

SGRA Report

No.0017 English Version

SGRA Forum #10th in Odaiba

Global Security in the 21st Century and East Asia



*Sekiguchi Global
Research Association*

SGRA

関口グローバル研究会

What is SGRA

Sekiguchi Global Research Association was inaugurated in July 2000, from a core of foreign students who have resided long in Japan in pursuit of their doctoral degrees in various fields. They form SGRA's driving force through their active participation in SGRA's various activities, irrespective of whether they remain in Japan or go abroad. Research teams are formed from such an international network of researchers to address various issues from multidisciplinary and multinational perspectives. In addition to this network of researchers, SGRA registered members and other interested parties cooperate with SGRA in various ways. SGRA hopes to widen its circle of activities and network through its activities. In the end, SGRA aims for the realization of good global citizenship through the principle of harmony in diversity.

- ★ SGRA is now accepting members. Those interested, please contact the SGRA secretariat. (sgra-office@aisf.or.jp)
- ★ This report is also available in Japanese version. Those who would like a copy sent, please contact the SGRA secretariat.

The 10th SGRA Forum (in Odaiba)

“Global Security in the 21st Century and East Asia”

A project for assisting regional cultural exchange with foreign students
by the Nakajima Memorial International Exchange Foundation

Organized by: Sekiguchi Global Research Association (SGRA)

With the support of:

Association for International Education of Japan (AIEJ), Tokyo International Exchange Center (Tokyo Academic Park),

Atsumi International Scholarship Foundation (AISF)

With the Cooperation of: Asahi Newspaper Asia Network (AAN)

When: February 8, 2003 (Sat)

Registration from 1:30 PM; Session opens at 2 PM and closes at 6 PM tentatively.

There is a reception thereafter.

Where: Tokyo Academic Park, Tokyo International Exchange Center, Plaza Heisei 3rd Floor, Media Hall

PROGRAM

2:00—2:10	Master of Ceremonies: Park Young-June (SGRA Researcher, Visiting Research Fellow, The Sejong Institute Japan Center, in Korea) Opening Greeting: Junko Imanishi (SGRA Director)
【Keynote Speech】 2:10—2:55	Japan and Asia Shiraishi Takashi (Professor, Kyoto University Southeast Asia Research Center)
【Talk 1】 2:55—3:20	The Building of a Peace Framework in Korea and Japan’s Role Nam Kijeong (Chief, Global Peace SGRA Research Team; Associate Professor, Tohoku University Graduate Studies in Law)
【Talk 2】 3:20—3:45	Understanding China’s East Asia Strategy Li Enmin (Chief, History Issues SGRA Research Team; Foreign Professor, Utsunomiya University, Faculty of International Studies)
【Talk 3】 3:45—4:10	The Bush Administration and East Asia Strategy Murata Koji (Associate Professor, Doshisha University Department of Law)
4:30—5:55	Open Forum
5:55—6:00	Closing Remarks: Shimazu Tadahiho. (Head, SGRA Managing Committee)
6:00—	Reception

Opening Address

Imanishi Junko
SGRA Representative

Ladies and gentlemen, thank you for joining us here in Odaiba in this cold weather.

I would also like to extend my cordial appreciation to our master of ceremonies, Mr. Park Young-June, and to Dr. Shiraishi Takashi and Dr. Murata Koji, who have taken time from your business schedule at Seoul and Kyoto.

As usual, I begin by providing a background of SGRA. Ten years ago, after my father passed away, according to his will, our family established a scholarship foundation to support foreign students studying in Japan. The Atsumi Foundation was born. From the outset we expected to build a multi-national intellectual network. We initiated scholarship support for foreign students writing doctoral thesis in post-graduate schools in the Kanto Area. The term of the scholarship is one year. During that period by meeting every month, talking, eating, drinking and traveling together the students became friends basically with everyone. In addition, with the rapid development of Internet around the time when we established our foundation, the network of over one hundred researchers around the world was formed. However, the Atsumi Foundation could support only 12 scholars a year. As the foundation continued to support exchange students, the number of its Japanese supporters increased. Since we wished to communicate with more international students and at the same time accommodate our increasing number of supporters, we organized in July 2000 a volunteer research network, which we named SGRA. SGRA stands for Sekiguchi Global Research Association. Sekiguchi is a Tokyo ward where the secretariat of Atsumi Foundation is located. We use the name Sekiguchi to signify our aspiration to communicate globally from this local office.



SGRA finds very rewarding work with researchers on various topics, which seem useful to adopt ever changing global world. This joint effort aims to compile policies and strategies and make recommendations to solve problems related to globalization. The conclusions and recommendations are communicated through forums organized by SGRA four times a year and by printing and publication of reports, and by using the website and e-mail mailing list. SGRA aims to contribute to the realization of good global citizenship not limited to one's country but targeting a wider society – the entire globe as a whole. We aim to get involved in international and multi-disciplinary activities covering broad research areas. We would also like to invite your further support and cooperation. For those of you who are willing to support, please sign up.

Now I would like to share with you how the 10th SGRA forum is organized in Odaiba. Mr. Komatsu Shinjiro, former head of Tokyo International Exchange Center and who is present today as well (he is standing there), has become very interested in SGRA's activities. He took time to join the SGRA forum held in May last year at the Tokyo International Forum. At that time he suggested that we organize a similar forum here in Odaiba. In fact Tokyo International Center has many doctoral students who are highly educated. These students live in residential homes. There is also an overlap of support for some of these students. Some are serving as SGRA members and also live here in Odaiba.

Actually, as Mr. Park introduced himself he is also serving as the coordinator of the SGRA World Peace Research Team. At the same time he has been involved from the very beginning at the planning stage of this forum although he was in Seoul at that time. He flew from Seoul to Tokyo last night

Mr. Komatsu introduced the principal speaker, Professor Shiraishi Takashi. Thank you very much for coming all the way from Kyoto and joining us even for one day only. As for speakers Dr. Nam Kijeong and Dr. Li Enmin we insisted that they serve as chiefs of SGRA research teams. I know them since they had worked on their doctoral research. We have known each other for about six or seven years now. In addition, when we consider security in East Asia, the United States issue cannot be excluded. To discuss the US issue, Dr. Nam referred Professor Robert D. Eldridge of Osaka University to us. However, the Professor could not be available today. Instead, we are fortunate to have been introduced to Professor Murata Koji, associate professor from Doshisha University department of law, who has come all the way from Kyoto to join us today. Furthermore, since this forum is also serving as a regional exchange of ideas we have asked doctoral candidates who are residents of Tokyo International Exchange Center to ask questions on the subjects discussed.

We believe that one of the missions of SGRA is to communicate voices of young foreign researchers who understand and are sensitive to Japanese issues. Since SGRA's series of forum last summer, Asahi Newspapers Asia Network (AAN) has been providing support. From time to time they are publishing commentaries of SGRA researchers in their columns. Today we have here with us Mr. Asano Chiaki. There is, therefore, a possibility that this forum will be also reported in Asahi Shimbun. To those of you who are involved in the operational activities here at Tokyo International Exchange Center, thank you very much for your support. A SGRA forum usually takes one to one and a half years to prepare. However, these days' global situations are developing so rapidly that we need to speed up our preparatory work for our subjects of discussion to remain current and relevant. For example, in the course of our preparation for the forum on Globalization and Nationalization, the September 11 tragedy happened in the US. And this time while preparing for this forum from last summer we started to see drastic changes in the Korean peninsula. I would like to request our lecturers today to help us become knowledgeable on the various topics to be discussed and I hope our audience would actively participate in the discussions. This concludes my opening remarks.

Thank you very much.

Japan and Asia

Dr. Shiraishi Takashi

Professor, Kyoto University Southeast Asia Research Center

My broad theme today is Peace and Security. Most likely within several months from now the situation about the Iraq war will become clear. I don't know how difficult the situation will become. In addition, within one year tension will be also mounting over the situation in North Korea. You may be hoping that I would be talking about these situations; but I will not. If you are interested in these issues, perhaps during the discussion after my presentation I can share with you some of my thoughts on these matters.



Today what I would like to present to you would be about East Asia, that is to say, the region that is often referred to as East Asia and what we see would be the major structure of the security and economic relationships in this region. Within this overall structure and framework, I will also talk on what the Japanese Government is trying to do and what the Japanese companies are, in fact, doing in this region.

Probably many of you have some familiarity with security and economic developments in East Asia during the last one to two years. Of course there is the security matter in the Korean peninsula and the China versus Taiwan relationship over the Taiwan Strait. Such security issues are very important but at the same time the trend toward regionalism seems to be moving on very rapidly. Now, when I say this word regionalism in Japanese it would be in relation with Japan. Last January, Prime Minister Junichiro Koizumi visited Southeast Asian countries and, in Singapore, signed the economic partnership agreement. This November political declarations were made for bilateral economic coopera-

tion between Thailand and Japan, Japan and the Philippines, and Japan and South Korea. The possibility of such comprehensive economic partnership also between China and the ASEAN countries has been put up for study. Over the coming two years free trade agreement negotiations will start and decisions will be made.

So, when we talk about this area called East Asia in terms of bilateral and multilateral economic partnerships we must realize that up until several years ago such arrangements were non-existent in this region (East Asia). Well then, the question is why after these several years such moves towards regionalism have come about. For the time being, I think we can say that in 1997-1998, as a result of the economic crisis, there has been more thinking among economists on the vulnerability of free markets and that such markets can fail and such failure can cause great national and regional disruptions. In preparation for such kinds of economic problems, it has been thought that such economic treaties maybe necessary. Of course this kind of general thinking is not wrong, but a long-term historical perspective is needed.

When we talk about changes in East Asia economic development the trend toward regionalism must be considered. And that is what I would like to talk about.

At the outset one important point to remember is that when we talk about Asia, words have to be carefully chosen and defined to avoid misinterpretation or misunderstanding of ideas being conveyed. For example, what does the term Asia basically envisages? More often than not, when we look at history, not the contemporary history, but the 18th - 19th centuries, when historians or people interested in culture in those periods think about Asia (of course this is not wrong) from the European concept. Under this concept Europe looks at Asia through a mirror that also reflects Europe – that is, Asia is a mirror image of Europe. Asia, particularly for Japanese and Chinese connotes language, culture, and civilization - rather fixed notions and commonalities that are used to explain the concept of Asia. I am not interested in the understanding of Asia as such.

Rather, what I have in mind is that when I think about East Asia, I think of it as a regional political and economic system. If I can be a little bit more concrete, I think when we think about East Asia we have some vague image of the Korean Peninsula, Japan, China, Taiwan, Hong Kong, and Southeast Asia. It is a very large area. Please imagine the map of this region in the past over one hundred years. Please think about the changes that have taken place - maybe going back to 150 years. For example if you just look at this region alone at the beginning of the Meiji period, Japan had four islands and from 1910 to 1945 she colonized the Korean peninsula. She also went to Taiwan as a colonizing empire. So if you have Japanese occupied territory colored red in the world map then the colored parts spread and reached the zenith around 1942 or 1943. All of Southeast Asia was colored red at that time. Then, after 1945, Japan went back to her original size. So when you look at even the history of territories surrounding Japan, the red colored parts of the map have also changed greatly. Then can you really look at East Asia as a fixed kind of political economic structure, which is a stable system? Then I think it can be said that rather than one system continuing on and on in the same form an evolutionary process occurs. An existing system matures, falls and is replaced by a new system. This is the first point under which terms I would like to regard East Asia.

Now we use the term East Asia as a matter of course. Well, what really is East Asia? Here once again between historians and people like myself who have training in history but who are more interested in international politics there is

a difference in interpretation. And if we include economists they have a quite different understanding of the term East Asia. What does the term East Asia imply? It means Japan, South Korea, China, Hong Kong, Taiwan, Southeast Asian countries, and North Korea together constitute East Asia. I think the economist would have the same concept of what is called East Asia. This concept has come to prevail since the middle of the 1980's and if my memory serves me right, and I did not undertake any formal research on this matter, I recall very clearly that Prime Minister Noboru Takeshita was the first leader to talk about East Asia in the manner that most of us currently understand. When many historians talk about East Asia they refer to the Chinese cultural region. With Southeast Asian countries, like Indonesia and Malaysia, which have strong Islamic influence, perhaps some historians have an intellectual resistance to incorporating these countries into the concept of East Asia. Of course, from a historical perspective these historians have reasons to have this viewpoint. Thus, for the time being even the term East Asia (as in the case of Asia) there seems to be different kinds of views. It was only in the 1980s that a common understanding of the term East Asia came about. The kind of political and economic structure that is encompassed in the term East Asia is my next point.

When we think about it perhaps this issue is very important at present. What is East Asia in the region we call East Asia? The political and economic system that we call East Asia was not born naturally. There was a certain force at work that was used very consciously. However, such a force did not work as planned. This major force at work to bring about a political and economic system that we call East Asia, I believe is a US force. This force worked very strongly. With this as background, and going back to history how was East Asia as a region formed? That is the next question I would like to think about.

I think there are three major factors in this. First is the US force and intention mentioned above. Here, it is very important to understand how Asia was viewed from Washington, or to be more specific from the Whitehouse, way in the 1950s. Just imagine you are in the Whitehouse in 1950. If you look at Asia from there, what can you see? First, Japan at that time was under US occupation. Second, the People's Republic of China has been established and Jiang Jieshi, with his Nationalist Party, had fled to Taiwan. Third, the Korean War was about to start. And fourth, in many parts of Southeast Asia, particularly in the Philippines, South Vietnam, and Malaysia, communist, guerrillas were very aggressive. So that was what you see from the Whitehouse. Given such a situation US policy makers considered two major strategies - strategic issues so to speak. First is the reality of the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China. These two countries formed a monolithic alliance, and as a result an international communist force was threatening Asia. How was the US to counter this? That was one strategic issue. The second issue is that although Japan was under US occupation the US could not keep Japan under its occupation forever. Therefore, perhaps US force and power could be used to promote and establish a long-lasting prosperity in Asia. For that purpose the US had no choice but to make Japan an ally. However if Japan becomes independent and its economic power grow it could become a threat to the US once again. Or if Japan becomes a leader of this region in lieu of the US, what would the US do?

These were the basic major strategic issues confronting the US at that time. The answer to this question for one thing is a containment policy on the part of the US. Thus, the Soviet Union and China were contained. That is one policy taken by the US. And on the other hand Japan, being made a junior partner, would be helped and restored as an economic power, yet remaining a junior partner of the US. George Kennan, political analyst, advisor and diplomat, was in charge of long-range planning for the State Department following World War II and was the chief architect of the pol-

icy of containment, wrote extensively on the policy of containment and the role of other countries, including Japan, in this policy. Among others, Mr. Kennan wrote that Japan would never become a threat to the US. So the US has to make sure that Japan would never become a threat again. Therefore Japan should remain a junior partner to the US, and if Japan shows any sign of becoming a threat to the US then Japan has to be controlled and suppressed. A mechanism for that purpose has to be made within the US defense military system. Japan has to be incorporated into the US military network, but always as a junior partner. So in this way Japan was controlled as a junior partner of the US. There were twists and turns in establishing this process; however the basic intention of the US was more or less realized. Thus, after World War II, the US virtually unilaterally defined its policy and interests in its relation with Japan and the rest of Asia. The post-war Japanese government tried to push forward to go beyond the policy framework set by the US. However, Japan realized it was impossible to go beyond the framework set by the US and it gave up trying to do so. Japan did not want to antagonize the US. Therefore, within the major framework set by the US, the Japanese government opted to secure stability and peace after the war. So I think that was the basic foreign policy taken by Japan after the war.

Now domestically, it was very clear in Japan that throughout the 1950's up to the beginning of 1960's politics was driven by rapid economic growth and initiatives. Therefore, rapid economic growth was the major priority issue for politics. This is very simple. In the case of Japan, especially in the 1950's when Japan regained its independence what was most important was to avoid division among its citizens. There are many ways that the Japanese people could be divided. For instance there was a big debate among Japanese people about what sort of attitude to be taken against the past war. In diplomacy is Japan going to attach importance to the US or is Japan going to take some sort of omnidirectional diplomacy including China and Soviet Union? However, the Japanese government did not have any choice at that time. Under such circumstance, the Japanese government tried to secure cohesion and uniformity among the Japanese people, regardless of rich or poor, by promoting economic development. Of course the Japanese people get frustrated or dissatisfied with many things, but the government thought that as long as the living standards of the Japanese people were improving, they would not oppose the government. In this way it was decided by the government that rapid economic growth could lead to better standard of living and by improving the economic well-being of the people the government can prevent the divisions among the people. And in the society, in general, potential divisions were contained. This was what the Japanese government tried to achieve, and in fact achieved very well in the 1950s and the 1960s. As you know very well Japan's standard of living improved miraculously. As many people said from the 1970s onward, the Japanese yen substantially appreciated versus the US dollar. As a result and in order to maintain international competitiveness the government adopted a policy to become "operational" abroad. In line with this policy, the government promoted direct investment abroad by the Japanese government and Japanese companies. Japanese companies shifted some of their manufacturing activities to Thailand, Korea, and Hong Kong, and so forth. In this way the economic activities of Japanese companies expanded. So that is the second major element.

I forgot to mention earlier but in the beginning I said the US set major strategic framework and the US came up with a major answer to that question. For security, the US policy was to contain the Soviet Union and China. And secondly, the US encouraged Japan to become an economic power but it had to be maintained as a junior partner. Figuratively speaking, Japan served as a spoke and the US served as the hub of a wheel representing US strategy. Under this strategy, the US-Korean relationship and US-Japan relationship could be bundled together to form a major security regime

with the US being the hub and US-Japan, US-Korea, and US-Southeast Asia being the spokes. Economic relationships were likewise designed as spokes in the strategy.

After the rapid economic growth in Japan, Japanese companies went into Asian countries, however based on the economic framework that I mentioned earlier. Japanese enterprises went into Korea and Hong Kong and Taiwan in this way. Under such circumstances what took place in other East Asian countries?

Developmental politics came into the picture. Probably, developmental politics is not the right word but a principle. What does that exactly mean? This is very close to the nature of Japan's highly developed economy, which is based on democracy. But in case of the East Asian countries politics was not based on democracy, so what does this specifically mean? Politically, to stabilize politics hard-line policies had to be adopted and implemented. That means, for example, if there are political causes opposing government policy the government would try to contain the people behind these causes - sometimes putting them in jails or prisons. By pursuing the ultimate and largest target of achieving economic development political stability had first to be established. This is especially important when attracting foreign direct investments or soliciting economic aid from which the economy would develop. After that, the standard of living of the people would increase and that would also result in strengthening political stability. So, it was necessary to maintain this kind of cycle in order to develop both politically and economically. And, I believe this is the basic approach for driving economic development based on political stability. This approach was applied first in South Korea, Taiwan, Thailand, Indonesia, and in the Philippines, although in the case of the Philippines this failed. This approach was also applied in Malaysia and Singapore. As a result when we look at the situation from the end of the 1980s, the East Asian region somehow became economically cohesive, or began to get cohesive at that time. What does that mean? That does not mean that each country developed economically on its own. Rather, economic development evolved from mutual independence to regional cooperation. When we look at the economic indices of the East Asian countries we can see that there was an increase in those numbers and regional trade increased by the end of the 1980s. Everybody started to consider East Asia as one region; people started to recognize East Asia, and everybody started to use the term East Asia. Up to that time when people said East Asia they automatically meant Japan or South Korea or China. They thought that this region was different from the South East Asia region. When at the end of the 1980s direct investments from Japan and South Korea were made in Southeast Asian countries and economic development in Southeast Asia was stimulated the perceived image of East Asia was revised to include Southeast Asia. Because of this, it is very natural to see East Asia and Southeast Asia as one region. So, what would be the characteristic of such an East Asian region?

What I have been referring to up until now is the major framework, which has been set by the US. Under that framework the Japanese government, as well as the other governments in Southeast Asia, has implemented measures to develop their respective economy but the key to development would be direct foreign investment. That is my key point. In other words in order to establish a cohesive East Asia, the drivers are direct investments and the capacity of the market. What does that mean? Let us take the case of Europe. With respect to European regional integration, some researchers feel that this is the model they are working on. However, if you just think about Europe in the 1950s from Washington's perspective how did it look? Germany was still under occupation by the US and its allies as well as by the Soviet Union. As the Soviet Union was also threatening the rest of Europe, what did the US consider at that time?

At that time the US was trying to contain the global communist forces led mainly by the Soviet Union. The problem was how to restore the economy of Germany, which was divided into West and East, and at the same time prevent the two Germanys from becoming another threat to the US and its allies. This situation in Europe was moving in parallel with the developing framework in East Asia. But the US tried to come up with totally different answers. For example, in terms of the security framework, Europe has the NATO. And economically, conditions were conducive to regional cooperation leading to the formation of a regional community. At present, the European Union (EU) has been established and is now operational. This was the basis of the regional development in Europe.

Comparing the experience in Europe with that of East Asia three major differences are noted. One is that, in the case of Europe there were two major wars in the twentieth century and as a result Europe was destroyed. Because of that experience, nationalism was considered a negative factor, more like evil. And this lesson from history remained in Europe. In order to achieve a perpetual peace, the Europeans realized that it was necessary to forget about nationalism. That became the common understanding - that is the first point of difference. The second point is the significance of the political relationship between France and Germany. As long as these two countries are at odds with each other security in Europe will not come about. In other words better relationship between France and Germany and avoiding war between them were necessary to proceed with regional integration and promoting economic development. The third point that I would like to stress is the awareness of a common identity of being Europeans among the different nationalities in Europe. This common understanding or recognition was developed along with the acceptance of common discipline or norms. Thus, the establishment of regional integration in Europe required, on one hand, restraining nationalism, particularly in France and Germany, and on the other hand, setting up common norms or standards. With the achievement of these two basic requirements regional integration became established in Europe.

You might have already realized that conditions in East Asia are different. For one thing, nationalism is not considered a powerful evil force in East Asia. Probably the only single ambivalent people will be the Japanese, who might wonder whether nationalism is a powerful force that can liberalize people. The Chinese and the other nationals feel that nationalism is a powerful force that would bring about their development.

The second point is the intention to build a common community in East Asia. This intention does not exist up until now. Recently, China has been working on a foreign trade agreement (FTA) with East Asian countries. This is now being negotiated. China is also proposing FTAs with Japan and South Korea, but I believe this is a political move. This does not necessarily mean that this would become the common political understanding between China and Japan. Also, I do not think that regional cooperation will be formed according to this structure. There are nations in the region, which have totally different political systems. I cannot see any common understanding of common norms within East Asia. There is a huge difference from Europe in this aspect. Europe is now much advanced in regional cooperation, but it is not that we will just be following Europe. Probably the historical experience since 1940's or even longer period, two regions are taking totally different paths to the regional unifications. This is why USA took the totally different strategies in the 1950s. This is also related to the difference in the creation of common understanding and common norm within the regions.

But then when we think about the future, we realize that, basically, there are more forces at work. And, East Asia is coming together as a region. In a nutshell, this is not a kind of regionalism based on political cohesiveness, but one that evolved through the operation of market forces. I think East Asia had this kind of a hallmark. As such, what would be the future of regional integration of this region? I would like to consider what kind of forces are at play here. I think this is a very important point to consider. Then what kind of forces should we think about? The most important factor would be the increasing move towards Americanization. Recently, over the past one to two years, particularly, there has been a perception of the US as an empire. How meaningful and useful is this perception? Perhaps to find an answer to this question alone would need more than one hour of discussion.

In the past, in East Asia the US had an informal empire-like - an imperial-like order built in East Asia. Even now to use the term American empire is a different issue but in this region in terms of culture, society, politics and economy how dominant the US power is must be considered. What kind of power does the US have? You have to really think about this in concrete terms. In military terms, the US has overwhelming power in this region. For example, when you look at North Korea and the nuclear missile development issue in general terms and the existing ruling regime there – no matter which element you think of, in the final analysis the will of the US government will have a definite importance in deciding the outcome. So militarily speaking the other countries cannot contend with the US. The US has overwhelming power. In the financial area, too, the US government, well, not government, but between Wall Street and the government there is a network that exists, which has overwhelming power. In 1997 the Japanese government proposed the establishment of the Asian Monetary Fund in East Asia but this effort failed mainly due to US objection.

Now on a softer level, let us look at the English language. English is a very important common language and together with that, over the past five decades, knowledge has become very American. For example economics - in the past Japan had her own version of economics; it was a Marxist kind of economics. In Holland there was the Dutch economics; and in the United Kingdom, the same, you had British economics. Of course there are still some people who go to the United Kingdom to study economics but most probably in Japan, economists in their 30s or 40s who had not studied in the US and do not have a Ph.D. from an American university will not be considered serious economists. That's how far things have gone. In terms of the military and financial aspects, the US influence is just as pervasive and strong. The way of thinking, the lifestyle, have all absorbed American influence. All of these are leading to the creation of a certain political and economic structures. The American strength is very overwhelming.

Then what about China or Japan? The move has been increasingly, I think, China-ization. To be able to speak Chinese is no longer effective in terms of accepting and embracing the Chinese civilization and culture. Instead, in the US, for example, you have many Chinese people residing there. These people, once again by learning the standard Chinese language like the networking of the Fujian people of the past, are now increasingly building a new Chinese network and are trying to construct a new kind of force. This is what is called China-ization. And from the 1980s to the 90s the Japanese keiretsu network from Japan, Taiwan, and Hong Kong to Southeast Asia had a great network of such kind of relationship. Such informal network acted to put together this region as one. And this was called as one feature of Japan-ization trends. Under the imperial kind of American order, it provides, I think, one model of how such society can be made. Maybe that is one central point of consideration about Japan-ization.

Let's take the case of animation or so-called manga cartoons of Japan, which are quite popular in East Asia. It cannot be denied that there is a lot of demand for things Japanese in East Asia. How are we to look at this kind of situation? Why has this been the case? You have on one hand the force of Americanization and on the other hand there are localizations. And it is good, I think, and, you can define Japan in that context. You have, thus, one model. In Korea you have Korean-ization and in Thailand you have Thai-ization which are a kind of localization.

But with just one last point: in East Asia right now you are looking at forces of localization like increasing Chinese elements or increasing Japanese elements, but the American strength is, in fact, contributing to the creation of East Asia. It must not have been forgotten that over the past 50 years there has been a major transformation. There is a growth of a middle class in society. According to a US sociology book - *Only Yesterday* is the title of the book - in the later part of the 1920s the middle class was born in the US. As a result how the US society was changed economically is explained in the book. In the 1960s in Japan a book with the same title – *Only Yesterday* - was also written, which also explained how the formation of the Japanese middle class changed Japanese society. Perhaps the same thing can be said of Korea in the 1970s and 1980s, and in the case of South East Asia towards the end of the 1980s and the beginning of 1990s. And also in the later half of the 1990s to today similar developments in Shanghai and in other parts of China could be explained in the same way. Therefore, for the past 50 or 60 years there was a major formation of a middle class as a mass in this region. Globalization and localization are benefiting this people to become middle class.

Earlier I compared this region with Europe. In the case of European regionalization nationalism was not welcome. Rather a common political policy was necessary, as well as the formation of a middle class at the same time. Compared with the past 30 years, we are at present able to increasingly share more things than before. For example, in the process of Americanization, I think when it comes to norms; we are sharing a major part of norms already with the US based on regional unification. I think regional integration will be able to construct a common region on that.

In summary, what is actually happening today is economic linkage with resulting economic benefits created by market forces. The region becomes one so that, for example, if something happens in Japan it would likely make a big influence on what would happen in Malaysia. Therefore if that's the case we would like to have a better control over such situation so that if some shock occurs in Japan it may be prevented from happening in Malaysia. With this perspective in mind, negotiation or discussion on regional integration was started. However, a community is built only when there is a common norm to be shared. With such a common norm under US imperialism, if I may use the words US imperialism - I don't know if this is appropriate or not - the middle class as a mass is to be formed. I think this prerequisite for community building is in the making now, although it will take some time to do. We can start sharing common norms as part of the community-building effort and build trust and confidence, including in the area of security.

Today we see that European governments are trying to solve issues within the European region without resorting to war. Something like that could be realized in Asia; however, we have to wait for more time before that can be realized.

I apologize for going overboard but I would like to stop here. Thank you very much for your attention.

The Building of a Peace Framework in Korea and Japan's Role

Dr. Nam Kijeong

Chief, Global Peace SGRA Research Team;

Associate Professor, Tohoku University Graduate Studies in Law



The relationship between Japan and South Korea is my field of interest, so I feel it is incumbent upon me to talk about the Korean Peninsular issue and the role of Japan. In fact I would like to research other topics, too, but we always have to draw attention to Korea, a point of global attention right now, which makes me feel somewhat overwhelmed. When it comes to the role of Japan you have to start with the summit talk between North Korea and Japan. The first month after this talk was followed with interest, but in the second month or third we really no longer feel that this issue of the role of

Japan is even worth mentioning. Based on the Japanese press coverage of the talks, it seems that rather than Japan leading the talks with its own ideas, it was always the US or China or Russia that were taking the initiative.

I think more positively about the role of Japan. At least I feel so myself and based on this thinking I would like to present some of my views. Now, why have we lost sight, so to speak, of Japan's role? The issue is a very complicated one and perhaps it has become too complex. Perhaps simple thinking is required here. To think about this issue, we should go back to that point in time right after the summit meeting between Japan and North Korea. Right at the very beginning you always have to think about the US. Since the intervention by the US it seems that the role of Japan has become complicated. That seems to be the starting point of where we stand right now. From more personal sentiments let me say that there seems to be similarities between America post 911 and Japan post 917, the latter being the date after the summit meeting between Japan and North Korea. Why do I say this? This is because vis-à-vis a logos there seems to be a counterattack of ethos and pathos. The Machiavellian principles that the prince must be free from religious conviction and instead must have a cool-headed, dispassionate and calculated judgment of good and bad are critical. These have been the basis and origin of modern international relations and the starting point for modern diplomacy. It seems, however, that diplomacy is fading away. Instead of a give-and-take principle based on a dispassionate calculation, it seems that the modern trend is that those who commit evil will be punished severely. With that, the position of diplomacy really has increasingly lost ground.

Let me now turn to Japan. The Pyongyang declaration was unveiled after the Summit Meeting. Compared with the first days of the Japan-North Korean talks during 1990-91, Japan was able to get a lot from this meeting. It was as if North Korea put up the white flag. Only one thing that North Korea could put in was the matter of history in the declaration. I think it was a major victory for Japan over North Korea, diplomatically speaking. And this was all possible

in the stage of diplomacy. You had the Kim Jong Il resolution and Mr. Koizumi's resolution, which seems to be different analyses as to who gained more, but the relationship between the two countries was one of give-and-take. Now, after the abduction issue was made public this relationship became very difficult, but until about October 15, there was willingness on both sides to give and take. North Korea permitted the five abductees to return to Japan and at the same time Japan reaffirmed to reopen the negotiation and to try to maintain the momentum. However, the following day when Mr. Kelly went to Seoul and then to North Korea, North Korea admitted to the development of a nuclear program, and this admission was immediately made public. I don't know what the US had in mind over the 10-day period from 5th or 6th when Mr. Kelly went to North Korea on the 16th. But, without doubt the US became involved and began to intervene in the Japan- North Korea talks. This intervention changed the negotiations. The talks would be determined by North Korean – US relations and the relationship of that country with Japan.

Now there are three theorems that I think can be deduced from all of these. One is the Japan and North Korea negotiation was affected by US policy. On a more dynamic basis Japan – North Korea relation was affected and bound by US – Japan relations and US – North Korea relations. So there are two hypotheses I would like to make. One is that Japan – North Korea negotiation comes to a deadlock if US – Japan relationship is binding. Another is that Japan-North Korea negotiation comes to a deadlock if US – North Korean relationship functions without Japan. There are a lot of people who don't think of these as hypotheses but rather as theorems. In other words, Japan-US relationship will determine Japan's relationship with North Korea. The US-North Korea relationship, generally speaking, will move ahead but there will be no movement on the part of the Japan -North Korean negotiations, which came to a deadlock. Now let us put this back as hypothesis and try to analyze it. Let me go to the main part of my talk, where I will consider the first hypothesis from the perspective of US-Japan relationship, the second hypothesis from the perspective of US-North Korea relationships, and the conclusions from this. Finally, I will give my own conclusion using this as a context.

I would like to consider Japan's role from the perspective of the US-Japan alliance and the US- Japan relationship. President Bush's policy vis-a-vis Japan is often said to be different from that of his predecessor. Where and how it is different, I do not have time to mention here. Bush's policy with Japan has shifted from burden sharing to power sharing. Japan, as a sovereign and independent nation, will share on equal footing with the US strategy and tactics particularly on security in this region. This basic thinking is confirmed from various documents coming out from the Bush administration and also from the Armitage Report. Other confirming reports and circumstances, particularly after 911 include the Rand Report, the Heritage Foundation Report, the Armitage Report, the fact of Japan's movement towards sending STF vessels to Afghanistan, and the fact that Japan went as far as to recognize the exercise of the right of collective self-defense. These have been all welcomed by the Bush Administration and no doubt influenced US –Japan's policy. That Japan is in a "normal" state in terms of security as a country able to think on her own is the basic position, I think, that Bush had vis-à-vis Japan. There is also a warning sent concerning this. In an article in the "Foreign Affairs", a lot of opinions were given on the Bush Administration policy in Japan. The article said that the policy should not be the only perspective by which to approach Japan; that there is this idea of comprehensive security still existing in Japan. So you have to think about Japan's own kind of thinking in terms of her foreign policy. The US should respect and honor that kind of thinking no matter if the thinking is different and the understanding is different but there is one commonality between the two. That is to say within the framework of Japan – US alliance the role of

Japan, relatively speaking, is increasing, that should be recognized, and that this trend will continue. So one more conclusion I can cite is the US – Japan relations set no limits to Japan’s policy towards North Korea. Japan should take the initiative especially for North East Asia. So if some serious issues occur in North East Asia, Japan should take the leadership and initiative in solving those issues. And this is to be possibly welcomed by the US.

Now, the second topic is US – North Korea relations. North Korea’s initial approach to the Bush Administration was reaffirmation of the validity of the agreed framework in 1994. That was the starting point, that is, mutual reaffirmation of the validity of the agreed framework. However, that was not the case with the US under the Clinton Administration, which was using a stick and carrot approach vis-à-vis North Korea. Perhaps the Clinton Administration has provided too many carrots to North Korea. Therefore, the agreed framework should be reviewed and reexamined, which from the perspective of the US shows that the US should attach importance to reciprocity in the alliance. However, after 9/11 the inclusion of North Korea in the axis of evil disrupted US-North Korea relations. Now, when you consider the word axis in what way has this word been used? I don’t know why the US came up with such terminology as “axis of evil”. However, this is reminiscent of the following two things. One is the Berlin-Rome-Tokyo axis, which is something we can remember. In this case, unconditional surrender was required but one country in the axis cannot go ahead and sign a peace treaty on an individual basis. Another principle is cooperation among great powers. These two basic principles are brought back to mind by the terminology axis of evil. Then, what was the response by North Korea? The initial reference to the reported North Korea’s nuclear development program brought on a disarmament requirement on North Korea by the US. Prior to implementing this requirement there was no room for negotiation with North Korea. And also this should be done with the close cooperation between US, Japan and South Korea. This was the US task. For this US policy the US-South Korea alliance and the US-Japan alliance will be the basis. Therefore, inevitably Japan’s role has to be evaluated from this.

I would like to make four speculations on North Korea’s strategy. Firstly, the Japan – North Korea summit or negotiation approach regarding the abduction case could also be applied to the US – North Korea summit meeting. This is a possible idea as shown that when Mr. Kelly went to Korea, North Korea’s Kim Jong Il said he wanted to meet with President Bush. In view of these moves by North Korea, I think North Korea tried to use the Japan – North Korea summit as a leverage to promote the US – North Korea summit. Secondly, perhaps North Korea was trying to avoid being the target of the US by lumping it with the Iraq issue. The first one was not successful, as US immediately refused North Korea’s proposal. I am not quite sure about the second point. Maybe it is half way successful from the point of view of North Korea because the US is only focusing on Iraq at present.

Thirdly, North Korea might have wanted to omit Japan’s involvement after spending the last card during the negotiation with Japan for the abduction issue. The Pyongyang declaration says that Japan and North Korea will continue to consult with each other regarding security issues as well. Therefore, dialogue on security will continue. Even if Japan’s position hardens because of the abduction case, when it comes to the security issue Japan would not want to be isolated. Therefore, Japan has to come to the negotiation table. This is the assumption made by North Korea.

Fourthly, North Korea wants to approach the US. For this purpose, Japan is to be used as a stepping-stone. So Items 2 and 4 are interlinked. In any case, North Korea would like to use Japan, and North Korea definitely wants to nego-

tiate with Japan. That is the underlying current. In Kuala Lumpur the negotiation was suspended, but even so from the declaration statements and reports coming from North Korea we can understand that North Korea wants to continue to dialogue with Japan, although it failed in Kuala Lumpur.

Now, in the case of the US, the nuclear development issue was raised by the US in the 1990's. The US wanted to check and prevent Japan from going far too ahead of the US in Northeast Asian affairs. In doing so the US is binding its hands as well. Because the US wants to avoid a catastrophe in North Korea it will try to continue to have a dialogue with North Korea. Unlike the Clinton Administration the Bush Administration is more inclined to Japan rather than to China. The US realizes that there is no choice but to negotiate with North Korea because of the US – Japan and US- South Korea alliances. On this basis, I think there is a role to be played by Japan. The US also wants to avoid the increasing external influences that come with procrastination of negotiations regarding these issues. Therefore, while controlling the pace of the Japan – North Korea negotiation, the US may speed up the settlement of the issue through Japan – US – South Korea cooperation. Thus, for conclusion number 2 we see the US- North Korea relations becoming a factor both for restricting and accelerating Japan – North Korean negotiation.

I want to see the return of real diplomacy based on impassionate negotiation. Reality is based on logic. I would like to see the rational reconstruction of the current situation where reality has collapsed due おいあ、 to lack of logic. Now I have two conclusions to share with you. The hypothesis we have understood so far cannot be denied. The conclusion is US – Japan relation which is represented by the US- Japan alliance is no longer a negative factor to the development of Japan – North Korea negotiation. US – North Korean relation was seriously strained after the nuclear crisis. Expectedly, the nuclear crisis worked as a negative factor; however, it can also be turned into a positive factor under a certain condition. And what is that condition? This condition is the understanding of all parties concerned to use the Japan – North Korea negotiation as a venue for discussing the security and nuclear issues of this region. This condition has to depend on Japan for its strong will to take the diplomatic initiative. The progress of the Japan-North Korea negotiation depends on the will of the Japanese government to lead in the negotiation and also to appreciate the great value of this negotiation as a stepping-stone towards the creation of a regional security framework for North East Asia.

This concludes my presentation. Thank you.

Understanding China's East Asia Strategy

Dr. Li Enmin

Chief, History Issues SGRA Research Team;
Foreign Professor, Utsunomiya University, Faculty of International Studies



In the 1990's, at just about the time of the collapse of the Soviet Union and the end of the cold war, China was going through the Jiang Zemin era after the Tiananmen incident. From that time, China has upheld her foreign policy of independence, autonomy and peace while taking the strategy of not opposing any country or forming alliances with any country. China was giving top priority to building her economy. For this purpose, China has strengthened her moral partnership with major countries like Japan, the US, and Russia and has undertaken the building of constructive strategic

partnerships for the 21st century. At the same time, China has been urging that all conflicts be resolved peacefully without taking a Germanic approach – that is, without resorting neither to the use of force nor to saber rattling. However, the realities seem to be different from the rhetoric when China's behavior and policy over the Taiwan Strait is considered. That is why the Taiwan issue remains a flash point or powder keg of potential conflict in East Asia. This issue is now in the limelight of world attention.

My report takes up the themes of unification and peace and will analyze China's Taiwan strategy in the Jiang Zemin era. It presents my understanding and analysis of the issue and includes some proposals. Over the past 50 or more years since Taiwan separated from the mainland in 1949, China's Taiwan Strait policy has undergone major transformations. During the period of 30 years up to the end of the 1970's, China vociferously demanded the complete withdrawal of American bases from Taiwan. China also aggressively used the term liberation of Taiwan, meaning to overthrow the government of the Republic of China (Taiwan) and oust its leaders, including Chiang Kaishek and his cohorts with force, if necessary, and to establish the Taiwan government as one of the local governments of the mainland Communist Party. However, with the changing international situation and the establishment of diplomatic ties between China and the US in January 1979 the Chinese government revised its policy to a new strategy vis-à-vis Taiwan. This new policy included such elements as the use of peaceful means, not force, and unification, instead of liberation. Subsequently, in January 1995, Jiang Zemin unveiled his eight- point proposal, which declared that China's Taiwan strategy is peaceful unification and the principle of one country two systems.

Now what do we mean by peaceful unification? Since 1979 China basically has been urging for the realization of unification through peaceful means and negotiations. At the same time China has attached two conditions in this regard.

First condition is that the Taiwan issue is strictly a matter of China's internal policy and no foreign interference will be allowed. The second condition is that China will not make a commitment of never resorting to the use of military force. China has repeatedly emphasized that this second condition is not aimed at the Chinese compatriots in Taiwan but is more targeted at foreign forces that are conspiring to interfere with unification and plotting to bring about the independence of Taiwan. What does one country two systems mean? It implies that after unification both Mainland China and Taiwan will respectively have their own economic and political systems. That is to say, China will uphold the socialist system on the mainland while Taiwan will maintain the political system that she has had from the past. Taiwan will become a special administrative region and will be given a high degree of autonomy. This is not talking of complete autonomy from China. Taiwan will have legislative and judicial rights. It will also be allowed to have its own military. The central Chinese government will not send troops or administrative personnel to be stationed in Taiwan.

With such a unique approach China was able to very smoothly recover and restore her sovereignty over Hong Kong and Macao from the United Kingdom and Portugal in 1997 and 1999, respectively. Because of these developments there is a sense of self confidence on the part of China reinforcing its effort towards implementing the one country two systems policy vis-à-vis Taiwan. To be able to realize peaceful unification with Taiwan within a certain time frame China currently is trying to suppress moves towards independence inside Taiwan through military pressure. On the other hand, China is trying to promote economic exchanges at the private sector level on the economic front. Closer economic ties between the mainland and Taiwan would bring about a more integrated economy between the two.

China has made the acceptance of the principle of one China as a precondition for political negotiations about Taiwan. The Chinese government has taken a very hard line position against whatever action may challenge this precondition. In March 1996, for example, the first direct presidential elections were held in Taiwan. China regarded this as part of the move towards Taiwan independence, and in an effort to influence the outcome of the elections it held military exercises in the vicinity of Taiwan. This is a part of history that everybody knows very well.

On the economic front, China is clearly taking a strategy of trying to encircle or surround politics with business. To explain politically, this strategy aims to strengthen the business partnership with Taiwan's business sector on a non-governmental level and to urge changes in Taiwan's China policy through the business sector. Taiwan is skeptical and is being cautious of the unification strategy through the economic formula. It has adopted the strategic policy of patience over haste. Accordingly, Taiwan has called for restraint in investment and trade with China. However, in light of the strong demand for strengthening complementarities of economic ties, Taiwan, on one hand, maintains indirect exchanges on economic activities, including investment and trade with China via Hong Kong. On the other hand, restrictions in the economy vis-à-vis China are being gradually relaxed. Thus, in spite of the limited direct links in communication, trade and navigation restricted economic exchanges between China and Taiwan are actually developing rapidly. For example, at the end of 2002, last year, Taiwan's cumulative investment in China reached US\$25.5 billion. This accounts for over 48 percent of Taiwan's direct foreign investment. In the same year the two-way trade between them exceeded US\$40 billion. Taiwan's trade surplus exceeded US\$25 billion and quite naturally the dependence of Taiwan on trade with China has risen on the import side to 13 percent and on the export front to 19

percent. It seems that with the two economies increasingly being integrated it seems to be the reality that Taiwan cannot move away from China even if it wanted to. It's very difficult to express this idea. So, the Taiwan business circle believes that economic exchange should be undertaken in advance of political exchange and the Taiwan business circle is currently hearing an increasing number of voices calling for the relaxation of the restrictions on the direct links mentioned earlier.

One bright spot is that in February 2003, right now, China is in the midst of the spring festival of the New Year. For the first time since the division of China and Taiwan the first direct charter flight between the two became a reality and support for the one country two systems in the opinion polls reached a record 18 percent. This is a political change, which has been created by the close economic interdependence. Nonetheless, even with such economic and cultural exchange, trust between both politicians is not yet built. The Chinese side especially does not grasp the real intention of the Taiwanese politicians. They are suspicious that the Taiwanese side is planning independence secretly under the name of unification.

In 1995, judging that there was no progress in the political negotiation for peaceful reunification with Taiwan, Jiang Zemin mentioned that indefinite extension of unification is not the desire of nationalist compatriots, although he did not make any specific time table. However, unlike Mao Zedong and Deng Xiaoping, he clarified his stand not to postpone reunification forever. In my opinion, as long as Taiwan remains divided from Mainland China voices asking for independence will rise both domestically and externally. Anyone can foresee a high probability or possibility of Taiwan independence as division continues.

In 1971, after China's accession to the United Nations, international opinion was negative towards Taiwan independence and at the same time it was against the use of force against Taiwan but they are positive toward the democratization of Taiwan. Based upon the will of the people in Taiwan and for the sake of peace and stability in the Asia Pacific region the voices are becoming stronger to unify Taiwan Strait. Thus, if China does not promote political reform or democracy and continues with military threats, voices asking for independence will become even stronger. In that case, international opinion should lean more in favor of Taiwan, and I'm anxious about that situation.

In order to realize the reunification between Taiwan and China what is required, in my opinion, is new wisdom - political wisdom. New political thinking will be required. Although this is may be premature thinking, I would dare to raise the following two points. Firstly, this is a proposal to the Taiwanese side that with its developed democratic experience and through peaceful unification Taiwan should hold new political thinking to promote political democracy across China. After 1990, Taiwan, in principle, appeared to be responding only passively in the debate for its reunification with the mainland. The Taiwanese, themselves, were proud of their democratic experience. However, they never try to promote this experience actively to the whole of China. From my perspective, Taiwan should see that reunification does not mean the greater swallowing the smaller or just putting two into one, but that it means peaceful coexistence through democratic competition and, thereby progressing together. Reunification should be recognized this way.

The Taiwanese experience, which is recognized globally, is a valuable experience by the Taiwanese. By this experience, the principle of sovereignty being invested in each individual has been realized for the first time in the Chinese civilization under the principle of democracy. Therefore, Taiwan is, in the heart of the younger generation in the mainland, a very attractive existence. Taiwan needs to serve as the precursor of democracy after reunification. As a major political force, it will be able to exercise its political power. This will inevitably bring about enormous impact directly on political reform in China. Therefore, with peaceful reunification the current political structure in China will have to be changed and it may be possible to establish a two major party system or a multiple party system. In that sense, peaceful reunification would be considered a starting point for democratization of China and become catalyst for political reform. I'm confident about this point.

The second proposal is for China to strongly pursue peaceful reunification without clinging to the one country two systems idea. Since the 1990s, as you are all aware, it is no longer the case that the nation can lead the general public by ideology alone. On the issues of political policies and democratic policies and unification strategies with Taiwan, citizen groups have started to have opinions whether it is correct or not to use arms in solving the Taiwan issue. Although they are still a small voice there are already negative opinions being expressed. Those voiced include: The expansion of power or arm, or both just simply raises tension and it is not viable for both Taiwan and China; definitely avoid conflict with the US on the Taiwan issue; the use of arms, which would trigger a civil war, cannot be agreed; and, after peaceful reunification with Taiwan is achieved, through fair competition of political systems based on the principle of survival of the fittest, the one country two systems idea might ultimately become a one-country one-system idea. This is the kind or tone of arguments we hear quite recently. If public sentiment will lose, the administration might be lost, and for the communist party to restore its prestige and also regain the trust of the people it is necessary to respect the will and intention of the people. In 2002, the 16th CCP National Congress was held and a new generation of leaders emerged. This March, meaning next month, with the National Congress China will officially enter into the post Jiang Zemin era and it will enter the Hu Chintao era. On the Taiwan issue I do not have any definite statement as to what kind of strategy the new administration will be taking. At least they will not be belligerent and will reserve public statement on using arms. I believe it is necessary to respect human rights, promote economic development and not just be trapped by the one country two systems idea, and pursue the idea of peaceful unification. This, I believe, would become the best choice for the people of Taiwan as well as the mainland in China.

This concludes my presentation. Thank you very much for your kind attention.

The Bush Administration and East Asia Strategy

Dr. Koji Murata

Associate Professor, Doshisha University Department of Law



The last speaker is usually disadvantaged, in my view, because you, the audience, are already tired and, also, the previous speakers have said everything. Therefore, I think I am at a disadvantage as the late speaker-comer, so to speak. However, at the risk of being repetitive, US power is disproportionately large. As a result, as Dr. Shiraishi mentioned earlier, the expression empire is often used to depict the US. After the cold war we are now in the post-cold war era, which is very difficult to define. However, since 9/11 the US is once again in the world's mode. Therefore, the 10-year period after the end of the cold war era was just a transition

period between cold war era and war era again.

Now what sort of big power is held by the US? As mentioned earlier, after the terrorist attack in the US, it was announced in February 2002 that in military expenditure vis-à-vis the previous year there was an increase of 15 percent for a total of 80 billion dollars. This accounts for 40 percent of the world's total military expenditure and this is also greater than the aggregate of defense spending of countries ranked the second to the twentieth in military spending. In this way, US military posture is growing and next year it will increase by 4 percent in terms of military expenditure. The increased military expenditure is accompanied by a highly developed "revolution military affair" (RMA, for short), which means high technology for military purposes. In this area America is the undisputed leader. Therefore, viewed from purely military technology, I think alliances for the US are not very important. In this context Japan's military force is not very important to the US. Even NATO cannot provide a very strong support purely in a military sense. However, when we consider the military issue we also have to consider logistics in addition to military expenditure and RMA. Deployment of military forces must be backed by logistics, such as communication and supplies, medical supplies and so forth. In this area the US is disproportionately dominant as well.

When it comes to the economy, the US accounts for about 40 percent of the world's GNP. Strong US influence on culture and related values is evident by the fact that perhaps 40 percent of all foreign students are studying in the US. About 80 percent of the information that we can get on the Internet comes from the US. Therefore, the US has a strong influence in culture and civilization in addition to military power and economics. As such, the US is a major economic, military, and cultural force. In the history of human beings, I think this is the first time that we see such a

big country, which is blessed with such major powers. The past empires of China, Great Britain, or ancient Rome never had such global influence as the US has today.

However, after 911 the US, with such a strong power, is now worried about its national security for the first time since the creation of the country. Perhaps 911 also reawakened bad feelings against the Japanese people because often 911 was likened to Pearl Harbor or kamikaze. These terms were often used in the media. But, there are differences. In December 1941 when Japan attacked Pearl Harbor, the civilians were not targeted – only the military facilities were the target. Also at that time, Hawaii was just an American territory - not mainland America. However, in the 911 treachery the central nerve of the US mainland was attacked. This is the first time since the 1812-1814 war between the UK and the US that mainland US was attacked. After that UK-US war the residence of the US president was repainted white and has since become known as the White House. Thus, I think 911 is the first time since 200 years ago that the US mainland was attacked, apart from Pearl Harbor which was an attack on US territory outside the mainland. Therefore, for the first time the US is worried about the national security. So I think we have to understand the paradox faced by the US otherwise we cannot understand the current world situation.

After the Bush administration was inaugurated, unilateralism is becoming more and more a household word. However, there is another group in the Administration seeking, for instance, a resolution in the United Nations on the war against Iraq. This group is seeking international cooperation, instead of unilateral action. Therefore, it is often said that there is a division between the camp represented by Mr. Rumsfeld and Mr. Cheney, often called Neoconservatives, who are advocating unilateralism, and the camp of Mr. Powell who is seeking international cooperation. This is the situation that we see within the US administration now. The famous US journalist Bob Woodward published the book called “Bush At War.” The United Nation Security Council passed the US-sponsored resolution on Iraq. The US president sought another resolution. The decision to seek this resolution was a last minute decision just before President Bush’s speech at the UN general assembly. What I would like to point out here is that the unilateralism and international collaboration views are in conflict within the Bush administration. I do not deny this. However, the existence of these two points of view should not be overly emphasized. I think in any administration there is bound to be conflicting opinions like this. Looking into US diplomatic history we see situations like this. For example, in the past Carter administration there was also a conflict between the Secretary of State and Mr. Bryzhinsky. Therefore, I think in any other administration at any time there is always a conflict of opinions on foreign policy, and this is not at all unique to the present Bush administration. That’s the first point I would like to share with you.

Secondly, the Bush administration recently announced the doctrine that preempted attack is tolerable for the sake of national security interests. This is becoming a new line of diplomacy on the part of the Bush administration. I think the Bush administration is using unilateralism, as rhetoric only and there is a gap between rhetoric and actual implementation of foreign policy. This is always the case with foreign policy. Therefore, we should not overly emphasize the unilateralism posture of the Bush administration because this is only rhetoric. It seems to me that this administration is very realistic and also very cautious. This assessment is supported by the fact that in September last year Bush opted for the UN resolution and also on February 14 this year. Bush agreed to allow more time for the weapons inspection being conducted by the UN in Iraq. The US is trying to keep in line with the international community in that sense. For the difference between rhetoric and actual reality in foreign policy of US administrations, I think a typical

example is the Eisenhower administration, also republican. Eisenhower often said that the US was ready to use massive amount of nuclear weapons against any attack from anybody. However, in spite of such rhetoric, Eisenhower's foreign policy was very cautious, showing that there was a gap between rhetoric and actual foreign policy. This is not unique to US; it can be found in many countries.

After 911 the US administration issued its global Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR), which is done once every four years. I do not have time to go into the details of this review today, but in the subject QDR the Bush administration clarified two basic policies. First is the recognition after 911 that terrorism is an asymmetrical threat. Therefore, a global fight against terrorism has to be waged and the corresponding US posture on this was clarified. Second, although the Bush administration did not specify any country, China was clearly in mind as a potential super power, which would challenge the US, and the US is ready to take whatever measures are necessary to meet that challenge. In this way, traditional power politics approach and counter terrorism approach are seen as two layers of US foreign policy under the Bush administration.

Next, I would like to talk about Japan-US alliance. As I said earlier, the US has adopted the policy of waging war against terrorism coupled with a classical type of strategy for contending with the growing military power of China. What is the significance of this policy on the US-Japan alliance? From the classical point of view Japan, at this moment, is suffering from an economic downturn. Still the US has enlisted Japan as a global ally. This relationship, which centers on Okinawa allowing the US to use military bases in its territory, continues to make Japan a very important US ally from the perspective of traditional power politics. From the perspective of the anti-terrorism war, the US-Japan alliance is also extremely crucial. For over 50 years now Japan has provided military bases to the US in exchange for the US commitment to the defense of Japan. This is how the alliance was shaped. It was understood that the US was not expected to have Japan protect it militarily. The main aim of the alliance was for Japan to offer military bases only.

After the 911 tragedy there is no longer the assumption that the US homeland is secure. Maybe an invisible enemy might attack San Francisco in the US. There is now greater possibility of the US being attacked by invisible enemies. Even though it is such a huge super power, the US will not be able to compete all the time with these enemies that also have global alliances. Therefore, it is especially crucial to work on the US-Japan alliance in fighting terrorism. Up until now US-Japan alliance had been implemented through the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Defense Agency in Japan, and on the US side by the Secretary of State and Department of Defense. But these arrangements are not enough. These arrangements also need to include MECS, as well as the Ministry of Justice, the former MITI, now METI, all the local municipalities where the military bases are located, and probably the NGO's might also need to be involved. So, considering these anti-terrorist activities it is once again necessary to reshape the US-Japan alliance.

Because I am running out of time I want to proceed more rapidly. From the classical power politics perspective and from the anti terrorism perspective US-Japan alliance is important, but this does not mean that the relationship between Japan and the US is stable because the economic downturn in Japan is a potential bomb or explosive for the US. When the Japanese economy was performing well this was not that crucial. The diplomatic tool that Japan used to rely on was money. However, when money was no longer abundant Japan needs to think about other possibilities.

The sluggish economy has imposed other activities on Japan. As such, Japan is not able to shape alternative strategies not based on money. As long as the US military superiority prevails not much is expected from Japan. The fact remains that the US will continue to maintain the military bases in Japan. In the long-term, however, this fact might not become as important as it is now, but at the moment the US-Japan alliance is still important for both countries. In a longer term, however, it might not be viable anymore. Therefore, it is necessary to reshape and also comprehensively reinforce the framework of the US-Japan alliance. Under such circumstances my concern is that when dealing with this issue there are still in Japan certain people who are becoming emotional and anti-US. This is something that I am concerned about. These people do not have a good understanding of the global situations or of the US. They just have to resist and oppose something big. This attitude is just a reflection of frustration. I believe this is rather risky or dangerous. What I feel is even more dangerous is that most of the people who are anti-US are basically anti-China as well. Strategically I do not feel this is correct. If people who are anti-US are on the other hand pro Chinese, I think it is okay, but if they are anti-US, anti-Russia, anti-Korea and anti-China there is nothing that we can work on. Japan is no longer sustainable if it continues to have just feelings of resistance against every single country in the world; I think this is a risky trend.

Actually recently there is a kind of argument that we need to make statements to the US on whatever we need to do. Of course, this is true. Why? Because what needs to be said should be said. This is simply a tautology. It does not mean, however, that we can say anything no matter what it is but in order to be effective it is necessary to select what we need to say in appropriate manner. This I think is diplomacy. On the part of Japan just making different statements to the US would be somehow wrongly taken as being independent. Making wrong statements or different statements from the US is not an important factor. As long as both the national interests of the US and Japan are the same Japan would say the same thing as US but still she is autonomous. So, by doing something different from the US merely to exercise Japan's autonomy, I believe is like an illusion.

I would like to make one final remark with reference to a report that was submitted to the Koizumi cabinet last year. This is the report from the external relations task force. This report describes the basic strategy of the 21st century for Japan's diplomatic relations. I think this report is quite good and it states that for Japan the US is the single allied nation, but for the US Japan is only one of 40 allies. It is necessary for the US to have many concerns or agendas and it is not possible that all these concerns will have the same priority. Japan should keep this in mind when considering its own e priority in its diplomatic relations.

Thank you very much.

OPEN FORUM

We have now come to the part where we will have the open forum. This afternoon we had presentations from our four speakers who will now respond to questions from the audience. Four participants (questioners) from the audience have been assigned to ask questions on the topics discussed by our speakers.

We would like to start with the question or questions on the presentation of Dr. Shiraishi. Please introduce yourself and give us your questions.



Questions by Mr. Tomikawa Hideo

Thank you. My name is Tomikawa, PhD candidate in Economics from University of Tokyo. I will be going to the Defense Institute from next year. I have four points I would like to ask. These may be rather bold questions, if I may be so allowed.

The first is on the theme of East Asia as a community and global security in East Asia. Dr. Shiraishi discussed this theme. Now when we think about this concept of East Asia, is there any meaning for us to look at it as one kind of a concept? When you look at the map that Dr. Shiraishi had mentioned you see the ocean, the Pacific Ocean. (Dr. Shiraishi has written a book called *The Empire of the Oceans*.) If you compress the map and disregard the ocean then you have the US right next door. Is there any reason for us to define East Asia as something different? Dr. Shiraishi mentioned that we cannot avoid thinking about the US when contemplating East Asia. The matters of the AMF or the EAEC of Prime Minister Mahathir were all frustrated and you will think that this was due to US external pressure coming to bear. For the AMF Japan was all that willing in the final analysis and on the surface Japan said that the US

frustrated these attempts. But the goal of Japan was to see the circulation of the Japanese yen. Although these matters were frustrated, the ideas that came to light from the discussions brought forth proposals from institutions like the IMF, World Bank, and BIS for reforming the financial system, including building an international financial system for the region. To the question of whether Japan can take the lead alone in building such an international system here in this area the qualified answer most probably is no, without the US. Is there really any meaning for thinking of reforms in East Asia without considering the involvement of the US in one form or another? This maybe self-contradictory but maybe it's a false idea to think of East Asia as one single entity. North Asia and Southeast Asia contain many elements and, thus, there are differences. I will not go into details, but for North East Asia in terms of political science you have to look at it through a balanced view. You have on one hand the US military power and Japan, China, North Korea, South Korea, and Taiwan on the other hand. How about Southeast Asia? Certainly based on the premise that the cold war has ended Southeast Asia has embraced Burma, Laos and other countries in the region even before the US had thought about this. So rather than power or balance of power it is more coexistence and cooperation that are working.

From the economic perspective North East Asia, South Korea, Japan, China has interdependence that is feasible. In ASEAN, of course, there is a rising volume of intraregional trade even before AFTA was established. How each country would attract direct investments from abroad would be up to each country. In the case of Malaysia, under AFTA, the automotive industry is worried that it would lose its competitiveness; that Thailand will take away everything; and therefore Malaysia's automotive industry is reluctant with the idea of AFTA. There are many such cases so from the economic perspective North East Asia is interdependent while South East Asia is centering on foreign investment and international division of labor. It is an ambivalent kind of relationship that exists. Thus, South East Asia and North East Asia should be divided when we think about this concept of East Asia. That's my second point.

The third point is as follows: As Dr. Murata mentioned this Americanization, with its progress, has caused feelings of anti Americanism to come up in parts of Japan, Southeast Asia and other parts of East Asia. Then I want to ask: What can Japan do? As Dr. Shiraishi mentioned Japan, as a junior partner in the economic field provided direct investments. Thus, in the economic field Japan did play a role. But beyond economics, as, for example, in security or politics, Japan has refrained from undertaking any role at all. Then the question is: should Japan or can Japan play an active role in these fronts? It seems that Japan herself does not want to get involved in any controversy so as to avoid anti Japan feelings in East Asia. With its World War II experience Japan, does not really want to get all that much involved. It's a kind of balance sheet that she wants at present. So what can Japan really contribute to East Asia? Maybe there is really nothing that Japan can do.

The fourth point is more like a rough kind of discussion. When you think about East Asia, what are the implications in South East Asia? Other than the economic grouping perhaps one has to look positively upon the potential political grouping. At the beginning ASEAN solidarity was based upon anti communism, politically speaking. Then ASEAN became an economic grouping and, setting aside its political anti-communist stance, admitted Vietnam and Laos into its membership. ASEAN is very aggressive in the economic front. If you observe Malaysia I don't think you can say that Southeast Asia is one, politically. Look at Malaysia's action in driving back to their countries or putting in prison illegal Indonesian workers and other illegal workers from neighboring countries. What about the use of water rights

in Thailand? This has become such a problem that may lead to disputes. It seems there are a lot of rivalries, but before these rivalries become open conflicts it seems the parties involved come to some kind of resolution. Looking at this kind of situation when you think about regionalization, ASEAN, as a grouping, does not force regionalization. Perhaps when you think about regionalization in East Asia it maybe one point to consider not forcing any particular norms but work towards an arms-length relationship based on profit-loss calculations. It may sound paradoxical but such a network of bilateral relations may lead to stability.

Answers by Dr. Takashi Shiraishi

Well first, my basic response to the questions is as follows. After the end of the cold war, in the 1990's, the basic principle of formation of global order shifted from the bipolar conflict of interest to regional groups - several of them – were organized in the world. So this was the major shift in international relations. Especially in the case of East Asia there were several factors, namely, the end of cold war, the economic crisis from 1997 to 1998, the prolonged economic downturn in Japan, the political stalemate in Japan, and the growing power of China, from the mid 1990's onward. In such a situation each region is going through a period of transformation.

So, by what standards shall we measure transformational changes in the region? My approach is to know what sort of order was formed in the 1950's during the cold war period - that is the starting point.

In the case of security, the US wanted to have Japan as a junior partner and sought to apply the hub and spokes formula. In the economic front Japan and the US and other Asian countries, formed a triangular trading system. China's participation in that framework was important. However, in the case of security China could not be brought in, although in economic activities China could be brought into this network. This shows how America was trying to transform this region and what could be Japan's contribution. That was my basic approach.

Therefore it isn't about East Asia is at one end, and whether we should look at it objectively or bring the US into consideration. That was not my concern. Rather, Japan is here and is already involved economically and socially in East Asia. With respect to Japan's involvement in East Asia what is the regional order that we can contemplate? That is the perspective I wanted to use for my approach.

EAEC was a failure but it does not necessarily mean that it is meaningless to think about East Asia in the context of that failure alone. Regarding the AMF, the financial system reform capability was lacking in East Asia. I think that is, in a sense, true if we look at the failure of the AMF. Even the Bank of Japan, for instance, does not have the ability to monitor financial systems in East Asian countries. Therefore, the IMF was the only avenue that could be resorted to. But, that was not the only reason why AMF was a failure. The AMF debacle has a meaning, although not very significant in my perspective.

The difference between North East Asia and East Asia, as you said is the existence of a balance of power in North East Asia and the interdependent economic activities now going on in South East Asia. However, the application of such a concept involves serious thinking. To start with, I need to think about regional order always with the realities



of Americanization, US global power at work, and local power, local force or regional force, which would go against the US global power. This is not surprising, this is just normal. For example nationalism is one expression of this. The recent surge of Islamism is also another form of resistance or opposition but what I was trying to point out is to go forward with regionalism regional economic revival is still to be brought about. At the same time the formation of a middle class as a mass, as we saw in the past 50 years, must continue into the future. If that is the case, local or regional resistance or

opposition will be always at work vis-à-vis global power, although this would not serve as a very significant check against global power. The order, which is established by the US today, has something to do with this. In the past 60 years the order building process of the US was based on dynamic capitalism. The dynamic capitalist powers, that are America and its allies, wanted to improve their standard of living, and for that purpose the creation of the middle class of people was the dynamism at work. I think it is more important to see whether such dynamism will be continued. Therefore, the force against the US is not so important in my view.

As Professor Murata said the sentimental emotional resistance is not very important in intellectual terms although it is important in political terms. What will stimulate the emergence of such a force will be more important intellectually.

The ASEAN way, I think, is losing its meaning. As was mentioned by previous speakers, it is not that norms are lacking but that norms are beginning to be somewhat shared. We can see after the economic crisis the World Bank and IMF were advocating transparency against which there is much opposition. If we look at corporate governance, the American way of corporate governance is not well accepted in East Asian countries. However, in the global governance theory advocated by Anglo Saxon countries, which for the past three centuries dominated the world, including democracy and human rights have not been rejected. In that sense, diffusion of norms would require time; however, it is making progress gradually. My perspective is not a span of two to three years; I take a longer perspective covering 20-30 years to come. From that perspective, of course, the current relationship in East Asia is based on profit and self-interest. However, such shared normal diffusion to middle class people may result in a change of regime and system and transformation of society. Then the political unity that we see in Europe will be formed in my view. From that perspective I see positively the future of East Asia.

Questions by Mr. Kaneko Mitsuya

I am specialized in Finance. I would like to ask some questions. I am beginning to realize and sympathize with the fact that there is a big role to be played by Japan in the Korean peninsula. I would like to ask two questions. My first question: What would be the specific roles of Japan in the Korean peninsula? Japan-North Korea relations involve the

US, South Korea and Japan and it is determined amongst a lot of nations. Under the circumstances of international politics and within the framework of the US-Japan alliance what roles will Japan play? Will it adhere to the principle of collective defense or exercise an independent role? What kind of influence the actors in the international politics would give? What kind of benefits would result, and to whom, would result from Japan's fulfilling its role?

The second question is: In your presentation you talked about US-Japan relations and Japan-Korea relations. In the Korean peninsula the most important concerned party is South Korea. Within the context of a new political administration, and Japan-North Korea relations, how should South Korea play its role, especially, in the relations between Japan and North Korea? How can South Korea cooperate with Japan?

Answers by Dr. Nam Kijeong:

Because there is not enough time I would like to be brief. For the first point, there are lots of things I would like to mention. I mentioned in my presentation that Japan's role is huge, but there is a role that is not huge that Japan can play. I am saying that there is a role for Japan to play and I hope you do not misunderstand this point. I did not mean that Japan has a lot of roles to play in the security framework, but everybody has his own role, and just providing economic support might lead to the security of the region.

As to how much of that would be played by the economic role I would like to think about that in the context of the 1965 system between Japan and South Korea. This is the basic treaty and the norm between South Korea and Japan. We started from that point and 20 years later, in the middle of 1980, the South Korean situation became more stable. Somebody mentioned earlier that we are now beginning to have the development of an East Asia community since 1980's but this has been just achieved by the economic development of South Korea and of China. In the past 20 years the situation of South Korea has been changing and I believe that Japan had a big role to play in order to stabilize the situation. And if you think about it, Japan was not the only one in the position to offer support. Without South Korea, Japan could not have been able to maintain and sustain such rapid growth for a long time.

Similarly, in terms of working towards some kind of North Korea project would be very important to Japan. This effort will have a huge significance to Japan. Prime Minister Koizumi decided in favor of such a project, despite expectation of negative reactions, and the reason why he made such decision is probably because there is a demand from the business circle for such a project. In light of the overall gloomy direction that Japan is currently taking such a project could probably become a factor to revitalize both sides.

I mentioned that it took about 20 years in South Korea, but in North Korea compared to South Korea in the 60's I think there are more infrastructures established so probably in 10 years or so they should be able to reach that stage. During that period economic support could become a sort of leverage in the security. So the Japanese economic support would become that kind of leverage.

When South Korea tried to equip itself with nuclear power, the need to open up to the assistance from Japan and foreign countries created a dilemma in South Korea. It is probably possible to create the same situation in North Korea.

So as I mentioned earlier diplomacy not using money but economic assistance would also have a role to play in the security area.

Now North Korea is trying to develop brinkmanship diplomacy since they are in a very severe situation wherein they have no more cards to play. In order to prevent North Korea from engaging in brinkmanship diplomacy I think Japan's assistance is especially meaningful.

Let me go on to the second part. What should South Korea be doing? I may sound a little radical but South Korea must minimize her own role. South Korea must think far back to 1994 when Carter went to North Korea during the Clinton eras the basic framework was established in Geneva. In order to maintain this and to bring it to reality, actually the biggest obstacle was the Kim Young Sam government at that time. The government said that this was a matter for their own people to decide and resolve this issue. Nationalism is an issue now but on the Korean peninsula with nationalism alone the situation could not be resolved. Cooperation from Japan, the US, Russia and China was needed. You have to look at this whole region as one and we have to give place for South Korea and North Korea to play. Then for the first time, South Korea and North Korea can directly face each other to try to be a little bit more self-restraining. That kind of mind set maybe necessary.

The new government will be formed. The kind of initiative talked about in the mid 1990's is not the kind of initiative that is needed. Perhaps a more peaceful dialogue is what they are looking for or perhaps they want to play a role in having a peaceful dialogue. I think it is not the case that in South Korea right now the new government wants to take the lead in bringing about peace on the peninsula or maybe they would relegate this initiative to Japan and the US. That's what I would like Japanese people to understand.

Comment by Dr. Park Young June

The role to be played by Japan in the Korean peninsula is not necessarily significant, but there is indeed a role to be played by Japan, although limited to economics according to the professor. This is a bit sad for the Japanese people. On the other hand, the role to be played by South Korea has to be minimized to the extent possible. This is also disappointing for the South Korean people. Then what is our remaining role in political and military terms? Who is going to play this role? From that perspective Professor Shiraishi's talk is relevant.

Questions by Mr. He Aijun

I am a PhD candidate in agriculture and life sciences. I am He Aijun. The He is peace, and Ai is love and Jun is army. Therefore I have an army for loving peace, so to speak, in my name.

Perhaps my question is not from an expert's, but rather from a layman's point of view. I must admit that I am not very familiar with the subject of national security. However, I know that without security we cannot have a stable environment. We cannot protect the global environment, either. Therefore, national security is truly important for the harmonization of global environment and for the protection of people. So I would like to ask the following question. The

Taiwan issue is very complicated and very difficult. I cannot foresee how this issue would evolve down the road. I would like to ask the following questions to Dr. Li. In academic terminology, when we discuss the Taiwan issue we have to first clearly understand the terms mainland China and Taiwan, which are often used. Are these the appropriate terms to be used in academic discussions of the Taiwan issue? When doing your research did you find it difficult to make open presentations, open expose? If that was the case how did you bring about the result of your research to the society at large? Maybe this is a very rudimentary question.

Secondly, as you said on the Taiwan issue, because of the three links the relationship between Mainland China and Taiwan is relaxing, but some people are still quite pessimistic on the resolution of the Taiwan issue. It is not clear what the result of the NPC will be, but what will be the major change or changes between the Jiang Zemin era and the new leadership under Hu Jintao? Will there be a different approach or policy to be taken by the new leadership? On the business issue, Mainland China and Taiwan are pursuing economic cooperation and partnership since sometime ago. Therefore, in economic terms, I think partnership is becoming more active so that Mainland China and Taiwan are becoming one in economic term. There are also national traits that are shared by mainlanders and Taiwanese, although there are, of course, different characteristics that are unique to each people. How do you see similarities or differences between the mainlanders and the Taiwanese toward the peaceful integration of Taiwan to China?

Mainland China is a very attractive land for the Taiwanese, especially for young Taiwanese. For the younger generation, those who were born and raised in Taiwan, maybe they have a different mentality vis-à-vis Mainland China compared with the people from the older generations. As time goes on, the peaceful integration of Taiwan may become more difficult. Do you see more potential for more democratic and peaceful solution to this problem? Another issue is that China has always maintained that the Taiwan issue is a domestic problem and that foreign countries should not interfere in its solution. Is it really possible to find a solution in an isolated way? Lastly in your presentation, in connection with the three proposals that you made, you mentioned that the communist party wants to regain confidence and credibility. Has the Chinese communist party lost confidence? So do you have any specific scenario? For instance, will the Taiwan way of democracy be promoted in Mainland China? Will Mainland China move to capitalism? What is the significance of this if it happens? Do you see any probability of that? If Mainland China becomes capitalist, with its population of about 1.3 billion people it will be faced with serious environmental issues and so forth. With such a big country going capitalism, maybe the Taiwan issue will be solved. What is the likelihood or probability of all these that I stated? I'll appreciate it if you can enlighten me. Thank you.

Answers by Dr. Li Enmin

So the time limitation is five minutes. Yes, that is good enough for me to answer. I think I always appreciate questions from laypersons. The former President of Taiwan, Mr. Lee Teng-Hui was a farmer. Later he became President. I think your questions are very good, but they are too many. In fact I wasn't able to take notes of every single question. If there are some questions I am not able to answer I would like to respond later.

First of all, I would like to start with some of the terms used. Usually we use the terms Taiwan and Mainland China. But I used the expressions China and Taiwan, instead of mainland. This could be reflecting the political intention,

which means just one China and one Taiwan. Politically, this is not consistent with the Chinese government's philosophy. In Japan, this is the expression usually used, and today's presentation is to enhance your understanding. So these are not the political terms, which are used - something I would like to stress. On your question of whether scholars from the mainland are able to freely speak up their own ideas, the answer is it really depends on where the ideas are presented and the style of presentation. First of all, in Mainland China no problem is created on what is expressed verbally. However, verbal expressions cannot be documented. There is no newspaper and that requires careful screening. In international forums like this when the presenters wish to speak up they need to be very cautious and prudent. In case of trips overseas, visiting scholars can speak freely as long as the country visited is democratic, but what would be the responsibility of these speakers? We are just simple people - not politicians. So we believe that we can share our personal views. And that is the reason why I did not use such controversial terms and, instead, used different terms. Under such circumstances, the terms used might not be consistent with the current Chinese government's policies regarding the Taiwan issue. But as I mentioned on diplomatic policies most Chinese scholars are speaking freely. Last October, by invitation from the Shanghai International Research Center I made a presentation at symposium on the interdependency of China, Japan and US. Most of the scholars who participated in the symposium are living in the US, Japan or countries other than China. They made proposals relating to the policies promulgated by the Foreign Ministry of China. On historical issues, the presenters proposed that these issues are better being left to the scholars to analyze and recommend appropriate positions, and not to the politicians. So it is possible to speak on these kinds of points at such symposiums. At this moment the Chinese (mainlanders and Taiwanese) are in the middle of a new year celebrations. Direct charter flights between the mainland and Taiwan have been opened, although limited at the moment. I would like to call it half direct flight because it does not fly directly from Taipei to Shanghai but stops in Hong Kong before proceeding to Shanghai. The passengers are not required to transfer to another airplane but the fact that the flight has to land in Hong Kong once makes it a half direct flight, in my view. In a sense this reflects the relaxation of the policies in the Taiwanese side. If Taiwan does not take this kind of measure it will not be able to make experiments.

Am I optimistic or pessimistic on the policies of Ju Jintao? Are these different from the policies of Jiang Zemin? In March this year the Ju Jintao administration was officially inaugurated. Of course, in China, the term "Ju Jintao administration" is not used, but instead "a leader group centered on Ju Jintao" is used. The reason is because this is international opinion and domestically in China this kind of opinion is already formed. At least among Chinese there will be no fighting. In the past, long time ago, there were civil wars but at that time all the Chinese underwent hardships. In order to avoid this kind of situation, as a national policy, the new leadership will place priority on the economy so if war breaks out it would not be viable for both sides of the strait. That will be the mutual understanding by the two parties. I have some more thoughts, but I would try to explain later about China becoming capitalist. To this question, I will respond to you later. I'm sorry my answer was lengthy.

Questions by Mr. Lee Myong Chan

Thank you. I am from Korea. In 1994 I came to Japan and since then I have been here. I am a PhD candidate in law at Keio University. On Japan's post-war security policy and diplomacy, I listened with great interest to the dynamic presentation by Dr. Murata. I have three questions that I would like to ask. One is the fact that American power is too

strong. On this matter it seems that all countries agree. But in the case of Japan the situation maybe a little bit different and that is the reason why I am asking the question. For example, the US accounts for 25% of the global GDP after the Gulf War; right now this is approximately 30%. Japan's GDP is approximately 15% of global GDP. From this comparative context when you look at US foreign policy moves and Japan's diplomacy moves I think what has started from the Gulf War has continued with us. With its 25% share of global GDP, the US has played maybe 60% of global diplomatic initiatives. What about Japan? Regardless of the fact that she has 15% of the world GDP her role in international diplomacy is only about 1%. Then I ask why is that?

Starting from there, I am looking at Japan's current foreign policy and at the various discussions about this. Since Japan cannot exercise the right to collective self defense it seems that the discussion arrives at the point saying that is the reason why she cannot assert herself all that strongly. In terms of her diplomacy, Japan has always been pursuing the goal of peace and maybe there was a strain of isolationism in her Asian diplomacy. But Japan wants to change right now and when she wants to change you come back once again to the Japan-US security relationship. In the Armitage Report it was mentioned that what used to be burden sharing is now shifting to power sharing. When I read that I felt that at the end of the cold war the US saw Japan as a threat and there was a lot of Japan-bashing. But right now the US is 100% self-confident and Japan is no longer a threat. So Japan is no longer a threat but will be just one of the forty alliance partners of the US. As was mentioned earlier, from the Japanese perspective this may sound sad. Of course there is a lot of controversy about this that in reality the fact is that Japan is exercising some form of right to collective self-defense. I'd like to hear if this fundamental line of thinking is being resolved.

Well, America is a democracy and the Bush administration is engaged in heavy power politics than the Clinton administration, which was perhaps a little bit on the softer side of power politics. From the perspective of Japan the Bush administration will not go on forever. So in Japan you have some forces that would respond very positively to the Bush Administration but there are also other voices saying that foreign policy should not be based on power politics alone, but on other means, as well, such as economic support and cooperation.

How do the Korean people think about this? The South Koreans don't really know very much about diplomacy. Using the crisis in the North, a lot of people have this sense of crisis - which Japan may revert to how she was in the pre-war days. Of course people that know very much about Japan do not have this kind of thinking. How do you feel about this? And if Japan can exercise her right to collective self-defense will she exercise that right within the context and framework of the United Nations? This question is especially relevant to related contingencies like the Korean peninsula issue. In the case of Taiwan, if China uses her veto power in the United Nations then Japan cannot take any action without the blessing of the United Nations. In the case of the North Korea issue one never knows the position of China and in reality and practicality what would be the effect of Japan's exercise of the right to collective self-defense?

Answers by Dr. Koji Murata

Thank you very much. Your question was centered around the collective self defense right of Japan. In terms of Japanese foreign policy performance that is not highly valued. That is true. However, in my view that has nothing to do

with the question of collective self-defense right, rather it is the ability of Japan to express itself in a diplomatic way. As you know Professor Tanaka often talks about world politics. We moved from power politics to money politics and now we are moving to world politics. Therefore communication capability to persuade others is very, very important. Japanese diplomacy was lacking both in terms of word and communication power; the Japanese lacked the capability of expression that is commensurate with economic and political power.



Now let us come to the collective self-defense issue. What is the definition of the right of collective self-defense? Based on various discussions of this issue, collective self defense can be broadly defined as follows: we offer military bases to the US forces - that is already exercising the right of collective self defense. Therefore for the past 50 years we have been exercising collective self-defense. A different definition of collective self-defense may also be made. We dispatched a maritime contingent of self-defense forces to the Indian Ocean and some people say that this is already exercising collective self-defense. However, in theory whether Japan is

able to exercise collective self-defense depends on the interpretation by the legal bureau of the cabinet. According to the interpretation by that bureau, we cannot exercise collective self-defense. I am against this interpretation. However, implementing collective self-defense power is a different question. This question has something to do with political decision, political judgment, rather than constitutional interpretation. Therefore, a more deep-seated issue is that although the government is saying that we cannot exercise collective self-defense, but the Japanese and the people of Japan's foreign partners are thinking that Japan is already exercising collective self-defense. Therefore the constitutionality of the issue is being ignored. On this basis, we have to obtain a wide range of public support for exercising collective self-defense. I think this is the most serious issue that Japan is facing. If the government changes its interpretation saying that we can now exercise collective self-defense it doesn't necessarily mean that Japan becomes a major super power in terms of military might. Japan is only one of the forty allies of the US, as I said in my presentation earlier. And according to the Armitage Report, power sharing is something US is emphasizing now. That is because US is no longer regarding Japan as a major threat. In a nutshell, a symmetrical alliance or something like this with the US does not exist. Korea, Australia, and Britain are all not symmetrical allies or partners of the United States. Therefore basically all of these allies are already asymmetrical partners to the United States but it doesn't mean that this is unfair. In the case of the US, from Clinton to Bush, the administration changed and the foreign policy vis-à-vis Japan also changed. Can a similar change also occur in Japan? That is another question.

It is true that from Clinton to Bush there was a change of diplomacy. The change of government in the US is possible because there is no major change of policy between two administrations. However, in Japan, if, for instance, the Democratic Party of Japan is advocating collective self-defense the other political party is against collective self-defense.

That is not the case in the US. There, change is only rhetorical, although sometimes-meaningful rhetorical differences do occur. However, there is no major difference between republicans and democrats in the US in terms of the government's policy vis-à-vis Japan.

On the other hand, in the case of Japan for many years, there were fundamental opponents to the security policies of the government in relation to its foreign policy, which is why in Japan there is a fear of change of government. However, it seems to me today that there is little difference between LDP and other political parties in terms of foreign policy; rather, there is generational change. Younger generations are more pro-active; but political parties alone do not define the foreign policy of a country. Rather, you have to look at it in international political context. Perhaps unnaturalistically people think that Japanese foreign policy or security policy may change. However, as long as we have a basic framework in terms of Japan-US security arrangement I don't think there will be a major change in terms of foreign policy of Japan down the road.

Question from the audience

My question is to Professor Murata. I come from a country, which was an ally of the former Soviet bloc - you know, the evil empire. I work for the Ministry of Finance and since bureaucrats are very linked to politics, I'm participating in this conference. In my country there are a lot of arguments and disputes whether or not the US is at the moment a hegemony. Especially after the New York attacks there are a lot of arguments, and mainly in Asia our politicians see three major emerging powers. These are China, India and Russia as a one bloc. There is another bloc composed of the US and its traditional allies. On the other hand, we don't deny that there is a strong US presence in Central Asia, but when we assess this military presence we realize that in the long run the US cannot keep and maintain its armies in Central Asia. And what do you think about the three emerging powers, nuclear powers, and on the other side the US bloc? And the second question is: Is the US a hegemony or not? - Thank you.

Answers by Dr. Koji Murata

Whether the United States is hegemony or not depends upon your definition of hegemony. Well, usually in terms of international politics when you talk about hegemony it's not merely being a major big power but at each point in time it has to be a country with responsibility and power to support international order. It's not just a matter of dominant power. In that sense, certainly China is rising very rapidly on the global scene. Some people say that China must be looked with suspicion because when China becomes a major player she may not have the fairness and capability and will to support the world order. The US - is she a unilateral power or not? Here, once again, there maybe divided views as to what would be the definition of unilateralism. Of course, the US is a big country; she can go it alone if she wants to. And frequently she does so. She takes unilateral action. I maybe quite pro-American, but I think the US is a country with self-restraint. It's a self-restrained super power. That is the kind of impression that I have. So to the extent that she can use a bilateral framework she will do this. It's not that she does everything unilaterally but the US is a unilateral learner. Questions such as the one given imply that unilateralism is bad in itself. I think unilateralism is not inherently bad. It has good points, positive points; and not everything that is done multilaterally is good either. There maybe some bad multilateral actions. You do not think that unilateralism is, by nature, bad. It's very difficult

to characterize the US as a unilateral power now. I maybe pro-American here once again but I want to add to that comment. For example, right now Japan is suffering economically. But if Japan accounts for 40% of the world's military expenditures and 30% of the world's GNP and if the yen is circulating as the US\$ does - if Japan is that kind of a major power would Japan become a unilateral country like the US? Most probably she would. If China has 40% of the military power and one third of the global GNP and if the renmmbi circulates to about 80% of the world as a currency would China become less of a unilateral power compared with the US? I think China will be more of a unilateral power. So when a country has that major power I think it's not fair to say that you seek from the other party the kind of self-restraint that you may not yourself be able to exercise.

You talk about the emerging powers like India, China and Russia. You also asked whether the US could sustain her military presence in Central Asia. Is Russia really an emerging power? I think she is a declining power. China and India, yes they are emerging but Russia, on a medium time horizon, I don't think you can define her as an emerging power like China and India. Of course, in Central Asia the extent of the US military presence will depend upon the budget, as well as the needs of the US. This is a technical matter and I will not discuss it here. But here once again on a long-term time frame, with the rapid advances in technology you don't need major facilities, military facilities, as long as you have the access points rapid deployment becomes possible. This means that you don't need a major US military base of several thousand square kilometers. Maybe that kind of definition may disappear but when it comes to efficiency the same effect can be achieved with smaller effort.

Question from the audience

I am from Indonesia. Actually my specialization is not on politics but my interest in Iraq brings me to this forum. So I would like to ask Professor Koji and Professor Takashi –you said that the case of Iraq is a fight against global terrorism I believe it's not as simple as that because, as an article in Newsweek this week claimed, oil and economics are the reasons for the US posture against Iraq. What is your opinion on this claim? For Professor Takashi - you said that at this time we are in a sort of American imperialism. Is there any possibility that Japan will become a new imperialist? Is it possible for Japan to have its own opinions and create a framework of peace? Thank you very much.

Answers by Dr. Takashi Shiraishi

The war against terrorism is one way of looking at it; however, since 1990, throughout these years, Iraq has been a threat to peace and order in the Middle East. The political cost for changing the ruling regime in Iraq has diminished since September 11; that is why maybe it is good timing now to solve this issue that is the basic stand I think.

Now consider the post-war reconstruction in Afghanistan. Afghanistan is a very poor country and the government was in disarray. Therefore, post-war reconstruction was very difficult. However, in the case of Iraq they have oil and also government is working, functioning. If we purge Saddam Hussein and a new leadership in government is set that shares the same language as the American administration, then we will be able to reconstruct peace and order in the Middle East. I think that is the basic stand of the US. Therefore, in a broadly defined sense this war will be against

terrorism; however it is not that simple. The construction of a stable peace and order in the Middle East is the primary purpose.

Now, as to whether Japan will become an imperialist country again. In the 1930s to 1940s Japan had two major military adventures in East Asia. In those days, America and Britain were expelled from the region and Japan assumed leadership here. In order to build a political and economic order, Japan started a war. The rest is history and we learned a historical lesson. In 1980's to 1990s, again this time around, through economic cooperation in FDI a flying geese pattern of economic growth was achieved. As a result, this time, Japan became an economic leader in this region. Under the US imperialism the medium term order was to be built. However, due to the long economic down turn in Japan, the 1997-1998 economic crises and the growing power of China, the medium term goal was not realized. Therefore, there was no option or choice for Japan to become an imperial power and Japan's leadership standing in the region was back to normal, status quo. Then what should Japan do down the road? This is a major challenge for us.

In my view, Japan is stagnating in economic terms; even so we are still a rich country. We are wealthy. That wealth has to be shared. To be more specific take the case of the flow of people. I think talented people come to Japan and become Japanese nationals. That kind of Japan should be created. I think that is a new and major challenge for Japan down the road.

Answers by Prof. Koji Murata

On Iraq, I totally agree with Professor Shiraishi's explanation. I would like to add some comments. The oil factor is probably one of the factors. But if you try to emphasize just one factor in international politics that would result to conspiracy theory and it's very dangerous. As for the dependency of the US in the Middle East oil, it is probably only 40% of her oil needs, and is not a major cause to go to war. The most critical issue will be Iraq's weapons of mass destruction. If Iraq becomes the dominant power in the Middle East and if it is able to exercise influence and acquires a major clout then it would become a major concern for the US as well. As for the weapons of mass destructions and the proliferation of such weapons there is no doubt that the US is very nervous and sensitive on these issues. Japan probably is not too sensitive about these issues. As Mr.Yoichi Funabashi, a lecturer in a previous forum, mentioned, one of the characteristics of the US is to try to make the future always advantageous for them- always in favor of them. So time is always on their side. So if time is allowed to pass without destroying weapons for mass destruction in the possession of rogue states, which would not be advantageous to the US, as the sole superpower now.

Question from the audience

I'm from Taiwan. I am studying Child Literature here. About China's Taiwan strategy we heard a very easy to understand presentation from Dr. Li. As a Taiwanese, I would like to thank him. Given the very tough circumstances in Taiwan and the kind of position we are in, I felt very strongly listening to his presentation. I am not an expert in political science and international relations, but as one Taiwan citizen, I have many doubts, which are not yet answered. First he talked about two new political thinking. It was mentioned that Taiwan has experienced democracy and that through integration or unification and the new kind of thinking it might be possible that China may be led to democ-

racy. Taiwan's experience is rated very highly by Dr. Li. I am very happy about this. But even if dialogue is attempted, it's very difficult to have a dialogue with China because the Chinese leadership does not listen to the views of Taiwan. Under such circumstances the democratization movement in Taiwan has been frustrated. After unification how will the experience of Taiwanese democracy be instrumental in bringing about the democratization of China? I think there is one good way to push this idea forward. Chinese people study in large numbers in countries like Japan, Europe and the US. They should pull their energies together and have them contribute to the democratization of China. That would be the fastest way to do this because the current situation cannot be overcome just as it is.

The second point about peaceful unification, we should not stick to this policy of one country two systems. Dr. Li mentioned human rights and political democratization, the liberalization of the economy - all of these are wonderful principles, but at the very end you said that there should be no attachment or preoccupation with the one country two systems idea. Perhaps Dr. Li's thought can be revised as follows - that there should be no preoccupation with the Taiwan issue but make China a wonderful country, make China into a country that is attractive to the Taiwanese youth. If efforts can be made in that direction then perhaps China can contribute and Taiwan can contribute to global peace and security. Maybe I'm putting my own political life at stake, but I think academicians like Dr. Li and if we can all make China grow into a country where you do not have to feel afraid to make any comments known to the leadership then I would be the first one to go to China.

Answers by Dr. Li Enmin

Thank you very much for your wonderful and inspiring questions. So let me try to respond to your questions one by one. I would like to share with you my understanding. First question. The proposal that Taiwan should contribute to the democratization of Mainland China requires the adoption of a new policy. Why did I make such a proposal? Basically, from my perspective since 1990's Taiwan has been quite passive on the issue of unification, but if you look into history more deeply, more closely, you will understand that since 1950s towards 1970s Taiwan's politicians, including Chiang Kaishek, had a different political philosophy. They had a major political ambition. The philosophy at that time was through democracy communism should be expelled and dispelled. However, since 1990s Taiwan does not want do something like that anymore; they are not motivated to do that. Then how can democratization of China progress?

The weak military posture of China will be beneficial to the international community, especially to this part of the world. We have high hopes for that. However, through Taiwan, democratization of China can be made possible, but of course Taiwan's power alone cannot do that. The Chinese students studying abroad and also students who are interested in politics within China, all the intelligentsia in China, have to cooperate and work together to change politics in China. They all have to be motivated to do that. In fact as I said in my earlier presentation, China, the term China or Chinese communist party, when we use those words or when you imagine CCP 20 years ago, 30 years ago the China 20-30 years ago is totally different from what it is now. Even within the Chinese communist party efforts are being made to align themselves to international trend. Of course, these efforts center around the Chinese communist party and dictatorship - we don't use that word in China - is still in power. However, today's system is totally different from the situation of only one dictator two decades ago. Democratization is making progress in China. Hong Kong, Taiwan, Macao and foreign Chinese residents can contribute in this effort, too. One country two systems may become one

country one system in the future. I share with you this idea but in the long-term perspective in 50 years, in 100 years to come China will be definitely different. China will change for the worse or for the better - I'm not sure. But, I am confident that China will become more democratic, will have more respect for human rights and will have more respect for people at large. That is my feeling.

Secondly, with respect to Asian security, as I said earlier, the economic growth of China is conducive to security and peace in Asia and in the world. Chinese leadership has to make sure that China does not become a threat to other regions or to this region. Chinese politicians often use two words: One is China is super power, big country. Therefore, in the international community China has to play an important role and become a responsible country. Second one means a prosperous country. They have the awareness that China is already prosperous and that China is a prosperous world or country. These are great expectations, but reality has still some way to go. China is still a poor country. China can barely feed her people. China has a vast land area and a large population and its military power has grown stronger for the past 20 years. That is why China has emerged as a power in the international community. However in my perspective, in going forward China should not become a country like the US, a unilateral country. For that purpose, China should make a concerted effort for domestic improvement and domestic construction - be it communism or capitalism. Deng Xiaoping had a theory of the white cat and the black cat. If you need further explanation, I think this is conducive to the welfare and happiness of the nation. As long as the Chinese government pursues policies conducive to the happiness and peace of the people, the Chinese people will support the policy be it a capitalist or communist policy. China will, then, become a very good country in 50 years to come.

Question from the audience

This is out of my specialty and my question is a beginner's question. I would like to ask about Japan-North Korea relationship. At this moment the relationship between Japan and North Korea is in a deadlock situation, in an impasse. From a third party, it seems that Prime Minister Koizumi already had a scenario before the summit meeting between Japan and North Korea. But once the abduction case was made public there was so much reactions and resistance from within Japan to the summit. If there is something not going well in the relationship between North Korea and Japan this might not be in line with the Koizumi scenario. As Professor Nam mentioned there is a determination to solve this issue clearly. This is something that a third party like us cannot understand. Is there really a determination or a capacity and competence, especially on the part of the politicians in Japan, to solve these problems? This is something that I would really like to ask.

Answers by Dr. Nam Kijeong

There is no use of talking about it if Japanese politicians did not have the ability, so let us believe they have. The abduction issue is an important theme anywhere. It has become an unavoidable entry point to check as to which side of the discussion one is in. When I first heard about it, I felt a cold shiver along my spine. But, thinking of it dispassionately, within the context of conflicts between States after World War II in this region, North East Asia, I think it is within what we could expect. Hence, it is not the backlash from comprehensive security policies Japan has taken within North East Asia system, which was led by the US, but a small negative point in what was overly a success.

The problem becomes how are you going to surmount this? It's not the issue that you cannot see the vision of any future state. Sometimes, this state may go too far which is the traditional security issue, but from now you have to think about human security, and in that context nationalism is an issue. How to bring about order, inclusive of the economic aspect, I think security issues have to be discussed. The actors here would not just be the state. Recently, many actors have come out - NGO's, local governments and other such actors. These people should come out in the open. Strategies that are brought out by the state should be complemented or supplemented by efforts of these non-state actors. I think Japan has a great power and capability in this regard. This may sound like a dream but in order to stimulate the discussion let me mention that you take the case of local governments, globalization is often called localization. If that kind of move can be made vis-à-vis North Korea I think it would be a positive move – that is, if the local governments can be made to play a role. For example if the abduction happened in Niigata prefecture, then maybe Niigata prefecture as a government unit could make the move vis-à-vis North Korea. Now I have digressed a bit but I don't think it's an issue that because of the abduction issue Japan cannot move forward. It's a matter of the capability to persuade and convince the people - a matter of grand design. If the people can be convinced that they have something to gain, then regardless of the heavy press coverage of the abduction, the people will understand and, of course, recognize that relationship with North Korea is, basically, very important. It's a possible scenario, I think. Japan may find it a little bit unpleasant to move alone and maybe that's why the US has come in. That's the reason why, all the more, Japan should have her own grand design - a vision to show to countries like Korea and the US, and to present to and convince the Japanese people.

Conclusion by Dr. Park Young June

Thank you very much. It's already 6:10 and the reception was supposed to start at 6. There are more people who want to raise questions, but we hope you'd use the reception for further questions. As a moderator and as a person who was involved in the forum right from the beginning I would like to summarize this forum today. The reason for organizing this forum with the foreign students studying in Japan is our desire to reflect upon Asia, East Asia, in the 20th century. As you know, in the 20th century Asia we had, or was involved in several wars: the Japanese war and World War I, and the Manchurian and Sino-Japanese war,



World War II, the Korean war, the Vietnam war and so forth. Even in the 21st century the scars from these wars are still vivid. In the consequence of these wars offenders and victims are alike – they were both victimized as a result of wars, in my view. Therefore, who is responsible for our wars? Which side? That question is very important. However,

those of us who are living in the 21st century should avoid mistakes, which were made by our predecessors who lived in the 20th century. We should avoid wars.

Of course, peace building has to go beyond national boundary. We have to work together with our neighbors. We have to work with a single mind. As was mentioned earlier we have to develop common norms and we have to share those norms. The students of younger generation of different countries should be brought together to mobilize their wisdom and ideas. I think that is very important as a first step. The SGRA forum is one excellent example of bringing together students from various countries. The selection of Odaiba as the venue for this forum is very appropriate. Odaiba was a fortress established by the Tokugawa shogunate as a protection against the aggression by western black ships. This was also a symbolic place for the isolated Japan at that time. After 150 years have passed students from various countries are brought together here to discuss in a very peaceful manner the international security in East Asia of the 21st century. With that background, I find this forum an extremely significant undertaking. The students from various countries numbering 70 people are participating in a very epoch-making event, in my view. We started this forum at two this afternoon and it's been more than four hours now. So I would like to express my appreciation to the speakers who gave very insightful presentations and also to the members of the audience who participated actively and earnestly. I would also like to express my appreciation, on behalf of SGRA, to all of you.

Speakers' Profiles

■ Shiraishi Takashi

Dr. Takashi Shiraishi is a Professor at the Center for Southeast Asian Studies, Kyoto University since 1996. He taught at Cornell University between 1987 and 1998 after being Assistant Professor at University of Tokyo. He is a specialist in government and politics in East Asia. His publications include: *An Age of Motion*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990; *Network Power: Japan and Asia*, (Coedited with Peter Katzenstein) Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1997; "Current Data on the Indonesian Military Elite: October 1995 to December 31, 1997," *Indonesia* 65 (April 1998), pp. 179-194; "The Indonesian Military in Politics," in Adam Schwarz and Jonathan Paris, eds., *The Politics of Post-Suharto Indonesia*, New York: Council of Foreign Relations Press, 1999, pp. 73-86.

■ Nam Kijeong

Dr. Nam Kijeong is an Associate Professor at the faculty of law of Tohoku University. Chief of SGRA's "World Security and Peace" research team. PhD from University of Tokyo, MA and BA from Seoul National University. His publications include: "Japan's Diplomatic Aim and Cooperation Policy during the Korean War" (in Korean, 2001), "Japan's Dispatch of Self-Defense Forces in the America's War against Terrorism: viewed from a legal standpoint" (in Korean, 2002), "Kim Jong Il-Koizumi Summit and Bush's Side Kick" (In Korean, 2002)

■ Li Enmin

Dr. Li Enmin is Foreign Professor of East Asian History at the Faculty of International Studies at Utsunomiya University. He is Chief of SGRA's "History Issues" research team. He received two Ph.D. degrees; one in Sociology from the Hitotsubashi University in Japan and the other in History from the Nankai University in China. Dr. Li is author of *Tenkanki no chuugoku nippon to Taiwan (China-Japan Relations and the Taiwan Issue in a Period of Transition)*, Ochanomizu Shobo Publishers 2001/Tokyo, awarded Masayoshi Ohira Memorial Prize by the Masayoshi Ohira Memorial Foundation) and *Zhongri Minjian Jingji Waijiao (China's Unofficial Economic Diplomacy toward Japan, 1945-1972)*, Renmin Chubanshe 1997/Beijing). Dr. Li's major is Chinese International Relations since the Opium War of 1840, and his current research interest is Sino-Japanese diplomacy in the postwar era. He is currently involved in a project on Japan-Taiwan economic relations 1945-1979.

■ Murata Koji

Koji Murata is currently Associate Professor of Diplomatic History, Department of Political Science, Doshisha University, Kyoto. Prior to this position, he was Associate Professor of American Studies, School of Integrated Arts and Sciences, Hiroshima University, Higashi-Hiroshima. Professor Murata received his B.A. in Political Science from Doshisha University, and his M.A. in Political Science and Ph.D. in Political Science from Kobe University, Kobe. Dr. Murata also holds his M. Phil. in Political Science from the George Washington University, where he studied as a Fulbright student from 1991 to 1995. Professor Murata's specialities include the history of U.S.-Japan security relations, U.S. foreign policy, and Japan's defense policy. Dr. Murata received the Yomiuri Merit Award for New Opinion Leadership, the Shimizu Hiroshi Award from the Japan Association of American Studies, the Suntory Academic Award, and the Yoshida Shigeru Award.

Professor Murata is the author of two books, *President Carter's Policy to Withdraw the U.S. Forces from South Korea*, and *The First U.S. Defense Secretary Forrester*, among other many articles in both Japanese and English.

■ **Park Young-June**

Dr. Park Young-June is a Visiting Research Fellow at the Sejong Institute Japan Center, in Korea. He is the Secretary of SGRA's "History Issues" research team. He was awarded PhD in International Relations from University of Tokyo in 2002. After receiving two MAs from Yonsei University and Seoul National University in Korea. He was teaching at the Military Academy in Korea. His publications include: "Birth of Navy in Modern Japan" "Reconsideration of Establishing Navy at the end of Tokugawa Era."

■ **Tomikawa Hideo**

Born in 1971, Mr. Tomikawa is a PhD Candidate at University of Tokyo. His major is economics. He studied at Malaya University from 2000 to 2001. BA Chiba University.

■ **Kaneko Mitsuya**

Born in 1975, Mr. Kaneko is a PhD Candidate at University of Tokyo in Economics. He took his MA from the University of Tokyo in 2000. His major is public finance.

■ **He Aijun**

Born in 1965, Mr. He Aijun is a PHD Candidate at the University of Tokyo in Agricultural and Life Sciences. He took his MA from the University of Tokyo. Researcher at Kunming Botanical Research Center of Science Academy of China before studying in Japan

■ **Lee Myong Chan**

Mr. Lee Myong Chan is a PhD candidate in Politics at Keio University. He took his MA from Korea University in 1993.

SGRA Report #17 English Version

Report of the SGRA Forum #10 in Odaiba
“Global Security in the 21st Century and East Asia”

Published by: Sekiguchi Global Research Association (SGRA)

Junko Imanishi, Representative

c/o Atsumi International Scholarship Foundation

3-5-8 Sekiguchi Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo 112-0014, Japan

Tel: 03-3943-7612 Fax: 03-3943-1512 Email: sgra-office@aisf.or.jp

SGRA Homepage: <http://www.aisf.or.jp/sgra/>

Edited by: Columbus E. Maquito, Leilanie Maquito-Miro

Date of publication: June 6, 2003

Printed by: Fuji Printing, Ltd.
