



Report on the Second Expert Meeting of the CSCAP Study Group on How to Realize Multilateral Security Cooperation in North Pacific/Northeast Asia

IFANS, Seoul, 11-12 November 2005

The Second Expert Meeting of the CSCAP Study Group on How to Realize Multilateral Security Cooperation in North Pacific/Northeast Asia was hosted by the Institute of Foreign Affairs and National Security (IFANS), Seoul, from 11-12 November 2005. The meeting was attended by representatives from seven CSCAP member councils, including Australia, China, India, Japan, Korea, New Zealand, and the USA. Other participants included: two officials from the Department of Asian Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the PRC; the Director of the Taiwan Security Research Center; three participants from IFANS, Yung-woo Chun, Deputy Minister for Policy Planning and International Organizations; Jeong-Sik Kang, Director of the Security Policy Division, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, Republic of Korea; Young-Koo Cha, Adjunct Professor, Seoul National University; and Geun Lee, Professor of International Relations, Seoul National University. All together, there were 20 participants, including the Co-Chairs: Professor In-Taek Hyun (CSCAP Korea); Professor Yoshinobu Yamamoto (CSCAP Japan); Mr Zhou Xingbao (CSCAP China), and Professor T. J. Pempel (CSCAP USA). CSCAP New Zealand was represented by Dr Tanya Ogilvie-White from the University of Canterbury.

Session 1: Overview of Security Situation in Northeast Asia and Tasks for Multilateral Security Cooperation

The first session was chaired by Professor Yoshinobu Yamamoto (CSCAP Japan). He and the other Co-Chairs stressed the positive context in which the Study Group's second meeting was taking place: the final day of the first phase of the 5th round of Six Party Talks in Beijing. With constructive bilateral and multilateral security dialogue currently ongoing at the Track 1 level, the timing for Track 2 discussions on the prospects for building a permanent multilateral framework for Northeast Asia could not be better. Following the Co-Chairs' remarks, Professor T J Pempel (CSCAP USA) presented a paper titled "Toward a Multilateral Framework for Northeast Asian Security", in which he set out some of the sources of insecurity and obstacles to cooperation in the region. He discussed on-going territorial disputes, weapons proliferation, resource competition, rising nationalism, and a counter-productive shift toward what he described as "regional bipolarity" - deepening divisions between maritime powers on the one hand (the US, Japan, Taiwan, the Philippines, Australia and New Zealand) and territorial powers on the other (China, the two Koreas, Russia, and much of Southeast Asia). Immediately following Professor Pempel's paper, Ambassador Jin Guihua (CSCAP China) presented a short paper titled "Opportunities and Challenges for Security Cooperation in Northeast Asia", in which he argued that the growth of cooperation and danger of conflict exists simultaneously in Northeast Asia. Echoing his comments at the first Study Group meeting in Tokyo, he stressed that 'Cold War Mentalities' are hampering regional multilateral security cooperation, and that a 'new security concept' was required to overcome outdated thinking. He then outlined the position that Chinese officials have been articulating in Track 1 discussions since the mid-1990s - i.e. the need for regional security interaction to be guided by the principles of peaceful co-existence. He also suggested that, in the short term, regional security dialogue should focus on achievable goals, particularly on less contentious issues, such as energy cooperation. The paper presentations were followed by discussant's comments, which were provided by Professor Kang Choi (CSCAP Korea). He outlined what he saw as one of the key obstacles to successful regional cooperation - the conflict between human security values and national security interests, which rest on competing notions of sovereignty. He also raised questions over the prospects for genuine cooperation in non-traditional security areas, explaining that while it might sound good in theory, in practice issues such as energy security were the source of serious tension. Animated informal discussion around the table ensued. One participant pointed out that the gap between 'words' (political rhetoric) and 'deeds' (actions) must close before genuine trust between regional actors could emerge. Another stressed the point that, although the papers had focused on external sources of insecurity, rising nationalism was occurring at the domestic level, and it was not clear how this important source of tension could be handled multilaterally. Professor Pempel's conceptualisation of regional bipolarity proved to be controversial, with participants arguing that it vastly oversimplified regional dynamics.

Session 2: Theoretical Framework, Approaches and Mechanisms for Multilateral Security Cooperation

The second session was chaired by Professor In-Taek Hyun (CSCAP Korea). The session began with a paper presentation from Tsutomu Kikuchi (CSCAP Japan), titled “Institutional Linkages and Security Order in Northeast Asia.” Focusing on the interplay between bilateral, sub-regional, regional, and global security institutions, the paper set out the complex conceptual analysis that was originally developed by Oran Young, identifying four characterizations of institutional relationships: embedded, nested, clustered and overlapping. He made two particularly interesting points in his analysis: the first was that any analysis of regional cooperation in Northeast Asia should begin with the assumption that the region will not be able to develop a strong regional multilateral institution that effectively regulates institutional relations for the foreseeable future, even if it is desirable to do so. His second point was that any attempt to promote multilateral cooperation through fostering linkages between existing institutions should be based on specific local conditions as well as regional values and interests. Professor Kikuchi’s paper was followed by discussants’ comments, which were provided by Dr Tanya Ogilvie-White, University of Canterbury (CSCAP New Zealand) and Mr Yi Yang (Department of Asian Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the PRC). Dr Ogilvie-White agreed that the creation of strong institutional linkages was desirable in Northeast Asia, and argued that understanding the complex web of institutions operating in the security realm at the sub-regional, regional, inter-regional and global levels presented a major challenge to scholars and practitioners alike, particularly in the context of the growing institutional overlap that has been occurring since the terrorist attacks of 9-11. With this in mind, she stressed the importance of ensuring that regional security cooperation, in its effort to serve local interests and reflect local conditions, did not conflict with the goals and norms of global institutions. She offered the example of the Six Party Talks and the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty (NPT) to illustrate this point, explaining that solutions that may appear appropriate at the regional level (such as a decision to concede to many of the DPRK’s demands in order to encourage its return to the NPT at the earliest opportunity) may set a negative precedent at the global level. Mr Yang then offered his discussant’s comments, reading from a prepared statement. He urged that Northeast Asia should not follow the same path to regional security cooperation that had been pursued in other regions. Echoing Ambassador Jin’s comments in session 1, he argued that it would be more constructive for the region to focus on functional security cooperation, dealing with less controversial ‘soft security’ issues initially in the hope that that would foster greater trust between regional actors. Informal comments from around the table raised the point that there exists far more functional security cooperation in Northeast Asia than is often assumed, and that the positive outcome of the fourth round of the Six Party Talks, in which a Joint Statement was adopted, offered cause for optimism that lasting cooperation on the most contentious issues could also be achieved in the future.

Session 3: 6-Party Talks and Multilateral Security Cooperation

The third session was chaired by Mr Zhou Xingbao (CSCAP China). The session began with a paper presentation from Professor James Cotton (CSCAP Australia), titled “Negotiating a Revival of the Six Party Process on North Korea.” Professor Cotton cautioned that while the outcome of the 4th round of Six Party Talks, in which the Joint Statement was adopted by the parties, was grounds for cautious optimism, the process faced an up hill struggle before genuine consensus on how to resolve the DPRK nuclear crisis could be achieved. He identified a fundamental sticking point between the US and the DPRK over the sequence of disarmament and aid provision: the US insisting on complete, verifiable, and irreversible disarmament (CVID) before assistance would be provided, and the DPRK insisting on a phased process of disarmament, during which Pyongyang would retain its nuclear deterrent until sufficient aid and assurances had been received (not simply promised). Echoing Dr Ogilvie-White’s comments from the previous session, Professor Cotton urged that the participants in the Six Party Talks should not concede too much to the DPRK without some form of punishment for its non-compliance. If the DPRK’s clear case of non-compliance was seen to have no serious consequences, other states may also be tempted to engage in nuclear blackmail and further weaken the nuclear non-proliferation regime. Professor Seo-Hang Lee (CSCAP Korea), Professor Hideya Kurata (CSCAP Japan) and Ms Yajing Zhang (Department of Asian Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the PRC) all provided formal discussants’ comments. The point was made that the DPRK was moving ahead aggressively with its nuclear programme; that its demands for a light water reactor should be treated with utmost caution; and that resolution of the nuclear crisis is likely to be protracted and difficult. A suggestion was put forward that the Study Group should not focus exclusively on the Six Party Talks as the basis for developing a multilateral security framework for the region, as other (more successful) regional institutions existed, such as the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF), 10+3 and APEC. Informal comments from around the table outlined the need for patience in allowing the Six

Party Talks to translate the ambiguous language of the Joint Statement into clarity and trust. The question was raised as to whether or not China believed US claims that the DPRK had a uranium enrichment programme. Although Chinese officials at the First Export Meeting in Tokyo confirmed that China did believe such a programme existed, on this occasion the question was avoided, and instead it was pointed out that China believes every country has a right to a peaceful nuclear programme.

Session 4: Non-traditional Security Threat and Multilateral Security Cooperation

The fourth session was chaired by Professor T J Pempel (CSCAP USA). Unfortunately, the author of the session's paper, Dr Rizal Sukma (CSCAP Indonesia), was unable to attend the meeting due to flight availability. In his absence, his paper, which was titled "Non-traditional Threats and the Institutionalisation of Multilateral Security Cooperation in Northeast Asia" was summarised by Professor Hyun (CSCAP Korea). In his paper, Dr Sukma looked to ASEAN and ARF as regional multilateral institutions that could be emulated in Northeast Asia, as they had led to an unprecedented level of 'comfort' and trust in Southeast Asia. He pointed out that multilateral cooperation had not led to the decline of bilateral security cooperation - both were able to operate in tandem, despite conflicting ideas amongst ASEAN members over the merits of some bilateral arrangements. However, Dr Sukma's paper questioned whether the evolution of a multilateral institution along the same lines as ASEAN could emerge in Northeast Asia before the DPRK nuclear issue is resolved. Would it be better, he asked, to institutionalise the Six Party Process now with a set of principles, a mechanism, and a broader security agenda given that the nuclear issue may take years to resolve? Professor K V Kesavan (CSCAP India) provided the formal discussant's comments in response to Professor Hyun's summary of Dr Sukma's paper. He sketched out the origins of ASEAN and the South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC), explaining that the latter has never dealt with traditional security issues. He then questioned whether multilateral cooperation in Northeast Asia would be possible in the context of a failed Six Party Process, and asked whether the emphasis could shift to dealing with non-traditional security threats, such as piracy, flu pandemics, drug-trafficking and energy security. During the discussion that followed, it was pointed out that to compare Northeast Asia with Southeast Asia was almost akin to comparing apples and oranges – that the security dynamics were so different as to make any comparison meaningless. The point was also made that no genuine trust and confidence could be built in Northeast Asia until the DPRK nuclear issue is resolved: while in theory it may be possible to conceive of a neo-functional-type cooperation over non-traditional security matters leading to greater trust and eventually to cooperation over hard security matters, the reality is that the nuclear issue is pivotal to the region's deep seated insecurities, which feed into all aspects of regional security dynamics. Others felt that this analysis was too pessimistic and defeatist, and that efforts to foster cooperation over traditional and non-traditional security issues could and should occur simultaneously.

Session 5: Wrap-up of discussions and project output

The final session was chaired by Professor Hyun (CSCAP Korea). The focus was on achieving agreement on the shape of the Study Group's output, which had been a contentious issue at the Tokyo meeting. During the discussions that followed it became clear that the group had made significant progress during the Seoul meeting, and that a consensus was emerging over the scope and goals of the project's output. The contents of a book - co-edited by the co-chairs, and with contributions from a number of the Study Group's participants - was agreed upon. The book will begin with an overview of the security environment in Northeast Asia, which will be written by T J Pempel (CSCAP USA) and Ambassador Jin (CSCAP China). Part 2 will comprise a general theoretical framework, written by Professor Yamamoto (CSCAP Japan) and Dr Philip Yang (Director of the Taiwan Security Research Center). Part 3 will comprise four chapters on the Six Party Talks:

- a general introduction to the 6PT, by Professor James Cotton (CSCAP Australia);
- a chapter outlining China's role in the 6PT, by Ms Zhang (Dept of Asian Affairs, PRC);
- a paper outlining Japan's role in the 6PT, by Dr Hideya Kurata (CSCAP Japan); and
- a chapter outlining potential outcomes of the 6PT, based on previous cases of nuclear rollback, by Dr Tanya Ogilvie-White (CSCAP New Zealand).

Part 4 will focus on non-traditional security cooperation, with chapters provided by Rizal Sukma (CSCAP Indonesia) and Seo-Hang Lee (CSCAP Korea). The co-chairs will also seek a contribution from CSCAP Russia on energy security cooperation. Part 5 will discuss security mechanisms, with chapters from Tsutomu Kikuchi (CSCAP Japan), and Professor Kang Choi (CSCAP Korea). A chapter will also be sought from CSCAP Mongolia, possibly on building a variation of a nuclear weapons free zone in Northeast Asia. Part 6, on policy recommendations, will be written by the co-chairs, based on discussions held at the fourth and final meeting of

the Study Group, which will be held in San Francisco or Hawaii in late 2006. It was provisionally agreed that the third meeting of the group will be held in Beijing, on 28-29 April 2006. Draft chapters for the first five sections of the book will be discussed at that meeting, which may have to be extended in order to cover all of the material.

Dr Tanya Ogilvie-White
School of Political Science & Communication
University of Canterbury