

# US-ROK-JAPAN'S TRILATERAL COORDINATION FOR A COMPREHENSIVE APPROACH TOWARD NORTH KOREA

*Jong-Chul Park*

Trilateral coordination among Washington, Seoul, and Tokyo will function as a major mechanism through which the ban of weapons of mass destruction and the dissolution of the Cold War system on the Korean peninsula will be discussed.

In the first place, a comprehensive approach will proceed through several channels. First of all, the US-DPRK talks will deal with the North's nuclear and missile development problem and the improvement of diplomatic relations. Second, a resumed Japan-DPRK dialogue will handle the diplomatic normalization and the economic compensation for the North. Third, an inter-Korean dialogue will discuss the implementation of the Basic Agreement of the Two Koreas and the promotion of inter-Korean cooperation.

In addition, a comprehensive approach involves diverse issues such as diplomacy, security, economy, and so on. A variety of issues are interwoven together, and each issue functions as a precondition of accelerating settlement in other areas.

Against this backdrop, the trilateral coordination of US-ROK-Japan is needed to work through a variety of issues and reduces possible disputes among the three countries.

Considering these factors, this paper suggests the specific coordination among the US, South Korea, and Japan concerning the following issues: stopping North Korea's missile development, improving inter-Korean relations as well as the relations of the North with the US and Japan, a peace arrangement on the Korean peninsula, security cooperation of US-ROK-Japan, and multilateral security cooperation.

## I. Introduction

There have been several kinds of bilateral or trilateral consultations among Washington, Seoul, and Tokyo to deal with problems engendered by North Korea such as the development of weapons of mass destruction, military tension, economic crises, and so on. In the process of outlining and implementing the Perry Report,<sup>1</sup> a regular form of trilateral coordination was needed. Therefore, the Trilateral Coordination and Oversight Group (TCOG) among the U.S, Korea, and Japan was formed for this purpose.

The US has been reviewing its policy toward North Korea since the Bush administration took power in February of 2001. The Bush administration has expressed skepticism toward North Korea and is likely to emphasize monitoring and verification as part of its policy toward North Korea.<sup>2</sup> Nevertheless, the Bush administration continues to hold

---

1 President Clinton appointed William Perry as North Korean Coordinator in November of 1998 with a mandate of reviewing the US policy toward North Korea and suggesting policy options. The Perry Report was submitted to the President and Congress on September 15, 1999. The Perry Report consists of two parts, that is, policy suggestions and negotiation proposals. Of these two parts, only the policy suggestion portion was made public.

2 Joint Press Conference by US President George W. Bush and ROK President Kim Dae-jung, March 7, 2001, <http://usinfo.state.gov>.

trilateral consultations among the US, Japan, and South Korea. Two rounds of the TCOG have been held, one in March and one in May, since the inauguration of the Bush administration.

The trilateral approach of US-ROK-Japan is needed to work through a variety of issues and reduce possible disputes among the three countries. Trilateral coordination will enhance the three nation's ability to negotiate vis-a-vis the North, making it easier to persuade the North. Also, it will provide a common response to the changing security situation on the Korean peninsula and in Northeast Asia.

Trilateral coordination will function as a major mechanism through which weapons of mass destruction could be banned and the dissolution of the Cold War system on the Korean peninsula could be discussed. A comprehensive approach achieved through trilateral coordination will be carried out by several channels and combined to resolve various issues.

First, a comprehensive approach will proceed through three pairs of bilateral relations. The US-DPRK talks will feature prominently in this comprehensive approach. They will deal with North Korea's missile program, the lifting of economic sanctions, improving diplomatic relations, and other issues. Second, in parallel with ameliorating the US-DPRK relations, Japan-DPRK dialogue will proceed. These discussions will deal with pending issues between the two countries such as the timing of diplomatic normalization and the condition and amount of economic compensation to be paid to the North. Third, in the wake of the summit meeting, an inter-Korean dialogue will deal with practical ways to promote reconciliation and cooperation.

In addition, a comprehensive approach involves diverse issues such as diplomacy, security, economy, and so on. A variety of issues are woven together, and each issue functions as a precondition that could accelerate settlement in other areas.

Considering these elements, this paper will suggest the means by which these three countries can coordinate their policies to put into

effect a comprehensive approach towards North Korea. In particular, it will recommend specific coordination measures concerning the following issues: halting missile development, improving inter-Korean relations as well as the relations of the North with the US and Japan, a peace arrangement on the Korean peninsula, security cooperation between the US-ROK-Japan, and multilateral security cooperation. This paper will propose a kind of road map for trilateral cooperation on these issues.

## **II. The Prospect for the Three Sets of Bilateral Relations with North Korea**

With regard to the changing relations between the US, South Korea, and Japan with North Korea, several points might be assumed.

First, the three sets of bilateral relations with North Korea are likely to improve gradually in the long run, even though there might be ups and downs. The two Koreas, the US and Japan would prefer a policy of compromise and coexistence through trial and error, with the realization that they may sometimes pass through periods of stalemate and crisis.

Second, the three pairs of bilateral relations with the North are interconnected and mutually influence one another. The three pairs of bilateral relations with the North are not separate relationships, but rather parts of a structurally intermingled whole. The subsequent negotiation will be a complex process involving four actors.

Third, these changing relations with North Korea are expected to evolve through three stages: short-term period, mid-term period, and long-term period. At each stage, three pairs of bilateral relations with North Korea must be coordinated among Washington, Seoul, and Tokyo.

## **1. US-DPRK Relations**

The Bush administration is expected to resume a dialogue with North Korea after completing its policy review of the North. The US has several policy objectives toward North Korea: halting the spread of weapons of mass destruction, reducing tensions on the Korean peninsula and building a peace regime on the Korean peninsula.

The short-term objective of the comprehensive approach is to halt Pyongyang's missile tests. The US agreed to ease economic sanctions partially as a compensation for the DPRK's suspension of missile launches in September of 1999.<sup>3</sup> Specific administrative measures to lift sanctions were taken in June of 2000.<sup>4</sup> North Korea has to continue its moratorium on missile tests.

In the mid-term period, the opening of a liaison office between Washington and Pyongyang will mark a turning point in the relationship between the two countries. A liaison office will be opened in accordance with the North's consent because technical issues have already been resolved through working-level talks on this problem.<sup>5</sup> This was reportedly discussed in detail when Pyongyang's special envoy, Cho Myong-Rok, visited Washington,<sup>6</sup> and when then-U.S. Secretary of State Madeleine Albright visited Pyongyang in October of 2000.<sup>7</sup>

---

3 Easing Sanctions Against North Korea, Washington, D.C., Office of the White House Press Secretary, September 17, 1999.

4 Federal Register, Vol. 65, No. 118/Monday, June 19, 2000, Rules and Regulations.

5 North Korea was reported to hesitate to open a liaison office because of the lack of human and financial resources to operate a liaison office and the possible leakage of information on North Korean society.

6 "U.S.-DPRK Joint Communiqué," October 12, 2000. Seoul, US Embassy, USKO-REA@PD.STATE.GOV

7 Secretary of State Madeleine K. Albright Press Conference, Koryo Hotel, Pyongyang, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, October 24, 2000. napsnet@nautilus.org

The North must completely halt its nuclear weapons development program. Two rounds of inspections at Kumchangri in the spring of 1999 and the spring of 2000 proved that the site was not being used for nuclear development. Also, there should not be any more suspicious underground sites like Kumchangri. Moreover, Pyongyang should accept a special inspection of the Youngbyun area when the cores of the light water reactors are delivered to the North in accordance with the Geneva Agreement of 1994. As a result of this inspection, the past history of nuclear development in the North should be made apparent.

Also, Pyongyang should put a stop to the development and exportation of missiles. The US intends to address this problem by combining the US-DPRK bilateral missile talks with the multilateral mechanism of the Missile Technology Control Regime (MTCR). However, the MTCR is not sufficient to restrain the North from developing its missile program. The MTCR attempts to constrain the export of missiles with a range in excess of 300 kilometers and with payloads of over 500 kilograms. The MTCR cannot regulate the independent development of missiles without support from abroad. Moreover, the MTCR is a self-control agreement without an inspection institution like the IAEA of the NPT. Given this fact, two options are available: the North's joining the MTCR with additional strict conditions, and/or the imposing of special obligations on the North by a separate US-DPRK agreement.

In regards to the US-DPRK relations, a substantial part of the US policy towards the North is to help the North join international financial institutions such as the IMF, IBRD, and ADB, enabling it to acquire loans from these monetary institutions.

The conclusion of Agreement on Nuclear Energy Cooperation between Washington and Pyongyang will be necessary when the light water reactor is handed over to the North. For that purpose, the US needs to lift sanctions on transferring nuclear technology based on the Atomic Energy Act and the Nuclear Nonproliferation Act.

As trade increases between the US and the DPRK, the establishment

of Trade Representatives in Washington and Pyongyang will be possible. This occurrence will be a sign not only of the expansion of economic relations but also of enhanced diplomatic relations between the two nations.

On the other hand, the US will seek to affirm negative security assurance for the North in order to persuade the North from developing weapons of mass destruction. Negative security assurance means the guarantee of non-aggression unless the North first provokes the US.

In the long-term, the US should eventually lift all remaining sanctions by giving the DPRK Most Favored Nation (MFN) status and General System of Preferences (GSP) status. However, the granting of MFN and GSP status may be delayed after the diplomatic normalization considering the history of the US-China and US-Vietnam normalization process.<sup>8</sup>

Also, a US-DPRK Friendship and Cooperation Treaty could be signed on the occasion of the normalization of diplomatic relations between Washington and Pyongyang. The conclusion of the Treaty will mark another turning point in the US-DPRK relationship by including non-aggression, friendly and good neighbor clauses, common interests in peace and cooperation, and other terms.

## ***2. Japan-DPRK Relations***

Japan-DPRK relations will be influenced by the progress of the comprehensive approach and the speed of the US-DPRK relations and inter-Korean relations. Above all, the nuclear and missile issues will be decisive factors in the negotiation process.

---

8 Vladimir N. Pregelj, Robert G. Sutter, Alan K. Yu, Larry Q. Nowels, *Vietnam: Procedural and Jurisdictional Questions Regarding Possible Normalization of US Diplomatic and Economic Relations* (Washington D. C.: Congressional Research Service, August 4, 1994), pp. 33-36.

In the short-term, in appreciation of Pyongyang's suspension of missile launches, Japan lifted the sanctions that were imposed after the North's missile launch in August of 1998. In addition, a Japanese delegation visited Pyongyang and reached an agreement to resume normalization talks, provide food aid, and cooperate to investigate the kidnapped Japanese in December of 1999. As a result, three rounds of normalization talks between Tokyo and Pyongyang have been held: one each in April, August, and October of 2000.

In the mid-term, Japan would provide Overseas Development Aid (ODA) in return for the North's permission to allow Japanese wives to visit Japan and for its cooperation in obtaining information about the kidnapped Japanese by the North. Also, Trade Representatives in Tokyo and Pyongyang may be established.

In the long-term, the US-DPRK relations, inter-Korean relations, and the resolution of conflicting issues between the two countries will affect the diplomatic normalization between Tokyo and Pyongyang. Among the pending issues of normalization talks, the interpretation of the Japanese colonial rule and the kidnapping of Japanese citizens would be compromised by concessions from both sides. The past history of the ROK-Japan normalization experience in 1965, in which Japan vaguely expressed regret for its colonial rule, may serve as a precedent for the DPRK-Japan normalization. The Japanese kidnapping issue could be settled in another way such as through the North's cooperation in the investigation of missing people.

The most difficult issue will be the volume and type of economic compensations given to the North. Economic compensations are a strong incentive for the North and useful leverage wielded by Japan. Economic compensations are also likely to follow the ROK-Japan normalization precedent. Economic compensations would be granted in the form of a public or commercial loan funded by the ODA.



### **3. Inter-Korean Relations**

In the short-term, in the wake of the inter-Korean summit meeting, the two Koreas have held several types of meetings: special envoy's talks, ministerial meetings, working level meetings, and red-cross meetings. These meetings have been effective mechanisms through which to discuss priority items of cooperation, and follow-up measures to fulfill the Joint Agreement signed during the summit meeting in June of 2000.

Inter-Korean relations have been stalemated since the advent of the Bush administration. North Korea reiterated that an inter-Korean dialogue would come to a deadlock unless the US-North Korean dialogue is reopened. Ministerial meetings and red-cross meetings were cancelled and the formation of a single table tennis team between the two Koreas was delayed. Nevertheless, inter-Korean relations will be restarted along with the resumption of dialogue between Washington and Pyongyang.

In particular, practical measures to facilitate the reunion of separated family members are expected to be discussed in the red-cross talks: the setting up of a meeting place and postal exchange centers, confirmation of the whereabouts of family members, and exchanges of letters. The humanitarian agenda should include not only those who have been separated since the Korean War, but also the South Korean abductees and South Korean Prisoners of War (POW).

The most pragmatic sector of the South-North relations will be economic exchanges and cooperation programs. Economic cooperation aims at achieving a balanced development of the national economy from which both the South and the North will benefit. For example, the connection of railways between the two Koreas will enable both countries to export goods at lower prices. The joint flood control project on the Imjin River is beneficial to both the South and the North. Furthermore, a special economic area for the inter-Korean joint venture will

add momentum to economic cooperation between the two Koreas.

In the mid-term period, at the government level, the process of reconciliation and cooperation will proceed: the provision of public and commercial loans, toning down the North's rhetoric, military confidence building, establishing trade representatives, and so on.

At the civilian level, increasing economic investment in the North and agricultural cooperation will also follow. Economic cooperation can be carried out in the form of governmental economic aid, civilian investment in the North, and international consortiums.

In the long-term, the institutionalization of inter-Korean relations will materialize. As inter-Korean committees function in order to implement the Basic Agreement between the two Koreas, inter-Korean relations will be activated in almost all areas. As a result, the exchanges and cooperation in economic, social, and cultural areas will be encouraged.

In addition, operational arms control and structural arms control will be implemented. Finally, the conclusion of a peace arrangement on the Korean Peninsula will be the last step to the institution of a permanent peace mechanism.

### **III. Coordination among the U.S., ROK, and Japan**

#### ***1. Burden Sharing to Halt the North's Missile Program***

The North Korean missile issue includes several sub-items: stopping the testing of long-range missiles, stopping the export of middle-range missiles and the dismantlement of deployed middle-range and short-range missiles. North Korea will use the diversified missile issue to try and obtain material payoffs.<sup>9</sup> North Korea reportedly

---

9 For the diverse objectives of North Korea's missile development program, refer to the following. Hong Young-Pyo, *North Korea's Missile Development Strategy* (Seoul:

<The Prospect for the Three Sets of Bilateral Relations with North Korea>

	Short-term	Mid-term	Long-term
US-DPRK relations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*North Korea's continuation of the moratorium on missile testing</li> <li>*additional lifting of economic sanctions by the US</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*the opening of a liaison office</li> <li>*special inspection of the Youngbyun area</li> <li>*putting a stop to the export and development of missiles</li> <li>*the North's joining of the MTCR</li> <li>*the North's joining of the IMF, IBRD, ADB and receipt of loans</li> <li>*US-DPRK nuclear energy cooperation treaty</li> <li>*establishing trade representatives</li> <li>*US's negative security assurance for North Korea</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*the lifting of all economic sanctions, granting MFN and GSP status</li> <li>*diplomatic normalization</li> <li>*conclusion of a friendship and cooperation treaty</li> </ul>
Japan-DPRK relations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*lifting economic sanctions on North Korea imposed in August of 1998 by Japan</li> <li>*food aid</li> <li>*resumption of normalization talks</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*granting loans to the North</li> <li>*establishing trade representatives</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*granting economic compensations for the Japanese colonial rule</li> <li>*diplomatic normalization</li> </ul>
Inter-Korean relations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*government level: summit meeting and several official dialogue channels,</li> <li>*civilian level: activation of economic and social cooperation, special economic area for inter-Korean economic cooperation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*government level: loans to the North, military confidence building, and establishing representatives</li> <li>*civilian level: expansion of economic and social cooperation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*government level: implementation of the Basic Agreement between the two Koreas, activation of several committees, arms control, and conclusion of a peace arrangement</li> <li>*civilian level: expansion of economic and social cooperation</li> </ul>

has requested one billion US dollars per year for three consecutive years in return for the halting of its missile exporting since the third round of the US-DPRK missile talks in October of 1998.<sup>10</sup> Moreover, during the summit meeting between Kim Jung Il and Russian President Vladimir Putin in July of 2000, Pyongyang asked that another country launch its satellites two or three times annually.<sup>11</sup> North Korea was supposed to reiterate the same idea on the occasion of its special envoy, Cho Myong Rok's visit to Washington when US Secretary of State Madeleine Albright visited Pyongyang in October of 2000.<sup>12</sup>

The comprehensive approach seeks to give the North an opportunity to overcome its hardships and co-exist with neighboring countries on the condition that it abandons its missile program. It tries to present material incentives for the North to choose the coexistence path. One of the ways is to trade development aid for the missile program. Development aid would change the assistance that the North receives from provisional humanitarian aid to long-term aid, which would enhance the developmental potential of the North.<sup>13</sup>

There are multilateral and bilateral mechanisms through which to provide payoffs to Pyongyang. One of the multilateral aid mechanisms is to form a "North Korea Development Fund" in the IMF, IBRD, and ADB and provide loans in return for the cessation of the missile program. If this occurred, the total amount of funds and the scale of donations from possible contributors would be important issues. The US, Japan, ROK, and the EU can be donors to that special fund. To that

---

Korea Institute for National Unification, 1999).

10 *The Hankyoreh*, July 13, 2000.

11 *Washington Post*, August 3, 2000.

12 Michael R. Gordon, "How Politics Sank Accord on Missiles With North Korea," *The New York Times*, March 6, 2001; Wendy R. Sherman, "Talking to the North Koreans," *The New York Times*, March 7, 2001.

13 Bradley O. Bobson, "*North Korea Economy Today: North Korea on the Brink*," an unpublished paper, January 1999.

end, the US economic sanctions against the North based on human rights violations should be lifted so that Pyongyang can join international financial institutions and receive loans.<sup>14</sup>

Support for agricultural development could be in another form of aid through a multilateral mechanism. North Korea had already asked the UNDP for 300 million dollars for agricultural reform in May of 1998.<sup>15</sup> A multilateral support mechanism to assist this program could be developed. Also, the Korean Agricultural Development Organization (KADO), which consists of South Korea, the US, Japan, China, and the EU, can be a form of multilateral cooperation for the purpose of rehabilitating agricultural land, reforestation, and the development of irrigation facilities.<sup>16</sup>

On the other hand, some kind of remuneration could be provided to Pyongyang through bilateral negotiations. The US is concerned primarily with the testing and development of long-range missiles and the export of middle-range missiles. The US is rightly responsible for providing incentives to the North in exchange for Pyongyang's making concessions in its missile program. Nevertheless, the US is not likely to

---

14 The US categorized the North as a human rights violator and restricts its joining in the international financial institutions through the influence on the American members of board. Zachary S. Davis, Larry A. Niksh, Larry Q. Nowels, et al., *Korea: Procedural and Jurisdictional Questions Regarding Possible Normalization of Relations with North Korea* (Washington D.C.: Library of Congress, November 29, 1994), pp. 21-36; North Korea was classified as one of terrorism sponsor states because of giving a haven for Japanese red-army and providing weapons for the Philippine terrorists in May of 2001. US Department of State, *Patterns of Global Terrorism 2000* (April 2001).

15 North Korea proposed a mid-term and long-term food self-sufficiency plan requiring \$2 billion at the conference on Agricultural Recovery and Environmental Protection: AREP, held in Geneva in May of 1998. North Korea primarily asked for 300 million dollars for recovering flood damages, repairing fertilizer factories, diversifying crops, strengthening peasant finance institutions, and a reforestation program for the period of 1998-2000. *Report for the Thematic Roundtable Meeting on Agricultural Recovery and Environmental Protection in the DPRK* (<http://undp-dprk.apdip.net>).

16 *Donga Daily Newspaper*, August 1, 1998.

contribute cash because of its conservative Congress. Therefore, the US is likely to formulate another multilateral mechanism similar to KEDO or arrange an international loan rather than offer financial compensation independently.

Japan is a probable candidate for offering material compensations to the North. Japan was upset by the missile test that flew over the Japanese islands in August of 1998. Shocked by the missile test, Japan delayed its support for KEDO and imposed sanctions against Pyongyang: suspending normalization negotiations, stopping food aid, and halting chartered flights to Pyongyang. In addition, Japan agreed to join the development project of Theater Missile Defense (TMD) beginning in 1999.<sup>17</sup> However, Japan was soon persuaded to continue its support for the KEDO project and signed the 'Resolution on Burden Sharing of KEDO' in November of 1998. Nevertheless, Japan reiterated that it would stop its financial support for KEDO in the case of another missile test from the North.

Japan is especially concerned not only with the development of the Daepodong 1 but also with the deployment of Nodong missiles because the already-deployed Nodong missiles can reach Japan. Therefore, Japan is likely to put more emphasis on the deployment of Nodong missiles than the export or development of long-range missiles.

Japan would like to accentuate the rewards for abandoning its missile program in the context of normalization talks with Pyongyang. The scale of economic compensation in the normalization talks will be determined by the solution of pending issues such as kidnapping, reparations for the Japanese colonial rule, the visits of Japanese wives to Japan, nuclear and missile development, and so on. Japanese economic compensation might be provided as part of ODA. Japan

---

17 The US and Japan Security Consultative Committee agreed to proceed joint research on TMD in September of 1998 beginning 1999. "Joint US-Japan Statement on Security Meeting," USIA Text, Washington, 1998. 9. 21.

would count payments for stopping its missile development as part of the economic compensation of normalization.

On the other hand, South Korea's position on the payoffs for North Korea is subtle. At first, Pyongyang's intermediate missile development does not pose a new threat to Seoul. Most of South Korea had been already within the range of the North's artillery and short-range Scud missiles. After all, Seoul is located only 40 kilometers from the forward-deployed North Korean artillery.

However, North Korea's missile development will reduce the US commitment to South Korea. In addition, North Korea is likely to threaten Japan in case of an emergency on the Korean peninsula. Also North Korea's missile capability will restrain Japan's support for the US army stationed in Japan. Considering these elements, South Korea cannot help but express some concerns over Pyongyang's missile program.

South Korea does not want to exaggerate the missile issue. The Kim Dae-jung government seeks to pursue an engagement policy in spite of military tensions. In this context, Seoul has tried to maintain close coordination with the US and Japan in order to ease tensions created by the missile development problem. South Korea has also made an effort to share information on the North's missile development and discuss possible options with allied countries.

Although it is inevitable that South Korea bears a part of the funds for the North, it should be limited to a minimal level. The fact that the South already shoulders 70% of the cost of the KEDO project should be taken into account. The ROK's portion for compensations to the North should be arranged in consideration of the ROK's burden sharing of the defense cost of the US-ROK alliance.

## ***2. Inter-Korean Relations in parallel with Pyongyang's rapprochement with Washington and Tokyo***

In dealing with the North Korean issue, the status of inter-Korean relations has been one of the sources of dispute among the US, ROK, and Japan. In particular, in the process of the US-DPRK nuclear negotiations, the ROK's request for an inter-Korean dialogue was a cause of dispute between Washington and Seoul. However, the Kim Dae-jung government put an end to any possibility of a dispute between Washington and Seoul in their policy towards North Korea by accommodating the improved relations between Washington and Pyongyang without demanding inter-Korean dialogue. The advent of the policies of the Kim Dae-jung government can be a good chance for Washington and Seoul to coordinate their strategic goals and policies toward North Korea.

Seoul anticipates that the rapprochement by the North in international relations will lead to Pyongyang changing its internal and external policies and eventual inter-Korean reconciliation. In this sense, the ROK endeavored greatly to formulate the Perry's comprehensive approach that proposed the diplomatic normalization with the North. Following this scheme, an inter-Korean dialogue at the government level is not likely to be connected mechanically to the US-DPRK and Japan-DPRK relations. Inter-Korean reconciliation is expected as a natural outcome of the general thawing of the ice in the North's international relations.

Some experts worry that Pyongyang will drive a wedge between Washington and Seoul by putting priority on the US-DPRK relations and neglecting an inter-Korean dialogue. However, Washington's policy toward Pyongyang will be in close consultation with the ROK and Japan. Moreover, Pyongyang cannot help but acknowledge that Seoul can provide economic resources, which the US and Japan cannot do in the short-term.



Therefore, it is important that the inter-Korean rapprochement and Pyongyang's expanding foreign relations mutually reinforce one another. While inter-Korean reconciliation is a conducive environment for Pyongyang's open policy, Pyongyang's joining international society is likely to induce its conciliatory attitude toward the South.

Especially, the improvement in the US-DPRK relations and Japan-DPRK relations is closely interlinked with inter-Korean relations. Seoul's consultations with the U. S. and Japan must be strengthened in a way to help the North make inroads into the international community and to contribute to inter-Korean cooperation.

Specifically, inter-Korean economic cooperation would be vitalized along with improved relations between the DPRK and the US and Japan. For example, if the US lifted economic sanctions against the North, South Korean enterprises could invest in the North through their subsidiaries operating in the US and export jointly-produced goods to the US and Europe. Also, South Korean business groups could form joint ventures to invest in the North.

The opening of a liaison office between Washington and Pyongyang will bring similar advances in Japan-DPRK relations and inter-Korean relations. Liaison offices or representative offices should be established in Tokyo and Pyongyang, and Seoul and Pyongyang, respectively. In addition, to keep abreast with the diplomatic normalization of Pyongyang with Washington and Tokyo, the re-activation of inter-Korean Joint Committees and the institutionalization of inter-Korean relations should accompany these developments.

### ***3. Bringing about a Peace Regime on the Korean Peninsula***

The long-term objective of this comprehensive approach is to bring peace and stability to the Korean peninsula and end the Cold War system by establishing a permanent peace regime to replace the armistice system. The peace regime on the Korean peninsula is

intimately interwoven with the US-DPRK relations and inter-Korean relations. The peace arrangement on the Korean peninsula involves several issues: the role of the participants, the format of a peace agreement, a guarantee system, and so on. Also, the peace arrangement will impact the status of the United Nations Command, the status of US forces in Korea, and the role of the US-ROK alliance. Moreover, arms control is the critical factor determining the feasibility of a peace regime on the Korean peninsula.

At present, the Four-Party Talks is a mechanism with which to establish a peace regime on the Korean peninsula. The Four-Party Talks is an experiment in which the international aspects of inter-Korean relations can be coordinated with the initiatives of the two Koreas in security issues.

Two critical issues of the Four-Party Talks are the agenda and the division of roles among participants. In the third round of talks in October of 1998, an agreement was reached to form two subcommittees on the creation of a peace regime and the reduction of tensions. Nevertheless, participants differ in their view of the priority of issues and their approach to the agenda. Washington and Seoul proposed to primarily discuss confidence building and reduction of tensions on the Korean peninsula. In contrast, Pyongyang insisted on the withdrawal of the US forces from the South and a conclusion of a separate peace treaty with the US. Although Pyongyang came to the table at the Four-Party Talks, it has made efforts to use this opportunity to negotiate mainly with the US.<sup>18</sup>

Tension reduction measures and procedures for peace arrangement should be dealt with simultaneously at two levels: the inter-Korean level and the four-party level. President Kim Dae-jung declared a guideline to deal with peace and security on the Korean peninsula in

---

18 For the agenda and controversial issues of the Four-Party Talks, refer to the following. Park Young-Ho and Park Jong-Chul, *Strategy for the Four-Party Talks: Focusing on the Operation of Subcommittees* (Seoul: Korea Institute for National Unification, 1999).

March of 2001: discussing tension reduction with North Korea on the occasion of Kim Jong-il's visit to Seoul and discussing the formation of a peace regime during the Four-Party talks.<sup>19</sup>

In the first place, military confidence building measures on the Korean peninsula have to be discussed and carried out through the inter-Korean military committee, not through the Four-Party Talks. The two Koreas should find a practical means to implement confidence-building measures as stipulated in the Basic Agreement between the two Koreas in 1992. This will encompass the following items: the establishment of a military hot line, exchanges of military personnel, exchanges of military information, and notification of military exercises.

Next, the Four-Party Talks should concentrate on hammering out a viable peace arrangement. Even if the Four-Party Talks is the main venue for arranging a peace regime on the Korean peninsula, inter-Korean initiatives should be respected in order to create a stable peace regime. The two Koreas should be required to draft a peace agreement. Then the four parties could sign the peace agreement. It is equivalent to a peace treaty replacing the armistice agreement of 1953. The four parties will collectively guarantee this peace agreement.<sup>20</sup>

In addition, it is anticipated that Japan and Russia will complement this new peace arrangement by an additional guaranteeing system such as the Six-Party Talks or a multilateral security cooperation body in Northeast Asia.

---

19 Kim Dae-jung expressed this view in the Seminar organized by American Enterprise Institute, March 9, 2001.

20 Tae-Hwan Kwak, "The Korean Process: Prospects for Peace Regime Building After the Summit," *International Journal of Korean Unification Studies*, Vol. 9, No. 1 (2000), pp. 26-27.

#### **4. The Prospect for Security Cooperation of U.S.-ROK-Japan**

The long-term objective of this comprehensive approach and the ending of the Cold War on the Korean peninsula will impact the security situation on the Korean peninsula. It will engender changes in the US-ROK alliance, Japan-ROK relations, and the general power distribution of Northeast Asia.

First, the comprehensive approach will usher in a new security arrangement and a changed US-ROK alliance. If North Korea's threat is reduced and a peace system is established on the Korean peninsula, the US-ROK alliance should be a regional security alliance that focuses on the maintenance of peace and security in the Asia-Pacific area.<sup>21</sup> While the primary function of the US-ROK alliance in the Cold War era was to deter North Korea's provocations, it should play a balancing role and pursue cooperative security in the post-Cold War era.

Along with the changes in the US-ROK alliance, the role of US forces in Korea and their reduction will be discussed. Even if the North reiterated its demand for the withdrawal of the US forces from Korea, it implied indirectly that it would be willing to accept the change of a status of the US forces and its gradual reduction instead of an all-out withdrawal. It was reported that Pyongyang views the presence of the US forces as a means by which to constrain South Korea's military buildup and prevent an arms race between Japan and China.<sup>22</sup> In the summit meeting between the two Koreas, Kim Jong-il reportedly implied that the North accepts the presence of the US forces in return for the US's guarantee of its system.

A gradual reduction of the US forces will be discussed. The US

---

21 Concerning the specific contents of regional security alliance of US-ROK, refer to the following book. Jonathan D. Pollack and Young Koo Cha, *A New Alliance for The Next Century: The Future of US-Korean Security Cooperation* (Washington D. C.: Rand Corporation, 1995).

22 Interview with Selig Harrison, *Joongang Daily News Paper*, September 28, 1995.

ground forces will be diminished with minimal naval and air forces. Strategic naval and air forces will be highlighted more than ground forces.<sup>23</sup> The backward deployment of the remaining US forces will also be implemented.

Second, the ROK-Japan security cooperation will be sought in the changed security situation of Northeast Asia. The ROK-Japan security cooperation is likely to be coordinated through the intermediation of the US. Two separate allies of the US would be interconnected through the ROK-Japan security cooperation. As a result, a quasi-alliance will be formulated among the US, Japan, and South Korea.<sup>24</sup>

The ROK-Japan security cooperation is expected to contribute to peace and stability on the Korean peninsula and throughout Northeast Asia by seeking common security. It will focus on conflict resolution and preventive diplomacy in Northeast Asia rather than the deterrence against the North.

The ROK-Japan security cooperation can be initiated with confidence building measures such as the exchanges of military information, exchanges of military personnel, mutual visits of naval ships, opening of a military hotline, regular military meetings, and so on. Also, naval cooperation will be possible in such areas as sea lanes, refugees problems, sea rescue, and so on.

It is recommended that the ROK and Japan take care not to provoke China by their security cooperation. The goal of the ROK-Japan security cooperation is not to deter China but to seek common interests, and this should be understood by China. Also, the simultaneous bilateral security cooperation between the ROK-China and Japan-China should

---

23 Zalmay Khalilzad, David Orletsky, and et al., *The United and Asia: Toward a New US Strategy and Force Posture* (Rand Corporation, 2001).

24 Quasi alliance is defined as the relationship between two states that remain unallied despite sharing a common ally. Victor Cha analyzed Japan-South Korean relations in the context of quasi alliance. Victor D. Cha, *Alignment Despite Antagonism: The US-Korea-Japan Security Triangle* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1999).

be enacted in order to dissipate Chinese apprehension.

Third, the new security alliance between the US and Japan contains the implications for the Korean peninsula. Washington and Tokyo forged the US-Japan New Security Guideline in September of 1997 to re-define the US-Japanese alliance. The New Security Guideline recognizes an expanded military role for Japan in East Asia for cooperative security.

In particular, the New Security Guideline called for the support of the Japanese self-defense forces for the US troops in the case of an emergency on the Korean peninsula. The Japanese self-defense forces are expected to support the US army stationed in Japan mainly through logistical means and join in activities such as minesweeping and an inspection of ships.<sup>25</sup>

In regard to this issue, tripartite consultations among the US, Japan, and South Korea have been undertaken. In particular, the position of South Korea, which will be the primary country concerned with the contingency plan on the Korean peninsula, should be respected. Tripartite coordination contains favorable aspects in deterring North Korean provocations. However, since it will officially permit a Japanese military role on the Korean peninsula, it should be dealt with caution in light of the delicate relations between Seoul and Tokyo tracing back to the period of Japanese colonialism.

### ***5. Initiating Multilateral Security Cooperation in Northeast Asia***

Creating new security arrangements would end the Cold War on

---

25 For the analysis of the US-Japan New Security Guideline and its implications for the contingency plan on the Korean peninsula, see the following paper. Jungho Bae, "The US-Japan New Security Guideline and Contingency on the Korean Peninsula," presented at the seminar, *Contingency on the Korean Peninsula and International Law*, organized by Korea Institute for National Unification and Korean Association of International Law, 1997. 11. 8.

the Korean peninsula. The new security format would be a combination of the pre-existing bilateral security mechanisms and the burgeoning multilateral security mechanisms.

Multilateral cooperative security is conducive to the stability of Northeast Asia. Multilateral cooperative security means comprehensive security including economic, environmental, and human rights in addition to traditional military security. Multilateral security seeks to attain cooperative security by which the countries concerned pursue their common security interests, adopt preventive measures to prevent disputes, and seek to resolve conflicts together.<sup>26</sup>

In configuring a multilateral security mechanism in Northeast Asia, several points should be highlighted.

First, inter-Korean relations and the unification process should be considered. The multilateral security mechanism should not only be favorable to the Korean unification process but also be relevant after Korean unification is achieved. In particular, issues such as arms control during and after unification, the strategic relations of a unified Korea, and the role of the US army in a unified Korea are closely interconnected with the characteristics of a multilateral security mechanism in Northeast Asia.

Northeast Asian cooperative security can help solve the Korean problems in several aspects. First, Northeast Asian cooperative security will be favorable to the peaceful management of a divided Korea and the coexistence of the two Koreas. It will guarantee the peace regime initiated by the two Koreas. This signifies a practical compromise between the internationalization of Korean issues and the Koreanization of Korean issues, and does not disconnect these two phenomena.

---

26 For the conception of comprehensive security and cooperative security, refer to the following writings. Ashton B. Carter, William J. Perry, and John D. Steinbrunner, *A New Concept of Cooperative Security* (Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institute, 1992), pp. 7-10; Janne E. Nolan, *Global Engagement: Cooperation and Security in the 21st Century* (Washington, D. C.: The Brookings Institute, 1994), p. 5.

Second, cooperative security in Northeast Asia will accelerate Pyongyang's reform and its entry into international society. It will attenuate Pyongyang's apprehension over its survival and facilitate Pyongyang's adaptation to international norms.

Third, Northeast Asian cooperative security is likely to form a favorable external environment for solving the Korean problems by reducing tensions in Northeast Asia. In the case of an arms race between China and Japan and increased tensions caused by territorial disputes or trade frictions, regional instability will be unfavorable for peace management on the Korean peninsula. Multilateral security dialogues can regulate the arms race in the region and expedite security cooperation favorable for peace and stability on the Korean peninsula.

Fourth, multilateral cooperative security is useful for crisis management in case of emergencies and for requesting a collaboration of the major powers in the unification process. In addition, a multilateral cooperative mechanism will play a certain affirmative role in engineering the foreign policy of a unified Korea.

However, there are several constraining factors that go into formulating a multilateral security mechanism in Northeast Asia: the lack of experience in multilateral security institutions,<sup>27</sup> the difference of interests among the countries concerned, gaps in national power, the overwhelming weight of bilateral relations, a historical legacy of hostilities, and mutual distrust. As a result, multilateral cooperative security in Northeast Asia will necessarily follow a different pattern from the European case.

First of all, the pace of confidence building and military cooperation at the bilateral level should be sped up. Mutual visits to military sites, ministerial or vice-ministerial level meetings, security consultations, and exchanges of military personnel are good examples of expanding

---

27 For the historical legacy of the underdevelopment of collective security mechanisms similar to the NATO in Asia, refer to the following study. Michael Leifer, *The Balance of Power in East Asia* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1986).



military cooperation at the bilateral level in the region.

In the second place, multilateral cooperative security should complement existing bilateral alliances rather than replace them. In this sense, the bilateral US-ROK and US-Japan alliances have to be adjusted and interlinked with the emerging multilateral security mechanism.<sup>28</sup>

Third, as a preliminary step, a civilian based track II approach would be instrumental in developing a multilateral security mechanism. Government representatives would gradually join this process. In the meantime, semi-official meetings such as CSCAP and NEACD should be activated in developing a government-level dialogue.<sup>29</sup>

Finally, multilateral cooperative security should begin with confidence building measures rather than explicit institution building: the establishment of a hotline, exchanges of information, notification of military exercises, observation of military drills, discussions of sea rescues, research on environmental damage due to military causes, and so on.

#### IV. Concluding Remarks

The comprehensive approach exemplified by the Perry Report should bring about tremendous transformation on the Korean peninsula and Northeast Asia. It is fundamentally based on the same foundation as the Geneva Agreement of 1994, which aims to stop the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

What makes the issue more complex is the fact that it is closely

---

28 Jong-Chul Park, "Globalization and Multidimensional and Multi-layered Security Policy," *Strategic Review*, Vol. 4, No. 1 (1996), pp. 81-82.

29 Seo-Hang Lee, "Multilateral Security Regime in Northeast Asia: Policies and Attitudes of Four Regional Powers," Yong-Soon Yim, et al., eds., *Security Environment in the 21st Century and Korea's Strategic Options* (The Research Institute for International Affairs and The Korean Association of International Studies, 1997), pp. 160-169.

related to the security situation on Korean peninsula and Northeast Asia. Considering the political aspect of military conflict, the fundamental way in which the North's threat can be resolved is to change the North Korean system and to introduce a workable peace system to the Korean peninsula. That is the reason why the comprehensive approach adopts various economic, political, and diplomatic issues to resolve the North Korean problem.

In the process of pursuing this comprehensive approach, the following factors should be taken into account: First, the comprehensive approach needs to review appropriate policy means. The effectiveness and limitations of each policy option should also be thoroughly reviewed. A multiple combination of carrots and sticks will be effective in persuading North Korea. In particular, a proper combination of policy options, including military, economic, and political measures, must be devised.

Second, progress must be arranged according to the time frame. Short-term, mid-term, and long-term policies should be elaborated. Also, interrelatedness and consistency among policy means are required at each stage. Particularly, the mid-term policies should be seen as a bridge linking short- and long-term policies.

Third, trilateral consultations among Washington, Seoul, and Tokyo at the government and civilian level should serve as the cornerstone from which the pursuit of a comprehensive approach to negotiations with Pyongyang should proceed. Perhaps it is even more important and difficult to find a common strategy among the three countries than to compromise with the North. In order to ensure this cooperation, not only the government-level coordination but also the creation of a civilian-level advisory group consisting of bureaucrats and experts from each country is recommended.

Fourth, domestic public opinion in the countries concerned is one of the crucial factors affecting the future of the comprehensive approach. In particular, the policy of the Bush administration toward the Korean

peninsula, the Japanese public opinion toward North Korea, and the attitude of South Korean's toward the North are likely to be key elements in pursuing the comprehensive approach. Therefore, it is urged that the comprehensive approach obtains the majority's support and maintains a consisting approach in the respective countries.