

grandfather, elite graduates from top universities in Japan. So, Abe tends to follow those who support and praise him. And the people surrounding Abe are conservatives. I heard from an official at the foreign ministry that the people surrounding Abe persuaded him to agree with the deal on the so-called comfort women issue by telling him that it would help him become a great leader embracing both conservatives and progressives. Not only historical issues, but also economic affairs have resulted in aggravating the bilateral ties. In Japan, jobs have increased but there are a number of non-regular workers, which has put them and the whole society under stress. The Japanese government is diverting this stress outside the country. Resolving the historical conflict alone will not resolve the problems in Seoul-Tokyo relations.

— **SUN Seung-hye** Non-governmental exchanges between South Korea and Japan should be viewed from the standpoint that peace between the two countries brings peace to Northeast Asia and to the world. There will be more possibilities of better ties when they regard each other in the context of multilateral relations, instead of a bilateral one, acknowledge their differences in their sentiments and approach each other based on soft power for the purpose of cultural coexistence and sharing. The normalization of South Korea-Japan relations proceeded in the 1990s amid the end of ideological confrontation in the world. With the gradual door opening to Japanese culture from 1998 to 2004 and the co-hosting of the World Cup in 2002, the two countries improved their relations. This also led to art exchanges. Art exchanges seem to be less susceptible to the changes in diplomatic relations between the two countries.

Despite the strain in Seoul-Tokyo relations since inauguration of Prime Minister Abe, exhibitions of Japanese modern art by Yanagi Muneyoshi(at Deog-sungung Branch of the National Museum of Modern and Contemporary Art), Yayoi Kusama(at Daegu Art Museum and Seoul Arts Center) and Takashi Murakami(at PLATEAU, Samsung Museum of Art) were held in South Korea in 2013. All of them were non-governmental exhibitions and enjoyed wide

popularity. This can be explained by South Koreans' familiarity with Japan's modern art. In this context, I would like to ask a question about regionalism found in the South Korea-Japan relations. In the 1990s, Japan held art exhibitions on the theme of putting East Asia together. Looking at the art scene of South Korea and Japan after that, it tended to seek for cosmopolitanism rather than bilateralism. I think such an emotional sympathy is an important factor linking South Korea and Japan.

Keywords

Vision for South Korea-Japan relations, National identity, Non-governmental exchanges between South Korea and Japan, Japan's view on South Korea, Non-governmental cooperation between South Korea and Japan, Historical views of South Korea and Japan, Exchanges between non-governmental organizations of South Korea and Japan, Cultural cooperation between South Korea and Japan

Policy Implications

- South Korea and Japan should push for cooperation on their shared values, culture and tasks. Exchanges between local governments are considered good opportunities to help expand cooperative ties. It is necessary to develop various local events in Japan as venues where the two countries' local governments can share and exchange their experiences.
- Although cultural exchanges at the non-governmental level have been undervalued due to anti-Japanese and anti-Korean sentiments, K-POP songs and dramas are still popular in Japan. Japanese culture, cartoons and animations particularly, also has a sizable fan base in South Korea. This suggests a need to constantly promote non-governmental exchanges through conventional media. The two countries should also pursue 21st century type cultural exchanges based on new media, emerging from the fourth industrial revolution.
- It is increasingly important to view non-governmental exchanges between South Korea and Japan in terms of multilateral relations rather than a bilateral one.
- Conflict between South Korea and Japan has been inevitable as the two countries have gone in the opposite direction while establishing their national identities in the 1990s and 2000s. This problem is expected to remain in place for the time being as the Moon Jae-in government and the Shinzo Abe administration are expected to maintain the status quo.

Cyber Security: Global, Regional, and National Context



Moderator	Angela WOODWARD Deputy Executive Director, Verification Research, Training and Information Centre, United Kingdom
Presenter	Brian EGAN Partner, Steptoe & Johnson Limited Liability Partnership Paul MEYER Senior Fellow, Simon Fraser University, Canada / Former Ambassador of Canada for Disarmament ZHA Daojiong Professor, Department of International Political Economy, Peking University, China LIM Jong-in Professor, Graduate School of Information Security, Korea University / Former Senior Advisor to the President for Cyber Security
Rapporteur	LEE Dongeun East Asia Foundation, Global Asia Fellow

— **Brian EGAN** I previously worked as a legal adviser of the White House and the State Department. There is no big difference in cyber security policies of the former Obama administration and the Trump administration. The Trump administration has made efforts to enhance network security through an integrated approach, while implementing a measure to strengthen the security of computer systems at all government departments. It is also giving consistent efforts to protect key facilities such as power companies by strengthening cyber security, and to defend the U.S. against cyber attack with the cooperation of its allies. However, the U.S. government has an uncomfortable relationship with private security companies. Large IT companies such as Microsoft and Apple have confronted the U.S. government over the issues of sharing personal information and coding technologies. With the European Union set to introduce a law on data protection violation by 2018, a change is expected in the responses to data protection violations by the U.S. companies. Such a change is meaningful because one is not legally obliged to report the violation of

cyber security to intelligence agencies in the U.S. Enacting an international treaty on cyber security is an urgent task, as well. Countries should be able to share information under the international system to identify the origin of cyber attack. It should be dealt with as a prime issue in the renegotiations of North American Free Trade Agreement(NAFTA) or the Trans-Pacific Partnership(TPP). But a cautious approach is necessary because criticism is mounting over the infringement of personal liberty and privacy, following the enactment of Patriot Act, with a controversy also going on over the scope of the State authority to access personal information.

— **Paul MEYER** In the last four years, the threat of a cyber attack against nuclear security has significantly increased. Nuclear security now faces a serious threat, as cyber attacks have been weaponized over the last ten years for the purpose of collecting information and destroying systems. The vulnerability of the U.S. strategic nuclear facilities to a cyber attack is another serious issue. Because a cyber attack can sever power supplies to nuclear facilities, which could eventually lead to meltdown of their nuclear

reactors, it is urgent to enhance protection of critical infrastructure and develop technology capable of detecting the danger in several minutes after the attack starts and bringing the contingencies under control. Transparency in cyber security among world powers such as the U.S. China and Russia should be improved as well. Countries should make a joint agreement under which they exclude each other's nuclear facilities from the target list. They should strengthen mutual trust by establishing norms for responsible behavior. The UN's Human Rights Council should state in a resolution that civilian privacy should also be protected on cyberspace, and define the scope of this privacy under protection.

— **ZHA Daojiong** There are no incentives for countries to cooperate on cyber safety, involving the integration of international technological standards and cyberspace norms. Major issues that should be dealt with include a lack of supranational responsiveness to cyber crimes on a global scale, such as money laundering, financial fraud and terrorism financing; fair competition in cyber markets; and international cyber governance. The efforts to establish international regulations at the World Conference on International Telecommunications in Dubai in 2012 ended in failure. It is urgent to update cyber-related regulations of the World Trade Organization as they were made 30 years ago. Meanwhile, cyberspace is a double-edged sword for China. Amid the expansion of cyber markets, Chinese firms such as Huawei and Xiaomi have grown as global corporate brands through manufacturing, exports and software development; but the development of cyber technologies has also given the government censorship tools, such as the "Golden Shield" to monitor and control the Internet. Cyber issues are becoming more and more important for the U.S. and China, as there is a great possibility for a cyber attack to cause grave damage to U.S. interests. Although the U.S. and China signed a bilateral agreement to guarantee each other's safety and enhance cyber security, they are still making slow progress in establishing rules to support a multilateral cyber security system.

— **LIM Jong-in** WannaCry incident has raised a serious question over the feasibility of sharing information freely in the anonymity of the Internet. The cyber technologies now enables to track the IP addresses used in cyber terror as North Korea has been suspected of being behind the WannaCry case. No matter how complicated the hacking techniques might be, current tracking technology can find out the hackers' fingerprint and identify the origin of the malignant code. As witnessed by the WannaCry ransomware that damaged a British hospital, a German car company and a French railroad firm, cyber attacks have been developed to the level of disrupting the security of society. Cyber terror is regarded as a tempting tool for poor countries to earn money easily as it is available anywhere. It is regarded as cheap nuclear weapon. Besides, Russian hacker groups have recently said they will share these cyber-weapons. If such cyber-weapons spread, they will be a severe threat to the cyber security of the whole world. The Budapest Convention on Cybercrime that began in 2001 showed those efforts for cooperation between countries. As with the convention on cybercrime aimed at sharing information between countries, South Korea also manifested its efforts for trust-building and competence sharing with other countries during the conference on cyberspace in 2013. On top of those efforts, each government needs to cooperate with the private sector and conduct education for cyber illiterates.

● ● ● Policy Implications

- It is urgent to supplement technologies capable of preparing for cyber terrorism that has been consistently sophisticated with the development of new technology. In addition, each country needs to establish cooperative relations between governments and the private sector for information and technology sharing. Each country should promote the peaceful use of cyberspace and enhance education to eradicate cyber illiterates. Especially, an international cooperation system should be established to prevent underdeveloped countries from yielding to the temptation of cyber terrorism.

The NPT: Challenges for the 2020 Review



Moderator **NYAMOSOR Tuya** Former Foreign Minister of Mongolia
Presenter **Nobuyasu ABE** Former UN Under-Secretary General for Disarmament
KIM Won-soo Former UN Under-Secretary General for Disarmament
Rakesh SOOD Former Ambassador to Conference on Disarmament of India
SHA Zukang Former UN Under-Secretary General for Economic & Social Affairs
John TILEMANN Director of Research, Asia Pacific Leadership Network(APLN)
Rapporteur **KIM Hyunjin** East Asia Foundation, Global Asia Fellow

— **NYAMOSOR Tuya** Non-Proliferation Treaty(NPT), was signed in 1968 and came into effect in 1970. Marking its 50th anniversary, a review conference is to be held in 2020. NPT has made a significant contribution to the prevention of nuclear proliferation worldwide. NPT stands on the three pillars of disarmament, non-proliferation and peaceful use of nuclear energy, and today's session will particularly focus on issues related to arms reduction, non-proliferation and regional security.

— **Nobuyasu ABE** As for nuclear arms reduction, negotiations over the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons are thought to be paramount. However, the gap between conflicting views seems difficult to abridge, with one side proposing step-by-step disarmament by participating countries, while the other expressing skepticism over gradualism. In fact, a number of treaties have yet to come into effect some 20 years after the negotiations, which suggests that the step-by-step approach may not be unfolding as expected. We need to find ways to address this. The importance of making actual progress by any means necessary is apprehended when we look at

the case of Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty(CTBT). However well-meant and well-conceived the treaty is, it has failed to be effective for the past 20 years. What is consoling to some extent is that the Nuclear Weapons Ban Treaty is making headway, if little by little. For the success of the 2020 review conference, the Middle East issues have to be settled. They will likely be the source of controversies in the conference and it will be difficult to draw a positive review without any progress on that front.

— **KIM Won-soo** It seems that adopting another treaty than the NPT and operating the two tracks will work well in the international community down the road. In any case, we should acknowledge the noteworthy progress the NPT has made. The absolute quantity of the nuclear arsenals worldwide actually shrunk in the post-Cold-War era and the figure has not grown since 2011. The two nuclear superpowers, the U.S. and Russia, actively engage in the NPT. While the relevance and effectiveness of the NPT itself and the efficacy of Article 6 may be called into question, progress essentially comes down to a matter of leadership exercised by powers.