

Japan to beef up its capabilities to respond to the North Korean threats. Tokyo is holding close discussions on this issue with Seoul and Washington.

Trilateral cooperation between Korea, Japan and the U.S., which is central to deterring North Korea's provocations, has greatly contributed to engaging with North Korea since the 1990s.

Given Seoul's sensitive reaction to Tokyo's move to boost its self-defense capabilities, Japan should increase the transparency of its policy through security cooperation with South Korea.

Japan believes that the ROK-US alliance will provide a foundation for peace and prosperity on the Korean Peninsula during and after reunification.

IN Nam-sik

Common threats must be identified to maintain the ROK-US alliance after reunification. China's rise to superpower status might be seen as a threat, but it is important that we strike a balance between the threat and economic opportunity that China poses.

What counts in the discussion on the future of the ROK-US alliance is mutual understanding of each other. It is important for us to precisely predict the future, as the U.S. leadership and foreign policies are standing at the crossroads amid the Trump phenomenon.

As the ROK-US alliance after reunification may develop into a trilateral security alliance between Korea, the U.S. and Japan, or a trilateral cooperative mechanism for regional cooperation, Korea should prepare its vision for the multilateral relations.

Jim BOLGER (former Prime Minister of New Zealand)

It is important to have long-term and short-term goals for reunification so that it may be possible to achieve the goals stage by stage.

It will also be important to set goals for South and North Korea to live on together sustainably.

A positive role of a third party in inter-Korean talks should be considered.

[Q & A]

Q. Jim BOLGER It is a worry that Donald Trump's "America First" policy could push America backward. Do you think it will have a great effect on the ROK-US alliance?

Q. PARK In-kook (Secretary-General, Korea Foundation for Advanced Studies) China said it would put "maintaining peace and stability on the Korean Peninsula" before "denuclearizing the peninsula," when it unveiled its policy on the Korean Peninsula in 2009, which I believe has led North Korea in the wrong direction. Isn't it about time for Beijing to readjust its policy priorities to focus on the denuclearization of North Korea?

Q. SHIN Dong-ik Professor Cheng Xiaohu said a unified Korea will experience a transition period for about ten years, during which the withdrawal of U.S. troops will not be necessary. Is there any reason for giving it ten years?

A. Snyder History shows, as Trump claimed, that Seoul and Washington have discussed on and off the issue of pulling U.S. troops out of Korea. I think they will reach a point sometime in the future where they should conclude this discussion. According to opinion polls in the U.S., more Americans are showing a tendency of sticking to conservatism, which I believe is indicative of internationalism, not isolationism.

A. Cheng In China's policies on the Korean Peninsula, there are some underlying contradictions between three factors: peace and stability, denuclearization and settlement through dialogue. Not only China but also other countries should find ways to achieve both goals on the Korean Peninsula - peace and stability and denuclearization of North Korea. I personally believe denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula is a precondition for peace and stability. Priorities will be readjusted over time, but China's stance on the denuclearization of the Korean peninsula won't change. The transition period after the reunification can last over ten years or fifteen years. They are given for the sake of convenience with no particular reason.

Towards New Cooperative Leadership in Asia: Theory and Practice

East Asia Foundation

Moderator	PARK Cheol-hee Professor, GSIS, Seoul National University
Presenter & Discussant	WANG Yong Professor, Center for International Political Economy, Peking University John NILSSON-WRIGHT Head of Asia Programme, Chatham House John DELURY Professor, GSIS, Yonsei University
Rapporteur	CHOI Ha-eun Fellow, East Asia Foundation Global Asia

Strategic dialogue among national leaders constitutes a critical platform for peace and stability in Asia. However, conflicts in security interest, and diverging economic interests and cultural values produce conflicts among national leaders, thus making diplomatic situations uneasy and unstable. This session looks at realistic ways of enhancing cooperation among leaders in Asia under newly-unfolding strategic contexts.

- **Park** This session will discuss sub-topics under the main theme of the Jeju Forum, "Asia's New Order and Cooperative Leadership," with three distinguished experts. In fact, regional cooperation in Asia is a frequently discussed subject at the Jeju Forum, which means it is such a significant issue and, at the same time, an abstract one that eludes a clear answer. In today's session, we will explore concrete ways to forge cooperation in the region amid the rise of China, Japan's military and security alliance with the U.S. and North Korean provocations.
- **Wang** There has been a lot of discussion about the rise of China, but many are misguided by exaggerated facts. It is right to call it a rise of all of

Asia, not China, alone. The rise of Asia is one of the most important developments in international relations over the last 20 years after the end of the Cold War. Major Asian countries, including Korea, China and Japan, share more common interests and are integrated on a higher level. On the other hand, the region faces diverse challenges such as territorial disputes, history issues and competition in security affairs, resulting from the changes in the regional order due to the sudden rise of China after the financial crisis of the world in 2008. Therefore, we should recognize the new order in Asia and seriously consider how to restructure this after setting common goals. Departing from the legacies of the Cold War and pro-U.S. lines, we should realize that Asia is divided into the Pivot to Asia strategy and the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP). Without repeating the past, such as ideological confrontation, we should be more open and tolerant toward each other, and make concerted efforts to build a new regional order. China, too, has to be more responsible as a rising state, approach other countries more cautiously, and listen to them. Recent Chinese foreign policies, like the Asia Infrastruc-

ture Investment Bank and the “One Belt, One Road” initiative, represent the will to contribute to regional peace and prosperity. Regarding some sensitive issues such as the territorial disputes over the South China Sea or Diaoyudao Islands, political leaders of the region need to have frank talks.

• **Nilsson-Wright** I would like to add one thing from the perspective of a European and a British viewpoint. To say my conclusions first, I see the cooperative leadership in Asia in a negative light. Let me illustrate the challenges the region faces; the first is the hegemonic rivalry (The U.S. and China develop the rivalry into an arms race and this impacts security alliances in the region); the second is the territorial disputes (the competition for resources resulting from economic expansion in Asia foments instability); the third the difficulties in claiming legitimacy (In Austria, a presidential runner almost became the first extreme rightist president in Europe, recently, and in the Philippines, Rodrigo Duterte, called “The Punisher” for his excessive abuse of the law enforcement power, was elected as president, indicating a symptom of quasi-fascism in Asia); the fourth the rise of nationalism; the fifth the growing distrust between the elite and the masses; the sixth rapid economic growth (economic growth may somehow help resolving conflicts, but its pace is too fast to reduce the gap between the rich and poor); the seventh unpredictable natural disasters and man-made mishaps; and the eighth, institutional fatigue (a situation in which too many systems require the choice and concentration approach).

If so, why do the challenges arise now? After the Cold War, hostile confrontations drew to an end, and the structural aspects of many problems have changed. Corresponding to the extent of the intervention of the U.S. in the region, geopolitical instability is getting serious, and Chinese President Xi Jinping and Japanese Prime Minister Abe actively engage in diplomatic activities.

Judging by the moves of the two countries over the South China Sea issue, they are not confined to the unipolar order anymore, and the relations between major players are being reshaped. Amid the growing tension, what kind of actions

would the countries take? They can revert to the traditional ties of alliance or unilaterally make a new approach as Japan does, or remove (hedge) the risk through China to ease the tension as South Korea does. These changes are explained by technological advances. Technologies enable countries to strengthen their military capabilities that make it impossible to respond to the enemy’s attack in time. In the case of North Korea, if technological development leads to its capability in ballistic missile launch, it may create a serious situation. Another factor fanning the tension in the region is the shrinkage of orthodox political elites. The support of the Chinese Communist Party for President Xi Jinping is weaker than in the past, and the Japanese political elite have lower support rates due to the economic recession. And as the results of the South Korean general election show, the anger of people, particularly the younger generation, is being unleashed on politics. The political situation makes it impossible for politicians to survive just by relying on traditional supporter groups.

There are also many local and national issues of unrest. In Asia, there are efforts to reestablish a national identity. In Japan, territorial disputes turn into political issues, and a possible amendment of the Constitution remains a Pandora’s Box, with Abe expected to embrace inclusive foreign policies in the future. Korea also has the government-designated history textbook issue, while China sees new discourses promoting political change. Given this, it is doubtful that the numerous ideas on cooperation in Asia will produce any result.

• **Delury** It is impossible to discuss the regional cooperation in Asia without referring to the role of the U.S. In fact, most Asian countries know that individual pursuit of interests will not help regional cooperation. If so, why have the domestic conditions of the Northeast Asian countries worsened? Which country wants cooperation and prosperity in Asia most in terms of strategy?

The U.S. policy of rebalance, designed to move its pivot of security to Asia, is seen here as a strategy of the U.S. to balance the rise of China. This rebalancing strategy of the U.S. enables some countries to remove their risk factors by using

the tension between the U.S. and China. Actually, many countries in the region are strategically utilizing the U.S. policy, with South Korea opting for the strategy to get economic gains from China and to have its security guaranteed by the U.S. In the position of second tier states or middle powers, it would be better for them to seek gains amid the tensions and misunderstandings between the U.S. and China than to seek regional cooperation.

From my perspective as a Chinese history researcher, the most serious concern is the historical identity and education issue. The historical identity of Northeast Asia is closely related to historical narratives. Recently, this region has shown a tendency to use nationalistic narratives to instill an identity among the next generation in a bid to build nation states. So to speak, the history education itself is to promote nationalism. From a single viewpoint, they instill national pride among their people and even imbue the historical accounts with moralism. North Korea is the extreme example of this. Though being less extreme, three Northeast Asian countries - South Korea which was embroiled in a history textbook controversy, Japan which distorts history for national pride and China which prohibits some historical interpretations - are no exception to the nationalistic move. Not only Asia, but also the U.S., which is witnessing the “Trump phenomenon” exposes nationalism in a different shape. In Northeast Asia, they are aware, at least, that what they do is nationalism; but the Trump case shows that nationalism was fanned by major press in the U.S.

Political leaders consider the public reaction, first of all, in their decision-making. Therefore, the public should more actively ask their leader for regional cooperation if they wish for a higher level of cooperation. As Prof. Nilsson-Wright mentioned, what raises more concern is that the public does not recognize the problematic feature of historical identity, paying no heed to the need of inter-state cooperation.

• **Park** We don’t have to be pessimistic about the present situation. When I teach students at college, I tell them that Asia hasn’t seen a big war since 1979 and managed to maintain a peaceful



PARK Cheol-hee

WANG Yong



John NILSSON-WRIGHT

John DELURY

state of affairs without massive massacres or terrorism, while expanding its international influence gradually. Though a global recession is underway, economic growth in the Asian region still continues, and countries, except for North Korea, are somehow doing well. Upon this assumption, I would like to ask Prof. Wang Yong, who mentioned an “open and tolerant Asia,” what he meant with open order and what the region expects about the role of the U.S.

• **Wang** First of all, we need a theoretical approach to the question about what stands in the way of regional cooperation and what kind of challenges we face. We should understand that there is a gap between countries, they utilize alliances to overcome the gap, and such moves are tied with the rise and fall of superpowers. We also live in a period of a new transition in the regional order. The transition is progressing so fast that we cannot catch up with it, but we should more objectively watch the realities and more seriously consider our common interests.

The statistics of human exchanges in Asia shows a steep increase in tourists and students studying in different countries, in particular. I have an optimism that the growing exchanges will lead to a pursuit of common interests and to regional cooperation. The talks on intractable

issues such as history or territorial disputes, too, might lead to a key to resolution, if the dialogue deals, first, with the economic and cultural ones, which can be easily negotiated on. Furthermore, the relations of the U.S. and China would not promptly worsen, as they heavily depend upon each other in the economic sector. Therefore, it helps us having an optimistic expectation about the regional cooperation.

To form a regional community by excluding a certain state may bring a more serious problem, as seen in the European precedent of the blockade against Russia. A more open and tolerant policy is needed.

- **Park** Can the U.S. play the role of promoting regional cooperation in Asia?
- **Wang** The U.S. can play a constructive role in creating a new Asian order and a collective security system.
- **Park** Prof. Nilsson-Wright cited distrust as an obstacle for regional cooperation. Then, what could resolve the security dilemma? As seen in Europe, could mini-lateralism for trust-building, though incomplete, work for regional cooperation? If so, what kind of concrete result could it make?
- **Nilsson-Wright** The European case cannot be applied to the East Asian situation. In the case of Europe, they could create a collaborative system because they were faced with a common threat, the Soviet Union. Actually, Europe does not have a completely cooperative system, either. Cooperation could be started in Europe as German leaders have shown a sincere attitude of repenting the past on their knees, and other countries sympathized with the action of German leaders and agreed to move forward. The recent visit of U.S. President Obama to Hiroshima is viewed in similar vein. One problem with East Asia is that they do not have this kind of sympathy. Recently, both Korea and Japan are shedding lights on the past again, but the seriously problematic feature here is that the leaders are making unilateral decisions on it. In the case of Europe, they have the principle that they should collectively deal with the past.

Middle powers tend to weigh their interests in the background of the tension between superpow-

ers. One example of it is public diplomacy. In the case of Japan, it actively solicits the intervention of the U.S. in the region by annually expanding its budget for public diplomacy activities. However, public diplomacy has limitations in advancing the regional cooperation; and it is necessary to go beyond such an unproductive zero-sum competition.

- **Park** Listening to the panelists here, I was reminded of Yoshihumi Wakamia, chief editorial writer of the Asahi Shimbun, who passed away recently. He was respected not only in Japan, but also in the East Asian region, because of his outstanding capacity of compassion. He was known as a man with a strong will for cooperation. I believe the East Asian region needs his compassion,

아시아의 새로운 질서와 협력적 리더십 Asia's New Order and Cooperative Leadership



above all, in this era.

A question that I would like to ask Prof. Delury is if it is possible to depart from the unitary view of history and teach regional history of East Asia (not the histories of Japan, Korea and China), based on national identities.

- **Delury** To answer it with American optimism, it is a top-down approach. The reason why such a suggestion always ends up with a mere idea that cannot be realized is because the message delivered by the leadership was imbued with national pride. It is a social phenomenon, not a citizenship issue. Researchers like us, NGOs, the younger generation would have to play a more active role. A government initiative cannot work it out.
- **Nilsson-Wright** Social scientists tended to rely on

quantitative (empirical) methodology during the Cold War era, but history tells us what counts is the narrative. The narrative on history can change flexibly without being exclusive. There should be more researchers with flexible views, and other frameworks than sociological ones should be developed.

[Q & A]

Q. **MOON Chung-in (Professor, Yonsei University)**

One point missing in this session on cooperative leadership is the fact that Chinese President Xi Jinping, Japanese Prime Minister Abe, Korean President Park Geun-hye, U.S. President Obama

and presidential candidates Trump and Hillary are all captives of domestic politics. As long as they are preoccupied with the need to minimize the dynamics of domestic politics, it is hard to expect cooperative leadership. It makes a comparison with the case of leaders of France and Germany, which used to be locked in antagonistic rivalry, but reached reconciliation in broader points of view after World War II for co-prosperity. French president Charles De Gaulle and German Premier Konrad Adenauer led public opinion to reconciliation, despite popular resistance and protests. Without being overwhelmed by public opinion, they persuaded people into reconciliation for a greater cause. As a result, the two countries became leaders of Europe, as well as achieving reconciliation. Can the leaders of Asia, Xi Jinping, Abe and Park Geun-hye change their minds and exercise real leadership? What kinds of influence would domestic politics have on cooperative leadership?

A. Delury Not only leaders but also the public counts. It is necessary to find out what the public want from their leaders. Even the dictatorship of North Korea needs to meet the demands of the people. Leaders have to give what people want and listen to them.

A. Nilsson-Wright I agree with Prof. Delury. Prime Minister Abe heeds people's opinions. When it comes to security policy, however, he always

judges everything in the context of the U.S.-Japan relationship, against popular wishes. He is uneasy with thorny issues, hates traditional dynamics and pursues a rational independent line. Therefore, he would unlikely suggest new solutions. In Britain, too, the public does not trust their institutions, as the Brexit vote showed.

A. Wang Domestic politics is also important in international relations. In terms of the relation of political leaders with the public, Prime Minister Abe is different from Prime Minister Hatoyama. President Xi Jinping is also different from his predecessors, Jiang Zemin and Hu Jintao. The power of influence political leaders have differs according to their characters, political system and beliefs. The character of the masses is a complicated issue, varying by industry, interests and political inclination. As political leaders are elected through the support of a certain united group, they can hardly represent all groups.

A. Park It is a problem that political leaders pay more attention to the opinions of cabinet members, the press and some political consultants than to the public. There is also the case of a mismatch in which political leaders insist on their own agenda without toeing the popular line, thus widening the gap between them and people. The public have negative and skeptical views on politics, as they do not know what politicians are about.

the relations because of their high economic interdependency upon each other in the region.

• Recently, in particular, the countries in the region show a tendency to strengthen the nationalistic narrative for the next generation to the end of building nation states through the education of national identity.

• As the messages of the leadership are imbued with national pride, researchers, NGOs and the younger generation should study history for regional integration, departing from the unitary view of the subject.

• An emotional sympathy should precede the institutionalization of cooperation to establish cooperative leadership.

• If talks start with economic or cultural affairs, which are easier to negotiate on, this could lead to a solution of the intractable history issues or territorial disputes.



Policy Implications

• In recognition of the new Asian order formed over 20 years after the end of the Cold War, the countries in the region have to be open and tolerant toward each other and create a new regional security order with concerted efforts.

• Some of the most challenging issues in the region are competitions for influence on hegemonic power; territorial disputes; difficulties in claiming legitimacy; the rise of nationalism; distrust between political elites and people; too rapid economic growth hard to adapt to; unexpected natural disasters and human mishaps; and institutional fatigue.

• Second-tier states or middle powers seek to remove risks or economic gains using the tension between the U.S. and China, but the superpowers are unlikely to unilaterally worsen

East Asian 'History Issues' and Political Leadership

Northeast Asian History Foundation

Keynote Speaker **YOO Euy-sang** Ambassador for Geographic Naming, Northeast Asian History Foundation

Moderator **KIM Min-kyu** Research Fellow, Northeast Asian History Foundation

Presenter **Mindy KOTLER** Director, Asia Policy Point

Reinhard ZOELLNER Professor, University of Bonn

Junro ITO Professor, University of Tsukuba

LEE Jong-guk Research Fellow, Northeast Asian History Foundation

Discussant **KWAK Jino** Research Fellow, Northeast Asian History Foundation

LEE Won-woo Research Fellow, Northeast Asian History Foundation

Rapporteur **KIM Min-kyu** Research Fellow, Northeast Asian History Foundation

KIM Min-kyu

As evidenced by the “comfort women” issue, the three countries of Korea, China and Japan are embroiled in long-standing conflicts over history. These conflicts are posing a serious threat to peace and prosperity in East Asia. In this session, we will discuss what kind of leadership is called for to resolve the history disputes in East Asia and thus to pass on a “sound historical views” to the next generation.

YOO Euy-sang

Recently, the historical and territorial disputes between Korea, Japan and China have worsened so much that they are threatening the peace and stability of East Asia. Many factors and backgrounds are said to be behind these rows. Various ways are also presented to solve them, but it is becoming more difficult to properly cope with the issue. The reason why history and territorial disputes are escalating is probably because internal or external factors have fanned nationalism, providing an opportunity for

the region's political leaders to use history or a certain interpretation of history for domestic political purposes.

That is why it is timely and meaningful for us to discuss the theme of East Asian history issues and political leadership in this session. I hope the three presenters here will help us look deeply into the backgrounds and roots of East Asia's history disputes and propose solutions to the issue. Experts from the Northeast Asian History Foundation are also expected to offer insightful views as discussants.

History Textbook Issue

Junro ITO

In Japan, all textbooks for elementary, middle and high schools are written in accordance with the “instruction manual” published by the Ministry of Education and Science. The draft textbooks are submitted to the ministry for approval, that is, to the Textbook Screening Council before they are eventually adopted by schools nationwide. Therefore,