



**Toward the Next “Strengthening” Agenda:
The US-Japan Alliance in Search of a Vision**

The Sixth US-Japan Strategic Dialogue

By

Brad Glosserman and David Santoro

Issues & Insights
Vol. 13-No. 5

Maui, Hawaii
February 2013

Pacific Forum CSIS

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

Table of Contents

Page

Acknowledgements iv

**Toward the Next “Strengthening” Agenda:
The US-Japan Alliance in Search of a Vision
The Sixth US-Japan Strategic Dialogue**

Key Findings..... 1

Conference Report 3

Appendices

Conference AgendaA-1

Conference Participant ListB-1

Acknowledgements

This publication results from research supported by the Naval Postgraduate School's Project on Advanced Systems and Concepts for Countering Weapons of Mass Destruction (PASCC) via Assistance Grant/Agreement No. N00244-13-1-0023 awarded by the NAVSUP Fleet Logistics Center San Diego (NAVSUP FLC San Diego). The views expressed in written materials or publications, and/or made by speakers, moderators, and presenters, do not necessarily reflect the official policies of the Naval Postgraduate School nor does mention of trade names, commercial practices, or organizations imply endorsement by the US Government.

Key Findings/Recommendations

The Pacific Forum CSIS, with support from the Defense Threat Reduction Agency, held the Sixth US-Japan Strategic Dialogue in Maui, Hawaii on Feb. 7-8, 2013. Twenty-five experts and officials and nine Pacific Forum CSIS Young Leaders from the two countries, all attending in their private capacities, examined the impact of the 2012 elections in both countries on their relationships and the alliance, compared assessments of China and North Korea, and focused on ways to strengthen extended deterrence. Key findings from this meeting include:

- All Japanese stressed that they have no doubts about the credibility and effectiveness of US extended deterrence, which they want to preserve. But there is growing frustration with the continuing “two-pronged” attack emanating from Beijing and Pyongyang, who may be emboldened by the realization that Japan cannot credibly fight back. Japanese voiced strong worries, in particular, about China’s assertiveness over the Senkaku islands. They stressed that “pushing” from China is a test for the US-Japan alliance.
- Japanese seek a stronger US statement in support of their claim to the Senkakus. The traditional US position – that the islands fall under Article 5 of the treaty as territory administered by Japan – is welcomed and appreciated but they remain concerned about the US caveat; namely that the US makes no judgment on the validity of any sovereignty claim.
- Most Japanese failed to appreciate the significance of Secretary of State Hillary Clinton’s statement opposing “any unilateral actions that would seek to undermine Japanese administration of the islands.” Beijing has not missed its significance, accusing Washington of “taking sides.”
- In an attempt to put the territorial dispute in perspective, some US participants urged caution, insisting that the US is unlikely to go to war over some insignificant islands. This raised concerns about the credibility of the US commitment and warnings that failure to draw a line at the Senkakus would only embolden Chinese elsewhere (especially the South China Sea).
- Other Americans urged Japanese counterparts to “read a map.” The Senkaku dispute highlights the importance of the US presence in Okinawa and Japanese officials and politicians should be forcefully making the case for that presence.
- US and Japanese perceptions of US policy continuity toward China differ. While US participants explained that policy has generally followed the same path since 1972, some Japanese highlighted inconsistencies, in particular moves to promote “strategic reassurance” between Washington and Beijing.
- Japanese identify North Korea as a primary threat, referring to Pyongyang’s military breakthroughs in missile technology and its growing ability to deliver nuclear-tipped missiles. Some complained about the “volatility” of US policy (citing the Bush administration’s 180 degree turn in dealing with the North); they warned that failure to

check DPRK capabilities could shift Japanese public opinion about the desirability of indigenous power projection capabilities and perhaps even nuclear weapons.

- After a lull of four years, there is again talk among Japanese of the need to acquire an offensive/ pre-emptive strike option against North Korean missile and nuclear facilities, despite the complexities or implications of such capabilities, which they generally did not acknowledge.
- Japanese have many questions about the US rebalance to Asia, notably its sustainability given US fiscal constraints and commitments elsewhere in the world, especially the Middle East; some Japanese worry that the future of the rebalance depends on the new US foreign policy team.
- Japanese are unclear about the role expected of their country in the rebalance and what their contribution is expected to be. They acknowledge there is a need and opportunity for Japan to “step up.” Although questions remain about its operationalization, applicability, and integration into alliance mechanisms, “Dynamic Defense” is meant to address this issue.
- Japanese participants argued that the US media image of Abe as a hardcore, right-wing nationalist is a caricature; in fact, he is a pragmatic realist. American participants countered that Abe’s image of himself as restoring sanity to the bilateral relationship is also exaggerated. His election has raised expectations in Washington as well as anxieties.
- Japanese participants warned that the Abe administration is focused on winning the summer 2013 Upper House elections and the US should expect no early decisions from Tokyo that might jeopardize that prospect. To Americans, this was an all too familiar refrain.
- Overall, Japanese are optimistic about using the US-Japan alliance to develop trilateral cooperation mechanisms with a third country. The US-Japan-Australia framework, in particular, is seen as a model of successful trilateral cooperation.
- Japanese stressed that institutionalized US-Japan-ROK cooperation is unlikely anytime soon. It seems doubtful that the incoming Park administration will make any significant early overtures and Abe will be focused on the Upper House election. Nonetheless, it was hoped that both sides would refrain from actions that would reignite tensions (since Tokyo did not want a “three front war”). Japanese also expressed concern about a US-ROK-China dialogue (an apparent Park priority), fearing that it would be used by Seoul and Beijing to beat up on Tokyo.
- While cognizant of the problems caused by history, Japanese participants urged the US to keep history concerns and territorial disputes separate. US participants cautioned Japan about taking any actions that would reinforce current stereotypes regarding Prime Minister Abe.

Conference Report

While the faces in the White House and the Japanese Prime Minister's Office are familiar, dynamics within the US-Japan alliance are shifting. The relationship remains strong and prospects are good, but uncertainties in each capital and throughout East Asia pose formidable challenges for decision-makers in each country on nuclear policy and broader security issues.

In an attempt to shed light on recent developments and chart a course for the future for the alliance, the Pacific Forum CSIS, with support from the Defense Threat Reduction Agency through the Naval Postgraduate School's Project on Advanced Systems and Concepts for Countering Weapons of Mass Destruction (PASCC), held the Sixth US-Japan Strategic Dialogue on Maui, Hawaii in February 2003. Twenty-five Japanese and American experts and officials and nine Pacific Forum CSIS Young Leaders from the two countries attended, all in their private capacities. Over a period of two days, they examined the impact of the 2012 elections in both countries on their relationships, the alliance, and attitudes regarding nuclear policy and reassurance; compared assessments of China and North Korea; focused on ways to strengthen extended deterrence and modernize the alliance; and explored the potential and limits of using the US-Japan alliance as a stepping stone to engage third countries, such as Australia, the ROK, and others.

Perceptions of Current US Foreign Policy

Our dialogue began with a comparison of US and Japanese assessments of current US foreign policy in the Asia-Pacific region. Our US speaker stressed that the so-called "rebalance to Asia" is often badly understood, arguing that the rebalance is a refocusing of US policy on the Asia-Pacific, which is taking place as the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq are ending. The rebalance is meant to tie US policy more closely to Asia, the most dynamic region of the world. Drawing on the Secretary of State Hillary Clinton's article in *Foreign Policy*, he noted that the policy is comprised of three main dimensions: forward-based diplomacy, economic and trade deals, and military forces. Unfortunately, the first policy document related to the "rebalance" was the January 2012 Defense Guidance which has left the (wrong) impression that the refocus on Asia is first and foremost military in nature.

Our speaker emphasized that the rebalance is not a *return* to Asia – the United States never *left* Asia. Indeed, the rebalance has its roots in the late 1980s, when the George H. W. Bush administration insisted on the need to enhance US involvement in Asia as the Cold War was coming to an end. Similarly, the rebalance is not aimed at China; after all, it predates China's rise. Of course, since the US-China relationship is based on cooperation and competition, the rebalance may not be aimed against China, but it is unavoidably *about* China.

Our US speaker then explained that the rebalance is based on the assumption that in addition to military forces and extended deterrence, the United States can provide other goods of strategic value to the region and to its allies. One example is trade. It is unclear, however, whether allies value non-military goods as a sign of US commitment to its alliances. Also at issue is implementation of the rebalance in a fiscally constrained environment and a turbulent domestic political scene in the United States. Our speaker acknowledged that these considerations cast important doubts on the future of the rebalance. However, he concluded by stressing that today, unlike during the Cold War, the challenge for the United States lies more with reassuring allies than with deterring its adversaries. The latter are effectively deterred, but it is proving increasingly challenging to reassure the former.

Our Japanese speaker noted that Tokyo expects much from the Obama administration, particularly given growing tensions in Northeast Asia created by North Korea's nuclear and missile developments and increasingly belligerent behavior and China's growing assertiveness in the East China Sea. He stressed that Japan welcomes the rebalance and, significantly, that it regards the Defense Guidance as the most clear-cut US commitment to the region. Japan is anxious to preserve the current balance of power and sees the US-Japan alliance as critical to this balance. He calls for a framing of the alliance as "providers of international public goods" and for the United States and Japan to present themselves as defenders of the status quo as a way to win public support in Japan and elsewhere for a higher profile for the alliance and, as a result, Japan.

There are concerns about US commitments to Japan, however. Our speaker noted that Secretary of State John Kerry did not mention Japan once in his confirmation hearings. Some observers suggested that Kerry might be "pro-China." Sustainability is also at issue in current fiscal circumstances (given that there will be \$500 billion in defense cuts over the next decade) and in a strategic context where the Middle East will continue to demand US attention and active involvement, at least in the foreseeable future. Our Japanese speaker also highlighted concerns in Tokyo that Washington may adopt a softer approach to China and change its current policy in dealing with North Korea.

Our speaker noted that there has been growing recognition in Japan that the success of the rebalance will oblige Tokyo to do more than merely complain about the limitations of US policy. Recent decisions to increase Japan's defense budget, among other indicators, suggest that tangible changes are occurring. Prime Minister Abe's decision to restart the experts committee to consider the exercise of the right of collective self-defense is also significant. Despite these positive developments, however, there remain numerous obstacles to an enhanced Japanese security role. Fortunately, one of the most enduring constraints – Japanese suspicions of the role of the military – has diminished in the wake of the performance of the Self-Defense Forces (SDF) and the succor provided by Operation Tomodachi in the aftermath of the triple catastrophe of March 11, 2011.

Discussion probed the questions surrounding the “rebalance,” most significantly whether it is sustainable, whether it is aimed at China, and what the United States will demand of allies and partners to make it work. Japanese participants acknowledged there is a need and opportunity for Japan to “step up” and do more than it is currently doing. Among other things, they stressed that “Dynamic Defense/Deterrence” is meant to address this issue although questions remain about its operationalization, applicability, and integration into alliance mechanisms. Significantly, most Japanese pronounced themselves pleased by and satisfied with the policy. As one explained, “Japan gets it.” Still, several Japanese participants urged the United States to be frank in acknowledging the policy’s caveats; in particular they want Washington to be forthright about the way it will deal with China, including express statements of a readiness to challenge Beijing if required. Some Japanese – like others throughout Asia – also worried that the future of the rebalance depends on the new US foreign policy team.

US participants noted that the rebalance was in some ways driven by signals from governments in Asia that sought a strengthened US commitment to the region. At the same time, the policy reflects US national interest – namely, a desire to tie the US economy more tightly to the most dynamic region of the world – and its outlines are visible in the Obama administration’s National Security Strategy. Several US speakers pointed out one especially poignant irony: while US allies express concerns or doubts about the rebalance, the Chinese indicate that they are very worried about it. Indeed, one of the greatest challenges in implementing the rebalance will be managing tensions and varying levels of distrust toward China among the United States and its allies.

Domestic Politics and the Alliance

After a comparative assessment of US foreign policy priorities (and Japanese expectations), we explored the impact of domestic politics on the alliance and nuclear policies. Our Japanese speaker stressed that the LDP victory in the December general elections signals a “resurrection of close Japan-US alliance.” While acknowledging that the Noda administration made significant accomplishments (e.g. the decision to purchase the F-35 fighter and modification of the three principles on arms exports), he noted that there were gaps in perceptions between Japan and the United States. For instance, Japan believes that Washington should warmly welcome the return to power of Prime Minister Abe (as Washington welcomed Prime Minister Koizumi during the Bush administration), whereas the United States insists that the Noda administration has achieved much and that the new Abe administration should build upon these accomplishments.

Under Prime Minister Abe, our Japanese speaker explained that Japan is set to “strengthen” as opposed to “deepen” the alliance. He warned that the new government is likely to take an “anything but the DPJ” approach to policy. At the same time, the government is unlikely to make any significant announcements before the Upper House elections next July. Overall, our speaker anticipates that Tokyo will adopt a harder line toward China and it will expect more tangible commitments on the part of the United States to protect Japan. For the time being, the economy is likely to be the focus of the Abe administration – the prime minister has learned a lesson from his first failures.

Our speaker pointed out three “gaps” for Japan and the United States. First, there is a priority gap: Washington would like Japan to endorse the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP), while Japan is more focused on the right to collective self-defense. Second, there is a threat gap: the United States is focused on the North Korean threat, while Japan is most concerned with China’s assertiveness over the Senkaku Islands in the East China Sea and its implications for extended deterrence and overall alliance credibility. Third, there is a military gap: the US emphasis on the rebalance demands allied input but Japan has shown little inclination to acquire assets to counter China’s anti-access/area denial (A2AD) capabilities or to embrace the AirSea Battle concept.

Okinawa remains a perennial problem for the alliance and our speaker warned that the situation regarding the province has been “irreparably broken” by the policies of the Hatoyama administration. In his opinion, “there is no going back to the pre-DPJ era,” even though Abe seems to think that he can buy Okinawa’s acquiescence to base modernization with more aid.

Finally, our speaker reiterated that Japan is deeply concerned about US budgetary cuts and the impact on US military assets and programs. How this will affect procurement of the F-35 by Japan, for instance, is unclear and worrisome to Japanese.

Our US speaker stressed that there will be more continuity than change in the United States. This is because there is a consensus that the Obama administration’s Asia policy has been a success and should be pursued. As proof, he noted that Asia policy was not an issue during the campaign. Changes in personnel, notably the arrival of John Kerry and Chuck Hagel at the State and Defense departments, respectively, are unlikely to derail the US rebalance to Asia. Our speaker reminded the group that Hillary Clinton, now perceived as the champion of Obama’s Asia policy, was not expected to be so involved in Asian affairs when she took office. More of concern, however, is how the rebalance will be implemented in a fiscally constrained environment.

From a US perspective, the election of Abe Shinzo raises numerous questions given his prior positions on Japan’s historical role in the region. Most observers agree that they are waiting for the “real” Abe to emerge. Given Upper House elections in July, however, our US speaker agreed with his Japanese counterpart that it is unlikely that Abe will make any controversial statements. Still, the United States remains concerned about the approach that the new conservative government will ultimately take and the impact that this could have on regional governments.

Our speaker concluded by noting that while the greatest immediate concern for the alliance is North Korea and the row over the Senkaku Islands, the United States and Japan have other important priorities. One is the position that Japan will adopt toward TPP. Another is the future of the Futenma Replacement Facility (FRF). Our speaker concluded by noting that for all the doubts about Abe, the United States would like to see continuity in the prime minister’s office. The revolving door of prime ministers is bad for Japan and bad for the alliance.

During the discussion, Japanese participants argued that the US media image of Prime Minister Abe as a hardcore, rightwing nationalist is a caricature. The reality, they stressed, is that he is a pragmatic realist and that he is likely to help improve the bilateral relationship and strengthen the alliance. US participants countered that Abe's image of himself as restoring sanity between the United States and Japan is exaggerated; relations with the Noda government were not bad. The Hatoyama administration is not the proper benchmark for US-Japan relations. And, they pointed out, Abe's election has raised expectations in Washington as well as anxieties.

Japanese participants also warned that the Abe administration is focused on winning the summer 2013 Upper House elections and the United States should expect no early decisions from Tokyo that might jeopardize that prospect. To Americans, this was an all too familiar refrain. For one US participant, this readiness to bide time until after the vote clashes with Tokyo's calls for the United States to be more forward leaning when dealing with the Senkaku dispute. "Look at a map," he growled after Japanese speakers suggested that there would be no movement on FRF until after the ballot.

Finally, while cognizant of the problems caused by history, Japanese participants urged the United States to keep history concerns and territorial disputes separate. US participants, however, cautioned Japan about taking any actions that would reinforce stereotypes regarding Prime Minister Abe. One US participant warned that Japan could create tensions with Korea without even taking on history issues: efforts to talk down the yen to restore competitiveness for Japanese businesses will trigger accusations of predatory currency policies in Seoul.

China after the New Leadership

The third session focused on China, its foreign policy after the leadership change, and implications for the US-Japan alliance and extended deterrence. Our US speaker explained that the next year will be a period of consolidation for Xi Jinping and that there will be little if any change to China's foreign policy. That is not reassuring as Beijing has taken a decidedly assertive turn in East Asia over the last year.

Our speaker identified three trends suggesting that China's policy toward its neighbors could worsen. First, the political atmosphere in China is becoming more nationalistic, so much so that some Chinese interlocutors have characterized the current period as "McCarthyism with Chinese characteristics." Second, security professionals in China increasingly view all policy through the lens of countering the US rebalance strategy. And third, the People's Liberation Army (PLA) is improving its military capabilities, which is engendering a new level of confidence among Chinese decision-makers that if China needed or chose to use force, it could do so successfully.

Nevertheless, our speaker explained that the United States will not change its policy toward China. Indeed, US policy toward China has scarcely changed in three decades: it continues to be based on engagement with, and encouragement of, China, with the objective of making the country a global responsible stakeholder. At the same time,

the United States will continue to hedge against the prospect of Chinese revisionism. Our speaker also noted that economic interdependence between the United States and China is growing, which makes it unlikely that Washington will alter the current trajectory of political and economic engagement (backstopped by hedging in the security realm). This is despite the fact US businesses are increasingly disenchanted with China as a business partner due to arbitrary practices, favoritism toward Chinese “champions” at the expense of foreign investors, poor to nonexistent legal protections, rampant intellectual property theft, endemic corruption, and economic espionage.

Our US speaker stressed that Washington sees Japan’s relationship with China at a nadir; it is perhaps as low as it has ever been since normalization of relations. Sadly, things could get worse if Prime Minister Abe revisits Japanese statements on World War II; that possibility is of deep concern to Washington. Meanwhile, our speaker noted that regional responses to China’s rise and new role vary often in direct proportion to geographical proximity: countries that share a border with China, i.e., through which the PLA can walk or drive, are more circumspect and guarded in how they push back against China. Yet all of China’s neighbors are realizing that they will always live in the shadow of China, and alliance or partnership with the United States will never change this. Regional states, in other words, will always be wary of China.

Our Japanese speaker began by describing the new Chinese leadership and concurred with the previous speaker that it is unlikely that China will change course on foreign policy. For instance, the Maritime Power Statement and remarks delivered in the Group Study Session in January 2013 indicate China’s position on maritime and territorial issues/disputes will remain unchanged. This is because Xi Jinping does not have the power to change the current course, at least in the short term; if he wishes to do so, he will have to first consolidate his power, which will likely take time. For now, collective decision-making will continue.

Meanwhile, Beijing is facing a number of acute challenges. At the domestic level, there is unrest in Tibet, Xinjiang, and Inner Mongolia. China is also bordered by more than 20 countries, including seven major industrial countries with which it has often been at odds. Significantly, many of China’s neighboring countries are US allies or partners; in contrast, China only has special partnerships with Pakistan and North Korea. Other challenges include endemic corruption, the widening gap between rich and poor, the lack of a social welfare system, and, significantly, economic slowdown and its related impact on the legitimacy of the Communist Party.

Still, our speaker insisted that China’s rise continues. China is going to become a maritime power and that has implications, not least of which is increasing attention to maritime resources. China’s rise means that this is the first time that great powers with different values will coexist in the Asia-Pacific region. That does not mean that a clash is unavoidable, although China will aggressively protect its national interests. (And domestic weakness within China will force it to take a harder line against external challenges.) In this environment, the US-Japan alliance has a key role to play in balancing China’s growing power.

During the discussion, it quickly became clear that US and Japanese perceptions of US policy toward China differed considerably. While US participants averred that policy has followed the same path since the Nixon administration in the early 1970s, Japanese participants highlighted inconsistencies, in particular moves to promote “strategic reassurance” between Washington and Beijing. In part, this reflects Japanese fears that they might again be “passed” by Washington if Tokyo proves difficult or unwilling to act. It also reflects a misreading of US foreign policy making, implying that personalities are more important than policy.

We were also divided (but not necessarily among national lines) when trying to ascertain reasons for China’s assertiveness. Some participants see Chinese behavior as an attempt to head off domestic dissatisfaction by directing public grievances at foreigners. As one US participant noted, “China is confident when dealing with the United States, but nervous when dealing with its own younger generation.” Another set of explanations focused on China’s views of Japan. A US participant worried that even China’s Japan experts didn’t seem to understand Japanese politics and political dynamics. For whatever reason – education, group think, or transition politics – China badly misinterprets the situation in Japan. Most Japanese felt that Beijing was asserting itself over a smaller power with which it has historical grievances. (For this group, a more powerful Japanese military was the proper response to this situation.) Another explanation credits/blames the princeling generation, which breathes deep the nationalism of their parents.

While they expressed concerns about China’s rise and future role in the region generally, Japanese participants voiced strong worries about China’s assertiveness over the Senkaku Islands in particular. They stressed that current “pushing” from China stands as a real test for the US-Japan alliance. They also suggested that China was using the Senkakus to make a broader point to the entire region: that US commitments could not be trusted.

Japanese participants insisted that there was an urgent need for a stronger US statement in support of their claim to the Islands. The traditional US position that the Islands fall under Article V of the US-Japan Treaty on Mutual Cooperation and Security as territory administered by Japan is welcomed and appreciated. Japanese participants, however, remain concerned about the US caveat, namely that the United States makes no judgment on the validity of any sovereignty claim. Several US participants pointed that Secretary Clinton’s statement opposing “any unilateral actions that would seek to undermine Japanese administration of the islands” was significant. Yet few Japanese participants seemed to have appreciated the significance of this statement. US participants stressed that Beijing did pick this up, accusing Washington of “taking sides.”

Japanese participants have heard US complaints: several insisted that they recognize that they have to lead on defense of the Senkakus, and they will not pass the buck to the United States. (In previous years, even members of this group had on occasion suggested that the United States would lead on any defense of the islands.) But there are two potential disconnects concerning the Senkakus that must be addressed. First, the United States frames the issue as a territorial and looks at it through that lens.

From that perspective, the Senkakus “are just rocks” with limited significance. For Japan, however, this is a matter of national territory and national pride; some Japanese participants also argue that checking Chinese ambitions here would signal resolve more generally and that a failure to do so could have severe consequences for the South China Sea and other areas of contention. Second, the United States must be careful how it makes that case. This is an emotional issue and the US reliance on logic and strategic analysis can sound indifferent to deep-rooted Japanese concerns. (This is an important point to keep in mind when thinking about other emotion-laden disputes, such as the Takeshima/Dokdo dispute between Japan and South Korea.)

Extended Deterrence

Our fourth session examined the role of extended deterrence in the region, including how it is applicable in different regional contexts. Our first speaker began with the fundamentals of extended deterrence. He explained that extended deterrence requires the United States to deter its allies’ adversaries *and* to reassure its allies that it has the capabilities and intentions to do so. In other words, extended deterrence has both deterrence and assurance missions.

While some argue that North Korea’s nuclear and missile developments and its provocations mean that deterrence of Pyongyang is failing, our speaker suggested that this was wrong. Deterrence is meant to prevent aggression or coercion against allies’ vital interests: it is not and should not be applicable to low-level provocations. There is a risk, however, that as its military capabilities improve, Pyongyang may feel increasingly confident that it can launch low-level attacks and control escalation, which is worrisome because escalation control is never guaranteed and misunderstandings, miscalculations, and mistakes are always possible.

Our speaker suggested that a similar dynamic may be at play in the East China Sea: China’s conventional and nuclear force modernization may be creating the possibility for low-level conflicts below the extended deterrence threshold. So far, tensions have increased, but no conflict has broken out. Although low-level conflicts are always possible and represent a test for the alliance, our speaker argued that extended deterrence is likely to function because Beijing knows that seizure of the Japanese-administered Senkaku Islands, which fall under the scope of the US-Japan Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security, would trigger a response from Washington.

Thus, our speaker concluded that extended deterrence is working. But, ironically, he concluded that assurance of US allies appears to be faltering. Both Seoul and Tokyo have doubts about the reliability of extended deterrence and both have developed military doctrines in response that are not yet properly integrated with alliance mechanisms. More importantly, there is a growing clamor in both countries for development of offensive/preemptive strike options to take out North Korea’s key military assets and, in the ROK, there are calls for development of indigenous nuclear weapon capabilities and/or the reintroduction of US tactical nuclear weapons on the Korean Peninsula.

Plainly, more reassurance of the ROK and Japan is urgently required through enhanced coordination and cooperation and in-depth discussions of their roles, missions, and capabilities, particularly to respond effectively to conflicts as they escalate from a low-level to a mid-level and higher level.

In this environment, trilateral coordination among the United States, Japan, and the ROK will become crucial sooner rather than later because Tokyo and Seoul have different expectations of Washington. Both are very worried about North Korea and, therefore, their interests may align in the event of a contingency on or near the Korean Peninsula. Japan and the ROK, however, have different threat perceptions when it comes to China: Japan is concerned by the row over the Senkaku Islands, while the ROK remains indifferent, except as it relates to its claim to the Dokdo Islands. A trilateral dialogue will become essential to ensure that these differences do not prevent cooperation on areas where there is a convergence of interests. And while historical and territorial issues between the ROK and Japan currently prevent the development of a comprehensive dialogue, functional discussions on extended deterrence should be envisioned in the short- to medium-term. In fact, selected participants from this dialogue and the companion US-ROK meeting will be invited to a small trilateral meeting focused on extended deterrence in Seoul in the fall, to further explore the possibility of broader trilateral cooperation in this area.

Our Japanese speaker addressed three questions: 1) What are challenges to the security of Japan? 2) What does Japan expect from extended deterrence and what are its concerns? 3) What are the roles of non-nuclear components in extended deterrence?

With regard to the first question, our speaker explained that Japan is concerned about additional North Korean provocations and China's opportunistic expansion in the East China Sea; also of concern to Japan is China's rise in general and the modernization of its nuclear and conventional forces in particular. Although the possibility of high-level conflict cannot be excluded, it remains only a remote possibility thanks to US extended deterrence. Creeping expansion, however, poses a complex challenge. That is why Japan is developing its "Dynamic Defense/Deterrence" doctrine. Still, our speaker insisted that it was important for the United States and Japan to work together more closely and ensure that they do not give Pyongyang or Beijing a sense that they can conduct low-level provocations or attacks without suffering consequences.

As far as the second question is concerned, our speaker explained that Japan expects that US extended deterrence will deter the use of nuclear weapons, which is its main goal. He also insisted that it is important for the United States and Japan to explore at what point extended deterrence comes into play in a conflict and what both countries can do to avoid a "stability-instability paradox."

Finally, our Japanese speaker stressed that Japan views US discussions on the reduction of the roles and numbers of nuclear weapons in its national security policy with some concern: Tokyo believes that US acceptance of mutual vulnerability with China or a US decision to proceed with deep cuts in its nuclear arsenal would undermine the

reliability of extended deterrence. In other words, Japan regards US qualitative and quantitative superiority as essential to effective extended deterrence. Notwithstanding Japan's belief in the centrality of nuclear components to extended deterrence, our speaker pointed out that Tokyo acknowledges the importance of non-nuclear components, notably missile defense and efforts to counter China's growing anti-access and area denial capabilities.

During the discussion, all Japanese stressed that they have no doubts about the credibility and effectiveness of US extended deterrence, which they want to preserve. There was general applause for US mechanisms to consult with Japan on extended deterrence concerns. But they also underscored the need for extended deterrence to maintain a nuclear component, and some wondered why the Northeast Asian theatre does not require forward deployed nuclear weapons, as in Europe (to which US participants responded that such weapons only have symbolic value and remain deployed on the European continent for political reasons). Notwithstanding their trust in US extended deterrence, it is critical to recognize the growing frustration in Japan (as in South Korea) with the continuing "two-pronged" attack from Pyongyang and Beijing, who may be emboldened by the realization that Japan cannot credibly fight back. It is not a sense that deterrence has failed but that Japan and the United States are not able to counter low-level provocations.

Japanese participants identified North Korea as a primary near-term threat to Japan and the region, noting Pyongyang's military breakthroughs in missile technology and its growing ability to deliver nuclear-tipped missiles. Some complained about the "volatility" of US policy, citing the Bush administration's 180-degree turn in dealing with Pyongyang. Significantly, they warned that failure to check North Korea's capabilities could shift Japanese public opinion about the desirability of developing indigenous power-projection capabilities and perhaps even nuclear weapons. After a lull of four years, there is again talk among Japanese of the need to acquire an offensive/pre-emptive strike option against North Korean missile and nuclear facilities. Japanese participants generally did not acknowledge the complexities or implications of such capabilities. Here too there is a concern that the United States is not sufficiently committed to rolling back North Korea capabilities. Japanese (like South Koreans) fear that the United States may accept a nuclear-armed DPRK if it does not proliferate. The United States must challenge that assertion and provide credible proof that it is not prepared to acquiesce to Pyongyang's demand that it be acknowledged as a nuclear weapon state. US comments about "managing" North Korean capability make intuitive sense, but could send the wrong signals to Japanese.

Questions again surfaced in this discussion about the new US administration. Some Japanese participants expressed concern about senior US personnel and their support for Global Zero. (Secretary of Defense Hagel is a signatory.) US participants countered that all senior US personnel are in line with the president's policies; as in the discussion of the rebalance, they are expected to implement White House directives.

Japanese participants also explained that US extended deterrence has a key role to play in the row over the Senkaku Islands. In an attempt to put the territorial dispute in perspective, however, American participants urged caution, insisting that the United States is unlikely to go to war over “mere rocks.” This raised concerns about the credibility of the US commitment and warnings that failure to draw a line at the Senkaku Islands would only embolden Chinese elsewhere, especially in the South China Sea.

Other Americans urged Japanese counterparts to “read a map.” As they pointed out, the dispute over the Senkaku Islands highlights the importance of the US presence in Okinawa; Japanese officials and politicians should be forcefully making the case for that presence.

It should be noted that there was no mention of concern about a Chinese sprint to parity in the event of a further reduction in US nuclear forces. This has been voiced in previous meetings.

Modernizing the Alliance: Goals, Rhetoric, Visions, Implementation

From extended deterrence we moved on to what the United States and Japan can do to modernize the alliance. Our US speaker kicked off the session by explaining that the modernization of the alliance, unlike popular thinking, was not a new issue but has been a work in progress for the past few years. Our speaker argued that a confluence of factors in Tokyo, Washington, and East Asia more generally has created not only the space for, but also urgency to move forward on modernizing the alliance. The new LDP government has brought decades of experience back to alliance management and has trumpeted the goal of strengthening US-Japan security partnership as the bedrock of Japanese foreign and defense policy. Similarly, the US rebalance strategy “pivots” fundamentally on stronger relationships with treaty allies, most obviously Japan. Moreover, as both countries enter an era of tighter budgets, they are forced to rethink how the alliance is coordinated and how to achieve greater efficiencies. Finally, the increasingly uncertain regional security environment demands that both countries reexamine the ins and outs of the alliance.

Our speaker explained that target areas for modernizing the alliance begin with mechanisms for communication and coordination. He argued that the Bilateral Coordination Mechanism outlined in the Defense Guidelines deserves reexamination because it is too closely focused on crisis management in conflict, which limits its use. Another way to improve communication would be to pass legislation that raises information security standards, which, at current levels, limit what both sides can tell one another.

Our speaker suggested that the United States and Japan could accelerate defense industry cooperation; this is particularly promising with the recent relaxation of the three principles governing Japanese defense-related exports and transfers. Finally, the United States and Japan should enhance efforts to reach out to potential partners in the region through security-related capacity-building programs such as humanitarian assistance and

disaster relief. Our speaker stressed that the revision of the Defense Guidelines could encompass all these areas, and others, bringing the alliance closer to exercising collective self-defense.

In conclusion, our US speaker noted that the success of US realignment plans for Okinawa remains critical to modernize the alliance. In delinking progress on the Futenma Replacement Facility from the proposed build-up on Guam, the latest 2+2 Statement helped to create opportunities to proceed with the revision of the Defense Guidelines. But this particular issue must be eventually tackled.

Our Japanese speaker stressed that Prime Minister Abe in December ordered a review of the Defense Guidelines to strengthen the capabilities and deterrence potential of Japan's Self-Defense Forces. In January 2013, a US and Japanese director-level meeting led to an agreement on the need to discuss a broader strategic vision as part of the Guidelines. Also agreed was the need to review cooperation plans on the alliance's roles, missions, and capabilities.

Japan's Ministry of Defense wants a review of the Guidelines as a result of changes in the Asia-Pacific security environment. Of concern is North Korea's nuclear and missile developments and increasingly belligerent behavior, China's rise and growing assertiveness (notably in the East China Sea), and the multiplication of a range of new challenges (such as space, cyber, or maritime security). Japan is also anxious to enhance cooperation with regional actors, notably Australia, the ROK, ASEAN, and India.

Echoing his colleague in a previous session, our Japanese speaker stressed that Japan would make efforts to strengthen its defense capabilities, pointing to the decision to increase its defense budget for the first time in over a decade. Also significant is Prime Minister Abe's desire to review the interpretation of Japan's Constitution, a step that remains politically sensitive at the moment.

During the discussion, US participants urged the two countries to agree on a document similar to the US-ROK Joint Vision Statement. While acknowledging the need for a shared vision for the two countries, and even suggesting that recent Security Consultative Committee (SCC, or "2+2") meetings could serve that purpose, Japanese participants insisted that priority be first given to strengthening the alliance's coordination and cooperation mechanisms. (Americans noted that using the SCC as a template could be problematic if the Abe government sticks to its "anything but the DPJ" approach.) Such a vision would lay the foundation for tough political decisions in Japan, most notably in Okinawa, where there has been little progress despite the decoupling a year ago of the FRF move and the relocation of other facilities. Several participants countered that no vision statement will change the fundamental sense of discrimination that Okinawans feel. They insisted that the only solution was moving facilities to the mainland to demonstrate that mainland Japanese genuinely understand the plight of Okinawans.

Some Japanese participants pointed out that the triple catastrophe of March 11, 2011 helped to strengthen military cooperation between the two countries, and that the military has since been regarded much more favorably in Japan (except in Okinawa). Unfortunately, there remains considerable suspicion of the SDF among the left in Japan, and many mayors and local authorities continue to refuse to work with military authorities except in exceptional circumstances. Japanese participants also stressed, that Japan still has much learning to do on capabilities. March 11 also revealed shortcomings in Japanese preparations for crises: enabling legislation is for war, so a peace-time crisis like March 11 is excluded from its ambit and there was little multiagency bilateral coordination (as opposed to cooperation among the militaries).

The discussion moved on to prospects of Japan developing a national security council. Japanese participants expressed skepticism that Japan needs such a body, arguing that it would only add another layer of bureaucracy. US participants pointed out that a national security council would help to coordinate Japan's various bureaucracies, which in turn would enhance Japan's crisis management mechanisms, which have proved under-developed and have functioned poorly when used. And, as noted, the success of such a system depends on the stature and expertise of the prime minister. No mechanism can overcome an ineffectual or indecisive prime minister.

Other participants warned that alliance modernization should encompass both hard power *and* soft power, and the latter has received little attention. A Japanese participant stressed that the two countries should underscore the collective soft power of the alliance. In modernizing the alliance and Japan's Self-Defense Forces in particular, they stressed that it will be important to enhance cross-cultural understanding to ensure that these efforts are not misperceived by regional governments. US participants, in particular, pointed out that it would be challenging (yet not impossible) to ensure that the alliance is not perceived to be directed specifically against China. A focus on soft power and regional perceptions requires that the Tokyo government be doubly attentive to moves that could reopen the wounds of history. Nothing would do more damage to regional perceptions of Japan or to Japan's soft power than a sense that it is indifferent to its historical legacy.

Alliance Networks: New Partnerships, Linkages (Australia, ROK)

Our penultimate session focused on the potential and limits to use of the US-Japan alliance as a stepping stone to cooperation with third countries. Our Japanese speaker began by explaining that Japan's 2010 National Defense Program Guidelines encompass broader objectives than previous efforts and a number of specific means to accomplish those ends. As in all cases, however, their aim is to guarantee the security of Japan, contribute to regional stability, and enhance international peace and security. This is achievable through Japan's own efforts, a greater level of activity in the US-Japan alliance, the development of new cooperative mechanisms with regional partners (with or without the United States, both at the track-I and track-II levels), and efforts to strengthen cooperation with the international community.

Areas for cooperation with the United States include supporting US policies in the Asia-Pacific region, which can be done by sharing ideas on the US rebalance to Asia through dialogues and consultations, supporting US military realignment (handling Okinawa will be the highest priority for Japan), and assisting the United States in “out-of-area” issues such as the Middle East, which can affect the US commitment to rebalance its forces to Asia. Another important area for cooperation among US allies is non-traditional military missions, such as humanitarian assistance and disaster relief preparedness, or nonproliferation and counterproliferation. Finally, our speaker explained that it is critical for US allies to coordinate policies when dealing with China. Ensuring that China buys into multilateral security frameworks and encouraging it to be a responsible regional and global stakeholder is a critical issue for US allies.

Our US speaker stressed that Prime Minister Abe seemed to echo Obama’s engagement of Asia in the first week of his inauguration, as evidenced by his visit to Southeast Asia. While there are concerns in Washington about Japan’s choices, these moves are encouraging and suggest that the United States and Japan may be able to enhance cooperation with third parties.

Trilateral discussions with Australia, in particular, have been successful and offer a template to emulate with the ROK. So far, informal discussions have been centered on how to deal with North Korea and there are concerns about initiating discussions on issues pertaining to China. Significantly, our US speaker noted that the failure to conclude the General Security of Military Information Agreement and the Acquisition and Cross-Servicing Agreement prevents genuine bilateral coordination and real-world cooperation between the two countries. Yet more can be done even without the two agreements. In the medium- to long-term, these discussions could be broadened to include extended deterrence issues more generally. This is important because Japan and the ROK seem to have very different expectations of Washington in the event of contingency on the Peninsula, for instance. Concluding, our US speaker suggested that there is potential for other trilateral dialogues, notably with India (with which Japan has much to share) and ASEAN (given the current priorities of Prime Minister Abe).

During the discussion, all Japanese participants expressed optimism about using the US-Japan alliance to develop trilateral cooperation mechanisms with third countries. They agreed that the US-Japan-Australia framework, in particular, is a successful model and that similar cooperation could be built with other partners.

When turning to specific trilaterals, the focus tended to be more on problems than opportunities. Japanese participants cautioned that institutionalized US-Japan-ROK cooperation is unlikely anytime soon, for reasons too numerous and obvious to mention. It is doubtful that the incoming Park administration in the ROK will make significant early overtures to Japan while for his part, Prime Minister Abe will be focused on the Upper House election. Nonetheless, both US and Japanese participants hoped that both sides would refrain from actions that would reignite tensions (since Tokyo did not want a “three-front war”). Borrowing from Hippocrates, the guiding principle should be “first, do no harm.” That said, a group of Pacific Forum CSIS Young Leaders provided a long

list of possible forms of cooperation, including outside Northeast Asia (e.g. to implement humanitarian assistance and disaster relief programs in Southeast Asia and Africa) or through the development of closer public-private partnerships, for example. [NOTE: A report summarizing their discussions will be published in the *Issues & Insights* series in the next few weeks.]

Japanese participants also expressed concern about a US-ROK-China dialogue (an apparent priority of the Park administration), fearing that it would be used by Seoul and Beijing to beat up on Tokyo. American participants calmed those fears, explaining that in such meetings – and apparently in ROK-PRC bilateral meetings – the tendency is for Chinese participants to beat up on the Koreans.

The Future of the US-Japan Alliance

Our final session looked into the future of the alliance. Our US speaker argued that the US-Japan alliance faces five main challenges: dealing with an ascendant China and avoiding a Japan-China conflict; contending with a nuclear North Korea; managing emerging US-Japan differences over history; achieving a greater level of trilateral cooperation with the ROK; and tackling other pending issues in US-Japan relations, particularly the Futenma Replacement Facility and TPP.

Our speaker explained that China is acting in new, assertive ways in the East China Sea because *it can* and because it believes that the time has come to redress grievances left over from its “century of humiliation.” Thus, the US rebalance is perceived almost exclusively in military terms by China, and as an attempt to stifle and contain Beijing and prevent it from playing its rightful role in the region and in the world. Our speaker also contended that Beijing perceives the return of the LPD to power and Japanese defense enhancements as threatening. One key task of the US-Japan alliance, therefore, is to create conditions for the reduction of tensions and establish a China-Japan dialogue aimed at preventing further deterioration in relations.

Our speaker noted that North Korea’ aims to become a full-fledged nuclear-armed state, which means that denuclearization is out of reach. Thus, the US-Japan alliance needs to reflect on how to pressure Pyongyang to limit its capabilities. Also critical is getting Beijing to join these efforts.

Beyond managing the China and North Korea cases, our speaker explained that the United States and Japan will have to learn to manage a number of differences. The possible revision of the Kono and Murayama statements would be troubling for Washington, particularly when Japan needs US support on the Senkaku Islands. Revisions of past statements would exacerbate tensions with China, the ROK, and other countries in the region, undercutting Japan’s regional standing and soft power. More importantly, it would detract from US congressional support for Japan and could draw an explicit negative reaction from President Obama personally.

Our speaker explained that trilateral cooperation with the ROK would be a positive development. In the meantime, however, China and North Korea are beneficiaries from Japan-ROK enmity and from the inability of Washington, Tokyo, and Seoul to forge stronger trilateral cooperative mechanisms. Finally, our speaker explained that while the Futenma issue remains a sore point for the US-Japan alliance, TPP offers an opportunity for Japan to step up its game as a regional player, reversing the image of Japan as a strategically disengaged regional actor.

Our Japanese speaker stressed that the US-Japan alliance faces three strategic challenges: Japan-China tensions over the Senkaku Islands, Japan-ROK mutual disillusionment, and North Korea's nuclear and missile capabilities and increasingly belligerent behavior. With regard to the row over the Senkaku Islands, it is not clear that Japan can defend the islands alone. Japan should strengthen its coast guard capabilities and introduce unmanned aerial vehicles. Japanese and US forces should step up joint exercises for amphibious operations. More generally, our Japanese speaker stated that Japan and the United States should make clear that they are determined to ensure freedom of navigation in the East China Sea.

As far as Japan-ROK relations are concerned, our Japanese speaker pointed out that it was a series of steps taken by the ROK that damaged bilateral relations (e.g., the decision to cancel the General Security of Military Information Agreement, and remarks by President Lee about the Japanese emperor). It remains to be seen if and how the two countries will improve relations. Until then, cooperation will remain limited; and meanwhile, the ROK's increasing dependence of the Chinese economy is enhancing ROK-China relations. This, in turn, limits the prospects for trilateral cooperation among Japan, the United States, and the ROK.

With regard to North Korea, our Japanese speaker insisted that Japan and the United States need to agree on how they would respond to a third North Korean nuclear test. As Pyongyang improves its nuclear and missile capabilities, Japan should strengthen its ballistic missile defense capabilities and allow the United States to station nuclear weapons on Japanese territory. Japan should also develop capabilities to strike North Korea's key military assets preemptively.

Finally, our Japanese speaker complained that Prime Minister Abe is wrongly portrayed as a rightwing nationalist in the US media. A more accurate picture would note that his determination to review the 1997 Guidelines for Japan-US Defense Cooperation and the 2010 National Defense Program Guidelines will help strengthen the alliance. The Abe government is also set to expand Japan's security role in several important areas, all of which will benefit the alliance: recognition of the right of collective self-defense, establishment of a national security council to conduct efficient intelligence-gathering and execute comprehensive national security policy, and constitutional revision to recognize the right of self-defense and to rename the Self-Defense Forces as "national defense force."

Our final discussion returned to some fundamental issues. Americans and Japanese agreed that the alliance was more tightly coupled than ever before. Both sides have recognized the value of the bilateral partnership and extended deterrence and have demonstrated their commitment to ensuring that it stays relevant. Still, the call for a more visible US nuclear presence, such as through the introduction of US tactical nuclear weapons, is disturbing. While both sides acknowledged that deterrence is a function of much more than military hardware, there remains a reductionist mindset that seems to prefer the presence of those weapons, at least offshore, if not on Japanese territory.

Frustration over the failure to roll back North Korea's nuclear program colors many of these calculations. Even while acknowledging that extended deterrence works and that the DPRK's possession of a nuclear weapon does not undermine the US commitment to defend Japan, Japanese participants still voice concern about their own vulnerability in a crisis. This seems to be behind the call by some Japanese to acquire an offensive strike capability. Even those Japanese who do not favor that course want more assertive and forthright statements from the United States to come to Japan's defense. Plainly, this is emotional territory and US counters that appeal to strategic logic and thinking increasingly fall on deaf ears. While that does not mean the United States should change its positions, US policymakers must be alert to the emotional elements of this discourse and adjust their arguments accordingly.

Our discussions provide a number of areas where the future iterations of this dialogue would bear fruit. For starters, all participants agreed on the need for a much deeper dive into the meaning, nature, and functioning of extended deterrence. Even though participants applauded the strengthening of bilateral discussions on this topic at the track-I level, more discussions are needed about the non-nuclear dimension of extended deterrence as there remain important misunderstandings and misperceptions and because the regional strategic landscape is changing rapidly. We should also explore in more depth ways the United States and Japan can work together to respond to military provocations that fall below the extended deterrence threshold, be it from North Korea or China.

More generally, our discussion on the modernization of the alliance suggested that Americans and Japanese have not yet agreed on how to best accomplish this task. In other words, despite preliminary discussions on the next "strengthening" agenda for the alliance, more thought needs to be given to the best ways to proceed and implement this agenda. This should be a focus should there be a next round of our dialogue, along with deeper discussions on how to use the US-Japan alliance to create new alliance networks, notably with the ROK; given the political sensitivities created by troubled Japan-ROK relations, this is an area which lends itself particularly well to a track-II dialogue.

APPENDIX A

Sixth US-Japan Strategic Dialogue February 7-8, 2013, Maui

AGENDA

Thursday, February 7, 2013

9:00AM **Welcome remarks**

9:15AM **Session 1: Perceptions of Current US Foreign Policy**

This session looks at security developments since we last met, focusing on perceptions of US foreign policy in Asia. How do both countries characterize that policy? What impact has the US Defense Strategic Guidance had on shaping both countries' perspectives on security developments? What does it mean for the US-Japan alliance and relationship? What are the implications for nuclear policies and postures? Save discussion of what the alliance must do to adjust until session 5.

US presenter: Brad Glosserman

Japanese presenter: Matake Kamiya

10:45AM **Coffee break**

11:00AM **Session 2: Domestic Politics and the Alliance**

This session looks at the impact of the US and Japanese elections on the alliance. Will the recent elections in each country influence perceptions of the alliance? Will either government change its policy toward the alliance? Why? What are the priorities for each government for the alliance relationship? What impact will budget politics in the US have on the alliance? What are the prospects for progress on the Okinawa issue?

Japanese presenter: Yoichi Kato

US presenter: Gordon Flake

12:30PM **Lunch**

1:45PM **Session 3: China after the New Leadership**

Here we explore views of China's role in Northeast Asia. What changes, if any, do you anticipate in Chinese foreign policy over the next year? Does either government anticipate a shift in policy toward China? What are the implications for nuclear policies and postures? How does your country see the other's relations with China and what impact does that have on the alliance relationship? How are other countries responding to the rise of China and its new role in the region? Discussion of the specifics of the dispute over the Senkaku/Daiyutai islands should be put off till the next session.

US presenter: Michael McDevitt

Japanese presenter: Komei Isozaki

3:15PM **Coffee break**

3:30PM **Session 4: Extended Deterrence**

This session explores thinking about what is required to make extended deterrence (ED) work. How has thinking about ED evolved in both countries? What is the role of nuclear weapons in ED? What is their reassurance mission? How is ED applicable to the East China Sea? The South China Sea? On the Korean Peninsula? How should it be applied/used in each case? What are the differences between each case? What lessons can we draw from these different cases? What should the United States do to make its ED more credible in these different contexts? What can allies do to increase ED credibility in these contexts?

Japanese presenter: Sugio Takahashi

US presenter: David Santoro

5:00PM **Session adjourns**

6:30PM **Dinner**

Friday, February 8, 2013

9:00AM **Session 5: Modernizing the Alliance: Goals, Rhetoric, Visions, Implementation**

This session explores thinking in each country about what is required to modernize the alliance through the review of the guidelines for Japan-US Defense Cooperation. Has the current strategic context changed the central purpose of Japan-US defense cooperation? What should the shared vision be? What are the main similarities and differences between national perspectives on the shared vision? How does the “rebalance” affect the alliance? How should the roles, missions, and capabilities of the alliance evolve? What is the place of nuclear weapons and their reassurance mission in that equation?

US presenter: Joe Young

Japanese presenter: Tetsuya Ito

10:45AM **Coffee break**

11:00AM **Session 6: Alliance Networks: New Partnerships, Linkages (Australia, ROK)**

This session explores the potential and limits for the US-Japan alliance to develop new partnerships and linkages with other regional actors on strategic issues. What is the participants’ assessment of the US-Japan-Australia dialogue? How can this process be strengthened to better address strategic concerns? Can the US-Japan alliance build upon this model to develop a similar dialogue with the ROK? What do the participants see as the main opportunities, for each country, and to improve the regional security environment? How have Japan-ROK relations influenced the prospect for trilateral cooperation? Have leadership changes in both countries improved or complicated the prospects of closer cooperation? What are the obstacles? How can these obstacles be overcome? What would be the role of nuclear policies, including diplomacy, extended

deterrence, and energy, in such a trilateral arrangement? Are there opportunities for using the US-Japan alliance to develop a stronger partnership with Southeast Asian countries? With India?

Japanese presenter: Noboru Yamaguchi
US presenter: Michael Urena

12:30PM **Lunch**

1:45PM **Session 7: The Future of the US-Japan Alliance**

This session invites specific recommendations on what the two countries can do to promote regional security and stability, specifically within the context of ED, and how these policies can strengthen the alliance and enhance strategic reassurance. How can the United States and Japan tighten their alliance and better cope with future strategic challenges? What role do nuclear weapons play in that equation? As the nuclear dimension of ED is downplayed, what opportunities are opened for a greater Japanese contribution to ED? What more can/should Japan do? What other issues deserve more attention? The Pacific Forum CSIS will hold a mini-trilateral meeting in Northeast Asia later in the year: what should it focus on?

US presenter: Evans Revere
Japanese presenter: Masashi Nishihara

3:15PM **Meeting adjourns**

APPENDIX B

Sixth US-Japan Strategic Dialogue February 7-8, 2013, Maui

PARTICIPANT LIST

Japan

Mr. Komei Isozaki
Visiting Fellow, Office of the Japan Chair,
CSIS

Mr. Tetsuya Ito
Director
Strategic Planning Office,
Defense Policy Division, MoD

Mr. Mataka Kamiya
Professor of International Relations
National Defense Academy of Japan

Mr. Yoichi Kato
National Security Correspondent
The Asahi Shimbun

Dr. Masashi Nishihara
President
Research Institute for Peace and Security

Mr. Sugio Takahashi
Senior Fellow
Policy Studies Department
The National Institute for Defense Studies

Lt. Gen. Noboru Yamaguchi (Ret.)
Former Commander
Ground Self Defense Forces
Research and Development Command

US

Mr. Ralph A. Cossa
President
Pacific Forum CSIS

Mr. L. Gordon Flake
Executive Director
The Maureen and Mike Mansfield
Foundation

Mr. Brad Glosserman
Executive Director, Pacific Forum CSIS

Dr. Robert H. Gromoll
Director
Office of Regional Affairs (ISN/RA)
U.S. Dept. of State

Mr. James A. Kelly
Counselor and President Emeritus
Pacific Forum CSIS

Adm. Michael McDevitt, USN (Ret.)
Vice President and Director, CNA
Strategic Studies, CNA Corporation

Mr. Evans J.R. Revere
Senior Director
Albright Stonebridge Group

Dr. David Santoro
Senior Fellow for Non-Proliferation and
Disarmament Affairs
Pacific Forum CSIS

Dr. Shane Smith
Research Fellow
Center for the Study of Weapons of Mass
Destruction,
National Defense University

Mr. Scott A. Snyder
Senior Fellow for Korea Studies and
Director of the Program on U.S.-Korean
Policy
Council on Foreign Relations

Mr. Michael Urena
Strategic Engagement Division
Office of Strategic Affairs
Bureau of Arms Control, Compliance and
Verification, US Department of State

Mr. Joe Young
Deputy Foreign Policy Advisor
U.S. Pacific Command

Young Leaders

Japan

Ms. Naoko AOKI
Ph.D. Student
University of Maryland

Dr. Ryo HINATA-YAMAGUCHI
Resident Vasey Fellow
Pacific Forum CSIS

Mr. Takashi KAWAMOTO
Researcher/Adviser
Consulate-General of Japan at Honolulu

Dr. Kei KOGA
Research Fellow
The Belfer Center, John F. Kennedy
School of Government, Harvard
University

US

Ms. Linnea DUVALL
International Relations Specialist
US Pacific Command

Mr. Adam LIFF
Ph.D. Candidate
Princeton University

Ms. Jenny LIN
Resident Sasakawa Peace Foundation
Fellow
Pacific Forum CSIS

Ms. Greer MEISELS
Associate Director and Research Fellow
China and the Pacific Center for the
National Interest

Mr. Nathan PINKUS
Staff Officer
Department of Defense

Ms. Cristin SHIFFER
Resident WSD-Handa Fellow
Pacific Forum CSIS

Staff:

Ms. Nicole FORRESTER
Director Young Leaders Program
Pacific Forum CSIS