



**Report on the Third Meeting of the CSCAP Study Group on
Multilateral Security Cooperation in North Pacific/
Northeast Asia,
Beijing News Plaza Hotel, Beijing, China, 28-29 April 2006**

The Third Expert Meeting of the CSCAP Study Group on *How to Realize Multilateral Security Cooperation in North Pacific/Northeast Asia* was hosted by CSCAP China, at the Beijing New Plaza Hotel, from 28-29 April 2006. The meeting was attended by representatives from nine CSCAP member committees, including Australia, China, the DPRK, India, Japan, ROK, New Zealand, Singapore, and the USA. Other participants included: Shen Shishun, Director of Asia-Pacific Studies at the China Institute of International Studies (CIIS); First Secretary Sun Shan, Department of Asian Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, PRC; Professor Liu Jiangyong, from the Institute of International Studies, Tsinghua University; Dr Piao Jianyi, Assistant Director of the Institute of Asia-Pacific Studies, Chinese Academy of Social Sciences (CASS); Dr Chen Xulong, Deputy Director of the Division of International Politics, CIIS; Dr Chyungly Lee, Chengchi University (Taipei); Professor Phillip Yang, Taiwan University; Professor Jongryn Mo and Dr Seok-Hee Han, both from Yongsei University (Seoul); Seung-bae Yeo, Director of the North Korean Nuclear Affairs Bureau, ROK Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade; and Christophe Bosquillon, GSSD Group, Australian National University. All together, there were 26 participants, including the four co-chairs: Professor In-Taek Hyun (CSCAP Korea); Professor Yoshinobu Yamamoto (CSCAP Japan); Ambassador Jin Guihua (CSCAP China); and Professor T. J. Pempel (CSCAP USA). Representatives from CSCAP EU and CSCAP Mongolia were also invited but were unable to attend. 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 Yamamoto of CSCAP Japan. Professor T J Pempel (CSCAP USA) presented a reworked version of a paper entitled “Toward a Multilateral Framework for Northeast Asian Security,” which had originally been presented at the Second Study Group meeting in Seoul. The structure and principal arguments of the paper remained unchanged, with the focus on on-going territorial disputes in Northeast Asia, 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). Professor Pempel argued that diplomatic tensions resulting from these developments are becoming embedded, exacerbating security dilemmas and arms racing dynamics, and encouraging self-fulfilling prophecies. He stressed that, in this unstable environment, the prospects for resolving the North Korean nuclear issue in the short-term did not appear hopeful, and that the emphasis in regional negotiations should thus focus on the more realistic goals of

encouraging functional cooperation, in the hope that this will foster trust and confidence over the longer-term. Following Professor Pempel's paper, Ambassador Jin Guihua (CSCAP China) presented a 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 Study Group meetings in Tokyo and Seoul, he stressed that 'Cold War Mentalities' are hampering regional multilateral security cooperation, and that a 'new security concept' was required to overcome outdated thinking. Professor In-Taek Hyun (CSCAP Korea) provided the session's final presentation, which was based on the outline of a paper entitled "New Dynamism in Post-Cold War Northeast Asia." He made the point that theoretical assessments of the future of the Northeast Asian region tend to be overly simplistic, in that they ignore the nuanced political and strategic realities of the region, leading to conclusions that are either too optimistic or too pessimistic. Rejecting theoretical parsimony on this basis, he proposed an empirical examination of nine factors that influence regional security dynamics, encompassing a broad range of political, strategic, economic, social, and cultural security sectors. During the free discussion that followed, most participants directed their questions to Professor Pempel, either challenging his conception of emerging regional bipolarity or asking for further clarification of the concept. Ambassador Jin was also questioned over his assertion that the New Security Concept that he was proposing was actually new, or a version of the position that Chinese officials have been articulating in Track 1 discussions since the late 1990s - i.e. the need for regional security interaction to be guided the principles of peaceful co-existence.

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

The second session was chaired by Professor In-Taek Hyun (CSCAP Korea). The first paper, entitled "Multilateral Security Framework in Northeast Asia – A Theoretical Essay," (a reworked version of a paper presented at the first Study Group meeting in Tokyo) was presented by Professor Yoshinobu Yamamoto (CSCAP Japan). He began by outlining the different types of multilateral security arrangements that exist internationally, based types of conflict and security cooperation, and went on to discuss whether and how these could be applied in Northeast Asia. Of the six different frameworks that he explored, he argued that 'cooperative security' arrangements would be most suited to the region. Such arrangements are inclusive in terms of membership, do not assume the existence of adversaries, remain flexible in terms of utilising both bilateral and multilateral frameworks for resolving different security problems, and aim to avoid competitive security dynamics and maintain stability through dialogue and confidence-building. Professor Yamamoto's presentation was followed by a reworked paper by Professor Tsutomu Kikuchi (CSCAP Japan) which was presented at the second Study Group meeting in Seoul. The paper, entitled "Institutional Linkages and Security Order in Northeast Asia," analysed the complex interplay of bilateral, sub-regional, regional and global institutions in Northeast Asia, arguing that problems that exist in the region do not derive from a lack of multilateral security institutions (as is often assumed), but from a lack of coordination between them. He went on to explain that achieving such

coordination would be difficult, but that the Six Party Talks process provided an “excellent testing ground” to explore the possibility of establishing a more formal and permanent regional security order in Northeast Asia. Inevitably, he argued, the process would be dynamic, possibly generating a variety of linked institutional arrangements to deal with security issues such as: security guarantees; economic assistance to the DPRK; transformation of the armistice regime to a peace regime; and normalisation of diplomatic relations. These arrangements would be addressed by a different composition of countries at different stages of the Six Party Talks framework, and over the longer term may generate de facto security multilateralism in Northeast Asia. The final paper of the session, entitled “Northeast Asia Security Cooperation: International Relations Theory and Embedded Regionalism”, was presented by Professor Philip Yang of Taiwan University. He used Realism, Liberalism, and Constructivism to provide different explanations and predictions of regime-building in Northeast Asia, then employed the concept of “embedded regionalism” to explain the evolution of East Asian economic and security institutions. He argued that Northeast Asia security cooperation is becoming more deeply embedded into broader East Asia regionalism, creating the potential for a sustained commitment to multilateralism as a means for containing the potential outbreak of hostility or military conflict. The discussion that followed consisted mainly of comments rather than questions. One participant made the point that while institutionalism is a wonderful idea in theory, in practice it can only promote genuine security cooperation if its members perceive themselves as having over-lapping interests. The problem in Northeast Asia is that, currently, in many crucial areas of hard security, such perceptions do not exist. Another participant argued in favour of developing a practical roadmap approach to regional security building (rather than abstract theoretical frameworks), setting out specific goals and shared interests that regional players can agree upon. The problem of reconciling dramatically different US and Northeast Asian approaches to security was also raised, as it was felt that this presented a major obstacle to successful regional institution-building.

Session 3: 6-Party Talks and Multilateral Security Cooperation

The third session was chaired by Ambassador Jin (CSCAP China). During this session six papers were presented on the subject of the Six Party Talks. The first presenter, Professor James Cotton (CSCAP Australia) presented a reworked paper from the second Study Group meeting in Seoul, which he gave the new title: “The Six Party Process on North Korea: Multilateral Resolution of the Nuclear Issue?” He incorporated an assessment of the most recent developments in the stalled negotiations into his paper, arguing that two issues stand out as crucial to advancing the talks and achieving the return of North Korea to the NPT: first, clear articulation by the US of the nature and timing of concrete benefits that will be provided in return for North Korea’s cooperation over the nuclear issue; and second, agreement between the five parties, including South Korea and China, regarding the sanctions that will be imposed on North Korea if such cooperation is not forthcoming. Next, Tanya Ogilvie-White (CSCAP New Zealand) presented a paper entitled “Negotiating Nuclear Rollback in North Korea: Lessons from Ukraine and Libya.” The paper examined the negotiations that have resulted in nuclear rollback in the past, arguing that these offer valuable insights into the dynamics of

cooperative nuclear disarmament and the relative strengths of different negotiating strategies. Above all, past experience shows that patience and flexibility is required from the key negotiating parties (which in this case are China, North Korea and the US); the role of a pro-active, fully engaged mediator is vital to the success of the negotiations (which in this case is China); and a focus on common interests must be prioritised for talks to have any chance of succeeding (which in this case is nuclear security, regional stability and economic prosperity). Professor Hideya Kurata (CSCAP Japan) gave the third presentation, which was based on his paper entitled “Building the Korean Peace Regime as Security Assurance: The Local/Regional Issue in the Global Non-Proliferation Regime.” Professor Kurata argued strongly that North Korean nuclear disarmament must precede any attempt to build an inter-Korean peace regime, given the pivotal importance of the former to the stability of the entire region. He also made the point that US should review the issue of security assurances, as the language of the Joint Statement of September 2005 implied that Washington had already offered comprehensive security assurances to North Korea, thus reducing US leverage in the Six Party Talks. Seung-Bae Yeo (CSCAP Korea) provided an update on the stalled talks, including the problem of linkage between the North Korean money-laundering issue, US financial sanctions, and Pyongyang’s refusal to return to the negotiating table until the US lifts its financial sanctions (which Washington argues are a law enforcement measure and thus not linked to the nuclear issue). He outlined the most recent informal discussions that had taken place between the six parties in Tokyo in April 2006, which had attempted to find a way out of the impasse. Although no concrete solution had been found, Mr Yeo felt that the Joint Statement provided a safety net to prevent the unravelling of the Six Party Talks, and that in the meantime patience and perseverance were required from all parties until the deadlock is broken. Shen Shishun (CSCAP China) gave China’s view of the Six Party Talks, which it sees as crucial to preventing nuclear proliferation across the entire region of Northeast Asia, accompanied by heightened insecurity and the possible outbreak of war. Given the sensitivity of the issues involved, China favours the adoption of non-coercive means for resolving the North Korean nuclear issues, and is opposed to the imposition of sanctions. Professor Shen described the Six Party Talks as “arduous and plodding”, identifying mutual distrust between the US and DPRK as the biggest impediment to their success. To kick-start the process, he called on the US and other countries to offer North Korea a “league” security guarantee in return for disarmament. The final presentation was made by Professor Jo Kyong Wan, of the DPRK. He started by outlining positive developments in relations between North and South Korea, but stated that despite these, the Korean Peninsula “remains the biggest hotbed for confrontation in the world” due to the “US hostile policy toward the DPRK.” In particular, he criticised US “nuclear threats,” dishonesty, Cold War mentality (including security arrangements with Japan and South Korea and the deployment of missile defence systems), policy of regime change in Pyongyang, imposition of financial sanctions on North Korea, and its “outrageous violations” of the spirit of the Joint Statement, which he claimed are deliberately undermining the Six Party Talks. He explained that the DPRK will not return to the negotiating table until Washington demonstrates the “political will to co-exist with the DPRK, putting an end to the nuclear threat and abandoning all anti-DPRK policies.” Evidence of such a shift in approach would include the lifting of financial sanctions and the provision of a light water reactor to the DPRK. Most of the

questions that followed were directed at Professor Shen, who was asked about the current nature of China's relationship with the DPRK, and to outline China's main priorities in the Six Party Talks. Professor Chen explained that China's relations with Pyongyang were based on mutual respect and that, as far as the Six Party Talks are concerned, China strongly believes that sanctions and negotiations cannot exist side by side. China would like to see the US take the first step in providing concessions to North Korea in order to break the current impasse, which includes the lifting of financial sanctions.

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

The fourth session was chaired by Professor T J Pempel (CSCAP USA). K V Kesavan (CSCAP India) presented a paper entitled "Energy Security in Northeast Asia: Challenges and Opportunities," in which he stressed the energy dependence of major Northeast Asian countries on Middle East energy supplies, including dependence of oil and gas from Iran. In particular, this creates difficulties for Japan, which must tread a careful path in its bilateral relations with its traditional ally, the US, and Iran. To reduce this dependence, China and Japan have been keen to diversify energy sources and exploit the vast energy resources of Siberia, Sakhalin and the Central Asian Republics. Over the longer term, however, countries in the region need to come up with new strategies for dealing with their energy supply vulnerability, perhaps putting more emphasis on nuclear energy, devising systems for collectively bargaining with oil producing countries, and perhaps developing a regional variation on the EU initiative to formulate a common energy policy. Dr Ralf Emmers, from Nanyang Technological University, Singapore, gave the next paper, in which he outlined existing multilateral efforts to deal with non-traditional security threats in Southeast Asia. He discussed the principal sub-regional architectures dealing with the issues of trans-national crime, people smuggling and SARS, identifying lack of national capacity and expertise as a major impediment to the effective implementation of numerous action plans. Although he was generally positive about the future of regional cooperation over non-traditional security issues in Southeast Asia, he was not optimistic that similar arrangements would be as effective in Northeast Asia due to the more volatile strategic environment. The final paper of the meeting was given by Jongryn Mo (CSCAP Korea), in which he focused on nationalism as a non-traditional security threat and explained that education, including student exchanges, should be used to overcome hyper-nationalism in Northeast Asia. Education can be used to foster liberalism, to confront sensitive histories and outstanding territorial issues, and foster an East Asian identity that transcends nationalism and parochialism. In the discussion that followed, most of the questions and comments addressed the subject of energy security, and whether it would be possible to develop a multilateral security framework entirely devoted to this crucial issue. K V Kesavan responded that he thought such a framework would inevitably emerge with time, and that several connected issues could be dealt with simultaneously, including supply security, sustainability, and environmental conservation.

Session 5: Wrap-up

Professor T J Pempel was elected by his co-chairs to provide a summary of the policy recommendations that had been proposed during the meeting. Following each discussion session, all presenters had been asked to provide policy advice, with a view to contributing to a list of practical proposals that the co-Chairs could present at the Steering Committee meeting in December. Professor Pempel put together what he described as a “laundry list” of provisional policy proposals, which attempted to capture all of those presented over the two days. Most of these are presented below:

- Regional security should be pursued through cooperative security arrangements, based on dialogue and an “all direction approach” (attempts to address “hard” and “soft” security issues in parallel);
- Greater emphasis should be placed on examining security dynamics in Northeast Asia, and on finding alternatives to the Cold War thinking that continues to dominate regional relations;
- Political realities of the region suggest that functional cooperation on non-traditional security issues where there is obvious common ground (such as health, piracy, and trans-national crime) may offer the best hope in the short-term of fostering the trust and confidence required for cooperation over more ambitious strategic issues. This functional process could be described as a “positive spiral of cooperation” and could be characterised by informality rather than a high degree of legalisation;
- Northeast Asia may benefit from engaging in discussions over energy cooperation, along the same lines as the EU;
- The United States should provide stability in Northeast Asia by peacefully engaging in the region as a “strategic balancer” and should encourage regional burden-sharing to reduce the risks from non-traditional security threats (this cooperation will help foster a sense of collective identity);
- US-Japan-ROK security dialogues should be expanded to include China. This would defuse some of the tension and hostility between China and Japan;
- Political leaders in the region should exercise caution in their choice of language in and out of negotiations, in order to promote an atmosphere more conducive to cooperation. Political rhetoric should be downplayed;
- The armistice agreement should be replaced with a peace mechanism on the Korean peninsula
- All states involved in the Six Party Talks should examine (and, where possible, reduce) the domestic obstacles to the successful resolution of the North Korean nuclear issue;
- Emphasis should be placed on finding a workable compromise over the dispute of the sequence of action-for-action concessions outlined in the Joint Statement;
- Ad hoc working groups should be set up to discuss “clusters” or “baskets” of issues related (although not necessarily directly linked) to the Six Party Talks. For example, a group dealing with economic issues could seek solutions to the contentious money laundering issue, which could then be de-linked from the nuclear issue;

- China should be encouraged to take a more direct role in influencing the substance of the Six Party Talks negotiations, and should use its powerful position as principal mediator to apply diplomatic pressure on the US and DPRK to move forward;
- China could attempt to break the deadlock in the Six Party Talks by proposing a detailed roadmap to promote the resolution of the nuclear issue. The first step in the roadmap could be the provision of temporary security assurances by the US in return for a freeze on the DPRK plutonium programme.
- Official and parliamentary exchanges between the countries of Northeast Asia should be encouraged with a view to building trust, familiarity, and a greater sense of shared identity;
- Student exchanges should be actively promoted for the same reasons.

All four co-chairs expressed their satisfaction that the meeting had been successful, thanks in part to the effective organisation and hospitality provided by CSCAP China, and to the high quality of the papers and the discussions during and after the formal sessions. Particular thanks were given to the North Korean representatives for attending the meeting, as it was the first time CSCAP DPRK had sent representatives to participate in this Study Group. The point was made that the fourth meeting will be a full-house meeting, and will be held at Berkeley, probably in mid-October 2006. In December 2006, the co-chairs will present the group's output, including final policy recommendations, to the CSCAP Steering Committee, and will request that the life of the Study Group is extended for a further two years.

Dr Tanya Ogilvie-White
University of Canterbury
May 2006