

Report of

The Second Japan-US-Asia Dialogue

on

“An East Asian Community and the United States”

January 22, 2008 / The International House of Japan

Tokyo, Japan

Sponsored by

The Global Forum of Japan (GFJ)

Supported by

The Japan Foundation Center for Global Partnership (CGP)

Co-sponsored by

The Council on East Asian Community (CEAC)

The Pacific Forum CSIS

Preface

The Global Forum of Japan (GFJ) aims to promote a policy-oriented exchange of views between business, opinion and political leaders of Japan and their counterparts in the rest of the world, and to contribute to the deepening of mutual understanding and the formation of the consensus. For this purpose, GFJ has been actively engaged for the past 26 years in organizing policy-oriented bilateral and/or multilateral “Dialogues” every year between Japan and the international community.

It is for this reason that GFJ held the Japan-US-Asia Dialogue, “An East Asian Community and the United States,” in Tokyo on January 22, 2008. This report intends to summarize the achievements of these discussions between Japanese, U.S., and Asian counterparts. Though the printed version of the report will be made available to only a restricted number of people such as members and friends of GFJ and their counterparts from the United States and Asian countries, the full text of the report will be available at <http://www.gfj.jp/>.

The Japan-US-Asia Dialogue “An East Asian Community and the United States” was supported by the Japan Foundation Center for Global Partnership (CGP), co-sponsored by GFJ, the Council on East Asian Community (CEAC), and The Pacific Forum CSIS. The Dialogue was attended by 99 participants including 13 panelists. Participants exchanged opinions on matters of significant importance related to the future of Japan-US-Asia relations. We would like to take this opportunity to express our gratitude to the Japan Foundation Center for Global Partnership (CGP), which generously supported this Japan-US-Asia Dialogue.

April 1, 2008

ITO Kenichi
President
The Global Forum of Japan

Table of Contents

Programs

1. Program.....	1
2. Participants List.....	2
3. Biographies of the Panelists.....	4

Outlines of Discussions.....	7
------------------------------	---

Minutes of Discussions

1. Morning Session:	
“Community Building after the Second Joint Statement on East Asian Cooperation”	9
2. Afternoon Session:	
“An East Asian Community and the US”	17

Keynote Papers of Discussions

1. Morning Session:	
(1) TANAKA Akihiko.....	25
(2) YANG Bojiang.....	26
2. Afternoon Session:	
(1) Ralph A. COSSA.....	30
(2) FUKUSHIMA Akiko.....	30

Appendix

1. An Introduction to The Global Forum of Japan.....	31
2. An Introduction to The Council on East Asia Community.....	34
3. An Introduction to The Pacific Forum CSIS.....	38

Programs

1. Program

“The Second Japan-US-Asia Dialogue: An East Asian Community and the US”

January 22, 2008 / The International House of Japan

Co-Sponsored by The Global Forum of Japan (GFJ),
The Council on East Asian Community (CEAC) and
The Pacific Forum CSIS

Supported by the Japan Foundation Center for Global Partnership (CGP)

January 22, 2008

9:30 Registration The International House of Japan

10:00-12:30	Session I	Community Building after the Second Joint Statement on East Asian Cooperation
<i>Opening Remarks</i> (10 min)		Prof. ITO Kenichi, President, GFJ/ President, CEAC (Japan)
<i>Moderator</i> (5 min)		Mr. MURAKAMI Masayasu, Executive Governor, GFJ/ Acting Executive Vice President, CEAC (Japan)
<i>Keynote Speaker</i> (20 min)		Prof. TANAKA Akihiko, Professor, the University of Tokyo (Japan)
<i>Keynote Speaker</i> (20 min)		Prof. YANG Bojiang, Director, Institute of Japanese Studies, China Institutes of Contemporary International Relations (China)
<i>Lead Discussant</i> (10 min)		Prof. URATA Shujiro, Professor, Waseda University (Japan)
<i>Lead Discussant</i> (10 min)		H.E. Mr. Domingo L. SIAZON, Ambassador of the Philippines to Japan (Philippines)
<i>Lead Discussant</i> (10 min)		Prof. OBA Mie, Associate Professor, Tokyo University of Science (Japan)
<i>Free Discussions</i> (65 min)		All Participants
12:30-13:30	Break	
13:30-16:00	Session II	An East Asian Community and the US
<i>Moderator</i> (5 min)		Amb. HIRABAYASHI Hiroshi, Councilor, The Japan Forum on International Relations (Japan)
<i>Keynote Speaker</i> (20 min)		Mr. Ralph COSSA, President, The Pacific Forum CSIS (US)
<i>Keynote Speaker</i> (20 min)		Dr. FUKUSHIMA Akiko, Senior Fellow, The Japan Foundation (Japan)
<i>Lead Discussant</i> (10 min)		Mr. Joseph R. DONOVAN Jr., Deputy Chief of Mission, US Embassy in Japan (US)
<i>Lead Discussant</i> (10 min)		Dr. JIMBO Ken, Assistant Professor, Keio University (Japan)
<i>Lead Discussant</i> (10 min)		Prof. ITO Tsuyoshi, Professor, Meiji University (Japan)
<i>Free Discussions</i> (70 min)		All Participants
<i>Closing Remarks</i> (5 min)		Mr. MURAKAMI Masayasu, Executive Governor, GFJ/ Acting Executive Vice President, CEAC (Japan)

2. Participants List

[Foreign Panelists]

YANG Bojiang	Professor and Director, Institute of Japanese Studies, China Institutes of Contemporary International Relations
Domingo L. SIAZON	Ambassador of the Philippines to Japan
Ralph COSSA	President, The Pacific Forum CSIS
Joseph R. DONOVAN Jr.	Deputy Chief of Mission, US Embassy in Japan

[Japanese Panelists]

ITO Kenichi	President, GFJ/President, CEAC
MURAKAMI Masayasu	Executive Governor, GFJ / Acting Executive Vice President, CEAC
TANAKA Akihiko	Professor, the University of Tokyo
URATA Shujiro	Professor, Waseda University
OBA Mie	Associate Professor, Tokyo University of Science
HIRABAYASHI Hiroshi	Councilor, The Japan Forum on International Relations
FUKUSHIMA Akiko	Senior Fellow, The Japan Foundation
JIMBO Ken	Assistant Professor, Keio University
ITO Tsuyoshi	Professor, Meiji University

(In Order of Appearance)

[Participants]

Mouhieddin H. ABDULLAH	Minister Plenipotentiary, Embassy of the Republic of Iraq in Japan
ARAI Thomas Yoshitami	Chairman of the Board, Systems International Inc.
ASAKURA Keisuke	Asia and Oceania Division Overseas Research Department, JETRO
ASANUMA Shigeo	Analyst, International Affairs Department of Japan Institute for Social and Economic Affairs
ASOMURA Kuniaki	Dean, International Cooperation Course, Graduate School, Kibi International University
CHEN Zhiwen	Second Secretary, Embassy of China in Japan
CHEVY Vichet	First Secretary, Royal Embassy of Cambodia in Japan
Ethan CHUA	First Secretary, Singapore Embassy in Japan
DINH Thi Hien Luong	Visiting Research Fellow, Institute of International and Economics Studies, Reitaku University
ETO Naoko	Ph. D. Student, Keio University
FUJIWARA Nobuo	Director, Fujiwara Associates, Inc.
FUJIWARA Toshiya	Senior Analyst, International Affairs Department of Japan Institute for Social and Economic Affairs
FUJITA Shinya	Principal Deputy Director, Policy Planning Division, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
FURUYA Chikara	Senior Economist, Institute for International Monetary Affairs
Soe HAN	First Secretary, Myanmar Embassy in Japan
HASHIMOTO Hiroshi	Senior Advisor, ITOCHU Corporation
HASHIMOTO Masuo	Senior Advisor, Japan Railway Technical Service
Bonifatius A. HERINDRA	Minister Counsellor, Embassy of Indonesia in Japan
HORIUCHI Mitsuko	Visiting Professor, Bunkyo Gakuin University
IYAMA Masashi	Manager, Administration Department of Yomiuri Research Institute, Yomiuri Shimbun
IKEO Aiko	Professor, Waseda University
IMAGAWA Yukio	former Ambassador to Cambodia
ISHIGAKI Yasuji	Professor, Tokai University Law School
ISHIZUKA Yoshikazu	Editorial Adviser, Keizai Koho Center
ITO Yoshiro	President, Itogumi Co., Ltd.
ITOI Kay	Security Program Specialist, US Embassy in Japan
Sam JAMESON	Visiting Scholar, Yomiuri Research Institute, Yomiuri Shimbun
Rentsendoo JIGJID	Ambassador of Mongolia to Japan
KAWAI Masao	Visiting Professor, Hakuoh University
KAWATO Akio	General Manager, Japan-World Trends
KHOO Seow Fong	First Secretary, Singapore Embassy in Japan
KIMURA Takayuki	Visiting Professor, International Christian University
KINOSHITA Hiroo	Advisor, National Small Business & Information Promotion Center
KITAGAWA Yoshitaka	Deputy Director, Management and Coordination Division, Minister's Secretariat, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
KOBAYASHI Shiro	Advisor, International Cooperation Consultant
KOGURE Masayoshi	former Professor, Toyo University
KOIZUMI Hiroko	Political Economic Assistant, Royal Thai Embassy in Japan
KONDO Takehiko	Professor, Meisei University
KONUMA Shiro	Principal Deputy Director, Economic Partnership Division, Economic Affairs Bureau, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Troy KNUDSON	Research Assistant, Global Institute for Asian Regional Integration, Waseda University
KURODA Makoto	President, Centre for Information on Security Trade Control

Mykola KULINICH	Ambassador of Ukraine to Japan
MA Fu Wei	Third Secretary, Embassy of China in Japan
Karen MACARTHUR	Counsellor and Head of Political Section, Embassy of Canada in Japan
MAHADI Maidin	Minister Counsellor, Embassy of Brunei Darussalam in Japan
MATSUBARA Kazue	University Student
MATSUI Akira	Visiting Professor, Kyorin University
MIYAWAKI Raisuke	Chairman, Ochanomizu Associates
MIYOSHI Masaya	Chairman, Miyoshi Networks Co, Ltd.
NAGASE Kensuke	Deputy Director, Policy Planning Division, Foreign Policy Bureau, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
NARITA Hironari	Professor, Ohkagakuen University
NEMOTO Takaaki	Official, Regional Policy Division, Asian and Oceanian Affairs Bureau, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
NGUYEN Van Niem	Counsellor, Vietnam Embassy in Japan
NIWA Fujio	Professor, National Graduate Institute for Policy Studies
NODA Tetsuya	Court Clerk, Sapporo Summary Court
OFUJI Kentaro	Graduate Student
OKAWA Sarah	Programmer, Political and Security Affairs, Tokyo American Center, US Embassy in Japan
OKAWARA Yoshio	Chairman, GFJ
ONO Hikariko	Director, Policy Planning Division, Foreign Policy Bureau, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
OSANAI Takashi	Deputy Director-General, The Japan Institute of International Affairs
OTANI Tatsumi	Professor, Soka University
Alexey OVCHINNIKOV	Counsellor, Embassy of Russia in Japan
Wolfgang PAPE	General Manager, EU-Japan Centre for Industrial Cooperation
Prashant PISE	Counsellor, Embassy of India in Japan
Mike POINTER	First Secretary, New Zealand Embassy in Japan
POU Sothirak	Ambassador of Cambodia to Japan
RADZI Abdul Rahman	Ambassador of Malaysia to Japan
SADOTOMO Tetsu	Professor, Nihon University
SAKAMOTO Masahiro	Senior Research Fellow, The Japan Forum on International Relations
SHIKATA Noriyuki	Director, Second North America Division, North American Affairs Bureau, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
SHIMIZU Yoshikazu	Director, U.N. Association of Japan
SHINDO Eiichi	Professor Emeritus, The University of Tsukuba
Suvidhya SIMASKUL	Ambassador of Royal Thai to Japan
Benjamin SUKANJANAJTEE	First Secretary, Royal Thai Embassy in Japan
TAIDA Hideya	Professor, Akita International University
TAN Hsien-Li	Visiting Research Fellow, Institute of International and Economics Studies, Reitaku University
TAN Chin Tiong	Ambassador of Singapore to Japan
TAKAGI Kiyomitsu	Representative, East Asia Strategic Centre
TAKEUCHI Yukio	Advisor to Minister, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
TOGO Kazuhiko	Visiting Professor, Temple University
TOMIYAMA Yasushi	Commentator, Jiji Press
Philippe TREMBLAY	Second Secretary, Embassy of Canada in Japan
TSUJII Seigo	Lecturer, J.F. Oberlin University
URAKAMI Norihisa	Graduate Student, General Security Studies, National Defense Academy
YANG Xiang Feng	Researcher, The Japan Foundation Japanese-Language Institute, Kansai
YAMAZAWA Ippei	Professor Emeritus, Hitotsubashi University
YOSHIDA Haruki	President, The Yoshida Labo for Economics & Industry, Inc.
YUNG Ying-yue	Professor, Asia University

(In Alphabetical Order)

[Global Forum Japan Secretariat]

WATANABE Mayu	Executive Secretary
NAKAMURA Yumi	Officer in Charge
NOGUCHI Kohei	Officer in Charge
YANO Takuya	Officer in Charge
SHIOJIRI Koutaro	Secretarial Assistant
Bennett RICHARDSON	Secretarial Assistant
NAKAI Chiyo	Secretarial Assistant
IKEDA Tetsushi	Secretarial Assistant

[Council on East Asia Community Secretariat]

TSUKAZAKI Eri	Officer in Charge
YAMAGUCHI Akira	Secretarial Staff
MIN Suk	Secretarial Staff
LEE Sang Hyun	Secretarial Assistant
ITO Fumiharu	Secretarial Assistant
KIMURA Emiko	Secretarial Assistant
Mario SIAHAAN	Secretarial Assistant
JEON Hae Yeon	Secretarial Assistant

3. Biographies of the Panelists

【Foreign Panelists】

YANG Bojiang Professor and Director, Institute for Japanese Studies, China
Institutes of Contemporary International Relations (China)

Served as Visiting Fellow at National Institute for Research Advancement (NIRA) in 1991, the Japan Forum on International Relations (JFIR) in 1992, the Fairbank Center of Harvard University in 2000 and the Brookings Institution in 2006. Also served as Director for the Center for Taiwan Related Studies (2002-2005), and the Institute of Korean Peninsula Studies (2003-2006) at the China Institute of Contemporary International Relations (CICIR). Concurrently serving as Committee Member of Council for Security Cooperation in the Asia Pacific (CSCAP), China.

Domingo L. SIAZON Jr. Ambassador of the Philippines to Japan (Philippines)

Received B.A. from University of Ateneo de Manila in 1959, B.S. in Physics from Tokyo University of Education in 1964 and M.P.A. in Public administration from Harvard University in 1979. Served as Ambassador and Permanent Representative to the International Atomic Energy Organization (IAEA, 1979-1985), Ambassador to the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO, 1979-1985), Ambassador to Austria (1980-1985), President of IAEA (1982), and Director General of UNIDO (1985-1993). Also served as Secretary of Foreign Affairs of Philippines (1995-2001).

Ralph COSSA President, The Pacific Forum CSIS (US)

Served in the United States Air Force (1966-93), achieving the rank of Colonel, and last serving as Special Assistant to the Commander-in-Chief, US Pacific Command. Served previously as Deputy Director for Strategic Studies, the National Defense University's Institute for National Strategic Studies. Concurrently serving as Board Member of the Council on US-Korean Security Studies and the National Committee on US-China Relations (NY), Member of the International Institute for Strategic Studies (London) and the Asia Foundation's Task Force on America's Role in Asia. Also, Member of the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF) Experts and Eminent Persons Group, and Founding Member of the Steering Committee of the multinational Council for Security Cooperation in the Asia Pacific (CSCAP).

Joseph R. DONOVAN Jr. Deputy Chief of Mission, US Embassy in Japan (US)

Received undergraduate degree in Foreign Service from Georgetown University and Master's Degree in National Security Affairs from US Naval Postgraduate School. Served as Deputy Political Counselor and Chief of Political-Military Affairs Unit at US Embassy in Tokyo, Deputy Head of the Political Section at the US Embassy in Beijing, Branch Chief of American Institute in Taiwan's Kaohsiung Office, and Director for Office of Chinese and Mongolian Affairs, Bureau of East Asia and Pacific Affairs at the US Department of State.

【Japanese Panelists】

ITO Kenichi

President, The Global Forum of Japan (GFJ) /

President, The Council on East Asian Community (CEAC)

Graduated from Hitotsubashi University and studied at Harvard University. Entered Japanese Foreign Service in 1960 and served various positions, including embassies in Moscow, Manila, Washington and Director of First Southeast Asian Division until 1977. Served as Professor of international politics at Aoyama-Gakuin University. Concurrently serving as a founding president of the Japan Forum on International Relations (JFIR). Also, Professor Emeritus of Aoyama-Gakuin University.

MURAKAMI Masayasu

Executive Governor, GFJ/ Acting Vice President, CEAC

Graduated from the University of Tokyo. Entered the Ministry of Finance in 1997. Studied at University of California, San Diego. Served as Vice Consul of the Japanese Consulate-General in New York, Deputy Director for Research Division of International Bureau at Ministry of Finance, Deputy Director for Cabinet Secretariat. Concurrently serving as Acting Executive Director of JFIR.

TANAKA Akihiko

Professor, the University of Tokyo

Received B.A. from the University of Tokyo, Ph.D. from Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Served in various positions including Visiting Professor at Rhur-Universitaet (1986-87), Senior Associate Member at St Antony's College, Oxford (1994-95), Member of Asia-Europe Vision Group (1998-99), Member of East Asia Vision Group (1999-2001), and Member of Initiative toward Japan-ASEAN Comprehensive Economic Partnership Discussion Group (advisory group for Chief Cabinet Secretary) in 2002. His research includes theories of world politics, contemporary international relations in East Asia, and issues in Japan-US relations.

URATA Shujiro

Professor, Waseda University

Graduated from Keio University in 1973 and received M.A. and Ph.D. in Economics at Stanford University in 1976 and in 1978. Served as Research Associate at the Brookings Institution and Economist at the World Bank. Concurrently serving as Faculty Fellow at the Research Institute of Economy, Trade and Industry, and Research Fellow at the Japanese Center for Economic Research.

OBA Mie

Associate Professor, Tokyo University of Science

Received B.A. from International Christian University and M.A. and Ph.D. from the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences of the University of Tokyo. Her research interests include international relations theory, international politics in the Asia Pacific region, and regionalism in Asia.

HIRABAYASHI Hiroshi

Councilor, JFIR

Entered the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in 1963. Served as Fellow of the Center for International Affairs at Harvard University in 1981, Director for Management and Coordination Division at Ministry of Foreign Affairs in 1988, and Director for the Cabinet councilors' Office on External Affairs in 1995. Also served as Ambassador to India, Ambassador to France, and Ambassador in Charge of Inspection. Concurrently serving as President of Indo-Japanese Association.

FUKUSHIMA Akiko Senior Fellow, The Japan Foundation

Received M.A. from the Paul H.Nitze School of Advanced International Studies of the Johns Hopkins University and Ph.D. from Osaka University. Served as Senior Fellow and Director of policy studies, NIRA (1994 - 2007). Also served as Adjunct Professor at Keio University (2000-2002), Visiting Professor at University of British Columbia (2002-2003), and Visiting Professor at Kuwait University (2005). Also served as a member of numerous committees of the Japanese government, including the Defense Strategy Group and the Defense Agency's Council on Defense Facilities. Concurrently teaching at Law School of Keio University.

JIMBO Ken Assistant Professor, Keio University

Received Ph.D. from Keio University in 2005. Served as Research Fellow at the Japan Institute of International Affairs (JIIA) (1999-2003), Director of Research at JFIR (2003-2004), and Executive Secretary at CEAC (2004). Concurrently serving as Senior Fellow at Keio Research Institute, Advisor on foreign policy at Foreign Affairs Division, Policy Research Council at Liberal Democratic Party (LDP) and Adjunct consultant on foreign policy at Democratic Party of Japan (DPJ).

ITO Tsuyoshi Professor, Meiji University

Graduated from Sophia University. Received Ph.D. from the University of Denver in 1997. Served as Assistant Professor in 1998 and Associate Professor at Meiji University in 2001. Also served as Adjunct Professor (International Security) at Waseda University and Adjunct Researcher of the House of Councilors. Recipients of the Eisenhower Fellowships in 2005 and the Nakasone Yasuhiro Award in 2006.

(In order of appearance)

Outlines of Discussions

Outlines of Discussions

The Global Forum of Japan (GFJ), The Council on East Asian Community (CEAC), and The Pacific Forum CSIS co-sponsored “The Second Japan-US-Asia Dialogue: An East Asian Community and the United States” in Tokyo on January 22, 2008. In the Dialogue, which had 99 participants in total, lively discussion was held among experts on how to involve the US in an East Asian Community, whose framework has been recently revealed to be multi-layered.

Morning Session: Community Building after the Second Joint Statement on East Asian Cooperation

In the Morning Session on the theme of “Community Building after the Second Joint Statement on East Asian Cooperation,” two keynote speakers stated respectively that “in order to build an East Asian Community, we have to overcome problems, such as tension between non-interference policy and universal values, and political tension between South Korea and China and Japan. We should also discuss the boundary of East Asia, which we have not resolved, that is, whether it includes India, Australia and New Zealand or not” (Prof. TANAKA Akihiko); “the process of East Asia integration is an irreversible historic trend. For East Asian countries, the question lies in how to realize regional integration, rather than whether to do it or not. The US policy on East Asia is dual-pivoted. While the US maintains the web of bilateral alliances, it adopts a hedging policy towards China. It is unimaginable to build an effective East Asian Community without a smooth and harmonious China-Japan relationship. As a measure to improve both East Asian integration and Sino-Japanese relations, the two countries should seek to maintain dialogues from the starting point of East Asian integration” (Prof. YANG Bojiang).

In the following Free-Discussions, all participants exchanged their frank views. Here are two examples: “Japan-China relations have dramatically improved since the visit of Prime Minister ABE Shinzo to Beijing in October 2006. Mutual understanding between Japan and South Korea has been also deepened through movie and music. Holding a summit among Japan and China and South Korea is a good development” (Japanese Panelist); “ASEAN has been seated in the driver’s seat in the process of community building at this stage. But in the long run, Japan, China and South Korea should exercise their leadership” (ASEAN Panelist).

Afternoon Session: An East Asian Community and the US

In the Afternoon Session on the theme of “An East Asian Community and the US,” two keynote speakers argued that “East Asian community building still has a long way to go. The East Asia Summit (EAS) may prove to be one step sideways rather than forward toward the establishment of an East Asian Community. In fact, the EAS should be a supportive framework. Therefore, ASEAN+3 is the main vehicle for community building in East Asia. While the US focuses too much on the Middle East and does not focus sufficiently on Asia, it supports the eventual creation of an East Asian Community” (Mr. Ralph COSSA); “For East Asia, good relations with the US are essential for economic matters and security. Engaging in Asia is also indispensable for the US to maintain its influence on China, India, and Japan” (Ms. FUKUSHIMA Akiko).

Afterwards, in the Free Discussions, frank opinions were raised, such as “the US role in an East Asian Community is the same as the Indian or Australian or New Zealand’s role. However, the US has little interest in the East Asian community building. In fact, no candidate has paid attention to this issue during the US presidential campaign” (US Panelist); “both APEC and ARF provide precious opportunity to hold meetings although somebody mentioned that both are being sidelined” (Japanese Panelist).

Minutes of Discussions

Minutes of Discussions

1. Morning Session: “Community Building after the Second Joint Statement on East Asian Cooperation”

Opening Remarks: *ITO Kenichi, President, GFJ/ President, CEAC*

There are two things upon which I would like to touch before I mention anything else. The first is that today’s meeting is the “Second” of the “Japan-US-Asia Dialogue” on the topic of “An East Asian Community and the United States.” There was held the “First” two years ago on 22 June 2006. Another is that a book titled “An East Asian Community and the United States” has just recently been published by CSIS Press in the United States. The book is edited by Mr. Ralph COSSA and Prof. TANAKA Akihiko, both of whom are present today as keynote speakers of the meeting.

Since two years ago when we had the “First Dialogue” on the topic of “An East Asian Community and the United States,” there have been many ups and downs and backs and forwards surrounding the concept of “an East Asian community.” And the attitude of the United States towards the concept has never been clear-cut. But many people will agree that one of the important factors which have taken place during those two years is the peaceful rise of China. Japan-China relations have dramatically improved since the visit of Prime Minister Abe to Beijing in October 2006. US-China relations are no worse. As a matter of fact, the Bush Administration has been, if not supportive of, more sympathetic to the efforts of the East Asian regional integration than any previous Administrations in Washington. Though the United States is geographically not a member of an East Asian community, it is both economically and security-wise one of the most important factors in the life of an East Asian community.

Two years ago in my opening remarks of the “First Dialogue” on this topic, I said, “The United States is not a country in the region geographically. It cannot be a member of the region for the same reason that Japan cannot be a member of the NAFTA. Personally I think the only way to solve this conundrum is to find some modus operandi which will treat the US with some sort of special status in an East Asian Community.” In the following exchanges of the “Dialogue,” some panelists argued for, and others against, my idea of the “modus operandi.” I hope and am sure that in the exchanges that will ensue today a variety of opinions will be disclosed and that such exchanges will contribute to the building of peace and prosperity not only in the region but globally.

Moderator: *MURAKAMI Masayasu, Executive Governor, GFJ/ Acting Executive Vice President, CEAC*

Regional cooperation has been rapidly developed in East Asia within the framework of ASEAN+3 since 1997 when the Asian financial crisis happened. In its Singapore Summit of last November, ASEAN+3 released the “Second Joint Statement on East Asian Cooperation” which looked back at the significant progress of the last decade and looked forward to the coming decade of consolidation and closer integration. At the East Asia Summit which started in 2005, declarations on energy security and environmental cooperation were also adopted last year. In this session, taking into consideration these recent new developments, we would like to discuss the prospect and the challenges of regional cooperation in East Asia.

Keynote Speaker:

TANAKA Akihiko, Professor, the University of Tokyo

We intended to create a basic reference book on an East Asian Community building covering political economic and functional areas. Ralph COSSA's chapter covers the US position and Simon TAY's chapter covers the ASEAN perspective. The purpose of the volume is to demonstrate an East Asian Community building and how it is changing, and how changes affect the relationship between the US and East Asia. East Asian Community building is a "rapid and recent" movement. Challenges are still relevant even after the Second Joint Statement.

First, the visions on an East Asian Community are still vague. There is the question of how to reconcile tension between non-interference policy and universal values including human rights. We see such tension in the situation in Myanmar. The tension has not been resolved; rather universalism is set up in verbal terms, but action is very cautious and closer to non-interference. I was a member of the East Asia Vision Group in 1999-2000. The goal set up in the Vision Group was peace, prosperity and progress, but could not include such words as universal values or democracy. But the Second Joint Statement mentions democracy and universal values so we have at least made some progress.

Second, we need political reconciliation among members. There is a tension between Japan and China, and Japan and South Korea. No customary meetings had been held by those countries. It is crucial to have some mechanism to cooperate among the northern three countries. After the Abe cabinet, relations among the northern three improved much better.

Third, the boundary of East Asia should be discussed. We haven't resolved this yet, but India, Australia and New Zealand are involved in the East Asia Summit. We have to find more or less a common understanding of East Asia in the future. We also have to settle the relation with the US. Good relations and coordination with the US is essential for community building. In East Asia, economic interdependence deepens, but we still need some realistic foundation to keep peace. An isolated East Asia or US economic instability will damage the survival of an East Asian Community.

Fourth, cooperation in many functional areas among East Asian Community members has been achieved, but cooperation on substantive matters is a slow process. There are some substantive achievements on ASEAN+1. Japan, China and South Korea are willing to give money for ASEAN+1, not ASEAN+3. Under ASEAN+1 (either China, Japan or Korea) there is much funding, but countries are unwilling to provide funds for ASEAN+3 schemes. The Second Joint Statement was positive as it was decided to establish ASEAN+3 cooperation fund, but whether it makes progress remains to be seen. We are now entering the period of more normal community building as Japan and China no longer fight each other.

Keynote Speaker:

Prof. YANG Bojiang, Professor and Director, Institute of Japanese Studies, China Institute of Contemporary International Relations

First, it is critical for all the countries and individuals to realize that the process of East Asian integration is an irreversible historic trend. The world is becoming a community within which one country's success benefits, while its loss harms other countries. This may lead to the subversion of the current rules and laws. It is not necessary for one country to rise on the basis of containing and weakening other countries, on the contrary, one country can develop its own strength only by cooperating with other countries.

The current trend of East Asian integration is characterized by natural, rather than factitious, economy-based, rather than politically led features, and these lay a stable groundwork for the integration process. It is fair to say that, facing the major competitors from Europe and North America, East Asian countries encounter unprecedented challenges as well as opportunities. For East Asian countries the question lies in how to realize regional integration, rather than whether to do it or not.

Second, East Asian integration should be global as well as regional. That is to say, East Asian integration can be effective only by opening to the world as a whole and to other countries outside this region, and by applying an international standard. Meanwhile, East Asian integration should take into consideration the existent characteristics of the region, and progress in a way that adapts to the regional situation. Relations among East Asian countries are all long standing and complicated. Contradictions and disputes will not disappear or be reduced along with the end of the Cold War. On the contrary, due to the looseness of environmental restrictions and the change of domestic politics, those contradictions and disputes could even escalate.

Another factor we should take into consideration is the existence of the network formed by the US bilateral alliances. The US on the one hand maintains alliance system in East Asia as its strategic pillar and gradually evolves its policy over alliances. On the other hand, the US adopts a hedging policy towards China. This policy emphasizes both cooperation and containment. The US East Asian policy tends to be dual-pivoted: the bilateral alliances network and cooperation with China. Nevertheless, the US is also obviously alert of the uncertainty of Chinese development. But the current US policy towards China is sophisticated and saponaceous. Both the US and China are making progress in dealing with each other.

East Asia is now standing at the entrance of a new system, but this doesn't help to reduce disputes or differences among each other. It is not the format of integration that we should pay most of our attention, but how to improve confidence among nations in order to accomplish peaceful adjustment and change through promoting the process of integration. I do not think the framework itself is of critical importance. So long as it is good for the development of each country, and good for East Asia as a whole to win the great competition in the 21st century, any framework is adoptable.

Third, the process of East Asian integration should go together with and help to improve relations among major powers, solutions for regional hot issues, and the establishment of sub-regional mechanisms. In order to prevent East Asian integration from being a mirage, we should adopt an outcome-oriented design, and at the same time, improve the regional situation.

It is unimaginable for us to build an effective East Asian cooperation mechanism without a smooth and harmonious China-Japan relationship. Currently, China and Japan are both at the strategic rising stage, and are both willing to become major powers on all levels. As a specific measure to improve both East Asian integration and Sino-Japanese relations, the two countries should seek to maintain dialogues from the starting point of East Asian integration. This includes constructive negotiations on the integration framework and process. Furthermore, informal trilateral leadership dialogue mechanism among China, Japan and the U.S. is recommended.

After Prime Minister FUKUDA took office, the atmosphere of cooperation between the two countries became much better. The Fukuda cabinet wants to solve the abduction issue between Japan and the DPRK, and realize normalization. This provides a new opportunity for China and Japan to cooperate. The relations between Japan and the DPRK is not only a bilateral relationship, but also involves the regional order of North East Asia, among which the most urgent issue is the building of a peace regime on the Korean peninsula and a security mechanism in North East Asia. The multilateral cooperation among China, Japan, and the Korean peninsula is indispensable.

From this year, China, Japan and the ROK will hold a trilateral summit beside the ASEAN + 3 framework. The conservative ROK president, LEE Myungbak's inauguration next month will provide a chance for the summit to have fruitful results.

Lead Discussant

URATA Shujiro, Professor, WASEDA University

Rapid expansion of interregional trade and production network is a key point – the role of trade and liberalization policies is important. The US plays an important role, but total trade volumes between US and East Asia have dropped, but the US is still a main final destination for many products made in East Asia. The US also provides capital and technology in East Asia.

The rise of regionalism, especially in the form of bilateral FTAs, is important – it was prompted by expansion of regional tariff agreements elsewhere in the world which made East Asia realize the importance of regional cooperation. Also, the East Asian financial crisis played an important role. During the East Asian economic crisis, the East Asian countries expected to get some help but didn't get much. Therefore, they pursue regional cooperation through economic partnership.

No region-wide FTA has been discussed formally – it has been the discussion of various initiatives such as ASEAN+6 or ASEAN/APEC, but no formalization of discussions. Some ASEAN+1 FTAs are under discussion, but we need to start the discussion of a region-wide FTA mechanism. Different countries promote different versions, but as long as it is some kind of region-wide agreement, they should not get stuck on details. ASEAN+3 or ASEAN+6 FTAs should be discussed and promoted. That is the same as the US. The US has already agreed to a FTA with Korea and under discussion with Singapore. When discussing a FTA, the WTO is important for regional FTAs because WTO rules apply to the rest of the world. The Doha Round is important as a world-wide mechanism would be best. I argue in favor of the ASEAN+6 mechanism as it is a very large market with the Indian population and Australian natural resources. Japan needs to promote structural reform in agriculture.

Lead Discussant

Domingo SIAZON, Ambassador of the Philippines to Japan

Last year ASEAN celebrated its 40th anniversary and signed the ASEAN Charter. Founding nations of ASEAN became independent in the 1950s or 60s from their colonial status and Southeast Asia is an ethnically diverse area. Due to its history, ASEAN countries inherited some territorial or religious disputes. Even today there remain some of these disputes. Such history of ASEAN countries influenced its non-intervention policy. ASEAN emphasized stability. This area is successfully avoiding conflict and learning to use the International Court of Justice to resolve disputes. Minister conferences and the ARF provide the chance to discuss outside ASEAN countries.

Success in East Asia is most visible in the economy. An East Asian Community can learn from ASEAN success since ASEAN first established an economic community like East Asian Community. ASEAN is now seeking a FTA with China, Japan and South Korea and a regional monetary framework. The number of intra-trade in East Asia is 55.8% and it is higher than the number in NAFTA or in the EU, but we need to develop this base further. Growing consumption by rapid economic growth contributes to intra-trade. Foreign exchange reserves by China and Japan in the area are also very high compared to the EU and UK despite not having a common currency.

Regarding regional integration, Japan must take the lead with China to develop an alternative to USD and EUR. Now India is negotiating a FTA with ASEAN. Trade with Australia and New Zealand is increasing. And cross border movement has been also increasing over the last 10 years. An East Asian Community is still vague but a common cultural community is needed for building an East Asian Community. The EU has a hundred year history for cultural community before the EU establishment.

The relationship between APEC and an East Asian Community is also important. The US should work to re-invigorate APEC once US elections are over. APEC would be bigger than an East Asian Community. Japan may have a great challenge in 2010 APEC. Though the US is outside of East Asia, keeping the US interested in East Asia is the consensus among East Asian countries. It is important that the US is the biggest market for East Asian countries. Benefits of keeping the US interested in Asia goes beyond economic to political and security due to the key role of the US. No CSCE and NATO were established in this region. No security alliance in ASEAN was established. The US is the only one who provides security in this region. ARF has potential to become a useful framework, but the US should wait until relations between Japan-Korea-China stabilize before fully joining frameworks. The US should take part to develop mechanisms for resolving disputes peacefully. ASEAN is waiting for the peaceful settlement of disputes among China, Japan and South Korea.

Lead Discussant

OBA Mie, Associate Professor, Tokyo University of Science

When I hear about an East Asian Community, I wonder why we use the word “community” rather than “cooperation” or “integration”, and people often say it is just a slogan. But I think the word “community” has a deeper meaning – Karl Deutsch suggested “security community” in 1950 as a group which has become integrated and sufficiently strong to promote peace between members. A sense of community is essential for community building. This task is very hard in East Asia with many difficult issues such as territorial disputes in the South China Sea and the history issue. It must be a long-term project because of the number of conflicts inside East Asia. Political reconciliation is difficult on the Taiwan or North Korea issue, and rivalry between China and Japan is problematic. We must resolve these problems in order to create a community among East Asian people. Prof. Tanaka pointed out that functional cooperation is easier than community building. Even so, functional cooperation can foster a sense of community.

There are some questions that need to be addressed -- how can we elevate functional cooperation to a level where we can create a community? Prof. URATA says that cooperation tends to be limited only to issues that are easy to agree on -- we need to focus on more difficult issues to achieve substantive community building. Community builders need to take other initiatives to promote a sense of community.

Also, what are the boundaries of the community? Though Dr. Yang stated boundaries are not important, the boundary issue still exists and is important. Pan-Asian identity is still unclear, so boundary issues will likely be protracted because identity is closely connected to boundaries. Disputes exist over the concept of ASEAN+3 and ASEAN+6. It is unclear what constitutes the boundaries, and this should be decided over the long-term.

The concept of an East Asian Community is closely related to ASEAN. ASEAN and an East Asian Community face similar issues like the tension between non-interference and international values including human rights and democracy. What are the implications of the ASEAN Charter and reconciliation between non-intervention and universal human values/human rights? The Charter contains both, so this needs to be reconciled. It might be useful to note the process by which ASEAN attempts to reconcile that tension.

Free Discussions

Ambassador ISHIGAKI said that community building in East Asia is a long-term goal and that ASEAN is the driving force for this effort. But he wondered if ASEAN was able to provide sufficient power to drive the process long-term. As the Singapore summit it was agreed to have a joint dialogue between the northern three nations, he also wondered if the community building process needs two engines (ASEAN and the northern three who are now trying to address bilateral issues) or if it is still premature.

Professor TANAKA responded that he agreed on the comment that the northern three should also become an engine. But ASEAN is not the driving force of an East Asian Community, but rather considered in the driver's seat. ASEAN just shows the direction, so the engine lies somewhere else. Japan and China should be engines and ask the driver to drive safely. Holding a summit among the northern three is a good development. The upcoming G8 summit at Lake Toyako is a good opportunity for having such a summit.

Ambassador SIAZON also responded that ASEAN is not the only engine for an East Asian Community. ASEAN, China, Japan and South Korea are all engines. But the question concerns who guarantees stability among the northern three. Until disputes among the northern three have been settled, ASEAN wants to be in the driver's seat. Maintaining unity is important. One example of how unity can be undermined is the example of China and Japan competing on the Mekong delta development. This splits ASEAN into two groups and is not good. He also said that in ASEAN the economic side is really strong, but the political side is not. Even ASEAN members don't succeed in understanding each other. They are a post-colonial group of countries, so there still remain territorial disputes. They also don't interfere in each other's domestic matters. The decision making process in ASEAN is not logical in that we don't define words before making a decision. ASEAN has a similar aspect to the idea found in Japanese society of *tatema*.

Professor YANG said that he would be cautious when using the word "community" as it is unclear if we are using a big C or little c. He prefers East Asia cooperation or integration instead. The East Asia Summit includes Australia, New Zealand and India which are geopolitically not part of East Asia. They are included in terms of economic integration. So it is difficult to find a basic concept of an East Asian community. In Chinese academic circles, we just try to avoid using the word. Then he mentioned China's policy is that ASEAN leads the integration. In reality there is no choice but that ASEAN sits in the driver's seat. But in the long run, growth in power of China, Japan and the US will be a real force for integration. We expect that the Japanese prime minister who follows FUKUDA Yasuo must not go to the Yasukuni Shrine, in order to keep relations between China and Japan firm and improving.

Professor YAMAZAWA raised a question on where Hong Kong and Taiwan fit into an East Asian Community and what the best way is to incorporate these regions both formally and informally. He mentioned that both are staying away from the issue, but on the private sector level they are deeply involved in ASEAN and making huge investments in the region. He asked Prof. YANG about the Chinese strategy on this issue.

Professor YANG responded on the Taiwan issue that the basic policy is to maintain the status quo, or avoid independence and promote unification. Maybe some informal non-governmental arrangement can continue and be reached on Taiwan. From a mid-term perspective he does not think any official governmental arrangement can be reached. On the other hand, economic

integration between China and Taiwan will continue regardless of who becomes the president of Taiwan. One of the basic assessments is the idea of Chinese threat, not from outside but inside.

Ambassador OKAWARA asked Professor YANG to explain what kind of mechanism he indicated for peace regime and security on the Korean peninsula.

Professor YANG responded that he wanted to recommend a Japanese book published last year which was said to be written by a Chinese. He was not sure that the book was truly written by a Chinese, but it illustrates well the relations between China and North Korea. China's basic policy towards North Korea is to encourage opening no matter which model they follow. He said that there was much diplomatic action in 2007, and new signs of cooperation came from KIM Jong Il. The Joint Declaration between the two Koreas states that China should be included within the formal process. He added that China also welcomed the improvement in relations between Vietnam and North Korea. Lastly, he mentioned while institutionalization of the six party talks seems to be slow, there are five working groups under the talks, so we can see some progress through the working groups.

Ambassador TOGO mentioned that Japan invited ASEAN leaders to a meeting in December 2003 and the resulting document spelled out Asian traditions and values. I expected this would help promote cooperation among countries in East Asia, but East Asian cooperation didn't work because of tension between Japan and China. But the mood is changing for the better now. Asian values are still vague but they should be something open and not exclusory.

Professor TANAKA responded that his concern on Asian values was empirical; He wondered what they are. He said when investigated empirically, there is a huge variation in the values of people around the region as shown by the Asian Barometer Project. For example, Northeast Asians are generally more secure compared to South East Asians, but northern countries share many values.

Professor OBA also commented that she agreed with the argument by Ambassador SIAZON that we can have an agreement first, without the need for a formal definition. We need a strong initiative to create and define Asian values.

Professor HIRONO said that if you look at ASEAN+3 or ASEAN+6, one factor is increasing trade and economic links. This is similar to the US-Japan, or ASEAN-Japan trade situation in the 1980s -- this came about due to the yen's appreciation in 1971, and again in 1985. Therefore, the Chinese government should decide the same with regard to their currency. He asked Professor Yang how ready China is for the yuan to appreciate and when?

Professor YANG responded that if China allows the yuan to appreciate, it may have a stabilizing influence. But he added that the number one threat for China is something from inside not outside and yuan appreciation will influence social stability. He said that we have to keep a watch on a rising yuan, as domestic problems will only be solved by economic growth.

Professor URATA mentioned that it is important that China avoids unemployment. At the same time, however, he said that inflation is important too. Pressure from outside is huge. Yen appreciation contributed to more exports towards East Asia, but it also caused a bubble economy and its subsequent bursting. Chinese leadership studied Japan's mistake well. He added that they will appreciate the yuan gradually and try to avoid our mistake.

Ambassador HASHIMOTO said that we need to promote the ASEAN+3 process over the ASEAN+1 process. Chinese economic growth will continue and the ASEAN+3 mechanism should be more firmly established. He agreed with Professor Tanaka's remarks that governments should provide more funding for ASEAN+3 projects, not for ASEAN+1 projects. He asked Professor TANAKA what sort of projects we should fund. He said that purely economic projects are easier to fund, but political and security matters cannot be funded because of many reservations within some countries on democracy and human rights. He suggested that corporate governance be funded because it is the field of economy but related to good governance ideas. Corporate governance would be a good way to promote the ASEAN+3 process.

Professor TANAKA responded that funding for ASEAN+3 projects is yet to be discussed. He said that he would like to see more academic exchanges.

Professor URATA also commented that regarding improvement of corporate governance or soft infrastructure, Japan as well as The World Bank can help. That kind of cooperation could be done by a FTA. Building solid systems for developing countries is important for cooperation. To set long-term goals is important, but building up a community itself is also important. At the same time discussion on the formation of an East Asian Community is important.

Ambassador HASHIMOTO added that ASEAN+3 should discuss the governance issue and avoid adopting something which was already established in developed countries.

Mr. KINOSHITA said that the common currency idea is important. The Euro has become a strong currency within 15 years of its creation. A political decision is the most important step for the process. He wondered how we could induce such a decision. He said that the most important thing is political leadership.

Professor TANAKA responded that common currency creation is a desirable issue for him because people can share some kind of joint destiny. He favored common currency through a basket mechanism. He added that a common currency is a long-term goal. It is beyond the scope of a single sovereign government and ownership of the issue must be shared among members. Europe has 50 years of such history. To have a joint destiny, we should share common values. Europe introduced the Euro after all members shared democracy and democratic values.

Professor URATA also mentioned that a common currency is a long-term goal. We have to have similar views on what government should do on monetary policy for a common currency to work. He said that developing countries make much of economic growth while developed countries prefer stability, so monetary policy is different between these groups of countries.

On the other hand, Professor YANG mentioned that the European experience should not necessarily be fitted to the East Asia situation. Asia has a different history. He said that we should improve the fundamentals of Asian community and improve mutual strategic confidence.

Ambassador KAWAI said that it is important to raise awareness on regional cooperation. A stable relationship among Japan, China and South Korea is important. Young Japanese students, however, don't know much about Asia, especially ASEAN countries. Chinese students also don't know, and the state of their knowledge may be even worse than the Japanese. ASEAN should push its desire for a stable relationship among the northern three countries and for a sense of cooperation. He wondered how we could raise awareness among young students on the present situation and future cooperation in East Asia.

Professor URATA responded that Japanese pop culture or Korean movie stars may contribute to mutual understanding. He said that the formal way to increase awareness, however, should be education through mass media. He expected that liberalization of services, trade in things such as movies, increasing travel, and increasing movement of people could contribute to an increase in awareness.

2. Afternoon Session: “An East Asian Community and the US”

*Moderator: HIRABAYASHI Hiroshi, Councilor, The Japan Forum
on International Relations*

Firstly, we need to ask how we can accommodate regional cooperation frameworks with multiple schemes for functional cooperation. Issues include, the ASEAN+1 versus ASEAN+3 debate, and whether the East Asia Summit leads to community building. Some of the schemes for functional regional or sub-regional cooperation in the economic and social areas include FTAs and EPAs, bilateral and regional agreements on energy and the environment, HIV/AIDS, SARS, or avian influenza. In the politico-security area, issues we face include international terrorism, piracy, non-proliferation of WMD, drug trafficking, illegal immigration, smuggling of small weapons, money laundering, cybercrime, etc. What is the implication of the multiplication of functional cooperation? Is this compatible with the development of structured regional cooperation? Is the US in favor of ad-hoc or functional cooperation over structured or institutionalized regional mechanisms?

Secondly, we have to ask how to accommodate East Asianism and Pan-Pacificism. How can we define the relationship between ASEAN-centered conventional meetings such as PMC, ASEAN +1 and +3 and the three year-old East Asia Summit? Pan-Pacific-oriented issues (which are favored by the US) include such problems as whether APEC is becoming more oriented to political issues over economic, and if the ARF is gradually becoming sidelined. If so, how can Pan-Pacific mechanisms and East Asian institutions be re-oriented to put ASEAN in the driver’s seat? Another key issue is what is the US attitude towards the East Asia Summit? Is an East Asian Community a realistic proposition or a very remote possibility? Is the US prepared for the eventual creation of an East Asian Community? How can we make compatible an eventual East-Asian Community with the existing US-centered network of bilateral security alliances in the Pacific?

During the third Meeting of East Asia Summit in Singapore in November 2007, the leaders of China, South Korea as well as Japan agreed to meet not only at ASEAN Summits and the EAS but also independently of these forums.

Other questions include if there is any possibility of the six party talks evolving into a North-East Asia security mechanism? Would that possibility be welcomed by the US? What would the role of the US be in such a mechanism? What are the implications of an eventual North-East Asian mechanism for existing East Asian frameworks?

Keynote Speaker: Ralph COSSA, President, The Pacific Forum of CSIS

Since early 2005, there has been a great deal of movement surrounding the effort to establish an East Asian community. “Movement,” one hastens to add, does not necessarily or always mean progress. Not all movement has been in the forward direction. Some has been sideways, some even backward. While it would be unkind to describe the process as “one step forward,

two-step-back," there certainly has not been any "great leap forward" either, although there has been some modest progress.

One presumed step forward was the establishment of an annual East Asia Summit (EAS). The inaugural meeting was held in Kuala Lumpur in December 2005; the second took place in the Philippines in January 2007 and the third in Singapore in November 2007. Efforts to develop the principles and modalities that will define the future role and mission of this new multilateral gathering continue. But as disputes and confusion over its composition, direction, and relationship to both broader and more selective existing mechanisms reveal, East Asian community building still has a long way to go. At this stage in its development, the EAS does not appear designed or destined to provide the foundation of an East Asian community but rather is more likely to serve as a broader-based endorsement or validation mechanism for a companion East Asian-only effort. In this respect, the EAS may prove to be one step sideways rather than forward toward the establishment of an East Asian community.

It is clear that main vehicle for East Asia community building is not the EAS but ASEAN+3. The EAS chairman stated that ASEAN+3 is the driving force. EAS has the right idea, but the wrong title. The real East Asia Summit takes place among the ASEAN+3 states. However, EAS is still an important vehicle and useful. The EAS should be a supportive framework. It is a Pacific summit, which doesn't yet include, but also does not preclude, the U.S. either.

There are a number of reasons that the US should want to join the EAS. First, though objectives are not clear yet, the US should support overall cooperation in such areas as energy. Therefore, the US should get on the train. Second, the US should not let the requirement to be a TAC signatory precludes it from joining. Instead, the US should sign the TAC because all its allies including Japan and Australia have already signed it. Third, some argue that the US president cannot visit Asia twice a year for APEC and EAS. One idea is for the EAS to have back-to-back meetings at the time and place which APEC is held. On years when APEC is not held in Asia, it may provide the only opportunity for the U.S. president to visit Asia.

The US won't focus on East Asia during the presidential election, which is good news for East Asia. Political leaders and bureaucrats in Washington have been reluctant to discuss the East Asian Community but a change in attitude at least at the bureaucratic level is now taking place, and this should help inform the political level after the 2008 U.S. presidential elections. As a result, one can be cautiously optimistic about future U.S. involvement in the EAS and broader community building efforts.

EAS or East Asian Community meetings should become not just a photo opportunity but need to pursue a more substantial agenda. I found some good movement on energy cooperation. The Bush administration, despite its public reputation for unilateralism, is more supportive of a multilateral approach than any previous administration. While it prefers ad-hoc multilateralism like the Six-Party Talks and PSI, the Bush administration gives APEC and ARF great support. The US involvement toward an East Asian Community, however, will never become deeper as long as its substance is just symbolic. The US needs substance and real movement. I am concerned that the ARF will become gradually sidelined and the US may be counting too much on the ARF and APEC. What's not clear is how the EAS, ASEAN+3 and an East Asian Community relate to the ARF and APEC today and in the future.

The US supports the eventual creation of an East Asian Community. The US supports it, despite its objection ten years ago, because it is not a threat against the US any more. The problem is that the US focuses too much on the Middle East and doesn't focus sufficiently on Asia.

ASEAN+3 is an important mechanism in East Asia. In ASEAN+3, ASEAN sits in the driver's seat. It is understandable. Two types of people occupy the driver's seat; the head of the family and the chauffeur. Today ASEAN seems to be playing the father while the plus three sometimes act like children arguing in the back seat. New leadership in Japan and South Korea over the last 6 months is improving the environment for three-way cooperation, which could then turn ASEAN into the chauffeur, still driving but with more positive input coming from its Plus Three partners.

Keynote Speaker: *FUKUSHIMA Akiko, Senior Fellow, The Japan Foundation*

I will focus on politico-security cooperation, on both traditional and non-traditional security challenges, in East Asia in relation to the United States.

East Asian regional architectures, namely ASEAN+3 and East Asia Summit, do not include the United States as a member due to the geographical footprint. This, however, does not mean that East Asia is hostile to the United States. An anti-US movement in East Asia is not prevalent as is exemplified in the guiding principle of open regionalism in these regional architectures. East Asia is also a part of Asia Pacific regional frameworks such as APEC and ARF along with the United States.

East Asia has moved to create these own architectures for regional cooperation because of several reasons. Amongst them, I would like to cite two factors. One is the Asian financial crisis in 1997 which compelled East Asian countries to appreciate deepening interdependence first in the financial market, then in trade and investment and subsequently in other areas including the environment through haze, piracy, pandemics like SARS and avian flu, and energy. In East Asia regionalism has been led by regionalization as has been the case with economy. Other security challenges have also turned out to be transnational in nature which demands countries in the region to promote cooperation. Secondly, many interlocutors have pointed out the rise of China and the need to engage China in regionalism. This coincided with China's own policy to assure the rest of the world of its intention to rise peacefully. China which was initially passive and skeptical on regional cooperation is now forthcoming in leading and participating regional mechanisms. Simon Tay in the book even observed that there is a possibility of an Asia less-centered on the US with the rise of China which could lead to a rebalancing of the economic center for Asia.

On traditional security issues, the US has maintained bilateral alliances with countries in East Asia which has in recent years come to serve as the stabilizer for regional peace. Although a regional mechanism for traditional security challenges might be a possibility in future, this web of alliances with the United States will remain to be an important vehicle for security in Asia for the foreseeable future.

On non-traditional security concerns, it is becoming a consensus that East Asia ought to promote a cooperative security approach for functional cooperation. In fact some cooperation is already underway on piracy, yellow dust, haze, avian flu and others as I have described in the book. Participants to this functional cooperation should be determined by the merit one can bring to the challenge rather than a fixed membership from the beginning. In this context the US functionally should be engaged in and can play a role.

In conceiving future relations between East Asia and the United States, I hope the US will take a proactive Asia policy to show its interest in Asia. Though unsolicited, I suggest the following three to the new US administration. First, the new US President should demonstrate his/her interest in

Asia, mapping out American policy on Asia. Second, if the US decides to engage more in East Asia, it should take advantage of the existing regional architectures like APEC and ARF which it is a member. Third, it is important for the US to enhance its bilateral relations with Japan, China, ROK, as well as ASEAN. Bilateral relations should be robust to promote regional cooperation.

However challenging it may be, East Asia community building is the vision for us to share even for the politico-security area. The path which will lead us to a community-like cooperation on politico-security issues can be rocky. Nevertheless, the process towards such cooperation would matter for peace and stability of the region.

*Lead Discussant: Joseph R. DONOVAN, Deputy Chief of Mission,
US Embassy in Japan*

Some transnational issues are new and some are old. Some are irreversible but undesirable results might be attached. Building trust is important but the format is also important. I wonder what happens next.

The majority of Asian states are achieving robust economic growth. We have regional structures like APEC, ASEAN+3 and the East Asia Summit. Economic and political diversity still exists, though. This region has a dynamic character and complexity. I want to point out two issues.

First, I want to question what the region is -- whether it is geographically East Asia or Asia-Pacific. Restricted membership isn't good.

Second, it is difficult to resolve regional security issues concerning North Korea and the Taiwan Strait. Mr. COSSA emphasized that APEC was useful for enhancing security, and the Bush administration is trying to strengthen APEC. Confidence and trust in functional cooperation will help in the security area. The six party talks are a model or platform for security dialog in Northeast Asia.

Lead Discussant: JIMBO Ken, Associate Professor, Keio University

The EU membership is like a platinum credit card. Candidate states need to fulfill standards of domestic economy, governance and neighboring policy. On the other hand, the process of the East Asian regionalism is more like a student card. It is easy to become a member but hard to get big finance. Therefore, the process of regionalization in East Asia should be evolutionary to increase the credit profile. In dealing with many political changes expected in coming decade in East Asia, while envisioning the rise of China, so many checks are needed through having regular exchanges among themselves.

I want to raise a fundamental question on whether the East Asian Community should pursue regional autonomy or continued dependence on the US. The US is the largest exporting market and key security provider for East Asia. In what kind of area can we pursue autonomy? Functional cooperation including environment, finance, IT or terrorism doesn't necessarily have to be limited geographically. We need to define regional problems that could be dealt and solved by regional efforts. During the process of the EAS, a broad approach is needed. I wonder what kind of cooperation will fit the functional cooperation of East Asia.

There have been three dimensions of US concerns on the East Asian Community. The first is China. Whether China may expand her sphere of influence in the East Asian Community or East Asian Summit, and what will be the effect of US engagement in this region. Second, the East Asian Community may challenge US flexibility of bilateral relations in East Asia both in security and

economy. Third, the East Asian Community may be used as an excuse for delaying democratic transition of East Asian states. Those concerns still remain. The East Asian Community, however, has debated such US concerns and showed a quasi-response. First, the East Asian Community added Australia and New Zealand. Second, leadership within ASEAN+3 agreed to share universal values.

I want to point out that progress in ASEAN shows that it is changing to a more rule-based institutionalized model. By signing the ASEAN charter, ASEAN developed a more full-fledged institutional and legal framework. ASEAN shares such basic values as democracy or human rights. Responding to the crackdown on the democracy movement in Myanmar, whether ASEAN fails to coordinate inside or not, will be a benchmark of ASEAN credibility. Another positive step is seen in the confidence building between Japan and China. Rivalry between Japan and China forces other countries to choose one of two options. China became an insider of the system rather than an outsider, especially after Robert Zoellick's "responsible stakeholder" initiative. Many US official documents including the NSS and QDR endorsed that concept. Strengthening the US-Japan alliance and cooperation with China at the same time is possible. Regarding the domestic politics of China, we can promote "rule of law" aspects among values which promote to achieve in the East Asian Community.

Lead Discussant:

ITO Tsuyoshi, Professor, Meiji University

My first comment is about the future of US commitment to East Asia. The question is whether the regional stability will be provided by one country's hegemony or the balance of power. In East Asia, the US hegemony through its power projection has been dominant and is now keeping stability. The US hegemony encourages Asia's stability because the potential for US interventions affects security policy of each country.

The main body of the East Asian Community is now functional or economic cooperation, and we see some kind of integration in East Asia, which is not touching on the US interests. A US concern about the East Asian Community is that its' development will lead to the loss of US influence over the region. The EU or EC was a good case study. But, the EU now cooperates politically while the EC mainly had economic cooperation in the 1980s. After the EU developed its economy and deepened interdependence, political integration has been advocated and developed. Therefore, the situation for the US is different.

Second, functional cooperation with a focus on the prevention of nuclear proliferation, piracy and also energy issues can be prototypes of the East Asian cooperation. East Asia suffers from the largest number of natural disasters and piracy in the world and this situation has led to de facto cooperation in this region. The US provides the government-government cooperation, a typical example of which is the six party talks. Active participation by the US is all right. But, along with that, East Asian cooperation has non-governmental and functional aspects. Regarding future commitment in East Asian cooperation by the US, I want to ask what kind of framework the US would provide. For example, Taiwan has its voice in the cross-strait issue. Non-governmental bodies are important for that kind of issue.

Third, I want to ask to what extent the US recognizes the region's autonomy vis-à-vis the US commitment. East Asia has many functional issues. Those areas like disaster relief fit a risk management approach rather than 100% military commitment, which the US provides traditionally.

Free Discussions

Professor SAKAMOTO mentioned that the US is too much involved in Iraq, but this is now improving. He wondered if the US would have more of a free hand to deal with issues in East Asia.

Mr. DONOVAN responded that the US should continue to watch security, and economic aspects that result when we take some action. North Korea and Taiwan are big issues for us. Big power relations are also important between the US/Japan and US/China. We seek to share values and influence in the region.

Professor SAKAMOTO also asked Mr. COSSA what the US role is in EAS. He asked why Japan would become marginal if it became too involved in Asia. He wondered what role Japan should take.

Before responding to Mr. SAKAMOTO, Mr. COSSA commented to Professor T. ITO that he agreed Taiwan's voice was only through Track 2 mechanisms and APEC. China, however, is reluctant to deal with security in APEC. When the US finds that there is anything contrary to the US interests, the US would make objections whether or not East Asia would hear it. Then he mentioned that for the US, East Asian community building should be a process by Japan and Singapore as they don't undermine US interests. The process of the East Asia Summit isn't clear yet nor defined. He stated that the US role in an East Asian Community is the same as the Indian or Australian or New Zealand's role – to help cooperation in East Asia in such areas as energy. Regarding building the East Asian community, no one should wait for an outside blessing from Washington. The US, India, and Australian role toward Asia is to support community building. He added that he was afraid that Japan was marginalized a couple of years ago due to KOIZUMI Junichiro visiting Yasukuni Shrine. However, Japan can play a role to establish bridges between the West and East - Japan is proud of that role, and it should be continued. It also can have more positive meetings.

Professor HIRONO asked Professor JIMBO if we had to cover all the problems in the East Asian Community. He asked what the priority point was and what area was favored to cooperate. He also wondered where the advantage was to joining the East Asian Community without the US and if we had to be cautious toward the US because the US power was not always strong.

Professor JIMBO responded that the best document describing such cooperation was a 1999 Manila document. In that document, we care about everything. However the spirit of the community is the problem. When the community accepts everybody as a member, and uses consensus based decision-making, it might fail. He said that real functional areas should be discussed like a FTA. He added that the non-traditional security area is a main concern for promoting risk management.

Professor HIRONO stated that somebody had to take leadership in promoting functional corporation. He asked whether Prof. JIMBO thought that the community should be limited to likeminded nations or countries that share values.

Professor JIMBO replied that those likeminded countries should take leadership, but the community should be open to others.

Professor TANAKA asked Mr. COSSA who among the US presidential candidates would present the most coherent policy on East Asia.

Mr. COSSA responded that if the Democrats win the election, senior democrats like Joseph NYE or William PERRY would advise for a Democratic president. That is the same for Richard ARMITAGE for the Republicans. Continuity will remain.

Ambassador SIAZON stated that ASEAN isn't necessarily a consensus-based body. He commented on Mr. COSSA's chapter of the book "An East Asian Community and the United States." Mr. COSSA wrote that ASEAN didn't play a major role during the East Timor crisis. However, Ambassador SIAZON said that the Philippines tried to send soldiers and Japan agreed to \$100 million financial support at that time. Singapore also committed to that process. He argued that three players, Japan, ASEAN and the United Nations, were missing in Mr. COSSA's remarks in East Timor.

Mr. COSSA thanked Ambassador SIAZON for detailed information. He commented, however, that because of China's attitude, no ASEAN member called on ASEAN troops for East Timor. That crisis was only solved on a bilateral basis.

Mr. SHIMIZU said that we need to create an ASEAN humanitarian force to address human security issues. US Defense Secretary Robert GATES emphasizes Central Asia. He asked Mr. COSSA the background of Secretary Gates' statement. He wondered whether the US wanted those Central Asian countries to join ARF or the East Asia Summit.

Mr. COSSA said that he was not familiar with any rapid force to address such natural disasters or other humanitarian crises. He added that regarding an ASEAN emergency force, there could be a force that wasn't a rapid reaction force, but rather that trained together and increased interoperability. He was not thinking of some type of standing force like a NATO force. He was not sure on Gates' statement, but he was sure that no one in the US supports inviting Central Asian nations to join East Asia Summit.

Ambassador OKAWARA stated that both APEC and ARF provide a precious opportunity to have meetings although somebody mentioned that both are being sidelined. He wondered whether the US or China would create a security role in the ARF.

Mr. SHIKATA wondered what is the likely trade or economic policy towards Asia of a new US administration. Democratic candidates criticize FTAs, but he wondered if that was rhetoric for the presidential campaign.

Mr. COSSA responded that Asia won't be paid attention during the campaign. Democrats pay more attention to labor, but they may move forward on pursuing FTAs.

Ambassador ISHIGAKI asked about the US participation in the East Asia Summit, whether the US seeks full membership or not. He also asked about the modalities of US participation, and whether

IV Keynote Papers of Discussions

Keynote Papers of Discussions

Morning Session: “Community Building after the Second Joint Statement on East Asian Cooperation”

(1) TANAKA Akihiko

Ten years after the Asian financial crisis of 1997, East Asia is now a region of dynamic growth and the East Asian economies are striding again. However, no one calls the dynamic growth of East Asia a miracle anymore; it is a fact of economic life in today's world. Uncertainty obviously abounds around the future of the East Asian economies, especially China's, but it has become an assumption of many businesspeople and politicians that the economies of East Asia will continue to be one of the centers of the world economy.

Along with the recovery of the East Asian economies from the 1997 crisis, voices of regionalism and efforts of community building in the region have grown. The year 2007 is the tenth anniversary of the first Association of Southeast Asian Nations plus Three (ASEAN+3) summit meeting—the gathering of the leaders of the 10 ASEAN countries, along with China, Japan, and South Korea. When the ASEAN+3 summit took place in the midst of the Asian financial crisis, it was an ad hoc meeting where 3 Northeast Asian leaders happened to be invited to join the ASEAN leaders who gathered together at the ASEAN summit. In following years, however, the ASEAN+3 has been developed to be one of the pillars of East Asian regionalism. It released the “Joint Statement on East Asian Cooperation” in November 1999, which identified the vision and comprehensive areas of cooperation among member states. It is now expected to agree on the “Second Joint Statement on East Asian Cooperation” when it meets in November 2007. (Continued)*

*For the continuation of this article, please turn to pp.1-13 of *“An East Asian Community and the United States”* published by CSIS Press.

(2) YANG Bojiang

First, it is critical for all the countries and individuals to realize that the process of East Asian integration is an irreversible historic trend. The current international structure is undergoing a major change, various regimes and different patterns of development compete and coexist with each other in a complex system. A multi-civilization world is under development. Although this process can be comprehended and described in various aspects and levels, the fundamental evolution is that, the Industrial Revolution leads to the leap forward of the global productivity, thus facilitates the world to break through in unifying from regional and political separations, and accelerates economic globalization. As a result, all countries are involved in a unified global market and the international network in which each country's own safety and interests are intertwined with others'. The world is becoming a community within which one country's success benefits while its loss harms the other countries. In comparison with other changes ever occurred in the international system, the current shift is characterized by the qualitative change or the change of pattern in international relations. This may lead to the subversion of the current rules and laws that have lasted for hundreds of years in the international society. The difference lies in several ways, for instance, gradual and peaceful structural change of the international system becomes possible; the development of a country, and furthermore, the rise of a major power does not necessarily cost damage for the established system, it is possible for peaceful rise; the hegemony discipline becomes vulnerable; and the mainstream of the relations among big powers changes from confrontation to cooperation: it is not necessary for one country to rise on the basis of containing and weakening other countries, on the contrary, one country can develop its own strength only by cooperating with other countries.

East Asia is taking a lead in such a historic trend. In the past several hundred years, East Asia has never been integrated, and there were probably only two periods of time during when the region was set within one system. One was the age of China dominant tributary system, the other was the WW II period when Japan waged a general invasion toward this region. Compared with the two periods mentioned above, the current trend of East Asian integration is characterized by natural other than factitious, economy based other than political led features, and these lay a stable groundwork for the integration process. It is fair to say that, facing the major competitors from Europe and North America, East Asian

countries encounters unprecedented challenges as well as opportunities. For East Asian countries the question lies in how to realize regional integration other than whether to do it or not.

Second, East Asian integration should be global as well as regional. That is to say, East Asian integration can be effective only by opening to the world as a whole and to other countries outside this region, and by applying international standard. Meanwhile, East Asian integration should take into consideration the existent characteristics of the region, and progress in the way that adapt to the regional situation. Generally speaking, relations among East Asian countries are all long standing and complicated. The history of contradictions and disputes can be traced back to the age long before modern international relations were formed, and before European and American powers entering into this region. It surely is much longer than the history of the Cold War. Therefore, those contradictions and disputes will not disappear or be reduced along with the end of the Cold War. On the contrary, due to the loose of the environmental restriction and the change of domestic politics, those contradictions and disputes would even escalate. The fluctuating relation between Japan and ROK in the past decade is just an example.

Another factor we should take into consideration is the existence of the network formed by the U.S. bilateral alliances. The U.S. adopts an offshore balance of power policy, however, compared with that adopted by the British in history, the American policy has its special features. The U.S. is a superpower which goes far beyond the UK of the time. Under this precondition, the U.S. on the one hand maintains alliances system in East Asia as its strategic pillar and gradually evolves its policy over alliances. On the other hand, the U.S. adopts a hedging policy toward China. This policy emphasizes both cooperation and containment. Along with the progress over cooperation and dialogue between China and the U.S., China has become an important factor that can not be ignored in U.S. policy toward East Asia. Furthermore, China has become a reliable power in regional hot issue solution. From this aspect, the U.S. East Asian policy tends to be dual-pivot: the bilateral alliances network and cooperation with China. Nevertheless, the U.S. also obviously alerts to the uncertainty of Chinese development. But compared with its containment toward the USSR during the Cold War period and its bashing policy toward Japan in 1980s and 1990s, the U.S. current policy toward China is more sophisticated and saponaceous: it avoids direct clash, and balance China through cultivating the “third power”. Both the U.S. and

China are making progress in dealing with each other.

East Asia is now standing at the entrance of a new system, but this doesn't help to reduce disputes or differences among each other. The diversity of political regime, developing stage, and history and culture is obvious. Concerning the power distribution, East Asia is not as balanced as the European countries, nor does it resemble the North America, it is far more complicated. What makes the situation even worse, the hostile and isolated history makes it a challenge for East Asian countries to build strategic mutual confidence. What I would like to emphasize is that, it is not the format of integration that we should pay most our attention, but how to improve confidence among nations in order to accomplish peaceful adjustment and change through promoting the process of integration. If we overemphasize the format of integration, the problem of competing for dominance will become even more outstanding. This will weaken mutual confidence among nations. In the end, none of the formats will work out. Concerning the framework for East Asia integration, there is a dispute between "pan-Asia-Pacific" and "pan-Asia". There is a "10 + 3" vs. "10 + 6" debate between China and Japan. However, I do not think the framework itself is of critical importance. So long as it is good for the development of each country, and good for East Asia as a whole to win the great competition in 21st century, any framework is adoptable.

Third, the process of East Asian integration should go together with and help to improve relations among major powers, solution of regional hot issue, and establishment of sub-regional mechanism. In order to prevent East Asian integration from being a mirage, we should adopt outcome-oriented design, and at the same time, improve the regional situation.

The importance of China-Japan relationship to East Asian integration went without saying. It is unimaginable for us to build an effective East Asian cooperation mechanism without a smooth and harmonious China-Japan relationship. Currently, China and Japan both at the strategic rising stage, both are willing to become major powers in all levels. East Asia is facing the situation of two big powers exist at the same time. The challenges ahead are unprecedented. On the one hand, there are developmental strategic and geo-political strategic collisions between China and Japan, the East China Sea issue and Taiwan issue are representatives; in the post-Koizumi age, these collisions become even more obvious. On the other hand, the change mentioned in the very beginning created space for the two

parties to walk out of the strategic dilemma. Geo-political factors certainly have great impact on China-Japan relations, but the increase of interdependence and mutual benefits determine that both parties must adopt peaceful, cooperative, and harmonious way to solve the problems between them. Besides, except for the real interests' collision, some misunderstandings and contradictions between China and Japan were exaggerated. In fact, both countries do not deny the developing right of each other, but they do care more about the way of rising and how will the power be used after rising.

As a specific measure to improve both East Asian integration and Sino-Japanese relations, the two countries should seek to maintain dialogues from the starting point of East Asian integration. This includes constructive negotiations on integration framework and process. Furthermore, informal trilateral leadership dialogue mechanism among China, Japan and the U.S. is recommendable.

During the DPRK nuclear test in 2006, China and Japan communicated and coordinated with each other, this is unprecedented. After Prime Minister Fukuda took his office, the atmosphere of cooperation between the two countries became much better. The Fukuda cabinet wants to solve the abduction issue between Japan and DPRK, and realize normalization. This provides new opportunity for China and Japan to cooperate. If we take a look at Pyongyang Declaration which was signed on Sept.17th, 2002, we can easily understand that the relations between Japan and DPRK is not only a bilateral relationship, but also involve the regional order of North East Asia, among which the most urgent issue is the building of peace regime in Korea peninsula and security mechanism in North East Asia. The multilateral cooperation among China, Japan, and the Korean peninsula is indispensable. From this year, China, Japan and ROK will hold trilateral summit besides ASEAN + 3 framework. The conservative ROK president, Lee Myungbak's inauguration next month will provide chance for the summit to have fruitful results.

Afternoon Session: “An East Asian Community and the US”

(1) Ralph A. COSSA

Since early 2005, there has been a great deal of movement surrounding the effort to establish an East Asian community. “Movement,” one hastens to add, does not necessarily or always mean progress. Not all the movement has been in the forward direction. Some has been sideways, some even backward. Though it would be unkind to describe the process as “one step forward, two steps back,” there certainly has not been any “great leap forward” either.

One presumed step forward was the establishment of an annual East Asia Summit (EAS). The inaugural meeting was held in Kuala Lumpur in December 2005; the second took place in the Philippines in January 2007. Efforts to develop the principles and modalities that will define the future role and mission of this new multilateral gathering continue. But as disputes and confusion over its composition, direction, and relationship to both broader and more selective existing mechanisms reveal, East Asian community building still has a long way to go. At this stage in its development, the EAS does not (appear destined to) provide the foundation of an East Asian community but rather is more likely to serve as a broader-based endorsement or validation mechanism for a companion East Asian-only effort. In this respect, the EAS may prove to be one step backward rather than toward the establishment of an East Asian community. (Continued)*

*For the continuation of this article, please turn to pp.144-174 of “*An East Asian Community and the United States*” published by CSIS Press.

(2) FUKUSHIMA Akiko

Friedberg contends that East Asia is “ripe for rivalry” and a place likely to emerge as the “cockpit of great-power conflict.” Does this assertion truly apply? If it does apply, it certainly applies to the political and security areas. With a heritage of old Cold War flashpoints namely, the divided Korean Peninsula and the Taiwan Strait East Asia shows patterns of competitive security that still demand traditional deterrence and crisis response mechanisms. The recent buildup of Chinese military power is reportedly beyond what is needed for the Taiwan Strait contingency. The U.S. Department of Defense, in the 2006 edition of its *Annual Report to Congress: Military Power of the People’s Republic of China*, stated: “China has the greatest potential to compete militarily with the United States and field disruptive military technologies that could over time offset traditional U.S. military advantages.” The legacy of the Cold War still lingers in East Asia, and it can be argued that the region has a long way to go in building a collective security community. (Continued)*

*For the continuation of this article, please turn to pp.104-143 of “*An East Asian Community and the United States*” published by CSIS Press.

V Appendix

1. An Introduction to The Global Forum of Japan

【Objectives】 As we embrace the 21st century, international relations are becoming increasingly interdependent, and globalization and regionalism are becoming the big waves. In this global tendency, communicating with the world, especially neighboring countries in the Asia-Pacific region at both governmental and non-governmental level, is one of the indispensable conditions for Japan to survive. On the basis of such understanding, The Global Forum of Japan (GFJ) aims to promote the exchange of views on commonly shared interests and issues in the field ranging from politics and security to economy, trade, finance, society and culture, and to help business leaders, Diet members and opinion leaders both in Japan and in their counterpart countries to discuss about the formulation of new orders in global and regional arenas.

【History】 The 1982 Versailles Summit was widely seen as having exposed rifts within the Western alliance. Accordingly, there were expressed concerns that the summit meetings were becoming more and more stylized rituals and that Western solidarity was at risk. Within this context, it was realized that to revitalize the summit meetings there must be free and unfettered exchanges of private-sector views to be transmitted directly to the heads of the participating states. Accordingly, Japanese former Foreign Minister OKITA Saburo, U.S. Trade Representative William BROCK, E.C. Commission Vice President Etienne DAVIGNON, and Canadian Trade Minister Edward LUMLEY, as representatives of the private-sector in their respective countries, took the initiative in founding The Quadrangular Forum in Washington in September 1982. Since then, the end of the Cold War and the altered nature of the economic summits themselves had made it necessary for The Quadrangular Forum to metamorphose into The Global Forum established by the American and Japanese components of The Quadrangular Forum at the World Convention in Washington in October 1991. In line with its objectives as stated above, The Global Forum was intended as a facilitator of global consensus on the many post-Cold War issues facing the international community and reached out to open its discussions not only to participants from the quadrangular countries but also to participants from other parts of the world. Over the years, the gravity of The Global Forum's activities gradually shifted from its American component (housed in The Center for Strategic and International Studies) to its Japanese component (housed in The Japan Forum on International Relations), and, after the American component ceased to be operative, the Board of Trustees of the Japanese component resolved, on February 7, 1996, that it would thereafter act as an independent body for organizing bilateral dialogues with Japan as a hub for all countries in the world, and amended its by-laws accordingly. At the same time, The Global Forum's Japanese component was reorganized into The Global Forum of Japan (GFJ) in line with the principle that the organization be self-governing, self-financing, and independent of any other organization.

【Organization】 The Global Forum of Japan (GFJ) is a private, non-profit, non-partisan, and independent membership organization in Japan to engage in and promote international exchanges on policy-oriented matters of bilateral, regional and global implications. While the secretariat is housed in The Japan Forum on International Relations, GFJ itself is independent of any other organizations, including The Japan Forum on International Relations. Originally established as the Japanese component of The Quadrangular Forum at the initiative of HATTORI Ichiro, OKITA Saburo, TAKEYAMA Yasuo, TOYODA Shoichiro in 1982, GFJ is currently headed by OKAWARA Yoshio as Chairman and ITO Kenichi as President. The membership is composed of 12 Business Leader Members including the two Governors, MOGI Yuzaburo and TOYODA Shoichiro; 86 Opinion Leader Members including the four Governors, ITO Kenichi, MURAKAMI Masayasu, OKAWARA Yoshio, and SHIMADA Haruo; and 21 Diet Members including the three Governors, KOIKE Yuriko, HATOYAMA Yukio, and TANIGAKI Sadakazu. Friends and supporters of The Global Forum of the Japan are organized into the Supporters' Club of the Global Forum of Japan. Financially the activities of GFJ have been supported by the annual membership fees paid by 12 leading Japanese business corporations (with 2 corporations, Toyota Motor Corporation and Kikkoman Corporation contributing 5 shares each and the other 10 corporations contributing 1 share each) as well as by the grants provided by The Japan Foundation, Japan-ASEAN Exchange Projects, The Tokyo Club, The Japan-Korea Cultural Foundation, etc. WATANABE Mayu serves as Executive Secretary.

【Activities】 Since the start of The Global Forum of Japan (GFJ) in 1982, GFJ has shifted its focus from the exchanges with the Quadrangular countries for the purpose of contributing to the Western Summit, to those with neighboring countries in the Asia-Pacific region including US, China, Korea, Taiwan, ASEAN countries, India and Australia European countries, Wider Black Sea area, for the purposes of deepening mutual understanding and contributing to the formation of international order. GFJ has been active in collaboration with international exchange organizations in those countries in organizing policy-oriented intellectual exchanges called "Dialogue." In order to secure a substantial number of Japanese participants in the "Dialogue," GFJ in principle holds these "Dialogues" in Tokyo. A listing of topics of "Dialogues" and its overseas co-sponsors in last five years is given below.

Year	Month	Topic	Co-sponsor
2003	January April October	Cooperation for Peace and Prosperity in the Asia-Pacific Region Entrepreneurship in Asia New Situation in Asia-Pacific region and Japan-Taiwan Cooperation	ASEAN-ISIS The Mansfield Center for Pacific Affairs (US) Foundation on International & Cross-Strait Studies (Taiwan)
2004	July September November	A Roadmap towards East Asian Community Future Prospect of East Asian Community and Japan-China Relationship Future of Korean Peninsula and Japan-U.S.-Korea Security Cooperation	ASEAN-ISIS China Association for International Friendly Contact (China) The Institute for Foreign Policy Analysis, The Fletcher School (US), Yonsei University (Korea)
2005	April June November	The Prospect of East Asian Community and Japan-Korea Cooperation The Prospect for East Asian Community and Regional Cooperation Peace and Prosperity in the Wider Black Sea Area and the Role of Japan	Presidential Committee on Northeast Asian Cooperation Initiative (Korea) ASEAN-ISIS University of Shizuoka, The Black Sea University Foundation (Romania), The International Center for Black Sea Studies (Turkey)
2006	February June September	Review and Perspective of the Japan-Taiwan Relationship An East Asian Community and the United States Prospect for Japan-ASEAN Strategic Partnership after the First East Asia Summit	Taiwan International Studies Association (Taiwan) Pacific Forum CSIS (US), The Council on East Asian Community ASEAN-ISIS
2007	January June July November	The China-Japan Relationship and Energy and Environmental Issues The US-Japan Alliance in the 21st Century The Challenges Facing Japan and ASEAN in the New Era The Second Japan-Black Sea Area Dialogue	China Institutes of Contemporary International Relations (China), Energy Research Institute, National Development and Reform Commission (China), The Japan Forum on International Relations National Committee on American Foreign Policy (US) ASEAN-ISIS Organization of Black Sea Economic Cooperation (BSEC), Embassy of Turkey, University of Shizuoka
2008	January	The Second Japan-US-Asia Dialogue	The Council on East Asia Community, Pacific Forum CSIS (US)

Membership List of The Global Forum of Japan

As of April 1, 2008

In alphabetical order

【Chairman】

OKAWARA Yoshio, President, Institute for International Policy Studies

【President】

ITO Kenichi, President and CEO, The Japan Forum on International Relations, Inc.

【Executive Governor】

MURAKAMI Masayasu, Acting Executive Director, The Japan Forum on International Relations, Inc.

【Business Leader Governors】

MOGI Yuzaburo, Chairman and CEO, Kikkoman Corporation

TOYODA Shoichiro, Honorary Chairman, Toyota Motor Corporation

【Diet Member Governors】

HATOYAMA Yukio, Member of the House of Representatives (DPJ)

KOIKE Yuriko, M.H.R. (LDP)

TANIGAKI Sadakazu, M.H.R. (LDP)

【Opinion Leader Governors】

ITO Kenichi, President and CEO, The Japan Forum on International Relations Inc.

MURAKAMI Masayasu, Acting Executive Director, The Japan Forum on International Relations, Inc.

OKAWARA Yoshio, President, Institute for International Policy Studies

SHIMADA Haruo, President, Chiba University of Commerce

【Business Leader Members】 (12 Members)

IMAI Takashi, Honorary Chairman, Nippon Steel Corporation

ISHIKAWA Hiroshi, Director, Kajima Corporation

KATSUMATA Tsunehisa, President, Tokyo Electric Power Company

KOBAYASHI Yotaro, Chief Corporate Advisor, Fuji Xerox Co., Ltd.

KUSAKARI Takao, Chairman, Nippon Yusen Kabushiki Kaisha

MATSUNO Haruki, Chief Executive Counselor, Member of the Board, Nippon Telegraph and Telephone Corporation

MOGI Yuzaburo, Chairman and CEO, Kikkoman Corporation

OKAYAMA Norio, Chairman, Sumitomo Electric Industries, Ltd.

SEYA Hiromichi, Senior Corporate Adviser, Asahi Glass Co., Ltd.

TAKAGAKI Tasuku, Senior Advisor, The Bank of Tokyo-Mitsubishi, Ltd.

YAGUCHI Toshikazu, President, Biru Daiko Co., Ltd.

TOYODA Shoichiro, Honorary Chairman, Toyota Motor Corporation

【Diet Member Members】 (21 Members)

AICHI Kazuo, Member of the House of Representatives (LDP)

HATOYAMA Yukio, M.H.R. (DPJ)

HOSODA Hiroyuki, M.H.R. (LDP)

IWAKUNI Tetsundo, M.H.R. (DPJ)

KITAGAMI Keiro, M.H.R. (DPJ)

KOIKE Yuriko, M.H.R. (LDP)

NAGASHIMA Akihisa, M.H.R. (DPJ)

NAKAGAWA Masaharu, M.H.R. (DPJ)

OGUSHI Hiroshi, M.H.R. (DPJ)

SHIOZAKI Yasuhisa, M.H.R. (LDP)

SUZUKI Keisuke, M.H.R. (LDP)

TANIGAKI Sadakazu, M.H.R. (LDP)

UEDA Isamu, M.H.R. (NK)

YAMAGUCHI Tsuyosi, M.H.R. (DPJ)

YAMANAKA Akiko, M.H.R. (LDP)

ASAO Keiichi, Member of the House of Councillors (DPJ)

FUJITA Yukihiisa, M.H.C. (DPJ)

HAYASHI Yoshimasa, M.H.C. (LDP)

HIRONAKA Wakako, M.H.C. (DPJ)

NAITO Masamitsu, M.H.C. (DPJ)

SEKOU Hironari, M.H.C. (LDP)

【Opinion Leader Members】 (86 Members)

AKASHI Yasushi, Chairman, The Japan Center for Conflict Prevention

AOKI Tamotsu, Commissioner, Agency for Cultural Affairs

AMAKO Satoshi, Professor, Waseda University

ASOMURA Kumiaki, Dean, International Cooperation Course, Graduate School, Kibi International University

EBATA Kensuke, Defense Commentator

FUKUSHIMA Teruhiko, J.F. Oberlin University

GYOHTEN Toyoo, President, Institute for International Monetary Affairs

HAKAMADA Shigeki, Professor, Aoyama Gakuin University

HARUNA Mikio, Professor, Graduate School of Nagoya University

HASEGAWA Kazutoshi, President, Japan-Australia-New Zealand Society

HATA Kei, Vice Principal, Sakushin Gakuin

HIRABAYASHI Hiroshi, Councilor, The Japan Forum on International Relations Inc.

HIRONO Ryokichi, Professor Emeritus, Seikei University

ICHIKAWA Isao, Executive Advisor for Financial Affairs, Keio University

IKEO Aiko, Professor, Waseda University

IMAGAWA Yukio, Former Ambassador to Cambodia

INA Hisayoshi, Columnist, The Nikkei Newspaper

INOUCHI Takashi, Professor, The University of Tokyo

IOKIBE Makoto, President, The National Defense Academy of Japan

ITO Eisei, Corporate Auditor, Toyota Auto Body Co., Ltd.

ITO Kenichi, President and CEO, The Japan Forum on International Relations Inc.

ITO Tsuyoshi, Professor, Meiji University

IWAMA Yoko, Associate Professor, National Graduate Institute for Policy Studies

IZUMI Hajime, Professor, University of Shizuoka

JIMBO Ken, Associate Professor, Keio University

KAKIZAWA Koji, former Minister of Foreign Affairs

KAMIYA Mataka, Professor, National Defense Academy

KANEKO Kumao, President, Japan Council for Economic Research

KAWAI Masao, Guest Professor, Hakuo University

KIMURA Takayuki, Guest Professor, International Christian University

KINOSHITA Hiroo, Advisor, National Small Business & Information Promotion Center

KOGURE Masayoshi, former Professor, Toyo University

KOKUBUN Ryosei, Professor, Keio University

KONDO Tetsuo, President, Institute for New Era Strategy (INES)

KUBO Fumiaki, Professor, Keio University

MANO Teruhiko, Professor under special assignment, Seigakuin University

MATSUMOTO Kenichi, Professor, Reitaku University

MIYAMOTO Nobuo, Diplomatic Commentator

MIYAZAKI Isamu, Honorary Advisor, Daiwa Institute of Research

MIYOSHI Masaya, Chairman and CEO, Miyoshi Networks Co., Ltd.

MORI Toshimitsu, Advisor, The Michinoku Bank, Ltd.

MORIMOTO Satoshi, Professor, Takushoku University

MURAKAMI Masayasu, Acting Executive Director, The Japan Forum on International Relations, Inc

MURATA Koji, Professor, Doshisha University

MUTSUSHIKA Shigeo, Professor, The University of Shizuoka

NAKAGANE Katsuji, Professor, Aoyama Gakuin University

NAKAHARA Nobuyuki, former Member of the Policy Board of the Bank of Japan

NAKANISHI Terumasa, Professor, Kyoto University

NAKOSHI Kenro, Foreign News Editor, Jiji Press

NISHIKAWA Megumi, Foreign News Editor, Mainichi Newspapers

OGASAWARA Takayuki, Professor, Yamanashi Gakuin University

OKAWARA Yoshio, President, Institute for International Policy Studies

OKONOGI Masao, Professor, Keio University

ONUMA Yasuaki, Professor, The University of Tokyo

OWADA Hisashi, Judge, International Court of Justice

OHYA Eiko, Journalist

RYU Ketsu, Professor, Waseda University, & Visiting Scholar, Columbia University

SAITO Akira, Corporate Officer, The Yomiuri Shimbun

SAKAKIBARA Eisuke, Professor, Waseda University

SAKAMOTO Masahiro, Senior Research Fellow, The Japan Forum on International Relations Inc.

SAJIMA Naoko, Professor, Senshu University

SHIMADA Haruo, President, Chiba University of Commerce

SHIMIZU Yoshikazu, Director, U.N. Association of Japan

SHIRAISHI Takashi, Vice President, The National Graduate Institute for Policy Studies

SOEYA Yoshihide, Professor, Keio University

SONE Yasunori, Professor, Keio University

SUDO Shigeru, Director of Energy and Environment Program, International Development Center of Japan

SUMIDA Nagayoshi, President, The Sankei Shimbun

TAHARA Soichiro, Journalist

TAIDA Hideya, Special Assistant to the President, The Japan Foundation

TAJIMA Takashi, Guest Professor, Toyo Eiwa Women's University

TAKAHARA Akio, Professor, Rikkyo University

TAKAHASHI Kazuo, Guest Professor, International Christian University

TAKASHIMA Hatsuhisa, Councilor, Ministry of Foreign Affairs

TAKEUCHI Yukio, Honorary Advisor, Ministry of Foreign Affairs

TAKEMI Keizo, Professor, Tokai University

TAKUBO Tadae, Guest Professor, Kyorin University

TANAKA Akihiko, Professor, The University of Tokyo

TANAKA Toshiro, Professor, Keio University

TANINO Sakutarō, Former Ambassador to China

URATA Shujiro, Professor, Waseda University

UTSUMI Yoshio, Honorary Advisor, TOYOTA InfoTechnology Center Co., LTD.

YAMAUCHI Masayuki, Professor, The University of Tokyo

YAMAZAWA Ipppei, Professor Emeritus, Hitotsubashi University

YOSHITOMI Masaru, President & Chief Research Officer, Research Institute of Economy, Trade & Industry

YUSHITA Hiroyuki, Guest Professor, Kyorin University

【Supporters' Club Members】 (20 Members)

【Executive Secretary】

WATANABE Mayu

[Note] DPJ: Democratic Party of Japan
LDP: Liberal Democratic Party
NK: New Komeito

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The Global Forum of Japan (GFJ) is grateful to its “Business Leader” members listed below for their generous contributions. Their support is making the activities of the Forum financially sustainable.

[GFJ Governors] [5 share]

Toyota Motor Corporation
Kikkoman Corporation

[GFJ Members] [1 share]

Sumitomo Electric Industries, Ltd.
Kajima Corporation
Nippon Steel Corporation
Tokyo Electric Power Co.
Asahi Glass Co. Ltd.
The Bank of Tokyo-Mitsubishi UFJ, Ltd.
Nippon Telegraph and Telephone Corporation
Fuji Xerox Co., Ltd
Biru Daiko Co., Ltd.
Nippon Yusen Kabushiki Kaisha

(In the order of enlistment)

2. An Introduction to The Council on East Asian Community

(1) Introduction

[Inauguration]


The concept of an "East Asian Community" has been spread quietly but steadily leading to the formation of a gigantic trend in the East Asian region. "The Council on East Asian Community (CEAC)" was inaugurated in Japan on May 18, 2004, considerably triggered by the launching in 2003 of "The Network of East Asian Think-Tanks(NEAT)" in Beijing and of "The East Asia Forum(EAF)" in Seoul in 2003. The establishment of CEAC was called for by 10 Think-Tanks, such as the Japan Forum on International Relations (JFIR) and The Japan Institute of International Affairs (JIIA), and 30 scholars such as TANAKA Akihiko, Professor of the University of Tokyo and YOSHITOMI Masaru, President & Chief Research Officer of the Research Institute of Economy, Trade & Industry. CEAC consists of representatives from wide-ranging fields in Japan who are interested in the concept of an "East Asian Community," including those who represent businesses corporations, such as Nippon Steel Corporation and Toyota Motor Corporation, and government agencies, such as the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Ministry of Finance and the Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry. Growing momentum for East Asian Community has finally come to take root in Japan whose attitude towards the issue tended to be passive until recently.

[Organization]

As an all-Japan intellectual platform covering business, government, and academic leaders, CEAC aims at the strengthening of intellectual collaboration, the building of intellectual foundation, and the sharing of strategic ideas among them. The membership of CEAC consists of 13 think-tank members, 92 individual members and 14 corporate members as of today. CEAC elected NAKASONE Yasuhiro, former Prime Minister of Japan, as Chairman, and ITO Kenichi, President of JFIR, as President at its Founding Meeting. CEAC is governed by its "Managing Plenary Meeting" and "Meeting of President and vice-Presidents." The "Policy Plenary Meeting," which is attended by the members of CEAC, conducts policy-debate among its members, and produce policy recommendations as occasions demand.

[Activities]

The activities of CEAC consist of the following four pillars: (1) the Policy Plenary Meeting, (2) the Research and Study, (3) the Website, and (4) the International Exchange. (1) The "Policy Plenary Meeting" is a forum where the members of CEAC are assembled to promote policy debate. They met eight times in their first year of activities and adopted a policy report entitled "The State of the Concept of East Asian Community and Japan's Strategic Response thereto." (2) The "Research and Study," mobilizing scholars of Japan, Asia and the US, organized an international research workshop under the topic of "East Asian Community and Regional Governance in East Asia" in June 2006. (3) The "Website" is an online network both in Japanese and in English for the purpose of publicity and enlightenment both within and beyond Japan and is accessible at <http://www.ceac.jp/>. (4) The "International Exchange" is a series of programs, which includes the holding in Tokyo of not only "Dialogues on an East Asian Community" with Korea in April 2005, ASEAN in June 2005 and US and Asia in June 2006, but the 3rd NEAT Annual Conference in August 2005. It also dispatches its members to conferences held abroad including the NEAT Annual Conferences in Bangkok in 2004, Kuala Lumpur in 2006, Singapore in 2007.



Membership List of The Council on East Asian Community

As of April 1, 2008

[Corporate Members] (14 Members)

ARAKI Hiroshi Advisor, Tokyo Electric Power Co., Ltd.
CHO Fujio Chairman, Toyota Motor Corp.
HATTORI Yasuo Vice Chairman, Seiko Epson Corp.
IMAI Takashi Honorary Chairman, Nippon Steel Corp.
INOUE Akiyoshi President, Sanyu Appraisal Corp.
ITO Yoshiro President, Itogumi Co., Ltd.
MAKIHARA Minoru Senior Corporate Advisor, Mitsubishi Corp.
MIYAMOTO Keishi Representative, Arigatou Foundation
MIYAUCHI Yoshihiko Chairman & CEO, ORIX Corp.
NAKAMURA Kimikazu President, Sankyu Inc.
NARITA Yutaka Principal Advisor, Dentsu Inc.
OKA Motoyuki Chairman, Sumitomo Corp.
TATEISI Nobuo Executive Advisor, OMRON Corp.
UESHIMA Shigeji Advisor, Mitsui & Co., Ltd.

[Think-tank Members] (13 Members)

GYOHTEN Toyoo President, Institute for International Monetary Affairs
HATAKEYAMA Noboru Chairman and CEO, Japan Economic Foundation
ITO Kenichi President and CEO, the Japan Forum on International Relations, Inc.
ITO Motoshige President, National Institute for Research Advancement
KURODA Makoto President, Center for Information on Security Trade Control
NAITOH Masahisa Chairman & CEO, the Institute of Energy Economics, Japan
NISHIHARA Masashi President, Research Institute for Peace and Security
OKAWARA Yoshio President, Institute for International Policy Studies
SATOY Yukio President, The Japan Institute of International Affairs
TAKAGI Yuki Governor, Agriculture, Forestry and fisheries finance Corporation
TERADA Haruhiko Deputy President, Japan Center for International Finance
YAMAMOTO Tadashi President, Japan Center for International Exchange
YOSHIDA Susumu Chairman of the Board of Trustees, Economic Research Institute for Northeast Asia

[Individual Members] (92 Members)

AKIYAMA Masahiro Chairman, Ocean Policy Research Foundation
AMAKO Satoshi Professor, Waseda University
FUKAGAWA Yukiko Professor, Waseda University
FUKUSHIMA Akiko Director of Policy Studies and Senior Fellow, National Institute for Research Advancement
FUNADA Hajime Member of the House of Representatives

FURUKAWA Motohisa Member of the House of Representatives
HAKAMADA Shigeiki Professor, Aoyama Gakuin University
HARUNA Mikio Special Correspondent, Kyodo News
HATA Tsutomu Member of the House of Representatives
HATTORI Kenji Professor, Aichi University
HAYASHI Yoshimasa Member of the House of Councillors
HIRABAYASHI Hiroshi Counselor, The Japan Forum on International Relations
HIRANUMA Takeo Member of the House of Representatives
HIRONAKA Wakako Member of the House of Councillors
HIRONO Ryokichi Professor Emeritus, Seikei University
HONMA Masayoshi Professor, the University of Tokyo
HONNA Jun Associate Professor, Ritsumeikan University
HOSOKAWA Daisuke Osaka University of Economics
ICHIKAWA Isao Executive Advisor for Financial Affairs, Keio University
IGUCHI Yasushi Professor, Kwansai Gakuin University
INOUCHI Takashi Professor, Chuo University
IOKIBE Makoto President, the National Defense Academy of Japan
ISHIGAKI Yasuji Professor, Tokai University Law School
ITO Takatoshi Professor, the University of Tokyo
IWABUCHI Koichi Associate Professor, Waseda University
JIMBO Ken Associate Professor, Keio University
KAKIZAWA Koji Former Foreign Minister of Japan
KAWAI Masahiro Dean, Asian Development Bank Institute
KAWASHIMA Shin Associate Professor, the University of Tokyo
KAWATO Akio General Manager, Japan-World Trends
KIMURA Fukunari Professor, Keio University
KINOSHITA Toshihiko Professor, Waseda University
KOKUBUN Ryosei Professor, Keio University
KONDO Masanori Associate Professor, International Christian University
MANO Teruhiko Professor under special assignment, Seigakuin University
MARUKAWA Tomoo Professor, the University of Tokyo
MATAEBARA Yutaka Editor-In Chief & Managing Editor, The Japan Times
MATSUDA Iwao Member of the House of Councillors
MIYAGI Taizo Associate Professor, National Graduate Institute for Policy Studies
MORIMOTO Satoshi Professor, Takushoku University
MURAKAMI Masayasu Acting Executive Director, The Japan Forum on International Relations, Inc.
MURASE Tetsuji Professor, Kyoto University
NAKAI Yoshifumi Professor, Gakushuin University
NAKASONE Yasuhiro former Prime Minister of Japan
NAKATANI Kazuhiro Professor, the University of Tokyo
NARITA Hironari Professor, Ohkagakuen University
OBA Mie Associate Professor, Tokyo University of Science
OE Shinobu Editorial Writer, The Yomiuri Shimbun

OGASAWARA Takayuki Professor, Yamanashi Gakuin University
 OGAWA Eiji Professor, Hitotsubashi University
 OKABE Naoaki Editorial Page Editor, Nihon Keizai Shimbun
 OKAMOTO Yumiko Professor, Doshisha University
 OKONOGI Masao Professor, Keio University
 SAKAKIBARA Eisuke Professor, Keio University
 SAKURADA Jun Associate Professor, Toyo Gakuen University
 SATO Koichi Professor, J.F. Oberlin University
 SHIMADA Haruo Professor, Keio University
 SHIMIZU Kazushi Professor, Kyushu University
 SHINDO Eiichi Professor Emeritus, Tsukuba University
 SHIOZAKI Yasuhisa Member of the House of Representatives
 SHIRAI Sayuri Professor, Keio University
 SHIRAISHI Masaya Professor, Waseda University
 SHIRAISHI Saya Professor, the University of Tokyo
 SHIRAISHI Takashi Vice President, National Graduate Institute
 for Policy Studies
 SHUTO Motoko Professor, Tsukuba University
 SOEYA Yoshihide Professor, Keio University
 SONODA Shigeto Professor, Waseda University
 SUGIUCHI Naotoshi Former Ambassador to Romania
 SUZUKI Keisuke Member of the House of Representatives
 TAJIMA Takashi Visiting Professor, Toyo Eiwa University
 TAKAHARA Akio Professor, the University of Tokyo
 TAKEISHI Reiji Professor, Tokyo International University
 TAKESADA Hideshi Professor, National Institute for Defense
 Studies
 TAKEUCHI Sawako Professor, Kyoto University / Special
 Advisor to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs
 TAKITA Kenji Professor, Chuo University
 TAKUBO Tadae Visiting Professor, Kyorin University
 TAMURA Jiro Professor, Keio University
 TANAKA Akihiko Professor, the University of Tokyo
 TANAKA Hitoshi Senior Fellow, Japan Center for International
 Exchange
 TERADA Takashi Associate Professor, Organization for Asian
 Studies, Waseda University
 TOMIYAMA Yasushi Editorial Writer Jiji Press
 TRAN Van Tho Professor, Waseda University
 URATA Shujiro Professor, Waseda University
 WAKISAKA Noriyuki Editorial Writer, Asahi Shimbun
 WATANABE Toshio President, Takushoku University
 WATANABE Yorizumi Professor, Keio University
 YAMAKAGE Susumu Professor, the University of Tokyo
 YAMASHITA Eiji Professor, Osaka City University
 YAMAZAWA Ipppei Professor Emeritus, Hitotsubashi University
 YANAGIMOTO Takuji Member of the House of Representatives
 YASUE Noriko Professor, Ritsumeikan University
 YOSHIDA Haruki President, The Yoshida Labo for Economics
 and Industry, Inc.
 YOSHITOMI Masaru President & Chief Research Officer,
 Research Institute of Economy, Trade &
 Industry

[Planning Committee]

Chairman	KAKIZAWA Koji	Individual Member, CEAC
Member	HIRONO Ryokichi	Individual Member, CEAC
Member	MURAKAMI Masayasu	Individual Member, CEAC
Member	SHINDO Eiichi	Individual Member, CEAC
Member	YOSHIDA Haruki	Individual Member, CEAC

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The Council on East Asian Community (CEAC) is grateful to its “Corporate Members” listed below for their generous contributions. Their support is making the activities of the Forum financially sustainable.

[Corporate Members]

Arigatou Foundation

Dentsu Inc.

Itogumi Co., Ltd.

Mitsubishi Corp.

Mitsui & Co., Ltd.

Nippon Steel Corp.

OMRON Corp.

ORIX Corp.

Sankyu Inc.

Sanyu Appraisal Corp.

Seiko Epson Corp.

Sumitomo Corp.

The Tokyo Electric Power Co., Ltd.

Toyota Motor Corp.

(In Alphabetical Order)

3. An Introduction to The Pacific Forum CSIS

Based in Honolulu, Hawaii, The Pacific Forum CSIS operates as the autonomous Asia-Pacific arm of the Center for Strategic and International Studies in Washington, D.C. founded in 1975, the thrust of the Forum's work is to help develop cooperative policies in the Asia-Pacific region through debate and analyses undertaken with the region's leaders in the academic, government, and corporate arenas. The Forum's programs encompass current and emerging issues in political, security, economic/business, and oceans policy issues. It collaborates with a network of more than 30 research institutes around the Pacific Rim, drawing on Asian perspectives and disseminating its projects' findings and recommendations to opinion leaders, governments, and publics throughout the region.

An international Board of Governors guides the Pacific Forum's work; it is chaired by Brent Scowcroft, former Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs. The Forum is funded by grants from foundations, corporations, individuals, and governments, the latter providing a small percentage of the forum's \$1.2 million annual budget. The forum's studies are objective and nonpartisan and it does not engage in classified or proprietary work.

The Pacific Forum staff is dedicated to playing an active role in fostering understanding of the Asia-Pacific region in Hawaii, as well as in the broader international community. To this end, the Forum's senior staff has participated in public speaking engagements for many community organizations and is regularly involved in media interviews and discussions both in the U.S. and abroad. In addition, The Pacific Forum enjoys collaborating with the Japan-America Society of Hawaii, the Pacific and Asian Affairs Council, the East-West Center, and the Asia Pacific Center for Security Studies, as well as with local educational institutions such as the University of Hawaii, Hawaii Pacific University, and Brigham Young Hawaii.

The Pacific Forum has various programs and projects such as Council for Security Cooperation in the Asia Pacific (CSCAP). CSCAP was founded in 1993 by Pacific Forum and nine other institutes as the first region-wide forum to foster multilateral security dialogue. Other founding institutes are based in Australia, Canada, Indonesia, Japan, South Korea, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore, and Thailand. Additional member committees include Brunei, Cambodia, China, India, Mongolia, New Zealand, North Korea, Papua New Guinea, Russia, Vietnam, and the European Union. Taiwan scholars also participate, increasing CSCAP's inclusivity. CSCAP members seek to enhance regional security and stability through dialogue, consultations, and cooperation on concrete policy issues and problems of mutual concern. CSCAP's research and analyses support and complement the efforts of regional governments and official multilateral dialogue mechanisms.

In addition to the weekly *PacNet* and the quarterly *Comparative Connections* journal, The Pacific Forum also publishes the Issues & Insights series, which consists of in-depth analyses authored by Pacific Forum staff, senior associates, and outside scholars, including participants at various Pacific Forum conferences and workshops. These are available free of charge from the Forum as well as on-line. The Forum also publishes its research in the CSIS *Significant Issues Series* and in *The Washington Quarterly*, *New Asia*, and other journals both in the U.S. and abroad. Pacific Forum's experts regularly contribute commentary and editorials to major regional publications such as the *International Herald Tribune*, *The Japan Times*, *The Korea Times*, *The South China Morning Post*, and *The Asia Times OnLine*, among others.

Copy Inhibit

GF- -E-B-0040



The Global Forum of Japan (GFJ)

17-12-1301, Akasaka 2-chome Minato-ku, Tokyo, 107-0052, Japan

[Tel] +81-3-3584-2193 [Fax] +81-3-3505-4406

[E-mail] gfj@gfj.jp [URL] <http://www.gfj.jp/>