea Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Australian National University for organizing the 2011 IFANS Conference on Global Affairs. We are especially thankful to the Center for Global Partnership (CGP), the MacArthur Foundation, the Korea Foundation, and the Japan-US Friendship Commission for helping to support this program. A very special thanks to Dr. Choi Kang and Ms. Hyerim Kim and IFANS for hosting Young Leaders. Also, thanks to Matt Anderson, Danielle Chubb, Sungmin Cho, Kyutoi Moon, Mihoko Matsubara, Dong Joon Park, and other Pacific Forum resident fellows for all their work in helping to create and organize the Young Leaders-only program.

Introduction

Pacific Forum CSIS brought 34 Young Leaders (YLS) from seven countries including the US, Japan, ROK, Australia, and the PRC to two Young Leader programs in Seoul. The first program, the *2011 IFANS Conference on Global Affairs: Alliance in Transformation and Regional Security Architecture in Northeast Asia*, brought experts from South Korea, Japan, the United States and Australia in Seoul in October 2011, to discuss the future of multilateral cooperation as a means to tackle traditional and nontraditional security threats.

The second Young Leader program explored challenges for regional cooperation by engaging YLS in a scenario exercise that involved a North Korean missile launch. The 34 YLS were divided into five country teams representing the US, ROK, Japan, DPRK, and the PRC. YLS were given the scenario overview during the opening dinner so that they could play out the scenario in real time over the course of two days. In preparation for this exercise, teams were designated two months in advance and tasked with reviewing 2010 DPRK provocations and how their assigned states dealt with the incidents.

During the IFANS Conference on Global Affairs, representatives of the Pacific Forum's Young Leaders program joined the general discussion and held parallel meetings to discuss the proceedings and provide their own perspectives. A significant divergence from senior views was the next-generation perspective on the significance of cyber-warfare and the threat it might pose to current deterrence efforts. Discussion over this threat revolved around the level of concern policy-makers should hold, and the degree to which cyber-attacks could be considered as a weapon of mass destruction (WMD). Those who argued that cyber-warfare could undermine deterrence framed cyber-threats as a new type of WMD that could cause mass destruction and provide states like North Korea – that are less reliant on sophisticated computer systems – with a significant asymmetric advantage. Others disagreed, arguing that the cyber-warfare threat could not be considered in the same category as nuclear weapons. Rather than posing a threat of mass destruction, cyber-threats would at best cause mass disruption.

Young Leaders also expressed concern that the language used at the senior conference harked back to a Cold War-style rhetoric, and that this was reflected in the structure of the East Asian alliance system. It was agreed that the alliance system needed to evolve to better respond to a new, post-Cold War reality. In particular, more attention needed to be paid to the pressures placed upon states as they sought to coordinate their military alliance with the US and, at the same time, continue to increase cooperation with China, the number one trading partner of all allies. A more evolved alliance system, it was argued, should allow China to re-emerge as a leader within the international system in a way that is conducive to peace and trade and accounts for the concerns and interests of China's neighbors and Asian allies of the United States. Alternative visions for a new multilateral environment in Asia were discussed. While the exact shape of such solutions

varied, there was broad consensus for a move beyond the US-centric bilateral hub-and-spokes system toward experimentation with trilateral structures.

A greater focus on trilateralism was necessary for two overarching reasons. First, there was recognition that the current system of bilateral alliances no longer addresses a changed geopolitical environment in which the US role was primarily to check the military adventurism of what were once considered ‘rogue states’ in US defense doctrine. Second, experiments at European-style multilateralism were likely to be constrained by a range of factors unique to the Asia-Pacific region, such as conflicting national interests, historically embedded mutual distrust, and variation in political system and values.

YL participants discussed the tendency of proposed trilateral models (such as those debated over the course of the senior IFANS conference) to focus on the inclusion of allies, with recognition of the need to ‘assuage Chinese fears.’ It was agreed that this reflected a tendency for China’s neighbors to turn to coalitions to mitigate or manage the rise of the regional power. Moving past this trend, YL participants discussed possibilities for involving China in trilateral efforts. Such a move would mitigate tensions arising from the existence of two great powers in the region by helping to create channels of communication and complicating the cost-benefit analysis of conflict. Suggestions for the forms these could take included a trilateral summit between China, Japan, and South Korea alongside efforts to forge trilateral cooperation between US, Japan, and the ROK. Moving beyond the trilateral model, there was also discussion of how to better institutionalize a security dialogue among Asian countries in forums such as ASEAN+3.

The simulation exercise further highlighted the lack of regional mechanisms (whether institutionalized or ad hoc) for dealing with crises. The crisis simulation revealed the complexity of multilateral cooperation in Asia. While YL participants had anticipated tensions between rivals, the difficulties of cooperating among US allies was more pronounced than expected. An important take-away was that, just as the PRC and DPRK experience difficulties in their relations, the divergent values of national constituencies complicate the formulation of comprehensive approaches to crises by the US and its allies. Most strikingly, it became clear that states in the region relied almost exclusively on functional cooperation through limited ad-hoc institutions in the face of serious crises, and did not turn to established institutions such as the United Nations or the ARF. The development of a more institutionalized response to crises was recommended, as a first step toward developing mechanisms by which greater multilateral cooperation could be ensured.

What follows is one-page summary of key takeaways drafted by fellows who participated in the scenario exercise, the scenario overview that introduced the specifics of the scenario, an analysis of how the scenario played out from the perspective of each country team.

US-ROK-Japan-China Quadrilateral Dialogue

Seoul, ROK ♦ October 13-18, 2011

Key Findings

US leadership is vital to successful trilateral cooperation between the US, Japan, and the ROK in crises. A stable regional security order requires Japan and the ROK to coordinate their responses to North Korea's provocations. In the absence of US initiatives to bring the two countries to the negotiating table during the crisis, cooperation between the ROK and Japan failed to materialize.

Korean and Japanese expectations of how the US should respond to the North Korean provocation diverged significantly. Despite calls for greater equality in the alliance, there is an ongoing expectation that the US' role is to act as a mediator between diverging priorities of the ROK and Japan.

US reassurance strategy should encompass diplomatic, as well as military elements. Military actions are important in assuaging abandonment fears, but diplomatic reassurances may also achieve that goal while de-escalating tension.

For both Pyongyang and Seoul, avoiding military confrontation on the Korean Peninsula is the most important objective. When ROK is not the principal, its concerns for stability on the peninsula outweigh trilateral cooperation. Thus, diverging security interests between the ROK and Japan is the greatest challenge for trilateral cooperation.

The DPRK quickly capitalized on rifts between regional actors and was able to control over the situation by maintaining tension for example between Japan and the ROK. The DPRK's efforts to use these tensions to its advantage highlighted the importance of an aligned trilateral front to ensure regional stability. The US is in the best position to lead efforts to improve strategic communications among allies.

Internal strategies for regime survival in North Korea play a greater role in determining DPRK policy responses than wider regional dynamics and other external factors.

Japanese domestic dynamics has a relatively strong influence on the government's response to crises. There were fears that the Japanese public would perceive a moderate response to the crisis as a sign of weakness. Under such pressure, Japan quickly evolved from its traditional pacifist track to discussing the overhaul of its constitution to allow for militarization. The US struggled, once the allies had diverged in both purpose and approach, to bring the three parties together.

In crisis situations, Cold War mentalities quickly reemerge in Northeast Asia. A lack of communication between the most influential states, China and the US, magnifies conflicting national priorities which escalate and destabilize the situation.

China's focus on short-term goals regarding the DPRK harms the pursuit of its long-term goals, which include reducing instability and nuclear proliferation. Without Chinese pressure on the DPRK, other countries will take stronger counteractions, including nuclearization, leading to instability in the region.

Despite China's influence in the region, other countries are becoming skeptical of China's role. China's fixation on its short-term national goals tend to conflict with other countries, namely the US, and there is growing concern that China is part of the problem instead of the solution.

Messages among states are often misinterpreted, missed, or ignored due to a lack of reliable communication channels in the region.

Multilateral responses to crises in Northeast Asia are limited. States in the region rely on functional cooperation through limited and focused ad-hoc institutions rather than broadly organized institutions, such as the United Nations or the ARF.

**PACIFIC FORUM CSIS
YOUNG LEADERS PROGRAM
US-ROK-Japan-China Quadrilateral Dialogue
October 16-18, 2011, Seoul, ROK**

Scenario Overview

Young Leaders will work in country teams that have been arranged prior to the conference. YLs are to take on the role of an actor within the team to discuss reaction to the scenario and how to negotiate with other countries to avoid further destabilization and increase regional cooperation. Objectives of this exercise are to:

- understand domestic dynamics involved in foreign policy decisions
- understand dynamics of interaction in multilateral negotiation
- propose action plan that increases regional cooperation and stability based on lessons learned from scenario/simulation

Scenario

On April 10, 2012, in the midst of South Korea's general election and North Korea's anniversary of Kim Il-Sung's 100th birthday, North Korea announced it was preparing to launch an experimental communications satellite using a rocket that is part of its ballistic missile program on April 12. South Korea, Japan, and the US criticized the plan for violating UNSC Resolution 1874. Japan deployed three Patriot Advanced Capability-3 systems in Tokyo and Honshu. For unknown reasons, the rocket lands in Yubari, Hokkaido prefecture of Japan, where the famous Oshibetsu Spa attracts international tourists, at 10:17 am on April 12. Seven Chinese tourists, two American tourists, and three Japanese locals are killed. The Japanese prime minister hosted a ministerial meeting on security and convened a press conference stating military measures are being considered for retaliation. The South Korean and American governments convene emergency meetings at the Blue House and White House respectively. China and North Korea keep silent on the incident. Now it is 2 pm on April 12, 2012.



Background Information and Assumptions

- Domestic politics in 2012 before the rocket launch
 - In January Ma Ying jeou was re-elected as president of Taiwan. Cross-strait relations remain stable.
 - In February North Korea lavishly celebrated Kim Jong-il's 70th birthday in Pyongyang in February.
President Lee criticized the extravagance of the festival and wrong use of resources.
 - In March, the 2nd Nuclear Security Summit was held successfully, the North Korean nuclear program was discussed several times. President Lee invited Kim Jong-il but North Korea declined to attend.
 - In April, The Grand National Party (GNP), ruling party of South Korea, has lost the general election on April 11.
 - GNP obtained 40 percent of the seats while the Democratic Party gained 50 percent. The remaining 10 percent seats go to the independents and small parties.
- Reactions of countries between North Korea's announcement and the rocket launch
 - China expressed concern and urged all sides to remain calm. China did not comment on whether the experiment violates UN Security Council Resolution 1874.
 - Regarding Japan's decision to intercept the rocket, North Korea asserted in an editorial of the Rodong-Daily that Japan's action would mean war and prompt counter strikes.
- Casualties
 - Twelve Chinese tourists were affected. Seven are dead, five are in critical condition.
 - Three American students were affected. Two are dead, one is in critical condition.
 - Seven Japanese locals including employees of the spa were affected. Three are dead.
 - In addition, three South Koreans, and two Australians were injured.
- Technical Background
 - The rocket did not possess explosives.
 - Launch location was unknown in advance and detected only after the launch.
- Domestic actors of each country
 - Ministry and Cabinet members of each country at the time of this hypothetical incident are assumed to be the actual figures as of October 2011.

Political Events of Northeast Asia in 2012

Date	Country	Political Event	Note
January 14	Taiwan	Presidential Election (4 year term)	President Ma(KMT) runs for re-election
February 16	North Korea	Kim Jong-il's 70 th Birthday	
March	Russia	Presidential Election	Medvedev-Putin Deal
March 27-28	South Korea	2 nd Nuclear Security Summit	
April 11	South Korea	General Election (4 year term)	
April 12	North Korea's rocket test failed, landing on Japan, killing 12 people. (Scenario)		
April 15	North Korea	100 th Anniversary of Kim Il-Sung's Birthday	Opening the Year of 'Strong and Prosperous'
September 8-9	Russia	APEC	Vladivostok
Mid- October	China	18 th National Congress of CCP (* 17 th held in 2007)	Xi Jinping, expected to succeed power
November 6	United States	Presidential Election (4 year term)	
December 19	South Korea	Presidential Election (5 year term)	

Worksheet and Guiding Questions for the Breakout Sessions

Use this worksheet to focus your team breakout discussions. Rapporteurs from each team are to produce summaries of group discussions that should be guided by questions below. Rapporteurs are also responsible for drafting joint action plan during Session III. Proposed action plans from each country will be posted on a Google document during the negotiation table (Session V) to be merged into a single joint action plan by the end of the session.

Session II: Group Breakout Session Phase I- 9:30 AM – 12 PM

Describe internal decision making process and how your country responds within the first two hours of the missile test. Discussion should only be within country teams.

1. Summarize each actor's position within your country.
2. Given domestic dynamics of your country (among leadership and public) and foreign relations, what is the best course of action that your government should take?
3. Did North Korea intentionally target Japan? What are the motives? What kind of unilateral action can you take? With which countries and how do you cooperate?

4. How do you anticipate other countries' immediate responses to this incident? What is your initial demand / request to other countries?

Session III: Group Breakout Phase II- 1:00PM – 4PM

Draft action plan to be proposed at the negotiation table. You may coordinate response with other countries during this session by sending or requesting a representative to/from other countries for talks. (i.e. Team US may request an emergency meeting with ministers from Team Japan and Team ROK to coordinate response.)

1. Do you need to coordinate negotiation strategy with others prior to the five-party talks? How? Which country do you contact? Who do you send? What do you coordinate with them (official/unofficial talks)? Remember, official talks will be announced by media (Adrian).
2. How does your country perceive others' demand/ request and how interpret their intentions? Do you accept/ reject other countries' demands/ expectation? If not, how would you modify it?

Scenario Response Summary

Team US

Descriptive report of how the scenario played out from the perspective of your team.

Upon news of the North Korean satellite landing on a Japanese hot spring and killing Japanese citizens as well as other foreign nationals, the US National Security Council (NSC) convened immediately to discuss appropriate responses. After meetings among various levels of the Department of State and the Pentagon, the US concluded that the best way to support its allies as they dealt with the aftermath of the tragedy was to consult closely with Japan regarding an appropriate response. The rationale behind this approach was to encourage a calm response, while simultaneously sending a strong message of support to its allies in the region. In view of upcoming presidential elections, the Obama administration had an extra incentive to avoid confrontation in Asia. Following 10 years of involvement in wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, there is no public support within the US for talk of conflict in the Asia Pacific.

Despite US efforts to coordinate responses with Japan, the Japanese government unilaterally released a statement confirming and condemning the incident and stating that an investigation was underway, to ascertain intentionality. A US statement, echoing Japan, was released shortly thereafter in an effort to provide an appearance of unity.

Both the Secretary of Defense and Secretary of State spoke with their counterparts in the Republic of Korea and Japan to discuss the option of conducting joint military operations in the Sea of Japan, in response to the incident. Japan expressed an interest in a three-way (Japan-ROK-US) military operation and the US acted as a liaison between the two countries to try and help decide the details of such an operation. The ROK expressed concern that China had contacted them and threatened to hold military operations with the DPRK in response. Both Japan and the US assessed that threat as not credible.

While Japan was determined to hold joint military operations, the ROK ultimately decided that the risks inherent in such exercises (an outbreak of war on the Korean Peninsula) outweighed the benefits and opted to not take part. Given that the operation had taken place on Japanese soil, and the ROK seemed unwilling to consider any type of strong response to the incident, the US decided to support Japan's request. This approach was developed as a means of demonstrating on-going commitment to the Asia Pacific in general, and to extended deterrence in particular.

When Japan announced it had received intelligence proving DPRK intentionality behind the attack, the US called for calm and encouraged Japan to join an independent, international investigation team. Japan agreed, citing sensitivity of intelligence sources as the reason behind their decision to not act on the information they had received.

President Obama met with the heads of state of Japan and the ROK to try to salvage the possibility of trilateral military exercises. However, the ROK continued to express uneasiness with the timing of operations and called instead for crisis management talks

(CMTs) to precede any such military response. The US facilitated a resolution to the impasse by persuading Japan to put a hold on military exercises (promising that they would take place within a month) and agreeing to participate in CMTs.

Identify top 3 short-term objectives of your team during the scenario. Some or all of these should have been posted in your proposed “action plan.”

1. Convene crisis management talks as a preliminary step to bring about stabilization in the region and prevent escalation of conflict
2. Join US-Japan military exercises: in view of Japan’s legitimate concerns about this breach of its territorial sovereignty, the US has proposed a joint missile defense exercise in the Sea of Japan. These exercises are intended to reassure Japan of the US commitment to deterrence of future attacks from the DPRK and to demonstrate the strength of the US alliance system in the Asia Pacific.
3. International investigation team to ascertain whether the incident was an intentional provocation by the North Koreans.

Identify up to 3 long-term objectives of your team during the scenario.

1. Prevent outbreak of war in Northeast Asia.
2. Ensure the strength of the US alliance system in Asia
3. Bring an end to North Korean provocations toward its neighbors.

Key takeaways including insights gained from the internal decision making process during sessions 2 and 3 (day 1) that determined the objectives identified above. Teams should also take into consideration the messages sent and whether they were received by other teams.

Insights gained from the dynamics of the "negotiation table" (day 2) when teams came together to form a single action plan.

The internal decision making process in the US was led by the National Security Council. The NSC played a vital role in determining the coordinated response from the US government toward the various parties, resulting in a coherent response: the US should stand firmly behind its allies and Japan should carry the primary role in determining proper responses, given that its territorial sovereignty had been violated.

While US actions were intended to signal that it was committed to a coordinated response in the region, its message was interpreted by the other parties as a sign of weakness or as an unwillingness to take a leadership role. As such, an important take-away from the simulation was that, despite calls from allies for more independence within the alliance relationship, Japan and the ROK continue to look to the US for leadership during crisis situations. Thus, the US has to lead the ROK and Japan toward responses that will best achieve regional security. In determining how it will demonstrate its leadership in the region, the US approach must encompass both diplomatic and military elements. Through

military means, the US can express unity of purpose with its allies and reassure US involvement in the region. Through diplomatic means, the US can bring parties together and help mitigate potential tensions.

An additional key take-away from the internal decision making processes was that, apart from the goals of maintaining peace and stability and deterring North Korean provocations, the US is reluctant to take action to change the status quo in the region. Many US policies were driven primarily by the interests and preferences of the allies.

With regard to the dynamics of the negotiation table on day two (CMTs), there seemed to be two distinct sets of competing agendas that drove the discussions. The first was competition among the allies. Japan and the ROK had starkly different motivations for action and aspirations for resolution. During this crisis, which saw Japan as the victim, it appeared to the US team that the ROK was more focused on how it could benefit from its self-professed role as ‘peacemaker’ than by trying to become the central mediator, reaching out to Pyongyang and Beijing, than on emphasizing closer coordination with its allies, Washington and Tokyo. It was also eye-opening to observe how quickly Japan evolved from its traditional pacifist track to a threat to overhaul its constitution. The US struggled, once the allies had diverged in both purpose and approach, to bring the three parties together. Clearly, greater leadership was required of the US from the very outset of the scenario.

The other set of different priorities manifested in the competing views and agendas between Washington and Beijing. Beijing is reluctant to join the international coalition against a provocative Pyongyang primarily for the fear of the security threat from a unified, pro-US Korea. The security dilemma between China and the US remains the most fundamental force shaping the security structure of Northeast Asia.

In what ways did the outcomes of the simulation compare to your prior assumptions regarding the dynamics of multilateral cooperation in NEA?

The United States’ role as a key diplomatic peace-broker, discussed in some detail during day one of the IFANS conference in Seoul, was confirmed over the course of the simulation. But, while it was agreed during the senior experts’ discussion that that emerging security challenges in Northeast Asia, especially in light of the diversification of North Korean threats toward its neighbors, required multilateral cooperation, this proved harder to achieve in practice.

An assumption regarding the dynamics of multilateral cooperation in Northeast Asia which was challenged during the simulation was that ROK concerns about North Korean provocations would draw it closer to the United States and make it more willing to engage in trilateral cooperation. To the contrary, the ROK saw cooperation within the US alliance system as risky, due to a perception that the Japanese push toward greater militancy was supported by the United States. While the US focused its attention on assurance via military demonstrations, it became quickly clear that a greater diplomatic effort could have avoided the breakdown of communication that occurred.

Team PRC

Descriptive report of how the scenario played out from the perspective of your team.

Initial Response: The team was less interested in actual events (wanted to know the nature of the DPRK launch but more for public relations control than for attribution of blame) than in perceptions and anticipated reactions. Participants feared a strong US response and how that might affect PRC interests. There was also fear of domestic opinion with regard to Chinese fatalities and expected regional reactions. The PLA was extremely pessimistic and feared for the worst while the civilian leadership and MoFA sought consultations with other countries. The team sought to be proactive and aimed at collaborating with the DPRK, calming the situation and avoiding isolation of the PRC. Overall, there was optimism that the situation could be handled and contained.

After first round of consultations: Participants were alarmed by invocations of defense treaties and trilateral coordination between US/ROK/Japan and citations of UNSCR 1874. These developments led to fears of either diplomatic isolation of the PRC if a new UNSC resolution were proposed and/or a threatening military stance by the trilateral parties. Fear of the situation getting out of control grew and was made worse by paranoia of the PLA and its pressure to show more support for the DPRK.

Later rounds: The team became increasingly frustrated with the DPRK but felt obligated to stick with them. Optimism reemerged as it became clear that there was no consensus between trilateral partners. We felt that the situation was unlikely to escalate to a worst-case scenario so focus shifted from containing the crisis to capitalizing on it to pursue other interests.

Identify top 3 short-term objectives of your team during the scenario. Some or all of these should have been posted in your proposed “action plan.”

- Reintroduce and maintain stability: first concern was Japanese/US retaliation and/or further North Korean provocations.
- Highlight Chinese interests: expected significant response from Japan/US. With that in mind, the PRC wanted to make clear from the beginning that it had a stake in the issue and that its interests needed to be taken into consideration by other parties.
- Avoid isolation: ensure that Chinese interests dependent on survival of current DPRK regime do not lead to its isolation in the region. To accomplish this, the PRC sought consultations with all countries in the scenario.

Identify up to 3 long-term objectives of your team during the scenario.

- Restart Six-Party Talks and promote their centrality in regional stability process: resumption of dialogue would calm situation. Also, China’s role as host increases prestige and promotes China’s bid for leadership in the region.
- Weaken US alliance system: South Korea identified as a soft target for driving a wedge between the US and its allies.

- Shield North Korea from harsh retaliation while exerting broader influence over Pyongyang's policies.

Provide key takeaways that include:

a.) insight gained from the internal decision making process during sessions 2 and 3 (day 1) that determined the objectives identified above. Teams should also take into consideration the messages sent and whether they were received by other teams.

- Apparent consensus between all actors about overall interests, but dispute with regard to prioritization and means to protecting those interests. The CCP and MoFA were in general agreement on priorities and means while the PLA was on its own.
- MoFA and civilian leadership linked scenario with many other concerns (reputation, bilateral ties with other countries, etc) while the PLA maintained its hawkish stance and narrowly focused on immediate security concerns.
- Civilian government had to hedge between diplomats and generals, which did produce some mixed messages externally. An example was PLA meetings with the DPRK military. Also, some actions by the PLA were taking on its own initiative, though grudgingly allowed by the civilian leaders.
- The PRC had a “good cop, bad cop” dynamic, this wasn’t necessarily a conscious decision but rather the result of compromise.
- Evident distrust and contempt for DPRK actions and diplomatic style.

b.) insight gained from the dynamics of the "negotiation table" (day 2) when teams came together to form a single action plan.

- Clear divisions between and among “camps”: The US/Japan/ROK camp was fractured and therefore slow to make decisions since the US sought to have all three on the same page. There was more outward solidarity, despite internal disagreements, that allowed the PRC/DPRK camp to be more effective in negotiations.
- Disproportionate influence by DPRK: Despite distrust and disdain for DPRK tactics and behavior, the PRC often felt obliged to support the DPRK.
- Shared interests: All parties strove for calming the situation and avoiding war, but due to distrust and domestic politics there were disagreements about responsibility, sequencing of responses and nature (defensive vs offensive) of actions that overwhelmed shared interests.
- Communication breakdown: Messages explicitly stated or subtly signaled the day before were often misinterpreted or ignored.

How does the dynamics and insight gained during the scenario compare to your prior understanding/assumptions of multilateral cooperation in NEA.

- Reaffirmed belief that the US bilateral alliance system is susceptible to contingencies that split interests of separate allies (Japanese aggressiveness vs. ROK restraint)
- Learned that PRC-DPRK relations face numerous challenges and tensions.
- Complications in the internal policy-making process had a bigger impact on inter-state dialogues than expected.
- Dilemmas faced by the PRC and ROK were far greater than assumed. The two states are often wedged between multiple compromising options.
- All parties can find baseline common interests in any crisis if they wish to resolve the tension.
- China and the DPRK have different national interests. Therefore they have different strategic thinking and interpretations about the same situation. It was hard for other countries to understand this.

Team ROK

Descriptive report of how the scenario played out from the perspective of your team.

Seoul offered its condolences to the Japanese government and expressed its disappointment that the DPRK undertook the launch of its “experimental satellite” despite explicit protests from Seoul, Tokyo, and Washington. While the ROK government was discussing future steps in light of this incident, Pyongyang attempted to explain that it was an accident and that it would like to maintain senior-level contacts with Seoul.

Meanwhile, Japan and the US approached the ROK on how to respond. While the US proposed trilateral training exercises initially only with the US and Japan as a way of demonstrating solidarity. Seoul suggested that the three nations hold trilateral 2+2 meetings with both heads of defense and state to explore diplomatic options.

Tension in the scenario reached a peak when Tokyo announced that it considered the incident to be intentional. At this point, the PRC warned that it was concerned with escalating tensions, and that it was considering joint PRC-DPRK military exercises should the US and Japan conduct their own. For the ROK, maneuvering between the PRC and DPRK on one hand and the US and Japan on the other became a difficult task, especially given pressure from Japan and the US to join their joint military exercises.

The ROK perceived joint military exercises less than 48 hours after the incident as provocative and therefore urged Japan and US to postpone exercise plans to a later date, at which point the ROK would be willing to participate. Meanwhile, the ROK recognized the lack of discussion between ALL parties, and proposed “Crisis Management Talks (CMT)” to commence at the earliest possible time.

Identify top 3 short-term objectives of your team during the scenario. Some or all of these should have been posted in your proposed “action plan.”

First, the ROK strove to prevent the DPRK from being completely isolated, to keep the DPRK from becoming an obstacle to the de-escalation of tension and to the establishment of an investigation team. De-escalation of tension required cooperation from the North in terms of demobilization, whereas the establishment of a non-Japanese investigation team was necessary for establishing a credible source of information regarding the incident.

Second, the ROK tried to align the positions of three allies—US, Japan, and ROK—to effectively pressure China with a unified voice. This was necessary to persuade China to act more responsibly toward the DPRK, as China has not acted as constructively as the ROK had hoped in similar incidents such as the sinking of the Cheonan or the shelling of Yeonpyeong Island.

Lastly, the ROK ensured that diplomatic approaches took priority over destabilizing measures, especially the immediate prosecution of a joint military exercise. The exercise was strongly pushed by Japan and the US, so the ROK was shoved into a difficult position of trying to strike a balance between firmly aligning with the US-Japan side and preventing measures that could destabilize the situation or escalate conflict.

Identify up to 3 long-term objectives of your team during the scenario.

One of the long-term objectives for the ROK was to maintain its strong alliance with the US while maintaining a constructive partnership with Japan. As indicated in section 2, the implementation of a joint-military exercise was not in the short-term interest of the ROK as it could lead to an escalation in conflict. However, this conflicted with the long-term interest of the ROK to maintain a good relationship with Japan and especially the US, which is critical for the well-being of the ROK for the foreseeable future.

Another long-term objective was the establishment of a viable, effective crisis-management arrangement, regime, or architecture that could be used to facilitate de-escalation in a future crisis. The need for such a crisis management mechanism was apparent throughout the scenario as the ROK representatives suffered from a deluge of conflicting information as well as different diplomatic approaches ranging from China's proposal to establish a forum similar to the Six-Party Talks to the US and Japan's bilateral initiative to conduct a joint military exercise without consulting other parties, to DPRK's direct bilateral approach to the ROK. Such confusion could be alleviated with a predetermined conflict management mechanism among the parties in East Asia. The proposed Conflict Management Talks (CMT) by the ROK had a potential to transform into such a mechanism, and thus was determined to be among the long-term objectives of the ROK.

Lastly, it was in the long-term interest of the ROK to not become a marginalized, secondary actor in Northeast Asia. One of the fears of the ROK is a situation where all the important issues in the Northeast Asian region—whether in a crisis situation or not—are determined by the US, China, Japan, and other actors without substantive consultations with the ROK. As such, to maintain its position as a primary actor on par

with other regional states in issues into Northeast Asia, it was in the long-term interest of the ROK to take a strong initiative in solving the current crisis. This is exemplified in the diplomatic proposals initiated by the ROK in the scenario, such as the 2+2+2 among the US-Japan-ROK and the CMT, which brought all relevant parties to the table for a comprehensive discussion of the incident.

Provide key takeaways that include:

a.) insight gained from the internal decision making process during sessions 2 and 3 (day 1) that determined the objectives identified above. Teams should also take into consideration the messages sent and whether they were received by other teams.

First, misperceptions among neighboring countries regarding the ROK position were an obstacle. Though the US is the ROK's most important ally, inter-Korean relations may limit foreign policy options. Seoul intended to reaffirm its alliance and partnership by joining military exercises at a later time, but initial reluctance was perceived by the US and Japan as an indication that the ROK was leaning toward the DPRK.

Second, contrary to initial ROK concern of being marginalized, the ROK was able to take a leading role. The basis for this concern was assuming that both China and the US would confer with only the DPRK and Japan, respectively. Yet, the lack of negotiations between China and the US and US-Japan coordination led to a situation where each side considered the role of the ROK to be important.

Third, the willingness of other countries to risk war to prove their determination was much greater than our team anticipated. Especially surprising was the aggressive behavior of the Japanese delegation, which threatened one of the most important short-term goals of the ROK to prevent the conflict from spinning out of control.

b.) insight gained from the dynamics of the "negotiation table" (day 2) when teams came together to form a single action plan.

The critical importance of speaking in one voice, whether within a country or among allies, was the most apparent yet profound insight from the negotiating table on day 2. There were several instances where one delegate's statement was repudiated by another delegate from the same country, which damaged the credibility of that country. Because the US-Japan-ROK group was far from speaking in a single voice at the conference table, what could have been a joint-proposal that would have benefited the three countries demobilization of the DPRK failed to materialize.

How does the dynamics and insight gained during the scenario compare to your prior understanding/assumptions of multilateral cooperation in NEA.

One of the most important insights was a stark reminder of how confusing a crisis situation can be. On top of the fact that decisions needed to be made as quickly as possible to work with other parties to ameliorate the crisis, the influx of conflicting

information and signals from different directions made this task formidable, if not impossible. As such, our outlook on the likelihood for multilateral cooperation in NEA, especially in a crisis management situation, is much less optimistic. One possible solution is to set up a multilateral mechanism/forum among the NEA countries for dealing with the early stages of the crisis to exchange information and attempt to prevent parties from taking rash actions, which may unnecessarily escalate the crisis.

Team Japan

Descriptive report of how the scenario played out from the perspective of your team.

Crisis management was fundamental to this scenario. Japan determined its course of action based on both domestic and international considerations. North Korea's previous missile tests and the Japanese abduction issue were significant factors in the decisions of Japanese policy-makers and the reaction of the general public. Domestically, the public was outraged over the launching of the rocket and appeared to favor a hardline crisis management policy. Internationally, the other countries involved in the crisis seemed hesitant to take a firm stance for fear of inciting further escalation. In light of these conflicting circumstances, the Japanese leadership faced a difficult dilemma.

For the other countries, preventing escalation was the priority. From the Japanese perspective, South Korean President Lee was overly concerned about the possibility of an outbreak of war on the Korean Peninsula and did not take into serious consideration the loss of Korean lives in the crisis. Given that South Korea reacted firmly to the attacks on the *Cheonan* and Yeonpyeong Island, and that Japan demonstrated its support for the ROK in response to the *Cheonan* incident, it was surprising that President Lee refused to participate in the joint military exercise with Japan and the US

There were also a number of surprising elements in Washington's course of action. First, Washington was not in favor of Japan's intention to revise the Constitution which would allow Japan to play a more responsible role in the alliance; the US government even asked Tokyo to retract its announcement regarding its plan to modify the constitution. This reaction was unexpected because the US has previously supported moves toward Japan's military normalization. The proposition of constitutional revision by Tokyo during the actual crisis appeared to cause a loss of face for the US, perhaps by signaling failure of the alliance. Second, Washington was reluctant to conduct a full-scale joint military exercise immediately after the landing of the rocket despite the fact the US had done so in the aftermath of the *Cheonan* incident. Third, Washington failed to take advantage of the opportunity presented by the crisis, to strengthen and facilitate bilateral cooperation between Japan and South Korea. Finally, Washington did not support Japan's claim that the missile launch was intentional, demonstrating doubt in the credibility of Japanese intelligence.

Given its relatively close relations with North Korea, China's lack of support for Tokyo was somewhat anticipated. However, considering that Chinese nationals were among the victims of the incident, Tokyo expected more from China. China did manage to drive a

wedge in the US-ROK alliance and increase its presence in the region by hosting the CMT in Beijing, and from this perspective, gained most from the crisis.

North Korea's behavior was full of contradictions: Pyongyang offered a statement of regret, later mobilized its military, and without offering any evidence, claimed that its rocket launch failed as a result of Japanese cyber-sabotage. Yet, North Korea was less vocal than Japan expected, as the Korean Central Broadcasting Station and *Rodong Sinmun* usually exaggerate and dramatize any military action by regional actors.

Identify top 3 short-term objectives of your team during the scenario. Some or all of these should have been posted in your proposed "action plan."

- 1) Respond to public concern by demonstrating a quick and efficient response
- 2) Coordinate with the US and conduct a joint military exercise in the Sea of Japan
- 3) Collect intelligence and analyze the intentionality of North Korea's rocket launch

Identify up to 3 long-term objectives of your team during the scenario.

- 1) Increase communication and engage in contingency planning with regional players to prevent future miscalculations and military escalation
- 2) Improve deterrence by strengthening Japan's missile defense system and the alliance with the US
- 3) Establish a fair system of international investigation for crisis situations

Provide key takeaways that include:

a.) Insight gained from the internal decision making process during sessions 2 and 3 (day 1) that determined the objectives identified above. Teams should also take into consideration the messages sent and whether they were received by other teams.

Japan's foremost priority was determining whether North Korea intentionally launched the rocket, as we believed that clarification would help us gain support from other countries and legitimize an aggressive approach by Japan, including the possibility of retaliatory attacks aimed at destroying North Korean missile bases. However, we found that our intelligence did not assist us in eliciting support from other countries. Our decision to share our intelligence—confirming that the incident was intentional—only with our US ally, appeared to cause discontent among the other countries involved; however, we acted on the premise that if we submitted raw intelligence to other regional actors and/or the international investigation team, Japanese intelligence sources would be revealed and we would not be able to utilize them in future.

Also, in the wake of the crisis, a general consensus was reached within the Japanese government about the need to improve Japan's military capabilities in the long term, particularly ballistic missile defense, even if it requires modification of Article 9 in the Constitution. The crisis seemingly provided the impetus to push the government toward

this consensus by affirming that North Korea poses a serious and direct threat to Japanese security.

b) Insight gained from the dynamics of the "negotiation table" (day 2) when teams came together to form a single action plan.

Some of the protocols of negotiating were unclear when the conference began, making it difficult for the various countries and numerous individual participants to negotiate. However, toward the end of the conference, the countries started to take advantage of side-talks during breaks and this facilitated understanding of each country's priorities and resolving perception gaps.

During the negotiations over the CMT agenda items, the group was divided into three camps: South Korea sided with China and prioritized the stability of the Korean Peninsula; Japan and the US worked together to obtain a statement of apology from North Korea and to ensure that the joint investigation would be conducted in a fair manner; North Korea leaned heavily toward China. A lack of preliminary communication prevented the parties from reaching an agreement on crisis management.

By denouncing Japan's aggressive approach, China and North Korea successfully diverted international attention from the fact that it was North Korea that caused the incident. Also, no country mentioned the *Cheonan* and Yeonpyeong Island incidents during the negotiation.

We had difficulty establishing an investigation team with balanced membership. In the scenario, Japan was dropped from the investigation team to ensure North Korea's non-participation, but in the real world, it would be easy to preclude North Korea on the basis of its admission that it launched the rocket.

How does the dynamics and insight gained during the scenario compare to your prior understanding/assumptions of multilateral cooperation in NEA.

Multilateral cooperation in Northeast Asia is more fraught with difficulty than we assumed. We expected it would be easy to obtain support from Washington and Seoul to act together against North Korea; however, Japan, the US, and South Korea failed to find common ground in preliminary negotiations. We never imagined that both the US and ROK would prioritize war prevention over relations with Japan. Since a contingency plan for the Korean Peninsula is closely intertwined with South Korean politics, it is difficult to establish a strategy for the three countries without intervening in South Korea's domestic affairs.

Team DPRK

Descriptive report of how the scenario played out from the perspective of your team.

The DPRK team's immediate objective was to avoid any military retaliation from Japan backed by the US and South Korea. To prepare for the possible attack from Japan, we first mobilized our forces along the eastern coast. Then, we tried to gain China's support in negotiating with the US and its allies while approaching South Korea to convince Japan that the incident was an accident and not a hostile intention. China and South Korea responded positively because both wanted to avoid war on the peninsula. China specifically requested that we make some form of conciliatory gesture to the international community to prove that the incident was indeed an accident and not an attack. We agreed to put forth an official statement expressing condolence for the victims of the accident. In reciprocation, China agreed to deploy its anti-access missiles near the border with North Korea. We also noticed diverging interests within the US-ROK-Japan alliance on this issue, and we tried to drive a wedge between the countries even further by deliberately warming up to South Korea and isolating Japan. We pursued the same "divide and conquer" tactic during the crisis management talks. At the same time, we consistently dismissed demands for an official apology, demobilization, and missile launch moratorium.

Identify top 3 short-term objectives of your team during the scenario. Some or all of these should have been posted in your proposed "action plan."

Our team determined that it was in our best interest to use the accident to quickly drive a wedge between Japan and ROK. Our first short-term objective therefore was to assure the ROK (and China) that DPRK was behaving as a responsible party and wanted to avoid conflict at all costs on the Korean Peninsula. Our second short-term objective was to encourage the Japanese to overreact and harden their stance on the issue by strategically ignoring both Japan and the United States. Our third short-term objective was to discourage the outbreak of conflict by preparing for either domestic instability or international attack with mobilization of our defensive forces and outreach to China to secure their support in the event of Western military action.

Identify up to 3 long-term objectives of your team during the scenario.

In the long-term, the DPRK wanted to widen the wedge between Japan and ROK and force the United States to choose sides. Our first long-term objective therefore was to amplify our message to China and ROK that Japan (not DPRK) was the destabilizing party in the crisis and the one driving an accident into a potential high-end conflict. The crisis negotiation talks actually played to our advantage in realizing this objective. Our success in playing on historical animosities and creating tension in the Western alliance ultimately advanced our second objective: forcing the US team to choose sides when Japan proposed a response in the absence of ROK participation. Our third objective was to take maximum advantage of the crisis and secure new defense cooperation with China in the form of new exercises and the possible relocation of their anti-access/area denial missiles to Northeast China.

Provide key takeaways that include:

a.) insight gained from the internal decision making process during sessions 2 and 3 (day 1) that determined the objectives identified above. Teams should also take into consideration the messages sent and whether they were received by other teams.

As Team DPRK one of our key insights was that once we were assured that China still considered its best interest to insure stability on the peninsula, China lost its leverage in our decision-making. China, despite its size, was easily persuaded to provide tangible concessions to appease our demands for security assurance. With its main goal being stability, China was more willing to succumb to our demands than we were willing to consider its requests. With China in our corner it was relatively easy to use everyone's fear of escalation to act unilaterally in defusing any real strong combined response by undermining any sort of possible multilateral resistance with backdoor-bilateral diplomacy. Once we had China on our side we were almost assured that the situation would not escalate to war and it was very easy to put the world's focus on Japan's coming "dangerous and militant" response rather than our initial recklessness. During the CMT our only real goal was to promote conflict in a way that other countries could be blamed for their inflexibility. Surprisingly the US was almost ignored, and South Korea was almost as quick as China to want to prevent further escalation. Thus the ROK was our second country to court to serve as a cushion between us and the US-Japan alliance.

b.) insight gained from the dynamics of the "negotiation table" (day 2) when teams came together to form a single action plan.

The negotiation table presupposed an incentive for all countries to participate and see negotiation and talks to their completion. But in reality, that is not the case, especially if there is incentive to do the opposite. From the DPRK perspective, it was in our favor to frustrate the talks. Then, cooperation or the prospect of cooperation could be used as a bargaining card for obtaining rewards. It was not difficult for the DPRK team as long as we could sit at the negotiation table with other participants with equal status. By simply raising objection to others' suggestion, we could gain veto power. In order to move on, other nations have to make concessions to the DPRK and we were ready to take full advantage of such dynamics. The heated debate was about the formation of joint investigation team. Japan opposed DPRK's joining the international investigation team as a formal participant. The DPRK strongly insisted it should be included to prevent Japan or another country from fabricating the evidence. Japan suggested Japan and the DPRK participate as an observer. DPRK countered that the DPRK participate as a facilitator. Regardless of the debate on DPRK's status and role, the DPRK team was convinced of China's support during the negotiation while noticing South Korea's passive support for Japan's position.

How does the dynamics and insight gained during the scenario compare to your prior understanding/assumptions of multilateral cooperation in NEA.

Multilateral cooperation in Northeast Asia has challenges for a variety of reasons such as the divergence of national interests between China and the US, history and territorial issues between Japan and South Korea/ China and different political values and systems between China and the US/ South Korea/ Japan. During the scenario planning, however, we realized the gap of national interests between Japan and South Korea can expand wider than we conventionally think whereas China is able to remain supportive of DPRK. In a crisis, the history or territorial issues between South Korea and Japan are least likely to affect their bilateral cooperation. Instead, they are most likely to fail to cooperate effectively because they do not address each other's security concerns. The simulation reaffirms the assumption that the US needs to take the lead to align South Korea and Japan and encourage both to have strategic dialogue more broadly first, so as to engage with China more effectively in pursuit of multilateral cooperation in Northeast Asia.

APPENDIX A



PACIFIC FORUM CSIS
YOUNG LEADERS

US-ROK-JAPAN-CHINA QUADRILATERAL DIALOGUE
October 16-18, 2011 – Seoul, ROK

PRE-CONFERENCE TEAM PROJECT

The US Reaction to the 2010 ‘Cheon’an Incident’ in 2010

Summary of Official Position and Reactions

The official position of the United States was to aid its ally South Korea, but also not to rush into conclusions about blame. “We, the United States and the Republic of Korea, are forming a joint investigative team and ... we will have the best experts from Korea and the United States really go over and determine what was the cause of this incident,” the commander [Gen. Walter Sharp] said at a luncheon with the American Chamber of Commerce in Korea.

The US supported the investigation’s findings – that the *Cheon’an* was sunk as the result of an external underwater explosion caused by a torpedo made in North Korea – and prepared for joint military exercises.

The US and South Korea held their “Two-plus-Two” meeting in Seoul, where Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, [then] Secretary of Defense Robert Gates and their South Korean counterparts, Foreign Minister Yu Myung-Hwan and Minister of National Defense Kim Tae-Young reaffirmed the strength of the US-ROK alliance. More financial sanctions against North Korea were announced by Clinton after the Two-plus-Two meeting.

Brief Summary of each Government Agency’s Position and Roles¹

President of the United States (Barack Obama): The President of the United States (POTUS) is solely responsible for all US foreign, defense and other national security policies. These policies are formulated within a well-defined policy development and decision making process, central to which is the National Security Council (NSC). In the case of North Korean aggressions, key advisors (through the NSC) include the Secretaries of Defense and State, as well as topic area advisors. The positions of these individuals, illustrated through their public pronouncements and actions, are described below.

¹ The role that each government agency plays is described in more detail below. Please note that, in May 2010, Panetta was not secretary of Defense though his position toward North Korea is important for future decision making and for this reason has been included in this overview.

For his part, President Barack Obama emphasized the need to obtain a full, accurate account of the event and follow the facts wherever the investigation led. Obama, along with South Korean President Lee, pledged “their utmost efforts to ensure the security of the Republic of Korea.” With the release of the findings on the investigation, President Obama made clear to President Lee the full support of the US in providing justice for those servicemen killed and the future defense of the Republic of Korea. In August 2010, Obama signed a new executive order, expanding sanctions against North Korea. Moreover, about a month prior to the *Yeonpyeong* Island shelling, President Obama gave a speech to US Forces Korea (USFK), stating that Pyongyang should understand that the United States will not falter in its commitment to defending the its ally, South Korea.

Secretary of Defense (Leon Panetta): Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta considers North Korea and its ballistic missile program as the greatest threat to the United States. Due to the current round of budget cuts in the United States, he has admitted that “difficult choices” may be necessary for Defense, but has continued to stress the need for the US to improve its defense system against countries such as North Korea, which have intercontinental missile capabilities. Regarding the North Korea problem, Panetta will closely observe North Korea and the progress of its missile program. Panetta’s greatest challenge will be sustaining the same level of deterrence under budgetary restraints.

Secretary of State (Hillary Clinton): Following the *Cheon’an* incident, Secretary Clinton made a series of pronouncements, signaling the US State Department position vis-à-vis the provocations: North Korea must unconditionally stop its provocations and halt its policy of threats and belligerence toward its neighbors; the United States will stand by its allies and fulfill its commitment to regional peace and stability; the international community should jointly condemn the sinking of *Cheon’an* and develop a coordinated response to make North Korea understand the consequences of its behavior. At the same time, China must change its position on North Korea’s provocations and stop “enabling” its bad behavior. Furthermore, the Six Party Talks will not resume without a significant signal from North Korea that it is serious about denuclearization and resuming bilateral dialogue with South Korea, as resumption of the talks otherwise will be viewed as a reward for bad behavior.

Special Representative for North Korea Policy (Stephen Bosworth): Stephen Bosworth has repeatedly stressed the importance of dialogue between the key actors in the region as a pre-requisite for dealing with North Korean provocations. Bosworth’s role is more flexible than that of any of the actors described above and his public pronouncements have reflected this. He has rejected criticism that attempts to talk to North Korea are akin to rewarding bad behavior, arguing that “much of diplomacy is rewarding bad behavior. You're trying to figure out how you can stop the worst of the behavior at the lowest possible price”. In testimony to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in March 2011, Bosworth stressed the importance of North-South talks, openness to dialogue, bilateral and multilateral sanctions, and a willingness to provide economic assistance and help North Korea integrate into the international community if it fulfills its denuclearization commitments.

Internal decision-making processes

The White House National Security Council (NSC) is led by the President (POTUS). The Vice President, Secretary of State, Secretary of Defense, The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Director of National Intelligence, National Security Advisor, White House Chief of Staff, and Deputy National Security Advisor are regular attendees of the Council. Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs and Special Representative for North Korea policy, Senior Director for Asia, Senior Director for Defense, and Senior Director for Multilateral affairs can also be summoned to the Council.

In the meeting, the President is solely responsible for national security policy. In order for the President to make a decision, the National Security Advisor shall provide all necessary information, identify a full range of policy options, and evaluate potential risks for each policy option. And, the legal and funding issues will be addressed as well as potential difficulties implementing the policy.

In the case of North Korea, the White House NSC has discussed a range of potential policy options, which included:

- a. The first priority for the US is to send a strong warning against future provocations. Both military and diplomatic cooperation with South Korea will be strengthened to deter future threats.
- b. Gaining assurances of future cooperation from China and Japan a high priority.
- c. Sanctions remain an important part of US deterrence policies.
- d. The resumption of multilateral (six-party talks) and bilateral (US-DPRK) dialogues will be remain off the table until further notice.
- e. The United States will send this crisis to the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) and generate international cooperation to deter future North Korean threats.

Demands and Expectations of the United States

The United States demands that North Korea stops its provocative behavior, halt its policy of threats and belligerence toward its neighbors, and take irreversible steps to fulfil its denuclearization commitments and comply with international law.

Regarding the incident, the United States demands that China acts responsibly by condemning North Korea for the attack, supporting Security Council actions while utilizing its influence over North Korea to prevent future provocations and persuade it to fulfil its denuclearization commitments.

The United States demanded that South Korea exercises restraint, maintains close consultations with Washington in sharing information and coordinating responses, while also conducting joint military exercises with the United States as well as actively enhancing its preparedness for future provocations as a response to the incident.

The United States demanded that Japan condemn North Korea for the attack, maintain close consultations and strengthen its security alliance with the United States, and prepare for further provocations from North Korea.

Lessons learned and outlook

The events of 2010 brought to the fore the importance of mechanisms that allow for a unified regional approach to tensions between the two Koreas. In this respect, the United

States continues to play an important role in promoting cooperation between the actors as well as by strengthening its own relationship with China, which was seen to have played an enabling role during the crisis with its initial refusal to condemn the sinking of the *Cheon'an*.

Tensions in inter-Korean relations have the potential to pose a security threat to the region as a whole, beyond the Korean Peninsula.

No clear framework exists for dealing with regional security issues, and the development of a range of such mechanisms is a high priority. Bilateral, trilateral, and multilateral efforts are all relevant.

The US must continue to keep a close eye on the dynamics of leadership transition in North Korea as domestic dynamics may continue to have an impact beyond the borders of the DPRK.

South Korea's Reaction to the *Cheon'an* Incident in 2010

Summary of ROK's Official Position and Reactions

After the sinking of the *Cheon'an*, much emphasis was put on accurately investigating how and why the vessel sunk. The South Korean government reaffirmed the international Joint Military-Civilian Investigation Group (JIG)'s conclusion that it was caused by a North Korean torpedo, and condemned such actions by the North as violating several inter-Korean agreements designed to preserve peace on the Korean Peninsula. Following the publication of the JIG investigation report on May 20, 2010, the South Korean government decided to implement "the May 24 countermeasures" consisting of strict measures including: (1) banning North Korean vessels from entering ROK's territorial waters; (2) imposing various limitations on the Gaesong Industrial Complex (GIC); (3) suspending almost all inter-Korean trade; (4) suspending humanitarian aid; and (5) resuming psychological warfare against North Korea, such as propaganda broadcasts. However, these countermeasures were not completely ironclad - the GIC was not completely shut down, nor did the suspension of humanitarian aid include those in need such as infants, children, and the elderly. Furthermore, Seoul requested formal apologies from Pyongyang, and vowed to respond more firmly if such acts of aggression reoccur. At the same time, the South Korean government has reiterated its goal of achieving a peaceful unification between the two Koreas.

Brief Summary of each Government Agency's Position and Roles

First, the Ministry of National Defense (MND) offers military support for the South Korean government's policy toward the North, **but the stated goal of the MND is to "achieve an everlasting peace on the Korean Peninsula."** After the *Cheon'an* sinking, the MND was hesitant to assign blame before completion of the Joint Military-Civilian Investigation Group (JIG) in which the MND played a major role, along with experts from the US, UK, Australia and Sweden. On May 20, the MND published the JIG's findings that an external explosion from a torpedo fired from a North Korean submarine sank the ship. The MND will do its part to prevent North Korean ships from entering South Korean territorial waters and coordinate anti-submarine and anti-proliferation military exercises with the US military.

However, despite its claims that North Korea is to blame the MND supports the South Korean government's assertion that the goal is not military confrontation but a peaceful Korean Peninsula.

On the other hand, the ultimate goal of the Ministry of Unification (MoU) has long been to achieve a unified Korea. As such, retaliatory measures against provocations by North Korea must not amount to the complete jettisoning of this ultimate goal. This implies that regardless of the political climate: (1) humanitarian aid to the North should not cease completely; (2) programs to educate and prepare the public for eventual unification should be maintained; and (3) protection of North Korean refugees should continue.

Meanwhile, the role of the President, in cooperation with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade (MOFAT), has been to present the results of the JIG to the international community to seek a joint international response, most notably in the form of a UN resolution condemning the North Korean attack. However, these efforts were undermined by skepticism of the findings of the investigation from China among others, as well as from NGOs within South Korea, thus limiting the extent of international pressure applied on Pyongyang.

Brief Description of Internal Decision-making Process

Initially after the incident, President Lee Myung-bak convened the National Security Council (NSC) in Seoul, which included the heads of the ministries of Unification, Defense, and Foreign Affairs and Trade. In light of the fact that it involved a Korean navy vessel, the Minister of Defense had the most say, with the Joint Chiefs of Staff (JCS) included in the discussions. However, with North Korean involvement a possibility from the beginning, the minister of Unification was concerned with the implications of the incident on inter-Korean relations. The minister of Foreign Affairs and Trade focused on the responses from neighboring countries including the US, Japan, and China. President Lee also shared this concern, warning that rash judgments about the sinking of the *Cheon'an* would have grave implications on not only inter-Korean relations, but also with Seoul's relations with neighboring countries. The government decided to focus on an objective, scientific investigation of the incident with experts from several countries in hopes of obtaining international backing for the findings. The statement released almost two months after the incident provided the foundation for additional decisions regarding the incident.

ROK's Demands/ Expectations for Other Countries

Based on the findings of the Joint Civilian-Military Investigation Group, South Korea chose to pursue a measured response condemning North Korea's actions while expecting support from the international society. South Korea acknowledged its appreciation of US support for South Korea both politically and logistically. 27 countries including the US, Japan, UK, France, Australia, and Sweden confirmed the findings of the JIG and demanded that North Korea act more responsibly. However, Beijing stated that China was not completely satisfied with the findings, and therefore remained silent on the issue. This was especially disappointing. South Korea was hoping for more support from China. Furthermore, Seoul agreed to talks with the North but asked that Pyongyang apologize as a sign of goodwill, a request that went unanswered.

Lessons learned and Outlook

In case of future North Korean provocations, both against South Korea and other countries, it can be expected that the decision makers in Seoul will be conflicted regarding how they perceive North Korea. In such situations, South Korean policymakers must choose between reunification and protecting national security and state interests. In terms of cooperation with other states, it is certain that South Korea would consult heavily with its ally the US. It will be interesting to observe how South Korea will cooperate with Japan given longstanding historical animosity between the two countries, as well as with China, which maintained an ambiguous stance even in light of fairly convincing evidence.

Yet a similar incident by the North implies that countermeasures taken by the South Korean government were inadequate to deter North Korean provocations. This is not limited to the South Korean government - a similar incident implies that international cooperation to pressure North Korea failed as well. As such, although reunification must remain the ultimate goal, Seoul must take an approach that differs from that of the response after the sinking of *Cheon'an* if the administration wishes to prevent North Korea from repeating limited provocations that undermine the security of South Korean nationals.

Japan's Reaction to the *Cheon'an* Incident in 2010

Summary of Official Position and Reactions

After the South Korean government released the results of the Joint Military-Civilian Investigation Group (JIG)'s investigation, which concluded that the incident had been caused by a torpedo fired by North Korea, Japanese Prime Minister Hatoyama Yukio issued a press release on May 20, 2010, supporting the investigation and its result. He stated, "Japan strongly supports South Korea. The North Korean behavior is totally abhorrent, and Japan condemns it with the international community. Japan will continue to cooperate and collaborate with South Korea and the United States for regional peace and stability."

(http://www.kantei.go.jp/jp/hatoyama/statement/201005/20comment_souri.html)

Prime Minister Hatoyama also stated on May 20 that Japan would take the lead to support South Korea when Seoul demands a resolution at the UN Security Council.

(<http://www.yomiuri.co.jp/politics/news/20100520-OYT1T01007.html>)

Prime Minister Hatoyama said on May 24 that tension on the Korean Peninsula underlined the importance of tight US-Japan ties, and was important to his decision to keep a replacement facility for the Futenma Air Station on Okinawa.

(<http://www.reuters.com/article/2010/05/24/japan-politics-usa-idUSN2426309520100524?type=marketsNews>)

Brief Summary of each Government Agency's Position and Roles

Press Conference by Deputy Press Secretary of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs on May 27, 2010:

- On May 24, the government held a Ministerial Meeting on Security, meeting of the ministers under the chairmanship of the Prime Minister.
- The Government of Japan strongly supports the Republic of Korea. For this purpose Japan will strengthen coordination with the international community, particularly with the Republic of Korea and the United States, either bilaterally or trilaterally.
- The Government of Japan will immediately start considering new additional, individual sanctions against North Korea.
- The Government of Japan will make every effort to have the bill on the cargo inspection passed in the Diet as soon as possible.
- The fourth is that the Government of Japan will ensure the safety and relief of the nation by continuing and strengthening information collection activities among others.
- Those four points were instructions from the Prime Minister, and government officials are working under these instructions.

(http://www.mofa.go.jp/announce/press/2010/5/0527_01.html)

Chief Cabinet Secretary Hirano Hirofumi stated at a press conference on May 24, "Japan strongly supports the South Korean government. Japan, the United States, and South Korea have to fully cooperate on this, and I hope that China has the same awareness." He also said that the next ministerial meeting on security would discuss specific reactions including additional sanctions on North Korea.

(<http://www.asahi-net.or.jp/~vb7y-td/L2/220529.htm>)

Foreign Minister Okada Katsuya issued a press release July 9 to welcome that the UN Security Council had adopted a chairman's statement on the incident. He stated, "Japan supports South Korea because the North Korean attack on the South Korean ship is abhorrent from a viewpoint of regional and international peace and stability. Japan has been making diplomatic efforts at every level to issue a specific message from the UN Security Council. Japan hopes that North Korea seriously considers the consensus of the international community and demands Pyongyang to refrain from aggravating the situation. Japan will continue to collaborate with international players including South Korea and the United States.

(http://www.mofa.go.jp/mofaj/press/danwa/22/dok_100709.html)

The Japanese government answered a written question on Japanese security policy from Upper House Member Oe Yasuhiro on June 18: "The government is reviewing appropriate reactions to various contingencies to protect the lives and properties of citizens, but cannot reveal the specifics due to the nature of the issue," and "the government will continue to closely collaborate with international players including South Korea and the United States, but would like to refrain from revealing the details in order not to harm future diplomatic relationship with those countries."

(<http://www.mod.go.jp/j/presiding/touben/174kai/san/tou89.html>)

Brief Description of Internal Decision-making Process

The prime minister hosted a ministerial meeting on security on May 24 after the result of the JIG's investigation was released. After the meeting, the Chief Cabinet Secretary explained what the ministers were instructed from the Prime Minister in relation to this incident of the sinking of the Korean naval vessel.

Japan's Demands/ Expectations for Other Countries

Japan expects South Korea and the United States to cooperate.

Japan expects China to cooperate with the international community to condemn North Korea and prevent such provocations from happening again.

Japan expects North Korea to follow rules and regulations of the international community and not to resort to similar acts of aggression again.

Japan expects to be involved when the international community brings up the issue to the UN.

Lessons learned and Outlook

This incident reaffirmed in Japan the continuing threat posed by North Korea. Despite North Korea's economic and diplomatic woes, it remains the most dangerous and volatile actor in Northeast Asia.

As with many North Korea provocations, this incident caught many by surprise and it reminded all of the importance of preparing for worse-case scenarios so they do not escalate into dangerous situations. Many expect North Korea to make a statement in celebration of 2012 (Kim Il-sung's 100th birthday and the year it achieves the status of a 'great and prosperous country, or "kang-sung-dae-guk"). Preparing for worse-case scenarios will be useful in dealing with North Korea if and when it decides to take radical actions that threaten the security of Northeast Asia.

This incident reminded Tokyo of the importance of the alliance between Japan and the US and between South Korea and the US.

Although China has the most influence on North Korea and therefore pivotal for the international community to obtain China's support on any North Korean issues, it is also extremely difficult to make Beijing cooperate, especially when China is concerned about US involvement such as the deployment of a US aircraft carrier.

If a similar incident happens in the future, Japan is likely to demonstrate full support of the South Korean government. As any form of military threat from North Korea - direct or indirect - underscores the importance of its alliance with the US, Japan can also be expected to boost security cooperation with and follow the US lead in dealing with the incident. In this sense, Japan's role will be determined by the South Korean and US government positions.

China's Reaction to the *Cheon'an* Incident in 2010

In short, the *Cheon'an* incident was a near nightmare for the PRC. China has extensive and complex interests on the Korean Peninsula. While the PRC's top leadership desires

to pursue its campaign of peaceful development and play the role of a responsible stakeholder, it also has vested interests in maintaining the current DPRK regime led by Kim Jong-il. Therefore, the *Cheon'an* incident presented the PRC with conflicting interests; maintaining stable and amicable relations with the US and ROK on the one hand, while avoiding placing too much pressure on the DPRK on the other. PRC interests in preserving the DPRK regime are twofold: avoiding instability on the peninsula and China's border with the DPRK by a collapse of the current regime and maintaining a buffer between China and US forces in South Korea. Internally, the interests in preserving the Kim regime in the DPRK are supported by CCP conservatives and the PLA while the interests that encourage more cooperation with South Korea and the US would be taken up by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and more liberal civilian leaders. The *Cheon'an* incident aggravated internal tension within the PRC leadership ranks.

Summary of Official Position and Reactions

Immediate crisis response:

- Express condolences for those who lost their lives and their families
- Call for calm on the peninsula and restraint in ROK and US reactions until situation was made clearer

Post-crisis response:

- Oppose UNSC resolution condemning DPRK
- Cast doubt on findings of international investigation team (after refusing to send representatives from China to take part in the investigation at the invitation of ROK)
- Oppose "provocative" US/ROK military exercises in the Yellow Sea
- Urge resumption of Six Party Talks
- Hosted Kim Jong-il as well as Lee Myung-Bak
- Reaffirmed security agreement with DPRK
- PLA visits to North Korea to consult, but also exert influence over the KPA

*The role of Chinese social media and online public opinion continued to assert itself into foreign policy issues as the online community displayed many anti-DPRK sentiments. This has added a new dimension to the Sino-DPRK relationship.

Brief Summary of each Government Agency's Position and Roles

CCP (Hu and Xi):

- Did not want to take chances given upcoming leadership transition
- Fear of antagonizing more conservative elements of the CCP and the PLA led top leaders looking for promotion or to promote their own allies to stay away from taking strong positions
- Refused to recognize the incident until a month later and only then "opposed threats to regional stability" without referencing the DPRK

PLA:

- Saw this through the prism of US-China relations and feared strengthening of US-ROK alliance and military provocations toward DPRK during leadership transition
- Focused on US-ROK military exercises in seas close to China
- Ensure that the DPRK is under China's influence (and control)

- In May 2010, the DPRK requested acquisition of China's J-10 multi-role fighters; Beijing refused (China, and especially the PLA would not want the DPRK/KPA to strengthen its military capability past a certain level)

MoFA:

- Stall for time and maintain ambiguity on China's position for as long as possible.
- Welcome high-level delegations from both North and South Korea to demonstrate ties are strong and attempt to restart the Six-Party Talks:
 - *President Lee Myung-Bak's attendance at World Expo in Shanghai*
 - *Premier Wen Jiabao three day visit to ROK 28-30 May 2010*
 - *Kim Jong-il's visit to Beijing 3-7 May 2010*
- Resist South Korean demands for China to ascribe responsibility to North Korea for the incident, citing the need to 'avoid escalation'.
- Accelerate progress on FTA talks with South Korea to further demonstrate the advantage to South Korea of good relations with the PRC
- Insist China has significant interests in peace and stability on the peninsula and therefore resist any pressure from the US and oppose military exercises in adjacent seas

Brief Description of Internal Decision-making Process

- Sent high-level delegations (including Zhou Yongkang of the Politburo Standing Committee) to DPRK
- Publicly show support for North Korea while privately communicating China's firm stance against further provocation

PRC's Demands/ Expectations for Other Countries

- Demand that US not send carrier strike group to the Yellow Sea
- "Oppose foreign military vessels and planes' conducting activities in the Yellow Sea and China's coastal waters that undermine China's security interests"
(MoFA Spokesperson, Qing Gang, 8 July 2010)
- Prompt resumption of Chinese-hosted Six Party Talks

Lessons learned and Outlook

- There is a disconnect between the amount of leverage China wields over the North Korean regime and what the West believes.
- The conflicting priorities of pursuing amicable relations with the US and other regional actors and the emphasis on stability in the peninsula are in flux.

It is unclear how China will react to a future incident. The PLA is alarmed by the increased ROE and military exercises of the US-ROK alliance. Hardliners are similarly alarmed about pressuring Pyongyang during its delicate leadership transition. However, MoFA and civilian CCP members are growing tired of North Korean provocations that increase tension between China and its trading partners. Similarly, shifting and increasingly visible public opinion against the DPRK is adding to the pressure against the China-DPRK "alliance."

DPRK Reaction to the *Cheon'an* Incident in 2010

Summary of DPRK Official Position and Reactions

North Korea denied involvement in the sinking of *Cheon'an* stating that the accusation directed at it was a “fabrication.” It claims that the accusation was politically motivated by South Korea for its local election. North Korea strongly opposes the US-South Korea joint military exercise, insists that South Korea accept its investigation team, and claims rejection of its investigation team is evidence of a conspiracy.

Brief Summary of each Government Agency’s Position and Roles

Kim Jong-il, chairman of the National Defense Commission: Kim Jong-il has been frustrated by the Obama administration’s silence in the name of ‘strategic patience.’ He tried to test the US and South Korea’s responses to a higher level of crisis, especially now that they are aware of North Korea’s nuclear retaliatory capability. In addition, he needed to escalate the external tension to bolster internal unity in support of his power succession to Kim Jong-un.

Chang Sung-taek, vice chairman of the National Defense Commission: It is important to note that a few months following the *Cheon'an* sinking, Chang was promoted to the current position and his wife and Kim Jong-il’s sister, Kim Kyong-hui were elevated to four-star general status. Chang Sung-Taek’s primary motive in support of the *Cheon'an* attack was to bolster Kim Jong-un’s military credibility and garner domestic support for his succession.

Kim Jong-un, general of the KPA, vice chairman of the National Defense Commission: Immediately prior to the *Cheon'an*, “The Brilliant Comrade” was designated Kim Jong-il’s heir apparent through a series of actions, including important military appointments. Reportedly authoritarian, ambitious, and politically astute, the Dear Young General was “a presence” in the attack but stop short of claiming responsibility for it.

Kim Yong-chun, the minister of the People’s Armed Forces: Kim Yong-Chun is suspected of being the mastermind behind the ambush on a South Korean naval ship across the NLL in November 2009. Kim Yong-Chun takes a hardline, ruthless approach to military action. He is among the most belligerent voices within North Korea’s circle of power, and he sought revenge against South Korea’s navy since defeat in the Dae-Chung battle in the Yellow Sea.

Kim Yong-nam, chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme People’s Assembly: As a former foreign minister, he arguably represents those who know the importance and intricacies of diplomatic engagements. He possibly opposed another provocation or at least argued that the attack should take the form of an ambush without leaving evidence of responsibility. It is possible that he was excluded from the decision-making process.

Brief Description of Internal Decision-making Process

North Korea’s Navy Command is believed to have planned the attack on the South Korean Navy corvette *Cheon'an*, which was carried out by the Reconnaissance Bureau. The plan was reviewed by the minister of the People’s Armed Forces, Kim Yong-chun,

and Kim Jong-un probably compiled the reports filed by the defense commission and briefed Kim Jong-il. Of note, Kim Jong-il visited the naval command with Jong-un to boost morale at the end of December 2009, after the defeat in the West Sea, He did not fire any high-ranking officials responsible for the naval defeat, but ordered them to seek revenge. Kim Jong-un and Chang Sung-taek are also believed to play roles in preparation for the attack.

DPRK's Demands/ Expectations for Other Countries

South Korea must accept North Korea's National Defense Commission's team of about 20-30 people, who can conduct an investigation of the *Cheon'an* sinking. South Korea must not engage in joint military exercises with the US in the future. South Korea must work toward convincing the UN to lift the sanctions imposed by UNSC Resolution 1874.

China should be careful not to be affected by the conspiracy of the US-South Korea alliance, which intends to widen the rift between North Korea and China. China should use its veto power to block the US and South Korean attempt to reinforce economic sanctions through the UN Security Council. Based upon the agreement during the summit, China's economic cooperation with North Korea should remain intact regardless of regional tension.

Japan must withdraw its support for American imperial forces and its puppet regime in the South. In the wake of the fabricated so-called *Cheon'an* Incident, Japanese imperialists joined the (ROK-US) combined naval exercise, 'Invincible Spirit', in July 2010, which constitutes a fundamental threat to North Korea. Japan should implement its commitments in the 2002 Pyongyang Declaration.

The US should stop putting forth the illogical argument that North Korea orchestrated this attack. The US concocted this incident as a golden opportunity to tighten control of its so-called allies in South Korea and Japan. If the Americans continue to blame, the DPRK will regard it as declaration of war. Rather, the US should immediately return to bilateral negotiations with the North Korea to minimize the prospect of escalation of this conflict.

Lessons learned and Outlook

Through the *Cheon'an* incident, North Korea learned that China was determined to protect North Korea from military threat by the US and South Korea. China will remain in support of North Korea for the next stage of provocation, which could entail a direct attack on South Korean lives and territory. South Korea was domestically divided between left and right groups. Bolder action will facilitate political divisions within South Korea. Japan will not take independent measure without consulting the US. America's domestic opinion became more hostile against North Korea. But for the time being, their hostility bolsters internal unity until the power-succession process is stabilized. The *Cheon'an* incident has emboldened North Korea to consider bolder actions in the near future.

APPENDIX B



PACIFIC FORUM
YOUNG LEADERS PROGRAM

2011 IFANS Conference on Global Affairs
“ALLIANCE IN TRANSFORMATION AND
REGIONAL SECURITY ARCHITECTURE IN NORTHEAST ASIA”

Hosted by Institute of Foreign Affairs and National Security (IFANS), MOFAT
Co-organized by Pacific Forum/CSIS, IFANS and Australian National University (ANU)
Sponsored by The MacArthur Foundation

October 14-15, 2011 - Seoul, Korea

PRE-CONFERENCE PAPER

What is the ideal security architecture in Northeast Asia and what do you expect from the US and its allies?

Mr. Matthew ANDERSON (US) The ideal security architecture for Northeast Asia is one that provides peace and stability. The divergence between interested parties begins when examining details as to how to get there. Since the end of WWII, US military preponderance has been the bedrock of a security architecture. But there has not been a formal architecture but rather the presence of stand-alone structures in the form of bilateral alliances with Washington. Though the web of US bilateral alliances has so far avoided any major wars, small provocations have occurred and they continue to threaten another large-scale, destructive war that could halt or reverse regional economic gains. These provocations and continued tensions in the region and within the US alliance system have highlighted the contrasts between US alliance systems in Asia and Europe.

There are many reasons argued for why the US chose to pursue bilateralism in Asia when it was using multilateralism so effectively in Europe. Victor Cha points out that bilateral alliances give stronger powers more control in alliances. Due to the unique dynamics of post-WWII/early Cold War Asia, US dominance vis-à-vis its smaller partners was more desirable for the US. The US needed not only to contain Communist expansion but also constrain rogue allies in Asia (ROK and ROC) and re-integrate past belligerents without provoking a backlash from other countries (Japan). These aspects of Asia required a different approach to the multilateralism that the US used in creating NATO in Europe.

The US sacrificed efficiency in its alliance system in Asia by pursuing and maintaining separate bilateral agreements out of necessity. However, time has altered the regional environment. The “rogue” allies that the US previously sought to constrain are now entrenched, mature status-quo powers. US efforts to dissuade them from military adventurism are no longer needed. What is needed is integration and multilateralism with all of the efficiencies that they bring. Whether perceived or real, US decline is becoming a larger factor in the foreign policy decisions of the region’s actors. Challenges to US

primacy are sure to increase and become more costly. Therefore, the US needs to transform its existing bilateral alliances into more integrated multilateral institutions that can better share the burden of maintaining stability and allow an austerity-minded US to more economically pursue its interest in the region. Trilateral mechanisms between the US, ROK, and Japan need to move from aspirations to reality. The convergence of interests between these three countries have increased despite minor, though politically salient, differences that hinder the formation of a true trilateral security agreement. These obstacles need to be resolved to pursue a higher value interest in regional stability that can work in the new environment of the 21st century.

Mr. Sungmin CHO (ROK) The Six-Party Talks has been cited for its potential to evolve into the security architecture in Northeast Asia simply because it is the only precedent where all the nations of Northeast Asia including the US as a resident Pacific power convene together. But given the conflicting national interests, mutual distrust, difference in political systems and values, establishing a multilateral security architecture which covers a comprehensive range of security issues in the region is not likely to happen in the near future. If multilateralism is not plausible given the conditions in Northeast Asia and bilateralism is not the ideal basis of security architecture in the region, trilateralism deserves serious consideration to narrow the gap between the unsatisfying reality and unreachable ideal.

There have been efforts to move beyond bilateralism, which characterizes international relations in Northeast Asia. The Trilateral Coordination and Oversight Group represents trilateral cooperation among the US, Japan and South Korea. China, Japan and South Korea started convening in the format of ASEAN+3 and others. Also, the three countries started the trilateral summit in 2007. The US, China and Japan strategic dialogue has been pursued at the 1.5 track level and has a chance to evolve into governmental-level talks. It is possible that the information flow between each trilateral talk helps promote multilateral cooperation in an indirect manner.

In addition to facilitating communication and exchanging information, trilateral consultation for security issues has another objective; complicating the web of networks. Bilateralism under bipolarity at the regional level is simple. Complexity stemming from the multiple forms of trilateral cooperation will complicate a nation's strategic calculations, raising uncertainty for every player. To the extent that uncertainty means unpredictability, a complex web of overlapping networks can deter a nation from taking provocative actions by increasing the uncertainty of consequences.

For example, China's rise tends to form a coalition of neighboring countries against it. It is easy to see the escalation of tension between China and the coalition. But if we can entangle China in the web of trilateral cooperation, it will help mitigate tensions arising from the bifurcation of the region by creating indirect channels of communication and complicating strategic calculations. Therefore the US and its allies should promote multiple forms of trilateral cooperation to get China entangled in the web of network. The trilateral summit of China, Japan and South Korea should be further institutionalized while the US, Japan and South Korea should expand their trilateral cooperation. The US and Japan are recommended to upgrade the current 1.5 track trilateral dialogue with

China to the governmental level. Australia and Japan are also recommended to establish a mechanism to pursue trilateral cooperation with China.

Ms. Erin CHOI (US) From the perspective of the US, South Korea, Japan, and Australia, the ideal security architecture in the Northeast would look a lot like that of the 70s through 90s. After President Nixon and Chairman Mao concluded the Cold War in Asia, the region enjoyed peace. America was the undisputed hegemon (although there was momentary concern about Japan's potential rise as a superpower), which provided a sense of stability and order in the region. As a result, Asian countries were able to focus on their economic and political development.

However, as China undergoes rapid economic growth, it is flexing its muscles and desiring to resume its central and dominant role in the region. South Korea, Japan, and Australia would prefer the US to maintain a strong presence in Asia, because each of these countries has much invested in the US presence in Asia, whether in terms of security, economy, and/or politics. Plus, these countries need the US to hedge and counterbalance China's rise. China's aggressive military build-up, territorial and maritime claims, poor human rights record, and questionable diplomacy (with North Korea and Africa) are a cause of concern for the countries in the region. It is too hard to judge what kind of superpower China will be, but the indicators are not reassuring. China has a ways to go in terms of acquiring the necessary soft power and confidence of other countries to lead.

Given China's impending rise, it is no longer feasible to wish for a turning back of the clock. Neighboring countries need to prepare for the emergence of a potentially "new" regional leader. The next best option would be to construct what Hugh White calls as a "Concert of Asia" modeled after the "Concert of Europe." This concert would include the US, China, Japan, and India, and provide a way to check China's ambitions while offering it recognition and a role by offering it a seat at the "superpower table." The Concert of Asia also leaves room for other countries (like India) to grow. A gradual transition to a cooperative rather than competitive "Concert of Asia" seems ideal for Asian multilateralism.

Dr. Danielle CHUBB (AUS) The establishment of stable security architecture in Northeast Asia must be flexible enough to adapt to swiftly changing circumstances and yet fixed enough to compel an ongoing commitment to it by all key actors. In this respect, most analysts argue that a combination of bilateral, trilateral, and multilateral arrangements offers the ideal arrangement in current circumstances.

While much hope had been pinned on the six-party talks as a vehicle for widening and deepening regional cooperation, the range of responses to issues such as the *Cheon'an* incident have reminded us of the challenges that face the establishment of more enduring security cooperation in Northeast Asia. Historical mistrust and suspicion among regional actors continues to inhibit efforts to overcome the fragmentation we often witness.

From an Australian perspective, the promotion of multilateral cooperative mechanisms remains a priority for policy makers, who continue to discuss Australia's involvement in Northeast Asian security architecture in terms of the country's commitment to its alliance with the United States. From such a viewpoint, the role of Australia is limited to engaging with its security partners in trilateral arrangements such as the ministerial-level

Trilateral (US-Japan-Australia) Security Dialogue and encouraging, through these ties, the development of a more comprehensive layer of multilateral cooperation that would lie on top of these ‘mini-lateral’ arrangements. Furthermore, the extent of such engagement is often limited by the increasingly important role that functional bilateral ties with China play in Australia’s economic development.

A more innovative approach to regional order – and one that is currently lacking – might see Australia looking beyond these approaches that focus almost exclusively on traditional security threats and seeking to encourage a more comprehensive engagement that draws on the region’s rich civil society tradition to deal with a wider range of nontraditional security threats that particularly challenge North Korea, such as food and energy shortages.

Dr. Sandra FAHY (IRL) The traditional role of US security in the region is changing. If taken on enough there will be opportunity for negotiation, power sharing and possibly a resolution to the sleeping Cold War in the region. If not, the rise of China will be ignored at the peril of the US and the entire region.

The ideal security architecture in Northeast Asia would have the US accepting the loss of its primacy in place of a security role that recognizes the increasing economic power of China. Negotiating a position of power with China may enable the US to encourage China into a “deterrence statement” with Japan, ROK, Australia. Since Australia is re-evaluating its position in Asia vis-à-vis the United States against the growing power of China, it may also be time for the US to engage Australia’s role in the region on security issues. As there are old historical wounds between China, Japan and Korea, Australia may be an effective alternative to the traditional role held by the US. However, it is more likely that Japan and Korea will want to retain the US, but only in a power sharing role to balance China.

On matters specifically related to the DPRK, the United States should consider a stance that resembles that of South Korea, where economic development and diplomatic relationships are promoted. This will appeal to China and South Korea. While we cannot be certain that this will lead to denuclearization on the peninsula – as ROK imagines it may – there could be more likelihood of this once the US support joins that of the ROK. While this is atypical of the US in the region, it may be time to negotiate this particularly in light of China’s rise. Finally, there is discussion of developing a “war treaty” in the region, where an attack on one would be considered an attack on all. In my view this is a dangerous approach. Instead, agreement on minimal standards of responsible nuclear behavior should be agreed upon in the region. Creating incentives for information, trade and exchange, as a means to try and indirectly involve the DPRK, may be the best alternative in the shifting power relations of the region.

Ms. Nicole FORRESTER (AUS) The shifting strategic environment in Northeast Asia presents an opportunity for greater political cooperation and further economic integration between Japan, ROK, the US and other key allies.

Should Northeast Asia fail to collaboratively address escalating provocations, proliferation and non-traditional security challenges it would be the detriment not only of Northeast Asia, but beyond into the Asia Pacific. Further, a serious disruption to Asia’s

strategic stability – which would in turn disrupt economic growth – would have severe, diffused consequences for the rest of the world.

While ASEAN has brought a mutual understanding of sub-regional security and the US bilateral security alliances (Japan, Korea, Australia, Thailand and the Philippines) have contributed to strategic stability and continuity across the wider region, the existing security architecture (both formal mechanisms and dialogues) addressing Northeast Asia remains limited.

Yet the potential to exacerbate old strategic uncertainties, historical animosities and persistent unresolved territorial disputes in Northeast Asia remains great. A single security mechanism is unlikely to provide a panacea in a region with such complex and intractable issues.

The region would likely benefit more from strategies which layer security architecture, using the US bilateral security alliances as a foundation. Such a layered approach to regional security architecture would preserve the options provided by existing alliances while building capacity of regional groupings to better deal with various challenges.

A layered approach could also include the creation of new relevant, trilateral (eg. US, ROK and Japan) and quadrilateral alliances (there are several possibilities), simultaneously with broader Asian “only” mechanisms like formalizing of a security dialogue among ASEAN+3.

Creating a concept of common security, based on shared interests and values, would underpin the development of greater and more effective consultation and cooperation towards regional security challenges. A strong and focused pan-regional institution, similar in membership to the EAS, could create common security, while providing a formalized counterweight to balance any one nation’s influence. Through substantive leaders’ dialogue, leading to deliberations on appropriate confidence and security building measures, it could provide a starting point from which to build plurilateral consultative arrangements around regional security policy challenges for the future.

Potentially, over time, a pan-regional mechanism could also provide a forum around which other security policy deliberations (such as ASEAN, ARF, APEC, SARC, ADMM+) would coalesce and allow the eventual institutional rationalisation necessary to remove unwarranted duplication of effort.

Although this is no quick fix, and will not lead to overnight resolution of enduring issues, developing more collaborative, regional mechanisms now will lead to formation of dedicated regional institutions, as well as regional norms and arrangements to enhance the balance, transparency and stability of security policy behavior across the region in the future.

Mr. Alex HAN (US) North Korea’s potential collapse or its use of nuclear or conventional weapons is one of the biggest threats to peace and stability in Northeast Asia. As such, the ideal security architecture in Northeast Asia should prevent North Korea’s collapse and remove the need for the use of their weapons. To accomplish this goal, China, South Korea, Japan, and the United States must collaborate to engage North Korea, bolstering its economy, mitigating its need to develop or acquire more weapons. Compromises need to be made around the table for the sake of increased stability in the

region. Although China should not demand that North Korea apologize for the sinking of the *Cheon'an* or the *Yeonpyong* Island shelling, as its major ally, China should nudge North Korea to admit and make amends with South Korea on this issue. After having done this, the Six-Party Talks can resume negotiations for the denuclearization of North Korea. As a compromise, the United States could reduce sanctions against North Korea, preventing North Korea from becoming pigeonholed into using military actions to gain attention from the international community. As neighboring countries slowly aid the North Korean community with food aid and economic development, North Korea will have a greater stake in stability. Currently, South Korea and Japan are engaged in large trade flows with China, making these countries more dependent on each other. Therefore, it makes sense that these countries should work together to bring greater stability to the region.

However, historical animosity among these countries persists, making collaboration difficult. The United States' military bases on Japan and South Korea feed China's perception that its security is threatened. Furthermore, the United States would not be willing to reduce its military presence in South Korea, in case North Korea attacks South Korea. This standstill may be problematic for the North Korean solution. Furthermore, certain US allies in the Asia-Pacific region, including Thailand and Australia, also have a stake in the stability of North Korea. Thailand's border with Myanmar and illegal weapons trafficking to that country threatens Thailand's security. Australia, threatened by the nuclear weapons in North Korea, would help the US and its allies in Northeast Asia to secure its own security. The key to collaboration is for these countries to prevent miscommunication about their goals and not to perceive each other as threatening. China is a key player in this solution. Therefore, it is paramount that the United States keep too many of its allies from meddling in this Northeast Asian problem, as not to sharpen China's perception of US intentions.

Mr. Ryo HINATA-YAMAGUCHI (JP) The ideal security architecture in Northeast Asia is one that focuses on region-wide arms reduction and concrete security cooperation. Realistically, there are problems concerning feasibility. The security paradigm in the Northeast Asia region fixated on competition as opposed to cooperation, due to state-centric policies, sovereignty issues and domestic institutional problems. Against this backdrop, the only solution is to first focus on minimizing regional ramifications rather than aggressively pursuing idealist benefits.

Establishing regional security architecture requires a region-wide realignment of military capability management paradigms. For the time being, the foremost issue is to establish a regime that focuses on the means of managing the military (i.e. *how*) rather than questioning the ends or output. Examples of this could include: greater transparency, set of "rules" for managing the military, etc. At the same time, we need to understand that a state's defense planning is domestically-constructed, and the magnitude of paradigm shifts varies accordingly. Hence we need to ensure that the building of regional security architectures takes into account the differing capacities, interests and circumstances, as well as not upsetting a state's sovereignty. One way to achieve this would be to focus on establishing a yin-yang architecture, whereby each state takes on their respective areas/roles in regional security.

The next step would be to establish a common *theme*, rather than a common *objective*. If successful, a solid establishment of a shared theme could lead to the establishment of larger regional objectives such as arms reduction or greater security cooperation. The key would be to start from relatively “soft” levels. For example, concrete cooperation focusing on nontraditional security threats would be a starting point. These could include, but not be limited to: military-level cooperation for disaster relief efforts; and military modernization has minimal ramifications on the environment (Ecological Military Capability Management). After achieving these areas, the themes can then be expanded to issues such as greater inter-military communication or even arms reduction.

To achieve the means and ends outlined above, the US, Japan, the ROK and Australia have a pivotal role, and a coherent initiative by the alliance will be essential. Given that the states of the US alliance possesses greater economic and political capacity (compared to China or the DPRK), these states should set an example by initiating these common themes in regional security and assisting Beijing and Pyongyang. Unless the US, Japan, the ROK and Australia embark on a coherent initiative, it is naïve to expect China or the DPRK to conform to regional security efforts. Progress in these areas could then be presented at regional forums such as the East Asia Summit or the Six-Party Talks as a starting point. While achieving the ideal regional security architecture may be a long-term goal, initiatives towards these ends are long overdue. Efforts toward establishing viable regional security architecture must focus on the means, common theme, and guarantee of sovereignty, so that this meet the interests and will of all parties involved.

Mr. Akira IGATA (JP) The ideal security architecture in Northeast Asia should have three characteristics: (1) overlapping security arrangements; (2) incorporation of nontraditional security issues; and (3) principle of open membership.

Many states in Northeast Asia have realized that problems can be dealt with cost-effectively by cooperating with neighboring countries. However, domestic politics and historical legacies have often precluded such measures from being taken. As such, states should be open to employing multifarious arrangements ranging from legally binding bilateral security treaties and looser multilateral arrangements to an ad-hoc forum like the six-party talks or a voluntary-based set of “actions” like the PSI in dealing with the security challenges of the region. Allowing for various degrees of constraints implies that states can be flexible in joining cooperative arrangements according to the political capital that each administration is willing to use.

Closely related to this first point is that this security architecture should not be limited to traditional hard security issues. Many states may reject cooperating militarily in a NATO-like arrangement, but this should not preclude them from enhancing cooperation in other areas. For instance, they may be more comfortable working together on issues pertaining to non-traditional security, such as cyber security, disaster relief, humanitarian assistance, pandemics, piracy, or nuclear security.

Lastly, open membership is vital. It should be uncontroversial to argue that the economic prosperity of all the states in the region relies on the absence of military conflicts. To prevent certain countries from feeling isolated or being targeted, the principle should be to inform and invite all states from the early stages of the development of a new security arrangement, both traditional and non-traditional.

A security architecture that has these three characteristics may seem redundant, confusing, and disorderly. However, such a security architecture would give states the option to cooperate in areas that they are comfortable with in a manner that they feel is appropriate. Once states decide to cooperate, this would serve as a catalyst to foster trust and clarify common interests among member states in that particular arrangement, which would increase chances of these states to further cooperation in other, more substantive areas.

Simply increasing military spending to deal with future uncertainties will not be prudent, as this would likely provoke military rivalry. As an alternative option, Australia, Japan, ROK, and the US should increase funding for diplomatic initiatives toward constructing a security architecture with these three characteristics. Ultimately, (or rather, hopefully), increased trust and clearer perception of common interests among states resulting from the participation of states in this security architecture will result in an increased possibility for peaceful resolution to the conflicts of interest that these states face.

Mr. Jihyung (John) LEE (ROK) For many Northeast Asian countries, the hub-and-spokes security structure centered on the United States has served its purpose well. It has been responsible for the region's lack of a major war since the 1950s and has set the stage for the region's rapid economic growth. However, North Korea's ever-present threat and China's rise have prompted discussions on whether the current system can accommodate these conditions and, if not, what type of security architecture provides the best solution to maintaining the peace and stability of the region.

Northeast Asia is filled with potential conflicts. The Korean War is yet to be concluded and South Korea has been the target of numerous North Korean provocations, including the attacks on the *Cheonan* and *Yeonpyeong* island in 2010. The Japanese have been victims of North Korean abductions and Washington's security interests have been challenged by China's aggressive diplomacy as well as North Korea's nuclear programs and proliferating activities.

North Korea has justified its nuclear weapons program with the claim that the current security architecture fails to address its insecurities and that *it* has been the victim of the system. The newly rising, or re-rising, China has also shown discontent over the US-dominated system. The ground for China's discontent is that the United States and her allies have hindered its rise in fear of a China-centric system. Although China has claimed to embrace a "peaceful rise," we have observed glimpses of China's assertive diplomacy in its one-China policy and continued support of the North Korean regime. As China continues its remarkable economic growth, its influence will spill over into the security realm, which will challenge the current system. The creation of a new security architecture or revisions to the hub-and-spokes system seems inevitable.

With these conditions, China and North Korea are likely to mold the current system to their advantage. North Korea's effort will largely stem from regime survival. As Kim Jong-il nears death and realities of political succession loom large, the potential for instability is greater. At the same time, China's attempt at molding a new system will stem from its desire to create a more China-centric environment. That means more of China's voice being heard and less of the United States'. No matter how China's official statements portray its rise, it is sure to exert great pressure on the US and its allies.

The US will try to solve the North Korean problem and accommodate China's rise *within* the current system. In addition, South Korea and Japan are likely to continue their support of Washington and the current structure. However, it is difficult to be optimistic about this structure due to the pressures exerted by China and North Korea. The future security architecture in Northeast Asia, therefore, will likely to see China and the United States reluctantly sharing leadership.

Mr. Joseph Boyd LENOX (US) To the United States, Asia has proved to be a different game compared to Europe after World War II. In Asia, a strong appeal to democracy has not yet appeared and nations seem to view themselves as strategic rivals regardless of their economic cooperation. At the same time, the region has displayed unprecedented economic success and growth. In Northeast Asia, we see both strong nationalism and an uneven balance of power that is swinging further in the direction of China. The combination of nationalism, arms-buildups and a strategic rivalry attitude raises the potential for eventual military turmoil. Potential hotspots include: Taiwan between the US and China, the Senkaku Islands dispute between Japan and China, the Kuril Islands between Russia and Japan, or a situation involving all parties in the Korean peninsula. This is a very dynamic region filled with overlapping interests that have created potential regional flashpoints, but thus far economic cooperation has been able to channel peaceful relations.

The balance of power is key to the current stability in Asia. Therefore, it is up to the US to find equilibrium. The strong US presence maintained in both Japan and South Korea cannot be denied, and with the rise of China, a sudden drawback of US presence would leave a power vacuum that could lead to nations dangerously and haphazardly compensating with mass armament. The US must strive to both strengthen and reassure its existing alliances while at the same time maintain cooperative relations with all Asian nations without making enemies. This strengthened alliance should not be used in any way towards a US lead containment strategy against China. China and the US must come to terms with one-another's regional presence and strive for stronger cooperation. The more cooperation that can be achieved between China and the US the more regional stability can be maintained. The US presence insures other countries that China's rising interests are dulled while further cooperation amongst the economic competition between the US and China ensures that future flashpoints could be peacefully managed (especially crisis on the Korean peninsula). In striving to create a Pacific community Northeast Asian interests can be peacefully integrated, but this can only be achieved along side what Henry Kissinger refers to as a the peaceful "co-evolution" of both China and the United States of America.

Ms. Mihoko MATSUBARA (JP) The ideal security architecture must address two major concerns in Northeast Asia: the North Korean nuclear program and the changing balance of power. The architecture should use US alliances as a hub to maintain security and stability in the region.

First, the North Korean nuclear development program threatens Northeast Asian security. Pyongyang uses its program to bring US and its allies to the negotiating table and obtain financial aid, although the regime has not given up its nuclear arsenals yet. The regime also uses nuclear weapons to increase tension and pressure South Korea and the United States. Moreover, North Korea is proliferating its nuclear technology to Burma, Iran, and

Syria. The international community has tried to persuade North Korea to follow the example of Libya and renounce the program. Nevertheless, after the war in Libya and Qaddafi's downfall, it is more difficult than ever to convince North Korea and the regime would be more eager to build up its nuclear capability for deterrence and the Kim dynasty's survival.

Unfortunately, the Six Party Talks have been unsuccessful in peacefully resolving the nuclear issue. The security architecture can take advantage of the Proliferation Security Initiative (PSI) for nuclear counter-proliferation. The US should use its alliances to exchange intelligence on this matter, prevent North Korea from gaining dual-use materials from the allies, and conduct official inspections with allies if necessary. A long term goal of the architecture is to denuclearize North Korea, but it will require some kind of security guarantee from the United States.

Second, as China continues to build up military power, the balance of power is changing in the region. Beijing has had double-digit increases annually in its defense spending over the last two decades. There is a perceptible unease over China's rise that lacks transparency. Its new aircraft carrier and stealth fighters increase China's power projection and may tip the balance of power toward Beijing.

The current change in balance of power is not only happening in the security arena but also in economy. While China's GDP enjoys rapid growth of over 10 percent over the last 30 years, the Japanese and US economies have plateaued. China is the second largest US trading partner and third largest export market. Facing protracted economic depression and strong economic ties with China, American allies are worried about US decline in terms of its commitment in the region. After the sinking of the *Cheonan*, the US hesitance to deploy an aircraft carrier upon request by Seoul raised concerns about Washington's future role in Northeast Asia.

As the United States has been bogged down economically and militarily, US allies are required to contribute to regional security more than ever. Washington and the allies have to continue to engage in Beijing for better mutual understanding. At the same time, the security architecture should fill in gaps in US commitment and alleviate concerns among allies to avoid an unstable balance of power.

Ms. Alisa MODICA (US) The ideal security architecture in Northeast Asia would involve a reinforcement of existing bilateral relationships with a new multilateral security mechanism (MSM) to ensure peaceful settlement of disputes and to more effectively deal with security concerns. There is multilateral cooperation in the form of functional, ad hoc arrangements such as the Six Party Talks (SPT), Track 2 (or 1.5) multilateral dialogues such as NEACD and CSCAP, and East Asian regional dialogues that deal with security such as the ARF; however, Northeast Asia is the only region in the world without its own formal multilateral security institution. There are a series of important questions to address in terms of membership and scope. Must the MSM include North Korea and China or other regional actors? What would be the nature of the institution: issue-based and dealing with topics such as cross-strait relations, the North Korean nuclear program and territorial disputes, or process-oriented with a goal of promoting cooperation and building trust? What would be the new roles for bilateral alliances?

As for membership, it is true that China can frustrate efforts to deal with regional problems, particularly with respect to Taiwan. For example, China's participation in CSCAP was conditional upon exclusion of the discussion of cross-strait relations. However, any attempt at greater regional security cooperation must include China to be relevant. Intransigent North Korea may be a different story. As Scott Snyder noted, "without North Korea, there is no compelling agenda that will bring the concerned parties of Northeast Asia around the negotiating table – but when North Korea is present at the talks, it is not possible to have a multiparty discussion on any issue but North Korea." Ralph Cossa argues that it may be easier to start the process of an MSM by excluding North Korea. As for other actors, Mongolia has an interest in integrating China, and Australia is an important regional actor; these states should also play a role in a Northeast Asian MSM.

An important goal of the MSM is to establish norms of trust and cooperation, but eventually it should deal with shared regional issues. The first is the denuclearization of the Korean peninsula and ensuring nonproliferation of nuclear materials. An MSM would be key to reducing miscommunication, creating a united front on measures such as sanctions, and dealing with reunification of the Korean peninsula. The second issue is the increasing strategic and political role of China in the region. Hugh White claims that China is likely to see shared regional leadership as a viable option, rather than hard hegemony, or soft Monroe Doctrine-style diplomacy that Japan and the US will not accept. Also, countries in the region do not want to choose between security offered by the US and the economic benefits of China, and an MSM would allay some security concerns raised by growing Chinese military might. The third issue is nontraditional security concerns such as infectious diseases, transnational crimes and environmental degradation.

The MSM should be a complement to existing bilateral alliances. The US has relied on its hub-and-spokes system of bilateral alliances to ensure stability in Northeast Asia. But given the growth of China at a time the US faces budgetary constraints, the US must understand that China is a stakeholder in a peaceful and stable Northeast Asia and accept its growing influence. The US should also work to increase bilateral ties with China. It is likely that there will be some US reduction in its commitment to Asia, but the US must continue to maintain strong relationships with allies while focusing on building a multilateral regime, because its allies will not feel complete secure in the absence of bilateral treaties. At the same time, US allies will be expected to contribute more to their own defense while seeking a multilateral platform to address security concerns. In particular, Japan and South Korea should increase defense cooperation and move past historical issues. More specifically, Japan needs to get over domestic political stagnation and find the political will to take a greater leadership role while moving the abduction issue to the background. Australia, while not geographically located in Northeast Asia, should participate as a regional Asian leader. Australia has strong bilateral ties with the US and more recently with Japan. Former Prime Minister Kevin Rudd once proposed an Asia-Pacific Community (APC), and Australia should continue to push this type of initiative.

Mr. Kyutoi MOON (ROK) The rise of China and North Korean nuclear program are two major issues for the security architecture in Northeast Asia, but a single security

architecture will not be enough to resolve these two issues. Thus, we must address them separately by using two different security frameworks.

To deal with China, the ideal security architecture would be trilateral partnerships. Since the Korean War, the hub-and-spokes security framework with the United States at the center was effective until the rise of China. Due to China's military and economic growth and the decline of the United States, Northeast Asia needs a more effective framework to stabilize the region and prepare for the new balance of power.

Ironically, as China increases its military budget, the United States is expected to cut its defense budget. The need for new security architecture will grow. The ideal security architecture would be to strengthen two trilateral partnerships: "ROK, Japan, and the US" and "Japan, Australia, and the US." By strengthening these trilateral partnerships, the region may be able to deter China.

The key to these trilateral partnerships is reduction of the financial burden on the United States. Due to defense budget cuts and the decline of economy, the United States will lose its influence in Northeast Asia unless South Korea, Japan, and Australia determine ways to reduce the financial burden on the United States. By expanding capabilities of trilateral partnerships, the United States will be able to increase the level of cooperation and sustain deterrence against China.

For the case of North Korea, a multilateral framework with every actor in the region will be a key to deterrence against North Korea. North Korea and its nuclear program need to be handled in the Six-Party framework. Regardless of the rise of China or the decline of the US, North Korea will follow the same path and make similar decisions. By using a multilateral framework, which can include China or other friendly nations to North Korea, the United States and its allies can generate regional agreements regarding North Korean issues including its nuclear programs and North Korea's military actions such as the sinking of *Cheon'an* and the attack on *Yeonpyeong* Island. Without regional legitimacy, the US and its allies will not be able to achieve deterrence against North Korea, and instability surrounding the Korean peninsula will continue.

Mr. Dongjoon PARK (ROK) The security architecture in Northeast Asia has been transformed over the past few years. Some of the more important changes in the region include the rise of China, the relative decline of Japan, and the acquisition of nuclear weapons by North Korea. Despite these changes the one constant regarding the security environment in this part of the world is the importance of the alliance system. In an ideal world where there are no conflicts and where it is relatively easy for states to reconcile differences with other countries, the ideal security architecture would be one where all states cooperate to prevent violent or non-violent competition. This is not the case in international relations, where pursuing national interests are considered the greatest virtue, or a matter of survival. Nowhere else is it more evident in Northeast Asia region, where several of the world's most powerful economies and militaries are located.

In terms of the security architecture in Northeast Asia, if one believes that close cooperation is difficult to achieve among related countries, then drawing a more clear-cut line between allies and competitors may result in a more stable environment. In other words, defining more clearly the alliance structure between separate blocs centered on the US and China might be more stable and peaceful.

There are two reasons behind this conclusion. First, referring to balance of power theory, this system would posit two relatively equally powered blocs against each other. In such symmetry, it would be harder for each side to alter the balance in their favor, decreasing the possibility of aggressive acts. Second, this would increase the need for US involvement in the region. This in turn has two effects; the existence of two major powers would increase the stakes of competition, forcing both actors to act more cautiously; while both China and the US will be inclined to exert more pressure on their allies to behave responsibly due to fear of entanglement.

If this is the case, the role of US allies such as South Korea, Japan, and Australia is quite simple; strengthen relations with the US and among each other. On the one hand, certain minor issues which even closest allies disagree upon will have to be over looked, which will be easier to ‘sweep under the rug’ given the stakes. On the other hand, US allies in the region would achieve greater stability if they could cooperate among themselves, regardless of historical differences. The traditional ‘hub and spokes’ approach to alliance relations among Asian countries and the US would no longer suffice, and coherence among the group would be vital for each bloc in such an environment.

Ms. Lauren RICHARDSON (AUS) While the current hub-and-spoke system has been effective in providing peace and security in the Northeast Asian region, a new regional architecture to designed complement, rather than replace this existing system, is required to accommodate changing regional security dynamics, the most significant of which is a rising China. However, the security architecture in Northeast Asia should not be a confrontational order in which China is treated as a ‘threat’, but ideally, a multilateral security framework characterized by cooperative engagement and collective leadership.

Based on the premise that the rise of China and the North Korean regime have the greatest potential to destabilize the region, and that territorial disputes continue to be flash points, the member states of the multilateral framework should be the six-Party process nations. The inclusion of China should be premised on engagement and furthering the transparency, enabling other member states to monitor China’s rise more closely, thereby relieving anxieties. In terms of North Korea, while denuclearization should continue to be pursued by member states, as this is not likely to be achieved in the near future, ‘containing’ the North Korean issue and deciding how to deal with North Korean contingencies should be paramount.

The inclusion of Japan, South Korea, China, and Russia in a multilateral security framework would be significant; all have a stake in North Korea’s actions, providing an important platform for cooperation. In the past, cooperative security efforts between Japan and South Korea and Japan and China have mitigated against flare ups of ‘history problems’, albeit it temporarily, and enhanced strategic cooperation between the three parties may serve as a buffer against territorial disputes. The same logic can be applied to Russo-Japan territorial issues. It is important, however, that Japan continues to act within the bounds of its constitutional constraints, to enhance strategic trust between China and South Korea, and the maintenance of the US-Japan alliance will be necessary to this end.

South Korea has an important role as facilitator of regional cooperation, particularly in managing the Sino-Japan relationship, but cannot do this alone; Australia should assist. Australia, as a neutral party, could also play an intermediary or diplomatic role in

historical disputes, and this was evident in the 2005 Sino-Japan history textbook dispute when leaders of both countries expressed their grievances about the matter with Australia's then Prime Minister John Howard.

The US, as an outsider, will continue to be critical to regional balancing but should be prepared to concede its regional hegemonic status, allowing a more collective leadership to take evolve.

Mr. Crispin ROVERE (AUS) Emerging regional giants challenge uncontested US primacy in Asia, strategic decisions are becoming more difficult, with increasing disparity between the economic and strategic interest of countries throughout the region. For none is this starker than for Australia, Korea and Japan. All three see China as their primary economic partner, while all three have longstanding alliance relationships with the United States. As strategic competition between China and the US intensifies, new security architecture must develop to mitigate risks.

To design such architecture it helps to view Northeast Asia as the epicenter of a large strategic theatre stretching from Pakistan to Japan. Unresolved tensions, competing territorial claims, and flashpoints between great powers are concentrated in this region. This is occurring as China and India reemerge as major powers, challenging the US-dominated status quo.

This shift exposes cleavages in the national interest of America's smaller East Asian allies. Australia, by reason of geography, and Korea and Japan, by reason of history, are not going to sacrifice their economic relationship with China for the same things, much less plunge their nation into a war that would devastate their nations. The ROK is not going to go to war with China over the Senkakus, and Japan will not retaliate against North Korea for shelling an island in the Yellow Sea. None of the three (Japan, ROK, Australia) want war over the political status of Taiwan, but US credibility depends on its willingness to fight.

A complex power-sharing arrangement must therefore emerge, with a security architecture that accounts for concentric centers of power and the diverging trajectories of economic and strategic interests. At the core are three established and emerging giants, China, India, and the United States. Whether discussing Northeast Asia, Southeast Asia, or the Indian Ocean regions, these three must have a seat at the table.

Groupings of middle powers need emerge to check any aggression that exceeds their respective thresholds while strengthening the concert arrangement of the dominant three. The Korea-Japan-Australia trilateral partnership would work against Chinese hegemony but also resist US entrapment. Other groupings, based on interest and geography, will manage regional flashpoints such as the Korean Peninsula or the South China Sea. Moderating strategic rivalry in Northeast Asia therefore requires a concentric web of interlocking middle power groupings, based on a core concert of power system.

In understanding what each of the East Asian allies require from the US and each other, it is necessary to clarify the strengths and drawbacks of this system. A trilateral partnership (Japan, ROK, Australia) could strengthen the US in preventing Chinese hegemony, while resisting US attempts to draw allies into a containment strategy that carries grave risks.

At the same time, each of the smaller allies will need to subjugate its own interests to that of the US on any matter that lies beneath the threshold of the other partners. When you consider that this is anything below a Chinese bid for hegemony or US attempts to maintain primacy, this threshold is dauntingly high. In practice this means accepting Washington's priorities when it comes to the Senkaku islands or low-level North Korean provocations, and for the US it means accepting China as a major power whose interests in the Taiwan Strait are decisive.

To be clear, the future presented above is not what any of the allies would ideally prefer Asia to be, but rather what is the best *architecture* that can be developed to manage the changing power relativities that are taking place. In the ideal world, the US would maintain its place as the uncontested security guarantor in the Asia Pacific in perpetuity, just as it has done successfully for the past 40 years. This is no longer possible, and as such a concert of power model, supported and mitigated by middle-power groupings, is the best architecture that Northeast Asia can credibly achieve.

Mr. Eddie WALSH (US) From an American perspective, the optimal security architecture in Northeast Asia remains the bilateral hub-and-spoke system. Over the past decade, China has made little effort to improve military transparency and North Korea has retrenched its nuclear ambitions. These conditions prevent adoption of a formal, comprehensive security architecture in Northeast Asia capable of accommodating these powers.

That said, there is a strong argument to be made that the US should layer on top of its traditional bilateral relationships a separate Trilateral Strategic Partnership (TSP) with Japan and South Korea. This partnership should emphasize not only enhanced defense and diplomatic cooperation but also should prioritize the pursuit of a common identity as a shared national security objective.

Despite a long history of cooperation, the partners must acknowledge the stark absence of a common identity. This all too often reduces the relationships to strategic calculations based solely on short-term national interests. For the partnerships to deepen, the partners need to leverage the TSP to forge a common identity that complements (rather than supplants) their strong national identities.

At the start of the Asian century, the US has failed to properly integrate the culture and language of its large Asian immigrant population into mainstream America. While the US possesses a unique capacity to retain a common identity with Europe while simultaneously forging a new one with Asia, it has squandered this opportunity. To meet emerging strategic objectives, the US must make Asian cultural integration, rather than assimilation, a national priority. This includes investing in programs that better reflect Japanese and Korean culture and language in American education and fine arts.

Japan and South Korea likewise need to prioritize forging a common identity between one another and the US. This involves more than compulsory English language training. It requires a national mandate to overcome historical divides and implement new domestic and international education and cultural relations programs.

The development of a common identity would lower barriers to cooperation within the TSP and bilateral relationships. This would not only help the partners better weather

future shocks but also would bind the US more closely to its long-term security commitments in Asia.

It is possible to see the agenda of the TSP expanding beyond foundational issues, which should be limited to the North Korean threat, nontraditional security concerns, and building a common identity. Continuing to handle more divisive issues through bilateral relations would prevent the TSP from being undermined by the China factor from the start. This would enable the TSP to be designed as a mechanism capable of pivoting to either contain or accommodate a rising China once its intentions are better known.

If progress can be made through the TSP, the initiative could spawn a new regional security architecture encompassing like-minded Asia-Pacific partners. At first, this could include Australia, Canada, New Zealand, Philippines, and Russia; countries struggling with the Asianness of their own national identities, sometimes questioning the long-term viability of US security commitments in Asia-Pacific, and sharing concerns over the North Korean nuclear program. However, there would not need to be specific limitations on membership aside from support for Asia-Pacific peace and stability.

Japanese Participant from the Japanese perspective, the ideal security architecture is one which aims to further support US primacy in Asia. In such a security architecture, Japan's expectations for the US and its allies are continuing promotion of trilateral partnerships.

An ideal security architecture that Japan aspires to develop in the region is one that supports the US strategic engagement in Asia and hence the Japan-US alliance. The relative decline of Japan and US provokes hot debates in both academic and policy circles in the Asia-Pacific region. The 2010 National Defense Program Guidelines, a foundational policy document for Japanese national security strategy, recognizes the changing balance of power in Asia. In response to this, Japan promotes the idea/policy of a regional networking strategy; an attempt to utilize a wide range of policy initiatives and regional security frameworks to achieve Japan's various security goals; especially to support the US strategic engagement in Asia.

In this context, the Japan-Australia-US and Japan-ROK-US triangles are of special importance. In the case of Japan-Australia-US partnership, the three countries have been building trilateral institutions for facilitating practical cooperation in nontraditional security areas. In the aftermath of the 3.11 disaster, for example, Australia deployed three C-17s to Japan, which supported Japan's disaster relief efforts and US-Japan "Tomodachi" operational cooperation. Such trilateral cooperation in nontraditional security areas allow Japan and Australia to share burdens and responsibilities with the US in the hope that such efforts reduce the cost of US security activity in Asia and signal allied resolve to work together with the declining superpower. Likewise, Japan-ROK-US trilateralism aims to cooperate on a wide array of security agendas including joint assistance to the lower Mekong river area and Afghanistan and trilateral cooperation in wider multilateral institutions. The expanding scope of the Japan-ROK-US trilateral partnership also offers Japan and ROK to share burdens and responsibility with the US.

In addition, it should be also noted that Japan-Australia-US and Japan-ROK-US partnerships play different roles in the security architecture. Japan-Australia-US

conducted a maritime exercise in the South China Sea in July 2011. The message of such trilateral action in that particular area is the trilateral hope that China should act in accordance with international rules such as freedom of navigation and peaceful resolution of conflicts. Given ROK's traditional sensitivity with regard to the rise of China, however, it may be difficult to expect Japan-ROK-US triangle to play a role to the same extent. By contrast, the focus of Japan-ROK-US trilateral cooperation is the Korean Peninsula. In particular, by bolstering the Japan-ROK leg of the triangle through developing joint intelligence-sharing mechanisms and eventually joint contingency planning, Japan wishes to strengthen the effectiveness of the US-Japan alliance. Many of the Japan-US allied efforts will be more effective if planned in trilateral, rather than bilateral settings.

APPENDIX C

PACIFIC FORUM

YOUNG LEADERS PROGRAM

2011 IFANS Conference on Global Affairs

**“ALLIANCE IN TRANSFORMATION AND
REGIONAL SECURITY ARCHITECTURE IN NORTHEAST ASIA”**

October 14-15, 2011 - Seoul, Korea

Hosted by Institute of Foreign Affairs and National Security (IFANS), MOFAT
Co-organized by Pacific Forum/CSIS, IFANS and Australian National University (ANU)
Sponsored by The MacArthur Foundation

Conference Description

Nature of Event:

An annual conference hosted by Institute of Foreign Affairs and National Security (IFANS), Co-organized by Pacific Forum/CSIS, IFANS and Australian National University (ANU) and sponsored by the MacArthur Foundation

Place of Venue:

1st Day **Orchid Room (2F.)**, The GRAND InterContinental, Seoul Parnas
2nd Day **The International Conference Hall (2F.)**, IFANS, Seoul

Number of Audience: 150 (*1st Day)

Composition of Participants:

Invitees will include government officials, professionals from security and diplomatic sector, journalists, renowned scholars from Korea and abroad, and especially undergraduate and graduate students. The Conference will be open to the public and publicly advertised.

Conference Venue Location

GRAND InterContinental, SEOUL PARNAS

521 Teheranno. Gangnam-gu, Korea

Tel: +82-2-555-5656

Fax: +82-2-559-7990

Location: <http://www.seoul.intercontinental.com/eng/grand/etc/map.asp>

Institute of Foreign Affairs and National Security

1376-2 Seocho 2-dong, Seocho-ku, Seoul 137-863, ROK

Tel: +82-2-3497-7600

Location: <http://www.ifans.go.kr/eng/about/location/index.jsp>

PROGRAM

Thursday, October 13 (Arrival of Overseas Participants)

19:00 – 20:30 **YL Welcoming Dinner and Intro Session**

Friday, October 14

(Public Symposium) Orchid Room (2F), GRAND InterContinental

09:30 – 10:10 **Opening Session**

Welcoming Remarks: Amb. **LEE Joon-gyu** (Chancellor, IFANS, MOFAT)

Congratulatory Remarks: Rep. **CHUNG OK-Nim** (Member of National Assembly, Grand National Party)

Keynote Speech: Minister **KIM Sung-Hwan** (Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade (MOFAT))

10:20 – 12:00 **Session 1: Diplomatic Roundtable “Security Perspectives”**

This session examines each country’s views on security priorities in Northeast Asia. IFANS will invite senior ROK, US, Japan and Australia participants to discuss their countries’ respective foreign policies. The guiding questions are as follows: What are the primary security concerns in the region? How important are nontraditional security threats in Northeast Asia? How should these concerns be addressed? Have North Korea’s nuclear programs changed security perceptions? Has potential instability in North Korea changed security perceptions? How? What role do domestic politics and conflicts play in shaping security perspectives? How can the four countries work together to reduce differences in perceptions?

Moderator: **YOON Young-kwan** (Former Minister of MOFAT, ROK)

Panels: **SHIM Yoon Joe** (Former Deputy Foreign Minister, MOFAT)

James A. KELLY (Former Assistant Secretary of State, US)

Noboru YAMAGUCHI (Former Special Advisor to the Cabinet)

Gareth EVANS (Former Minister of Foreign Affairs, Australia)

12:00 – 14:00 **Luncheon (Grand Ballroom (2F), GRAND InterContinental)**

14:00 – 15:50 **Session 2: “The Rise of China and Its Implications”**

This session explores China’s growing influence in East Asia. How is China’s role in the region perceived? Has the balance of power in the region shifted? Is China’s role in Northeast Asia different from in Southeast Asia? How? What are the security implications? How does China’s influence affect Japan’s and South Korea’s relationships with the US and Australia? How does China influence Australia’s role in East Asia? How do the US and Australia view trilateral cooperation among China, Japan, and ROK?

Moderator: **LEE Joon-gyu** (Chancellor, IFANS, MOFAT)
Presenters: **KIM Jae Cheol** (Professor, The Catholic University of Korea)
Bonnie S. GLASER (Senior Fellow, CSIS)
Yoshihide SOEYA (Professor, Keio University)
Nicholas BISLEY (Professor, La Trobe University)
Discussants: **LEE Ji-yong** (Professor, Dept. of Asian and Pacific Studies, IFANS)
Brendan TAYLOR (Strategic and Defense Studies Centre, ANU)

16:10 – 18:00 **Session 3: “Agenda of Cooperation among the US Allies: Regional and Global Affairs”**

This session will examine views on existing and new opportunities for cooperation among the US and its allies in regional and global affairs. Should allies be more or less engaged in security issues of the region? What does each country expect from the US and other US allies? How does each bilateral alliance relationship influence perceptions of the other allies? What can be done by the US and its allies to support and promote peace and stability in the region? What regional security issues are appropriate for increased cooperation among the US and its allies? What global security issues are appropriate for increased cooperation? Is there a need for new security architecture in the region?

Moderator: **William T. TOW** (Professor, ANU)
Presenters: **PARK Cheol-hee** (Professor, Seoul National University)
John PARK (Senior Program Officer, USIP)
Masashi NISHIHARA (President, RIPS)
Rikki KERSTEN (Professor, ANU)
Discussants: **LEE Sang-Hyun** (Director-general for Policy Planning, MOFAT)
Tomohiko SATAKE (Fellow, NIDS)

18:30 – 20:30 **Dinner**

Saturday, October 15 (Expert meeting closed to public)
International Conference Room (2F.), IFANS

08:00 – 09:00 **YL Breakfast Meeting (TBD)**

09:40 – 10:50 **Session 1: “Complementary and Conflicting Views of Extended Deterrence”**

This session will focus on the four countries’ views on extended deterrence and its role in the present and future of US alliances. How effective has deterrence been on the Korean Peninsula? Were the 2010 North Korean provocations examples of failed deterrence? Do the North Korean nuclear programs serve as a deterrent? How important are nuclear weapons to the US extended deterrent? What role does missile

defense play? What impact does the reduction of the US nuclear stockpile have on extended deterrence? At what point must China become part of the dialogue? How does the “global zero” movement impact the US nuclear extended deterrence? How important is the triad Cold War triad (bombers/ICBMs/SLBMs) to nuclear deterrence? What impact has the 2010 Nuclear Posture Review had on the US extended deterrent? What is capabilities-based deterrence? Can it serve as a substitute for more traditional nuclear deterrence?

Moderator: **Noboru YAMAGUCHI** (Former Special Advisor to the Cabinet)

Presenters: **SHIN Beomchul** (Chief, Korea Institute for Defense Analyses)

Jeffrey LEWIS (Director, East Asia Nonproliferation Program,
Center for Nonproliferation Studies, MIIS)

Ken JIMBO (Professor, Keio University)

Andrew K. O'NEIL (Professor and Director, Griffith University)

Discussants: **KIM Young ho** (Professor, Korea National Defense
University)

Brad GLOSSERMAN (Executive Director, Pacific Forum
CSIS)

William T. TOW (Professor, ANU)

11:10 – 12:30 **Session 1** (Continued)

12:30 – 14:00 **Luncheon**

Hosted by MOFAT

IFANS CLUB (2F), IFANS

14:00 – 15:40 **Session 2: “US Alliances and Multilateral Security”**

This session focuses on the US alliance system and multilateral security in East Asia. To what extent has the US alliance system shaped multilateral organizations? What is the relationship between the alliances and the existing multilateral organizations? Are they compatible? How do the US alliances influence multilateral security relations in the region? What are the alternatives to maintaining the US alliances? How would those alternatives impact regional security? Can the Six-Party Talks serve as a basis for establishing a multilateral security mechanism in Northeast Asia?

Moderator: **Carl BAKER** (Director of Programs, Pacific Forum CSIS)

Presenters: **PARK Ihn-hwi** (Professor, Ewha Woman’s University)

Scott SNYDER (Senior Fellow, Council on Foreign Relations)

Matake KAMIYA (Professor, National Defense Academy of
Japan)

Brendan TAYLOR (Strategic and Defence Studies Centre,
ANU)

Discussants: **CHOI Jong Kun** (Professor, Yonsei University)

David ENVALL (Department of International Relations, ANU)

16:00 – 17:00 **Session 3: Wrap-up and Next Steps**

This session will focus on the prospects for further examination of the US alliances in East Asia. What are the key findings from the discussions thus far? Is the alliance system more than the sum of its bilateral parts? Should the US alliance partners in Northeast Asia and Southeast Asia be linked? How? Should the feasibility and modalities of networking among some or all US alliance partners in East Asia be examined? Should the role of the alliance system in the evolving multilateral security architecture and community- building efforts in East Asia be further examined? Should the role of the US alliances in shaping Chinese security policies be further examined?

Moderator: **Ralph A. Cossa** (President, Pacific Forum CSIS)

Discussants: all participants

17:15 – 18:30 **Young Leaders Wrap up Session**

List of Participants

ROK	YOON Young-kwan	Former Minister of MOFAT Professor, Seoul National University
	SHIM Yoon Joe	Former Deputy Foreign Minister, MOFAT Visiting Scholar, The School of International Studies, Peking University
	LEE Sang-Hyun	Director-general for Policy planning, MOFAT
	KIM Jae Cheol	Professor, The Catholic University of Korea
	PARK Cheol-Hee	Professor, Seoul National University
	SHIN Beomchul	Chief of North Korea Military Studies, Korea Institute for Defense Analyses
	KIM Young Ho	Professor, Korea National Defense University
	PARK Ihn-hwi	Professor, Ewha Woman's University
	LEE Ji-yong	Professor, Dept. of Asian and Pacific Studies, IFANS
	CHOI Jong Kun	Professor, Yonsei University
US	James A. KELLY	Former Assistant Secretary of State President, EAP Associates President, Emeritus and Scowcroft Chair, Pacific Forum CSIS
	Ralph A. COSSA	President, Pacific Forum CSIS
	Carl W. BAKER	Director of Programs, Pacific Forum CSIS
	Brad F. GLOSSERMAN	Executive Director, Pacific Forum CSIS
	Bonnie S. GLASER	Senior Fellow, Freeman Chair in China Studies, CSIS
	John PARK	Senior Program Officer, Center for Conflict Analysis and Prevention, United States Institute of Peace (USIP)
	Jeffrey LEWIS	Director, East Asia Nonproliferation Program, Center for Nonproliferation Studies (MIIS)
Scott SNYDER	Senior Fellow for Korea Studies and Director, Program on US-Korean Policy, Council on Foreign Relations	

Australia	Gareth J. EVANS	Former Foreign Minister of Australia Chancellor, Australian National University (ANU)
	William T. TOW	Professor, Department of International Relations, ANU
	Nicholas L. BISLEY	Professor of International Relations, La Trobe University
	Rikki KERSTEN	Professor, PSC, ANU
	Brendan TAYLOR	Director of Graduate Studies, Strategic and Defence Studies Centre, ANU
	David ENVALL	Postdoctoral Fellow, Department of International Relations, ANU
	Andrew K. O'NEIL	Professor and Director, Griffith University
	Satomi ONO	Department Administrator, ANU
Japan	Noboru YAMAGUCHI	Former Special Advisor to the Cabinet Professor & Director, Center for National Security and Crisis Management Studies
	Ken JIMBO	Assistant Professor, Keio University
	Tomohiko SATAKE	Researcher, National Institute for Defense Studies (NIDS)
	Yoshihide SOEYA	Professor, Faculty of Law, Keio University
	Masashi NISHIHARA	President, Research Institute for Peace and Security (RIPS)
	Matake KAMIYA	Professor, International Relations, National Defense Academy of Japan

APPENDIX D

PACIFIC FORUM

YOUNG LEADERS PROGRAM

US-ROK-Japan-China Quadrilateral Dialogue
Seoul ♦ ROK
October 16-18, 2011

AGENDA

October 16- Sunday

18:00-20:00 YL Opening Dinner -Seoul Palace Hotel

Brad Glosserman, executive director, will provide introductory remarks and explain Young Leaders Program. Sungmin Cho, Kelly Fellow, will present scenario for breakout session in detail and explain objectives of exercise.

Dinner Discussion: Developments on the Korean Peninsula and Explaining 2010: Did Deterrence Fail?

Chair: Brad Glosserman, Pacific Forum Executive Director

How does each country interpret developments in North Korea over the last year and what forces are at work? Why did North Korea sink the Cheonan and shell Yeongpyeong island? Were these a failure of deterrence? How do we see the current situation on the Korean peninsula and intra-Korean relations? What about the impact of the Cheonan incident on regional security relations, the six-party talks, and China-ROK relations? What is the scope for regional cooperation (especially between US-ROK-PRC-Japan) on Korean Peninsula issues?

October 17- Monday

9:00 AM Session I : Scenario Overview and Ground Rules

Ground rules for simulation exercise will be covered and any questions about the scenario exercise will be clarified.

Scenario Controllers:

Brad Glosserman, Pacific Forum Executive Director

Carl Baker, Pacific Forum Director of Programs

Adrian Yi, Young Leader Program Officer

9:30 AM Session II: Group Breakout Session Phase I

YLS are to break into pre-arranged country teams to discuss (**within country teams only**) how its government will respond to the contingency. Team members should take on role assumed during preconference project to simulate domestic dynamics. Questions to guide teams will be provided when scenario revealed (Oct. 16). Rapporteur for each team is to produce summary based on worksheet questions.

► **Scenario Time: 2 ~ 4 pm, April 12, 2012**

Team ROK: Dong Joon Park and team

Team DPRK: Sungmin Cho and team

Team PRC: Matt Anderson and team

Team Japan: Mihoko Matsubara and team

Team USA: Danielle Chubb and team

13:00 PM **Session III: Group Breakout Phase II**

Draft country action plan. Prepare specific demands to other governments. Devise negotiation strategy to maximize each government's national interest while avoiding international conflict and preserving regional stability. Teams are welcome to contact other teams officially or unofficially by sending team members or "envoys" to other teams. Official visits and statements should be communicated to Adrian Yi (media) to be announced along with other pieces of "breaking news."

► **Scenario Time: 4 pm, April 12 ~2pm April, 13, 2012**

16:15-17:30 **Session IV: Presentation of Each Group's Response and Action Plan**

Chair: Brad Glosserman, Pacific Forum Executive Director

Each group presents the outcome of their internal discussion and bilateral/trilateral negotiation for 10 minutes. Specifically, each will take turn to present their specific demand to other countries.

18:00-19:30 YL Dinner

October 18- Tuesday

09:00 **Session V: Negotiation Table**

Chair: Carl Baker, Pacific Forum Director of Programs

US, Japan, DPRK, Japan, and PRC officials manage to meet in Beijing to hold 'emergency talks' as of 2 pm April 13, 2012. Five teams will present their proposed action plans and negotiate a single joint action plan. All team members are encouraged to be speakers representing their team.

Rapporteurs will be logged on to Google document and make updates during negotiation.

► *Scenario Time: 2pm April 13, 2012.*

11:00

Session VI: *Scenario Wrap-up Session*

Chair: Carl Baker, Pacific Forum Director of Programs

Young Leaders will discuss what lessons they learned from the exercise. What assumptions did they have before the session and how did assumptions change after the session? What are the challenges and opportunities that were newly identify and how are they different from conventional wisdom?

13:30-16:00

Session VII: *Future of the Korean Peninsula and Regional Order in Northeast Asia/ Post conference Project Discussion*

Chair: Carl Baker, Pacific Forum Director of Programs

How do Young Leaders view the future of North Korea in the long run? What are the prospects for the on-going power succession within North Korea? Under what the conditions is unification of Korean Peninsula possible? Will it be peaceful or violent? What impact would unification have on the US-ROK alliance? What impact will the change have on the regional order of the Northeast Asia region?

Post conference project: Discuss recommendations and concrete approaches to build greater trust and mutual confidence between US-ROK-PRC-Japan so as to create a more stable and peaceful environment.

APPENDIX E

PACIFIC FORUM

YOUNG LEADERS PROGRAM

YL Participant List

1. **Mr. Matthew ANDERSON (US) ***
Non-Resident WSD-Handa Fellow
M.A Candidate, UCSD
2. **Dr. Hongliang CHENG (PRC) ²**
Assistant Professor
China Institutes of Contemporary
International Relations,
3. **Mr. Sungmin CHO (ROK) ***
James A. Kelly Research Fellow
Pacific Forum CSIS
4. **Ms. Erin CHOI (US) ***
M.A. Candidate
Korea University
5. **Dr. Danielle CHUBB (AUS) ***
Vasey Fellow
Pacific Forum CSIS
6. **Dr. Sandra FAHY (IRL) ***
Sejong Society post-doctoral Fellow
Korean Studies Institute, USC
7. **Ms. Nicole FORRESTER (AUS) ***
Senior Int'l and Gov't Relations Advisor
Australian Industry Group
8. **Mr. Alex HAN (US) ***
M.A. Candidate
Johns Hopkins, SAIS
9. **Mr. Ryo HINATA-YAMAGUCHI (JP) ***
Ph.D. Candidate
Australian Defense Force Academy
University of New South Wales
10. **Mr. Akira IGATA (JP) ***
Ph.D. Candidate
Keio University
11. **Mr. Yusuke ISHIHARA (JP) ²**
Research Fellow
National Institute of Defense Studies
Ministry of Defense, Japan
12. **Mr. Jihyung (John) LEE (ROK) ***
M.A. Candidate
GSIS, Yonsei University
13. **Mr. Joseph Boyd LENOX (US) ***
M.A. Candidate
Seoul National University
14. **Ms. Mihoko MATSUBARA (JP) ***
SPF Fellow
Pacific Forum CSIS
15. **Ms. Alisa MODICA (US) ***
M.A. candidate / Boren Fellow
Korea University
16. **Mr. Kyutoi MOON (ROK) ***
James A. Kelly Research Fellow
Pacific Forum CSIS
17. **Mr. Joseph OH (US) ¹**
Operational Net Assessment Analyst
Combined Forces Command, USFK
18. **Mr. Dongjoon PARK (ROK) ***
James A. Kelly Research Fellow
Pacific Forum CSIS

- 19. Ms. Pu SHI (PRC)²**
Journalist
Sanlian LifeWeek Magazine
- 20. Ms. Lauren RICHARDSON (AUS) ***
Ph.D. Candidate
The Australian National University
- 21. Mr. Crispin ROVERE (AUS) ***
Ph.D. Candidate
The Australian National University
- 22. Ms. Yun SUN (PRC) ²**
Visiting Fellow
Brookings Institute
- 23. Mr. Eddie WALSH (US) ***
Non-Resident WSD-Handa Fellow
Pacific Forum
DC Correspondent, *The Diplomat*
- 24. Ms. Adrian YI (US) ***
Program Officer
Pacific Forum CSIS
- 25. Mr. Minghao ZHAO (PRC) ²**
Ph.D. candidate
School of International Studies, Peking
University

Observers:

- 26. Mr. Gwangseong JEONG (ROK) ***
B.A. Candidate
Seogang University
- 27. Mr. Sungchul KIM (ROK) ***
B.A. Candidate
Handong University
- 28. Ms. Hyeonseo LEE (ROK) ¹**
B.A. Candidate
Hankyong University of Foreign studies
- 29. Mr. Sungju LEE (ROK) ²**
B.A. Candidate
Seogang University

- 30. Mr. Sul LEE (ROK) ²**
B.A. Candidate
Seogang University
- 31. Ms. Jungah CHANG (ROK) ***
Student
- 32. Mr. Max CHO (ROK) ***
Student
- 33. Mr. Joonsung LEE (ROK) ***
Student
- 34. Ms. Jiwon KIM (ROK) ***
Student
- * Attending both IFANS conference and
Pacific Forum Young Leader Program
¹ Attending only IFANS conference
² Attending only Pacific Forum Young
Leader Program