

U.S. Alliances and Regional Security Architecture

Victor Cha

Professor, Georgetown University
and Senior Adviser and Korea
Chair, CSIS

Judgment of Failure

- Theory and Areas Studies verdict
 - US unsuccessful at architectural thinking for Asia
- Ineffective
 - EAS/ARF talk shops
- Anachronism - U.S. alliance system
 - Hub and spokes
 - Cold war dinosaurs

Not as bad as you think

- Architecture is emerging and evolving
- U.S. is not leaving
- U.S. alliances are strong, deep, and central
 - Moreover, at threshold of “normative” entity
- China is not taking over
- Answer is not condominium or concert
- Contrary to popular verdicts, U.S. proactive interest
 - Evident during Clinton and Bush

Security Dilemma

- ...But there is a security dilemma
- US-initiated bilateralism or multilateralism seen as containing China
- Asia-initiated multilateralism seen as excluding U.S
- ...but non-zero sum outcomes ARE possible

Theoretical and Empirical assumptions

- No single institution will work (no PATO)
- Adhoc vs. Formal institutions
- Function vs. Process
- Provision of Public goods
- Multilateral and bilateral not diametrically opposed concepts but mutually reinforcing
 - Tsunami relief

Basis of Evolving Architecture

- Not really EAS, but....
- APEC
- US-Asean deep engagement
- “Networking” or “Patchworking” of U.S. alliances
 - TCOG
 - TSD
 - US-Japan-China
 - Quad
 - 6 Party Talks
 - NEAPSM
 - Asia-Pacific Partnership for democracy and development

Ameliorating the Dilemma

- Not aimed at China
 - E.g., agenda of TSD
- Not zero-sum
 - SCO, Asean + 3
- Not exclusive but aimed at inclusion
- To provide public goods

Areas of future cooperation

- US-Japan-China
- US-China-Korea
- APDP
 - Rule of law v. religious freedom?

Alliance System and Comprehensive Security in East Asia

Chinese Perspective :

Alliance System and
Comprehensive Security in East Asia

Jia Qingguo
Peking University

1. The Alliance System in East Asia

- ◇ Military alliances between
 - ◆ US and Japan,
 - ◆ US and South Korea,
 - ◆ US and Australia and New Zealand

2. Comprehensive Security

- ◇ Military security
- ◇ Economic security
- ◇ Ecological security
- ◇ Human security

3. Why Military Alliance after the Cold War?

- External threat is the cause of military alliance. When the cold war ended, many argue that the cold war military alliances would disappear because the Soviet Union was gone.
- Eighteen years has passed. The military alliances have not disappeared. They have survived and some even strengthened.
- Why?

3. Why Military Alliance(con't)

- ◇ Explanations:
 - ◆ Changing nature of the military alliance
 - ◆ Insistence on the part of the US
 - ◆ Fear of uncertainty
 - ◆ Situations of South Korea – North Korea, Japan - China
 - ◆ Maybe a mixture of all these factors

4. Chinese Perspective

(1) In principle, China is opposed to the military alliance system in East Asia because:

- ◇ outdated
- ◇ divisive
- ◇ exclusive
- ◇ anti-China

4. Chinese Perspective (con't)

- ◇ **outdated:** it is an outdated form of security arrangement because it belongs to the cold war
- ◇ **divisive:** it is divisive because it separates countries into "we" and "them"
- ◇ **exclusive:** it is exclusive, hence it is not capable of rallying broad support to accomplish something
- ◇ and it is **anti-China** because explicitly or implicitly, the existing military alliance system in East Asia has a purpose of hedging against China.

4. Chinese Perspective (con't)

- (2) In practice, China has found certain utilities in the existing military alliance system in East Asia.
- ◆ It has helped avoid an arms race in the region.
 - ◆ It has helped keep Japan from becoming militaristic.
 - ◆ It has helped prevent proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

4. Chinese Perspective (con't)

(3) China is in favor of developing a regional multilateral security mechanism.

- ◆ Mutual trust
- ◆ Mutual benefit
- ◆ Equality
- ◆ Cooperation

4. Chinese Perspective (con't)

- (4) China hopes to see a stable and smooth transition from the current military alliance system to a multilateral, inclusive East Asia security cooperation mechanism.
 - ◆ Success of Six-Party Talks could be used as a basis for developing such a mechanism.

4. Chinese Perspective (con't)

- (5) Cooperation in military security can help the process of building mutual understanding and trust between states.
- (6) The Chinese Government has expressed its willingness to engage with other East Asian countries in cooperation in comprehensive security.

4. Chinese Perspective (con't)

(7) Challenges and opportunities

- ◆ Challenges
 - ◆ Lack of trust
 - ◆ Different priorities
 - ◆ Fear of uncertainty in terms of transition

- ◆ Opportunities
 - ◆ Most of the states in the region are in a mood of cooperation
 - ◆ Major powers have good political relations
 - ◆ Both the major powers and most other states are supportive of the Six-Party Talks

4. Chinese Perspective (con't)

- ◆ Proposed measures
 - ◆ Enhance confidence
 - ◆ Building trust
 - ◆ Gradual and smooth transition from the current alliance system to a multilateral cooperation security mechanism

Alliance System and Comprehensive Security in East Asia

Japanese Perspective : Alliance System and Comprehensive Security in East Asia

Yoshihide SOEYA, Ph.D.
Professor of Political Science, Faculty of Law
Director, Institute of East Asian Studies,
Keio University

1. Comprehensive Security : Postwar Japanese Experiences

- Détente and Interdependence as Backgrounds: the 1970s
- Economic Security, Energy Security, Domestic Security: the 1980s
- Environmental Security, Human Security: the 1990s

2. National Defense, Alliance, Comprehensive Security

- National Defense as Denial Capability
- Alliance as Regional Reassurance
- Comprehensive Security as Global Order

3. Alliance and Comprehensive Security under the DPJ Government

- “Close and Equal” Alliance with the United States
- East Asian Community and Alliance
- Hatoyama Diplomacy and East Asian Community
- East Asian Community and Comprehensive Security in East Asia

ROK-US Alliance and Northeast Asian Security: A South Korean Perspective

Chaesung Chun(Dep. Of International Relations, Seoul National Univ.)

I. Searching for new strategic visions in a new era

Factors that affect Northeast Asian security architecture, aside from global megatrends such as globalization, democratization, and IT revolution, are the transformation of American unipolarity or primacy, emerging power transition that comes from rapid development of rival states such as China, and changes in regional politics such as increasing economic interdependence, and the establishment of new leadership in each state.

The ROK-US alliance has its *raison d'être* that arises from the continuing threats from North Korea, but will be faced with new challenges to cope with these new factors if it is to persist. Not only the ROK-US alliance has changed into the concept of the 21st century “strategic alliance, but also the concept of alliance itself is being transformed. As security threats become highly diverse, uncertain, and asymmetric, military alliance needs to deal with new challenges which are not pre-determined and unpredictable. Indeed, uncertainty not only of the origin of threats, but also of the future development of security order, is the challenge that alliances in the 21st century have to deal with.

Then, the purpose of the ROK-US alliance will be the following from the perspective of South Korea:

- To deal with North Korean military threats, especially with the strategy of extended nuclear deterrence
- To compel North Korea to give up all nuclear programs and weapons, and other types of WMDs
- To cope with the contingency and the process of transformation of North Korea in the future, with stable common policy of stabilizing the Korean Peninsula
- To lay a foundation to the alliance based on common strategic views, values, and trust
- To cope with power transition in East Asia, hopefully to manage the process of

power transition peacefully

- To help the transformation of balance of power logic in Northeast Asia, aiming at the development of multilateral security cooperation
- To find South Korea's proper place in global security affairs based upon the future vision of the alliance, and share common vision in dealing with global military and human security threats.

After making the Joint Vision in April, 2009, now the task is to concretize the policy agendas. South Koreans are watching how the basic security strategy of Obama administration will materialize at regional and global level. It is quite sure that the US will want to ensure its continued leadership, especially after the global financial crisis which brought about mounting debate about American decline, and to adjust itself to new security environments. So far, South Koreans are eager to look at Obama doctrine in the area of foreign affairs. A set of inherited problems from the former Bush administration, that is, rising terrorism, global economic turmoil, and weakening soft power, gives hints about the tone for new strategic thinking. Strategic concepts such as "power of balance," "strategic leadership," "partnership," "smart power," and "network power" will affect the future role of the alliances.¹ The withdrawal of the US troops from Iraq, focus on Afghanistan, and enforced efforts to adopt more aggressive diplomatic means "smartly" are some of the changes that already happen. As changing security strategy will affect American strategy of alliance, South Korea will be sensitive to required corresponding efforts from the alliance partner. How South Korea will help the US with redefined global and regional leadership remains to be seen.²

II. New Mission to Prepare for "transitional" North Korea

The most basic mission of the ROK-US alliance, that is, deterrence and defense

¹ Kurt M. Campbell, Nirav Patel, Vikram J. Singh, *The Power of Balance: America in Asia*(Center for a New American Security, 2008); Stephen J. Stedman, Bruce Jones, Carlos Pascual, *Managing Global Insecurity: A Plan for Action*(The Brookings Institution, 2008); Gayle Smith, *In Search of Sustainable Security: Linking National Security, Human Security, and Collective Security to Protect America and Our World*(Center for American Progress, 2008). See also Robert Gates, "Balance," *Foreign Affairs*, Jan/Feb. 2008.

² Kurt M. Campbell, Victor D. Cha, Lindsey Ford, Nirav Patel, Randy Schriver, Vikram J. Singh, Kazuyo Kato, *Going Global: The Future of the U.S.-South Korea Alliance*(Center for a New American Security, 2009)

against any possible North Korean attack, will remain, for the time being, one of the most essential element of the alliance. North Korea's "military first policy" aims at maximizing political effects of military means, legitimizing its dictatorship, and revitalizing its system in the future. With North Korea's continuous efforts to develop nuclear weapons and long-range missiles, the task of making them give up, and providing extended deterrence will be daunting task in the future.

North Korea's continued military provocations such as nuclear or missile test will alarm South Korea as well as Japan and China, leading them to demands on arms increase. Especially if the US appears to be unreliable in providing effective, extended deterrence, South Koreans' worry about the North's nuclear attack will be worsened. Also the alliance's failure to deter the North's nuclear provocation will reinforce nuclear proliferation in Northeast Asian region, leaving China and Japan with undesirable options.

Then, the impending issue is how to denuclearize North Korea. With repeated failure with North Korean nuclear crisis, it becomes clearer that the so-called "action to action" approach will not finally succeed. Also functional cooperation in inter-Korean relations did not spill over to politico-military dimension, in opposition to liberal view.

What we need is North Korea's political and strategic decision that it will conform to the basic rules of international society. Without the decision, it is unlikely that North Korea will gain political guarantee for its survival and economic assistance. North Korea will not give up the nuclear program if they are not sure about the future possibility to survive, especially in terms of the political leadership.

Then, the combination of principled coercion and long-term plan to guarantee North Korea's reformed regime will hasten the decision of North Korean leadership. Although it is not sure whether Kim Jong Il or his successor will make that decision, more comprehensive view to look at both "nuclear" problems and "North Korean" problems is essential. However the so-called the ideas of "grand bargain" or "comprehensive package deal" is not evident in their concrete components.

When we expect the leadership change of the North and subsequent contingencies in North Korean political affairs and system, the ROK-US alliance should be prepared to deal with "transitional" North Korea.³ Success to denuclearize North Korea, will

³ Charles Wolf, Jr., Norman D. Levin, *Modernizing the North Korean System: Objectives,*

leave the alliance with new tasks to further arms control mechanism in subsequent steps to establish peace structure of the Peninsula.

Yet both the US and South Korea seem to be ill prepared to plan and coordinate a long-term, new North Korean policy. There should be intense debate about how to convince North Korean leadership of their survivability with detailed programs of modernizing the North, once they decide to give up nuclear programs. As we don't know how much time is left before the happening of any contingencies, delays in preparing for comprehensive deal will narrow the chance to manage the transition period. All these strategic components are related to more concrete issues such as the future status of USFK, peace agreements, and the military governance of future Korea.

In addition, regardless of our plan, we do not know there will be any chance of reunification of the Peninsula any time soon. Yet it is sure that unprepared process of unification will post great challenge to the alliance managers in dealing with the rapidly changing political, military relations of the Peninsula, and the process of demilitarizing the North.

III. Regional Role to manage power transition peacefully

The ROK-US alliance during the Cold War era, had taken important regional security roles to deal with communist security threats from the former Soviet Union, communist China, and North Korea. To develop trilateral security relations among the US, Japan, and South Korea based on common values such as democracy and market capitalism had been another significant task for the alliance.

The end of the Cold War at the regional level-except continuing threat from North Korea-transformed the regional security environments and the role of the ROK-US alliance as well.⁴

First, the US and South Korea need to develop common strategic view on the "rise of China" and to ponder upon future implication of growing China. Whether strong

Method, and Application(Rand, 2008).

⁴ Ralph A. Cossa, Brad Glosserman, Michael A. McDevitt, Nirav Patel, James Przystup, Brad Roberts, *The United States and the Asia-Pacific Region: Security Strategy for the Obama Administration*(Center for a New American Security, 2009)

China both in economic and military sense will contribute to further stability of Northeast Asian security is to be discussed between two countries. South Korea, which is geographically proximate to, and economically dependent upon China, experiences hard times in correctly evaluating the future implication of the rise of China, and in understanding the US strategy toward China.

The need to cooperate with China is unquestionable. Yet how the growth of economic power of China which will naturally lead to military strength will redirect the US strategy is uncertain to South Koreans. Changing strategic view on future China will redefine the role of the ROK-US alliance and there is a need to prepare for this change.⁵ South Korea desires great power cooperation between the US and China, which will place South Korea in less difficult position. By maintaining strategic cooperative relations with China, and strategic alliance with the US, South Korea tries to set up cooperative trilateral relations. But uncertainty about the future regional security architecture itself will be a challenge.

Second, despite of overall good relationship between South Korea and Japan, it is regrettable that two countries suffer from the lack of common strategic vision for the future security agendas such as the future of North Korea, the rise of China, regional security cooperation, and trilateral security cooperation with the US. The so-called nationalist agendas stretching from territorial disputes to history issues block two countries from forming solid and sustainable basis on which two countries coordinate strategic issues.

With the mounting expectation about DPJ's new East Asian strategy based on the concept of "fraternity" two countries also expect constructive, leading roles of the US in facilitating trilateral coordination. Then, the ROK-US alliance needs to be viewed from trilateral security cooperation.

Third, in the 21st century, we witness the development of network-type of security relations. Simple bilateral relationship or bipolar confrontation will no longer dominate the security architecture. Multilateral, mini-multilateral, trilateral networks mix together.

On one hand, South Koreans want to see the development of Northeast Asian regional security mechanism, possibly one evolving from the Six-Party Talks. Multilateral security cooperation might lessen the working of balance of power logic, which will benefit South Korea, a relatively weak country.

⁵ See Also Nina Hachigian, Michael Schiffer, Winny Chen, *A Global Imperative: A Progressive Approach to U.S.-China Relations in the 21st Century*(Center for American Progress, 2008)

On the other hand, South Koreans do not want to see the development of security networks without the participation of itself, such as trilateral dialogue among the US, China, and Japan.

However, in the age of multi-dimensional, overlapping networks, more significant is the development of security networks which have their own tasks. Both South Korea and the US need to develop security cooperation mechanism for each important issue. For example, issue of dealing with North Korean contingency is hard to be discussed without the help of China. Trilateral dialogue at some point, at some level, will be necessary to properly cope with this kind of incident.

IV. Globalizing the alliance smartly

South Korea has never been a global power. South Korea's market for manufactured and cultural goods has spanned globally, yet South Korea's national strategy has been confined to the Korean Peninsula or Northeast Asia at best. Although South Korea has dispatched its troops to Vietnam, Afghanistan, and Iraq, it has been done rather as a junior partner to the US, lacking its own global strategy. In this process, national consensus for South Korea's global role has been absent.

Now South Korea, with its success in terms of economy, democratization, and socio-cultural influence, aims at contributing to global peace and stability, as is coined in the term, "Global Korea." To implement its strategy globally, South Korea needs a lot of things: well-planned policy goals, concrete target regions and countries, national consensus on the concept of national interests at the "global" level, and proper policy means. Up to now, however, "Global Korea" is not a strategy, but a rhetoric describing South Korea's future vision.

South Korea, then, needs multi-staged, gradual efforts to expand its strategic dimensions, acquire public support, and accumulate successful experiences. South Korean troops dispatched to Iraq, despite of some oppositions, turned out to be successful contribution not just to global stability, but also to consolidation of the ROK-US alliance.

In contrast, killing incident of South Korean civilian missionary group has worsened worries about global mission of South Korean army. Still, South Korea gradually expands its strategic scope in the Middle East, Central Asia, and Africa.

What is crucial is for South Koreans to have their own strategic view on global affairs, and then to find consensus in globalizing the ROK-US alliance. Global missions imposed by the alliance without solid national consensus at first hand might work in the short-term, but will finally fail in the long run. It is regrettable if both countries weaken the possibility of promoting long-term, global alliance by lacking well-staged plans.

Now the issue of dispatching PRT team and support military or policy forces to Afghanistan is rising. What is important is to develop a logic that is sustainable in defining South Korea's global roles, and relevant utility of the ROK-US alliance.

Alliance in the 21st century is not just military partnership against predetermined adversaries. In dealing with uncertain security threats, and human security problems, common values and norms are indispensable in managing security affairs. The concept of strategic alliance in the 21st century, then, contains common values, trust, and norms as crucial elements for future, "smart" alliance. This is especially true in globalizing the ROK-US alliance. When common norms support the basis of the alliance, its global role will gain support from civil societies of both countries.

Values and norms such as non-proliferation, durable peace, modernizing failed states, and solving human security problems are ones that South Korean civil society can easily support, with past experiences in dealing with North Korea and Northeast Asian security problems. When universal values of these specific experiences are realized among South Korean public, global role of South Korean strategy will be supported.

Global perspective for South Korea is important not just for the future role of the alliance. More broadly and more fundamentally, South Korea's future status of "global middle power" will be determined by whether South Korea can find the right place for the ROK-US alliance.

The US, on the other hand, needs to understand that South Korea needs a staged, gradual strategy to globalize its perspective and policies. Also the US effort to make itself understood as legitimate global leader will pave the way for South Korea's advocacy for the US policy.