

The Non-Governmental Exchanges for New Korea-Japan Relations



Chair **CHO Hee-yong** Director, Center for Japanese Studies, Institute of Foreign Affairs and National Security, Korea National Diplomatic Academy
Presenter **HAN Young-hae** Professor, Graduate School of International Studies, Seoul National University
MUN Gyong-su Professor, Department of International Relations, Ritsumeikan University, Japan
Discussant **Yoshihiro MAKINO** Seoul Bureau Chief, Asahi Shimbun
SUN Seung-hye Director, Cultural Exchange Cooperation Division, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Korea
Rapporteur **PARK Sun-young** Researcher, Korea National Diplomatic Academy

— **CHO Hee-yong** The relations between South Korea and Japan have been expanded and developed both qualitatively and quantitatively since the two nations signed a treaty to normalize diplomatic ties in 1965. Their trade once reached more than 100 billion dollars. Last year, more than seven million people were involved in non-governmental exchanges. Another example of the vigorous interactions was the 850 flights between the two countries a week last year. After the normalization of diplomatic relations, South Korea and Japan achieved political, social and economic development and boosted their status in the international community, which also helped complement and develop their bilateral relations. In recent years, however, concerns have been raised by people in both countries over the stagnation in bilateral ties due to past history disputes.

Fortunately, right after the Moon Jae-in government was launched on May. 10th, the heads of the two states held a telephone conversation on May. 11th, during which they called on each other to wisely overcome historical disputes, and agreed to make efforts to establish future-oriented relations and to jointly

respond to North Korea's missile threats. They also agreed to hold South Korea-Japan summit talks at the earliest date. As South Korea and Japan have agreed to stabilize bilateral relations, the two countries are expected to move onto a more mature partnership through practical cooperation. Against this background, non-governmental exchanges are expected to play a more important role for the bilateral ties. In spite of the disputes over history, civil exchange in various fields has admittedly contributed promoting a deeper understanding of each other. Non-governmental exchanges should be expanded to make the potential of bilateral cooperation fully realized.

— **HAN Young-hae** Relations between South Korea and Japan made some progress after 1965, but I think non-governmental exchanges began to see a full-scale increase after President Kim Dae-jung and Prime Minister Keizo Obuchi announced a joint declaration on the South Korea-Japan partnership in 1998. Next year will mark the 20th anniversary of the joint declaration. Over the last 20 years, the two countries have accumulated assets in their relations, though having jarred with each other some-

times. After the joint declaration, the expansion of non-governmental exchanges were accompanied by the deterioration of diplomatic ties. I described the deterioration in relations as jarring each other.

South Korea and Japan have reconstructed their national identities from the late 1990s to the 2000s, and I think the present state of bilateral ties is a result of their opposite ways of national identity building. They regarded some problems arising from the two opposite directions as conflicts, and some incidents occurred, such as Japan's territorial claim to South Korea's islets of Dokdo, former President Lee Myung-bak's visit to Dokdo and Japan's move to create new history textbooks. Those incidents rekindled controversies over the past history, and I think such moves to opposite directions provided the background for the conflicts between them.

Historical issues emerged as an important national agenda in South Korea after the first civilian government took office in the 1990s, followed by the liberal governments of Presidents Kim Dae-jung and Roh Moo-hyun called the "People's Government" and "Participatory Government," respectively. The belief that Korea's national identity was built, and characterized, by the civil revolution and democratized Korea started to take root in Korean society, and I think this exerted influence on South Korea-Japan relations, as well. In Japan, conservative forces emerged to write history textbooks anew after the 1990s, as opposed to the views of the historian Saburo Ienaga. The Japanese government's approval of such textbooks touched off a considerable backlash in South Korea. Also, a conservative group, called Parliamentarians for a Review of Japan's Future and History Education, emerged to spearhead the rightist campaign, and led to erasures in many parts of the history books about Japanese atrocities during wartime. South Korea and Japan were subject to this clash, I think, because of the opposite ways of rebuilding their national identities in the 1990s and 2000s.

Discussions on whether the politically strained South Korea-Japan relations can be improved through non-governmental exchanges began to

emerge in 2005. The same topic is still being discussed. Nothing has changed over the last 12 years. I think this discussion will continue for the time being as President Moon Jae-in and Prime Minister Shinzo Abe are expected to maintain the status quo. As conflict is expected to last for the time being due to the clash of policy directions of the two nations, they would have to admit to their differences and seek solutions to them.

— **MUN Gyong-su** Nippon Kaigi, the Japanese Conference, has a considerable influence upon Japanese society. The rightist organization has infiltrated among parliamentarians and local councilors, as well as engaged in various activities by organizing such groups as the People's Gathering to Draft a Beautiful Constitution and the People's Forum to call for an earlier revision of the Peace Constitution, and by paying homage at the Yasukuni Shrine. The conservative swing in Japan is stronger than observed by outsiders. But it would not be right to sever relations with Japan. I think the agreement between the foreign ministers of the two countries should be fulfilled, too. It was a great historical achievement for South Korea, as the agreement was made in negotiations with a conservative Japanese government.

South Korean and Japanese people have common lifestyles as they both live in information-consuming societies. They also have similar tasks to overcome amid globalization. Civic societies of the two countries need to hold discussions and learn from each other about the issues involving unemployment, low birth rates, aging societies and high rates of suicide. Exchanges between local governments are called for as well.

— **Yoshihiro MAKINO** Last year, Japan staged a strong protest against the installation of a girl statue in Busan symbolizing the victims of Japan's wartime sex slavery. Japan even recalled its ambassador to South Korea. Prime Minister Abe was known to have expressed his frustration with the issue by saying, "Do the South Korean people know how much difficulties I have undergone?" Abe is known to have a serious inferiority complex toward his father and

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