

Talking Points at Jeju Peace Forum

1. On the assessment of the Singapore Summit of June 12.
 - Overall assessment seems to be : “it was a meeting short on substance and long on possibilities.”
 - The meeting produced one and half page, 4 point agreement. The 4 points were rehash of old points and point 3, on de-nuclearization, was a retreat from previous agreements. Short on substance.
 - But, long on possibilities. The atmospherics changed from war to peace and the momentum changed from bottom-up to top-down. The summit can serve as a starting point of a meaningful road to peace, if we stick to the right course.

2. Wish list to guide us in our negotiation with NK
 - First, don't compromise on the sequencing between CVID and rewards.
 - Second, don't compromise on the strength of verification. We must remember why the agreements of 1994 and 2005 collapsed. Each time, NK would not comply with the verification. If verification was important in those times, there's all the more reason why verification must be stronger this time.
 - Third, don't compromise on the strength of the alliance. It has been the linchpin of peace and prosperity in Asia- Pacific for the past 70 years. It has to play the same role in the coming 70 years and beyond.

3. A broader point. The roles to be played by the US and China in Indo-Pacific in the coming years.
 - The US has played a leadership role in the region for the past 70 years, and its impact has been mostly positive. Question: what made it possible for the US to play that role? US attachment to certain set of values and goals: respect for sovereignty and territorial integrity, respect for the rule of law rather than the rule of power, respect for transparency and human rights, non-proliferation of WMD's.
 - Now, China has risen as a major power in the region. What is the expectation of the regional countries for China, as it assumes increasingly important role in the region? To balance its power with the values and goals to ensure peace and prosperity for the whole region.
 - Why do I make this broader point in the context of NK nuclear issue? It is because both US and China have such an important role to play to determine the prospect of the NK nuclear issue. It will make a huge

difference between when they are motivated by broader values and goals and when they are motivated by parochial, narrowly defined national interests. (End)