

be dealt with. Particularly at this moment, the two states stress greater emphasis on the climate pact and play a leading role on the global stage. When it comes to industries, the door to the Chinese market will be open wider to South Korea's service sector as well as the culture and manufacturing companies, while more investment from China will flow into South Korea.

— **WON Heeryong** While the bilateral relations saw impressive achievements over the last 25 years since its establishment, the rapid strain on the relationship over THAAD goes to show that the fundamentals of joint problem-solving are still vulnerable in comparison with the huge potential for improvement. In case of THAAD, intergovernmental dialogue and consequent trust-building is the key. As both governments defer making a clear public announcement on their stances, efforts for exchange and mutual understanding on the civilian level are all the more necessary. Ironically, the two nations have been rather negligent in understanding each other in depth, believing that they know each other well enough already. This should change and we must move on to the next stage of better understanding and coordination.

Jeju Island witnessed the most dramatic changes resulting from the establishment of Korea-China relations. Part of the evidence is a rise in investment from China into the island as well as the large number of Chinese tourists here. However, I should say this is not always a positive development. Due to the giveaway pricing and the poor quality of tourist-package deals offered to Chinese visitors, the image of Jeju Island is suffering. Also, tourists from China have few, if any, chances to meet the local population directly, including merchants and restaurant owners. This means the booming tourism does not translate into a boon for the local economy. We need to break this vicious circle while refining tourism culture among the Chinese. Another issue is Chinese investment in Jeju Island. Most investors prefer indiscriminate development and a sizable tourist zone, but preserving the natural environment

takes precedence among the local population. Thus, investment should be made in such ways that go hand in hand with the local culture as well as with a view to long-term interests. Moreover, government exchanges on the local level and the central level should be separated. While THAAD is a matter for Seoul and Beijing, exchange and cooperation among local governments and the civilian organizations must continue. A sincere dialogue between the two countries will solve discord and possibly boost the relationship to a higher level.

In addition, cooperation is necessary in resolving environmental issues. In the 2015 UN Climate Change Convention Conference, I presented the carbon-free island project to replace all vehicles on Jeju Island with electric cars and to use 100 percent new and renewable energy for electricity by 2030. While advancements in technology are still in progress for tackling climate change, global consensus is also imperative. With the U.S. withdrawal from the Paris Agreement, China has a bigger role to play on this score. On top of that, Asia is expected to be a leading region regarding environmental issues. Particulate Matters(PM) ten or fine dust is a case in point. It is already a serious environmental hazard in South Korea. While the government is striving to solve the problem, an active cooperation on China's part is strongly warranted.



Policy Implications

- Civilian exchange through diverse channels and in various forms should substitute as well as support inter-governmental exchange.
- The deteriorating bilateral relations stand at a crossroads as the new president takes office. Both parties should make exhaustive preparations for the upcoming summit in order to make substantial improvements in the relationship.

Will the U.S. Pivot to Asia Continue under the Trump Administration?



Moderator	John DELURY Associate Professor, GSIS, Yonsei University
Presenter	Bonnie GLASER Director, China Power Project, Center for Strategic and International Studies, United States Yoshihide SOEYA Professor of Political Science, Faculty of Law, Keio University, Japan SHI Yinhong Distinguished Professor, School of International Studies, Renmin University, China CHOI Young-jin Distinguished Professor, Yonsei University / Former Ambassador of the Republic of Korea to the United States
Rapporteur	CHANG Jiseon Global Asia Fellow, East Asia Foundation

— **Bonnie GLASER** Obama's Pivot to Asia started as a strategy to balance against the deep entanglement in the Middle East and obsession with democracy and terrorism throughout the Bush administration. The policy was first raised as a topic as the Asia-Pacific region was emerging as an economic powerhouse as well as a focal point of security matters. In effect, the pivot aroused the U.S. interest in the East Asian region and prompted the country's participation in regional multilateral fora, including the East Asia Summit(EAS). As a response to the growing fear of diminishing U.S. interest in regional security and the increase of Chinese influence in the region, the U.S. has redeployed 60 percent of its naval and air-force assets in the Asia-Pacific region.

However, the Pivot to Asia faltered largely because President Obama failed to convince the domestic constituency and earn its support. President Obama belatedly advocated the Trans-Pacific Partnership(TPP) and again failed to garner enough votes for its ratification in Congress. As for the Trump administration, it has yet to come up with a clear approach towards the Asia-Pacific region. For

example, President Trump has not been emphasizing the importance of multilateral consultation. While he said he would take part in the EAS this fall, the comprehensive U.S. policy on these organizations is not clear. Unlike the Obama administration, the Trump administration has little to talk about values or human rights. Lastly, the U.S. seems poised to engage in foreign policy in a completely different manner from the past. With the advent of "America First," a tectonic shift in the entire world as well as in the Asia-Pacific region is likely.

— **Yoshihide SOEYA** President Trump will not employ the Pivot to Asia strategy for two reasons: First, the Anything but Obama principle also holds true for the Pivot. Second, Trump does not look at the U.S. security policy within the context of international or regional order. Thus, China will less likely be the focal point of Trump's Asia-Pacific policy. President Trump will not follow the Pivot policy, but bases his foreign policy on two pillars: one is to restore "fair trade" vis-a-vis China and Japan in terms of "America first," and the other is the question over North Korea. An unexpected and unlikely cooperation might

come as a byproduct of negotiations on North Korean issues. Meanwhile, economic and trade policies could come into conflict with political and security policies.

No matter how complacent and negligent President Trump could be about all Asian matters, his foreign policy team will nevertheless deem the region as the most pivotal region in the future international order as well as the U.S. grand strategy. The President is not the only decision-maker on U.S. security policy. On top of that, the Middle East looms large as the road ahead remains unpredictable. Currently, President Trump seems so preoccupied with North Korea that he cannot afford to be concerned about the Middle East. Another uncertainty lies with Iran. We will have to see how the nuclear deals with Iran and the consequent situation in the Middle East will unfold. The development in the Middle East will affect the U.S. policy towards Asia and North Korea.

— **SHI Yinhong** Advocating “America First,” the Trump administration is expected to roll back on a large scale from the Asia-Pacific region in strategic as well as diplomatic terms. The U.S. is in the transition from all-round defense to what is regarded as retrenchment. For instance, the U.S. is reducing its trade volume with China. Under the banner of “America First,” it is trying to twist China’s arms to exert more influence on North Korea.

Meanwhile, China wants a more active role. It seeks to forge stronger ties with ASEAN member states while avoiding conflicts. President Xi and Prime Minister Abe of Japan have impressively mended fences with each other and it is expected to result in better Sino-Japan relations in general. As for Korea-China relations, China is shifting away from its latterly aggressive stance. It was only a few months ago when it snarled at Terminal High Altitude Area Defense (THAAD) but now it is easing tension by saying that it does not want to damage the relationship with Korea any longer as a friendly nation.

The U.S. has always had a special interest in Asia, maintained amicable relations with Japan and sought

to protect the world from the threat of North Korea’s nuclear missiles. The Trump administration talks of U.S.-Japan alliance and takes a hardline stance towards China on strategic grounds, which is unlikely to change.

— **CHOI Young-jin** President Trump is unpredictable and hardly fathomable. We should look instead into how the U.S. will respond to East Asia as well as the rise of China before we could squarely comprehend the Pivot to Asia policy. The U.S. began to see China as a key rival since the Bush era and President Obama has noted the significance of East Asia. Asia has become a more critical region than the Middle East to the U.S. Obama’s Pivot to Asia is summed up as cooperation and competition. While TPP represented competition, expanded trade with China amounted to cooperation. Trump promotes “America First.” However, the more he talks about it, the more likely the U.S. will lose its global leadership, which China is likely to assume.

Looking into the East Asia strategy, the U.S. will likely stand by the current relationship with Korea and Japan. Also, it will seek to avoid conflict with China while continuing cooperation and competition at the same time. In other words, the U.S. and China will pursue the path of harmony instead of traditional military conflict. China will compete with the U.S. not in military terms, but in economic terms. President Moon Jae-in of South Korea has an important role to play here, and the success in this regard will largely determine his legacy in five years. To this end, a well-measured, appropriate amount of talk and pressure is required, and President Moon will have to find a solution to the North Korean issues. All of these should start from the ROK-U.S. alliance.

— **John DELURY** Should we take heed to what President Trump, his aides or secretaries say? Who dictates the Asia policy?

— **Bonnie GLASER** Views vary widely among those in the cabinet. Climate change is a case in point. While Secretary Tillerson and others argued for honoring the Paris Agreement, the final verdict in

the end came from the President. For instance, the withdrawal from the TPP as well as the Climate pact and the renegotiation of the NAFTA were all decided by President Trump. He likes to listen to various opinions before making his decision.

— **John DELURY** For China’s part, the retrenchment of the U.S. could present a new opportunity. Could President Xi seize this chance?

— **Bonnie GLASER** Naturally, President Xi found a window of opportunity as the U.S. changes course. China seems poised to make the best of this chance as the U.S. has withdrawn from the Climate Change Agreement.

— **SHI Yinhong** It is obvious that the U.S. is retreating or retrenching in diplomatic and economic terms. President Xi also takes reductionist steps, but he seems to want a superpower status, as well.

— **John DELURY** You said Trump lacks the concept of order. Could you elaborate on that? How will that affect the U.S. role in Asia? From Japan’s perspective, where does its interests lie?

— **Yoshihide SOEYA** Obama’s Pivot to Asia is less of military interaction, but more of a statement of political will. It is an announcement of the U.S. will for world security. When President Obama decided to withdraw U.S. troops from the Middle East, he made this point clear several times. This is a reiteration of its resolution on Asia’s regional security, expressing that the U.S. will continue to regard the Asia-Pacific region as a centerpiece of its strategy. Back to Trump’s Pivot to Asia, the rivalry continues between the U.S. and China for the time being. Now, China may get a chance to realize its strategic vision. Also, China has been trying to form a significant relationship with the U.S. In contrast, the Japanese government does not seem to set a strategic priority. Japan must rely on the U.S. physically. Japan alone cannot face or resist China. That is why Japan deems the U.S. important.

— **John DELURY** How did the Obama administration fare regarding the North Korean issues? What is the future course of the Pivot? And how will Trump handle the North Korea policy?

— **CHOI Young-jin** The U.S.-China rivalry will be the default mode of the relationship. If China were to become stronger than the U.S., it would be less a product of careful planning than a sudden rise from the default. The U.S. wishes a planned resolution to the North Korean problem. They called for Complete, Verifiable, Irreversible Dismantlement (CVID) in 2002 but failed strategically on the negotiation table. The Trump administration still demands CVID. Since North Korea will never agree with that, the status quo will continue. Although it carries considerable risk, it also means that the Moon administration may hold the key to solving the nuclear conundrum of the Korean Peninsula: it should accommodate North Korea and lead the way to an inductive negotiation.

Keywords

U.S., Trump administration, Pivot to Asia, East Asia, China, Middle East, U.S.-China relations.



Policy Implications

- Experts agree that Trump’s foreign policy is unclear and unpredictable. Thus, it is important to observe how the U.S. will respond to the rise of East Asia as well as China. The resource is limited and its allocation remains to be seen for the time being.
- President Trump puts forth “America First” and this could put the U.S. global leadership at risk. Consequently, China may get a chance to realize its strategic vision.
- The future of the Pivot to Asia in the Trump administration is still unclear. Yet, the importance of Asia to the U.S. does not seem to diminish. The current trend points to a growing significance of Korea, China and Japan to the U.S., and the U.S. interest and influence are expected to follow a similar path.
- It remains to be seen whether and how “America First” and Trump’s personal character will come into play in the U.S. conduct of foreign policy towards Korea, Japan, and China.