

That is because tensions of this nature are not confined to a single country and have a strong possibility of spilling over to the region or the rest of the world.

Constrained by numerous political and other systematic factors, ASEAN has not proven itself as a role model for settling conflicts in the region. That means domestic politics are affecting international politics, and vice versa.

After all, the borders of ASEAN should be more open than they are to better address ethnic tensions. Countries in the region should increase exchange to foster regional cooperation.

ASEAN and Security Issues on the Korean Peninsula

Makmur KELIAT

Inter-Korean disputes are not only a matter of a clash between different political systems but also structural problems. On top of that, the conflicts between the two Koreas have historical background, thus exposing the complicated nature.

A change in the North Korean regime, an issue hotly debated in the wake of the reckless provocative actions taken recently by the country, seems possible through a revolution from the bottom up or a collapse from within. Many other factors may bring changes. As a consequence, North Korea could end up with either a hard or soft landing.

A variety of scenarios have been presented to forecast the North Korean regime's future, and different action plans for different scenarios have been explored by ASEAN.

It is true that ASEAN countries have different views on how to respond to the issues of North Korea or the Korean Peninsula. Nevertheless, ASEAN on the whole gives priority to treaties of friendship as well as engagement and negotiation. In addition, ASEAN prefers the gradual dissolution of the North Korean regime. In short, ASEAN seems to prefer diplomatic to military solutions on this matter.

To conclude, ASEAN is opposed to a military response to North Korea in favor of diplomacy to bring about change in the country. But the problem is that ASEAN countries do not have a uniform view on how to prepare for change in the North Korean regime, with some countries siding with the United States and others China.

Policy Implications

- It is not desirable to regard the factors behind East Asia's uncertainty only as a threat.
- Regarding the strategic stability of East Asia, countries may share a single "conscious" management formula or a single value, but their interests inevitably vary.
- It is not necessary to analyse risks and threats separately when it comes to North Korean issues.
- More discussion is needed to explain the uncertainty evident today in East Asia from the perspective of "strategic stability."
- Detailed analysis is needed to explain the fact that the well-known friendly ties between North Korea and China turned sour recently in terms of strategic stability.

Possibilities and Conditions of East Asia Peace Community II

Jeju Special Self-Governing Province / Korea Council for Reconciliation and Cooperation (KCRC)

Moderator	KIM Young-hie Editor-at-Large, JoongAng Ilbo
Presenter	Haruki WADA Professor Emeritus, University of Tokyo LEE Bu-young Chairman of Organizing Committee, 2015 International Conference for Peace in East Asia
Discussant	Shingo FUKUYAMA Chairperson, Peace Forum, Japan CHUNG Hyun-back Professor, Sungkyunkwan University Seishiro FUKUDA Secretary, Rikken (Constitutionalism) Forum, Japan PARK Ihn-hwi Professor, Ewha Womans University
Rapporteur	KWON Ji-yeon Secretary, KCRC

KIM Young-hie

My constant belief is that the reunification of the two Koreas is impossible without the existence of the East Asian community. I came to further strengthen the belief, while writing a book on German unification. Thus far, we used to pay attention to the German situation in the 1980s and 1990s only, but if we see German unification now, about 20 years after it, we get to know that external factors, that is, the European situation influenced it a lot much.

Likewise, peace on the Korean Peninsula is impossible unless the Northeast Asian peace is guaranteed, and vice versa.

Japanese Peace Constitution and Northeast Asian Peace Community

Haruki WADA

Northeast Asia - the first-grade danger zone ridden with multi-layered conflicts

Currently, East Asia and Northeast Asia face

crises. The first factor is the North Korean issue. Opinions about its root cause may vary, but personally I think it is because North Korea did not establish diplomatic ties with the U.S., thus failing to secure its international status, whereas South Korea has stabilized its status by opening its ties with China and Russia after the end of the Cold War in the early 1990s. There have been improvements in the ties of the two Koreas, but they seem to have failed to achieve authentic cooperation. Stronger sanctions have been imposed against the provocations by North Korea, but failed to have the desired effect, only heightening tension.

The second factor of the crisis is Japan. The problem lies in the fact that Japan, as a responsible state, should have maintained a consistent position, based on correct historical understanding, but has not done so.

The third factor is China. It achieved capitalistic economic growth under a communist system. Chinese economic success bolsters not only the Asian



KIM Young-hie

Haruki WADA

LEE Bu-young

Shingo FUKUYAMA

CHUNG Hyun-back

economy but also substantial parts of the world economy. In the process, China pushed for nationalism, which replaced its communist ideology, aggrandizing itself, and was embroiled in territorial disputes with neighboring countries as well as exposing diverse domestic problems.

The fourth and last factor is the Okinawa Island issue. The island was under the occupation of the U.S. after World War II, and the residents have endured the rule of U.S. forces for 70 years and are locked in conflict over the military base there.

The inception of the Japanese Peace Constitution

Japan calls itself as a country with a “Peace Constitution.” It is necessary to examine what ‘peace state,’ based on the Peace Constitution, means.

After defeat in the war, the Japanese people had aspirations and visions to become a “peace state,” and intellectuals translated them into a pursuit of demilitarization and an anti-war state, thus producing “peace state discourse.” Based on this principle, Article 9 of the Japanese Constitution was made. It was not forcibly introduced, but produced out of the wishes and opinions of the Japanese people.

After the outbreak of the Korean War, the U.S. forces which were occupying Japan at that time, requested Japan to join the war, but Prime Minister Shigeru Yoshida refused, with the opposition agreeing with him in compliance with the Constitution. The decision came from their recognition, based on the wartime experience, that war can bring no solution.

The anti-war position was maintained for 60 years, but Prime Minister Shinzo Abe made a proposition to amend it last year, touching off a controversy.

Japan should pursue “peace diplomacy” based on its Peace Constitution

To play a positive role amid the East Asian crisis, Japan should go against the policies of Prime Minister Shinzo Abe. This means that Japan has to do “positive peace diplomacy,” based on the principle of the Peace Constitution, and it is a different kind of “peace diplomacy” from that of ordinary countries. Article 9 says that the Japanese people forever renounce war as means of settling international disputes. To observe the Peace Constitution means conducting “peace diplomacy.”

If doubts are continually cast over the effects of the stronger sanctions on North Korea, a radical change to the policy should be considered. The diplomatic achievement recently made by the U.S. and Cuba might be used as a reference for the North Korea case. If a military clash breaks out on the Korean Peninsula, it would directly damage South Korea and Japan.

Therefore, Japan should bring a change to the current situation with peace diplomacy.

Japan and North Korea may open embassies in each other’s capital and start discussions on three issues as follows: 1) unconditional establishment of diplomatic relations 2) mutual trade 3) operation of a shipping service between the two countries. As a matter of course, the UN embargo on some items must be observed.

Two concrete tasks for the East Asian community

For regional security, the East Asian community should be set up, but there are two tasks prior to this. One is to create a cooperative system to cope with disasters, such as earthquakes, in the region. The other is a joint move to address environmental



Seishiro FUKUDA

PARK Ihn-hwi

issues. Air pollution in Beijing is so severe that it affects Korea and Japan. China has to make efforts to solve the problem in recognition of pollution as an issue for the entire region.

The discussions on the East Asian community should be joined by the U.S. Without its presence in the talks, it will be impossible to create the community.

Realization of a big dream

A big dream may come true. If we pursue an ambitious dream with strong determination, it may be realized. If East Asia makes concerted efforts to realize the big dream of the East Asian Community, conflicts and tension might be resolved.

Conditions for East Asian Peace

LEE Bu-young

East Asian countries’ future policy toward North Korea

The crisis of the Korean peninsula was worsened due to improvements in North Korea’s nuclear weapons. As South Korea insists that it will not hold talks with North Korea, as long as it possesses nuclear weapons, U.S. State Secretary John Kerry and Assistant Secretary of State Daniel Russel expressed their willingness to negotiate a peace treaty between the U.S. and North Korea. Chinese Foreign Minister Wang Yi proposed to the U.S. that denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula and the peace treaty be negotiated simultaneously.

The Korean government’s position not to respond to North Korea’s proposal for military talks is expected to change somewhat with the opening of the 20th National Assembly. A change in the government position is more likely to come with the

reopening of Kaesong Industrial Complex, regularization of the reunion of separated families and a start of South-North dialogue.

In the case of Japan, considering the Japanese people’s strong will to safeguard the Peace Constitution in opposition to the security bill, ahead of the Upper House election, it is doubtful that the Japanese will permit the Abe Cabinet to secure enough House seats to amend the Constitution.

As regards the U.S., I think that the U.S. might change its policy toward North Korea, which has been characterized as strategic neglect, as North Korean nuclear weapons have emerged as a real threat with their upgraded capability. There is the possibility of a change in U.S. policy such as an agreement on negotiations for a peace treaty.

Sanctions and a blockade cannot resolve the North Korean nuclear issue

The six-party talks and the U.S.-North Korea talks have produced meaningful statements and agreements for the last 20 years, but they were annulled just as many times. Even though many predicted the collapse of the North Korean regime, it has endured isolation and sanctions for the last 20 years, just to upgrade its nuclear weapons. This means that a blockade or sanctions cannot thwart the development of nuclear arms.

If the U.S. calls for denuclearization at this point as a precondition for reopening the six party talks, North Korea has to abolish its nuclear technologies and achievements all together, for the talks; but this is a condition the North can never accept. This means that the nuclear issue has reached a dead-end.

Time for complete shift of viewpoint – start of “Korea Process”

It is time now to be disillusioned with the wish for a collapse of North Korea, and to encourage Washington and Pyongyang to make a compromise, that is, the normalization of the armistice system. For instance, it is necessary to consider suspending South Korea-U.S. joint military drills if North Korea puts a halt to its development of nuclear arms. As the JoongAng Ilbo suggested in the name of a “complete shift of viewpoint,” it is the time for us to change



our mindset.

First of all, South Korea should independently judge and act. Dialogue and negotiation do not harm the national interest. Nevertheless, some still play an antagonistic role against the North and are confrontational. To be a protagonist of a new paradigm, we should pursue a new “Korea Process.”

The Korea process over the short term might be aimed at 1) the restoration of inter-Korean talks 2) the reopening of the Kaesong Industrial Complex and resuming Mt. Kumgang tours 3) the reunion of separated families and exchange of letters 4) the implementation of the agreements of the June 15 Declaration of 2000 and Oct. 4 Declaration of 2007 5) the start of the project to reconnect the inter-

Korean railways and roads as already agreed.

Over the long-term, the Korea process should pursue 1) the establishment of South and North Korean missions in Seoul and Pyongyang 2) the agreement to and promotion of the normalization of the relations of the U.S. and Japan with North Korea 3) a readjustment of the U.S.-Korea alliance with the abolition of North Korean nuclear arms and a peace treaty 4) discussions on the Trans-Siberian Railway and Trans-Korean Railway, and the project to establish gas pipeline from Sakhalin to Korea 5) discussions on the linkage of the Shandong gas pipeline to Korea.

These projects will be achieved by the establishment of an East Asian cooperation organization,

which might start with “the East Asian peace conference” suggested by former Japanese Prime Minister Yukio Hatoyama.

PARK In-hwi

At the heart of the uniqueness and instability of the Northeast Asia region lies the North Korean issue. Korea has a strong identity as a “Northeast Asian state.” So, the stable development of the Northeast Asian region is a key factor for Korean development.

Unlike other regions, Northeast Asia is characterized by two regional orders in operation. Being inter-dependent, though, they distrust each other in security and political affairs. North Korea utilizes

this duality for its survival, well, and South Korea has to cope with this situation with limited diplomatic resources.

I have two questions about the presentations today. First, the Wang Yi initiative which seeks simultaneous pursuit of denuclearization and a peace treaty is actively being discussed among experts, but no one talks about concrete ways of integrating the two objectives. There should be an insight to this matter. Second, while Korea always has to grapple with the question of what kind of position it has to take between the U.S. and China, Japan seems to have no such task. As regards the North Korea issue, in particular, I wonder what kind of position Japan should take between the U.S. and China.

Haruki WADA

North Korea is the only country which has no diplomatic relations with the U.S. To remove North Korea’s nuclear weapons is a daunting task, taking a long time, but I think that there should be negotiations on measures to give the opportunity of economic cooperation to the North when it gets rid of its nuclear arms.

Japan, still under the influence of the U.S., wants to be on a par with the U.S. and I think Korea has the same wish. A country, beset by the U.S., China and Russia, has to behave independently.

Shingo FUKUYAMA

The Abe Cabinet evidently wants to abolish Article 9 of the Constitution and dreams of a state capable of war in connection with the U.S. military strategy. It will eventually raise military tension in the Asian region. The peace movement is very important to counter it. As the peace movement in Japan has a crucial role in deterring dangerous acts by the Abe Cabinet, it should be strengthened.

Recently, the peace movement reveals three characteristics. First, a full-scale peace movement with the slogan “no more war” started in December, 2014. The peace movement thus far has been divided into the communist line and non-communist line, but it is now being organized into one group. Many people from various fields stage peace movement, along with specialized committees, across the

country, an unprecedented phenomenon.

When the “security bill” was proposed in March, about 37,000 assembled in front of the National Diet and called on the Abe government to step down, and about 50,000 joined the campaign to safeguard the Constitution at more than 200 places.

The campaign to safeguard the Peace Constitution secured 12 million signatures, which means that Japanese society is changing.

Second, the opposition parties formed a united front against the “security bill,” pledging to cooperate to repeal the bill and dismiss the incumbent government. A significant change is expected in the Upper House election, with the opposition parties agreeing to field a single candidate. Therefore, it is expected to bring an upset result in the election. I think that the National Diet of Japan would see a result similar to the Korean elections in which the opposition won the majority seats in the National Assembly.

Third, the support rate for Abe’s administration is still high, but supports for individual policies such as the security bill, construction of a U.S. military base in Okinawa and the economic policies of Abenomics are declining, with a majority opposing one of them. The support rate remains high only because there is no alternative to the incumbent administration.

Seishiro FUKUDA

The Rikken (constitutionalism) Forum that I belong to is a consultative body of 48 Upper and Lower House members of the opposition, excluding the Communist Party. The Abe government is peculiar in that it won the election with the slogan “Retake Japan.” Abe’s highest goal as well as his government’s task is constitutional amendment. Given the fact that Abe’s term is to last just two years, he is trying to mobilize every means to amend the Constitution.

In fact, the Liberal Democratic Party has proposed a dreadful Constitution draft called the “Military Constitution,” when it was an opposition party. This is the reason why we call our forum “Rikken.” More than 700 local councilors are forming networks joined by prominent scholars. Japan has to recognize that it faces a post-war Con-

stitution crisis.

CHUNG Hyun-back

With the North Korean nuclear arms test and declaration of its possession of nuclear arms, I had the fear that a war might break out in the form of local conflict on the Korean Peninsula. Korea should raise its sensitivity about war, and civic groups have a crucial role to that end. It is important that citizens know about the security issue and manifest their right to make a decision on it.

For the Korea process, Lee Bu-young suggested, South and North Korean governments have to play more important roles. The situation has changed, and South Korea has more initiatives in improving inter-Korean relations and realizing East Asian peace. We should explore ways to implement the June 15 Declaration of 2000 and Oct. 4 Declaration of 2007.

The achievement of the 2015 International Conference for Peace in East Asia was the consensus shared by all from conservatives to progressives that the armistice treaty should be replaced by a peace treaty. Based on the consensus, another forum, the Korean Peninsula Peace Conference was organized.

As to the question of Prof. Park Ihn-hwi about the concrete means to pursue both denuclearization and a peace treaty, I would like to say that it is time to propagate discourse on a peace treaty itself, before trying to find out the means. We should make more efforts to disseminate voices for a peace system on the Korean Peninsula.

Strategic Diplomacy in Northeast Asia

East Asia Foundation

Moderator	MOON Chung-in Professor, Yonsei University / Editor-in-chief, Global Asia
Presenter	Jochen PRANTL Associate Professor & Director, Asia-Pacific College of Diplomacy, Australian National University Evelyn GOH Shedden Professor, Strategic Policy Studies, College of Asia and the Pacific, Australian National University PARK Cheol-hee Professor, GSIS, Seoul National University HUANG Jing Professor, Lee Foundation / Director, Centre on Asia and Globalization, Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy, National University of Singapore
Rapporteur	Kim Gawon Fellow, East Asia Foundation

Jochen PRANTL

It is becoming difficult in a globalized world for states to achieve their desired outcomes. There is no manual to solve complex problems. To address this problem, strategic diplomacy looks at international issues from a system-based perspective, not state-based (e.g. addressing global finance within the larger international system).

German reunification was possible through understanding of the larger European security system, not just bilateral relations.

Instead of a “Master Idea” that dominates the international system, there are competing concepts today: the U.S. vision of a liberal world vs. the Chinese understanding of how the world should be organized. China is trying to shape the system and take a strategic narrative to make a difference.

Various policies can take place under a strategic narrative/ master strategy (e.g. War on terror and middle power diplomacy).

Evelyn GOH

Strategic diplomacy serves the greater purpose of

national interest or regional order rather than day-to-day issues. The global war on terror is a successful strategic label put forward by one hegemon and powerfully impacted various states’ policies.

The strategic narrative of the U.S. rebalance to Asia is global strategic re-prioritization to make Asia its primary region of interest. However, the U.S. is pursuing uncontested goals in the rebalance:

- Goal 1** Reassure U.S. allies in the region about its commitment.
- Goal 2** Deter China and encourage its peaceful integration into the U.S.-led system.
- Goal 3** Preserve U.S. leadership in the region.

Goal 1 had the unintended consequence of making allies such as the Philippines take riskier actions than before, which hindered achieving Goal 2 and made the U.S. take stronger measures than originally intended. Goal 3 was the most problematic. It is impossible to persuade the rising power to accept the status quo of U.S. hegemony without strategic