

The Security Community in Northeast Asia: A Korean Perspective

Kun-Hyung Kang*

— 목 차 —

- | |
|---|
| I . Introduction |
| II . The Building of Multilateral Security Council
in Northeast Asia |
| III . The methods to pursue the Multilateral
Security Council |
| IV . A Korean Perspective |
| V . Conclusion |

I . Introduction

Even though the Cold War had ended, there have been many factors threatening the security in Northeast Asia, such as nuclear proliferation, territorial disputes, and a hegemonic competition between Japan and China. How to solve these problems is the most urgent task we face at the beginning of the twenty-first century. Especially, the post-Cold War and the Cold War factors coexist and also the trend of integration and disintegration lies together in Northeast Asia. The historical Summit between the North and the South in July 2000 could reduce antagonism the two countries have endured for more than 50 years. However, North Korea's continuous missile and nuclear development has made considerable negative impacts on the

* 제주대학교 법정대학 정치외교학과 교수

reconciling mood in the Korean Peninsula.

Furthermore, it is almost certain that wars among great powers will not break out after the end of the Cold War, but different factors threatening security are likely to happen, such as the proliferation of WMD(Weapons of Mass Destruction), anti-terror, environmental issues, and HIV/AIDS. These are new challenges not to be solved through only one nation's effort. Therefore, we need a new concept of security, not in terms of military strategy, but in comprehensive and cooperative security. It is essential that world peace and security be solved through cooperative efforts of all states. Thus, the idea of "cooperative security" emphasizing cooperative attainment by way of mutual confidence through dialogue and cooperation of states is very important.

In this respect, great efforts should be made to attain peace and security in Northeast Asia through peaceful means, instead of through military. The pre-stage to accomplish the security community in Northeast Asia is to build a security cooperative regime like a multilateral security council based on "cooperative security." We can assure the transparency among states and also learn the importance of dialogue and cooperation within the framework of security regime. If the practice of dialogue is institutionalized, it will much likely build the security community in Northeast Asia.

In this context, I'll explore the idea of a multilateral security council in Northeast Asia and analyze a Korean perspective about it.

II. The Building of Multilateral Security Council in Northeast Asia

1. The Multilateral Security Council as a Security Cooperative Regime

Peace is the best available formula for coexistence in the real world. The

peace we pursue is not a negative peace of the absence of war, but a positive one of institutionalized peace. Positive peace is only possible among those who can freely make voluntary agreements with others. Thus such peace is attainable only in a free democratic society where all individuals enjoy basic human rights, and thus have the ability to run their own lives and achieve their own social contracts.¹⁾ Therefore, peace order means a state of absence of other's arbitrary violence.

From this perspective, international peace order can be attained by the institutionalized order guaranteeing that a nation cannot invade another nation through force. Such a peace order simultaneously includes negative peace of the state of absence of war and positive one being institutionalized to guarantee it.

In this respect, a multilateral security council should be built like a security cooperative regime, which can solve conflicts and disputes among Northeast Asian nations not by force, but by peaceful means such as dialogue and compromise.

If we can build a multilateral security council which provides nations with a kind of norms at the anarchical state in Northeast Asia, it will be a turning point to forming the security community as well as settling disputes in Northeast Asia. Therefore, the security community in Northeast Asia can be attained through the formulation of international regimes such as a multilateral security council guaranteeing the transparency among Northeast Asian nations.

According to Stephen D. Krasner, international regimes can be defined as sets of implicit or explicit principles, norms, rules, and decision-making procedures around which actor's expectations converge in a given area of international relations.²⁾ Principles are beliefs of fact, causation, and rectitude.

1) Sang-Woo Rhee, "Rummel's Tireless Endeavor to Foster Peace," in Sang-Woo Rhee, *Rummel's Libertarian Peace Theory* (Seoul: New Asia Research Institute, 2002), p. 333.

2) Stephen D. Krasner, "Structural Causes and Regime Consequences: Regimes as Intervening

Norms are standards of behavior defined in terms of rights and obligations. Rules are specific prescriptions or proscriptions for action. Decision-making procedures are prevailing practices for making and implementing collective choice.

Keohane and Nye, Jr also define regimes as “sets of governing arrangements” that include networks of rules, norms, and procedures that regularize behavior and control its effects.³⁾ Mack and Ravenhill refer regimes as those multilateral arrangements that are created to facilitate international cooperation.⁴⁾

Regimes must be understood as something more than temporary arrangements that change with every shift in power or interests. Agreements are *ad hoc*, often “one shot” arrangements, regimes as Jervis argues,⁵⁾ implies not only norms and expectations that facilitate cooperation, but a form of cooperation that more than follows short-run self-interest. Thus, international regimes are different from international organizations in which nations have an official membership with the secretariat, rather they can be transitional forms to develop international organizations.

International regimes enable states to act, not by short term interests, but by long term ones, and afford cooperation with others, and keep the norms and rules of regimes. Regimes can play a direct role in reducing, if not eliminating, uncertainty and in ameliorating the security dilemma by facilitating communication, transparency, development of defense-oriented national strategies, institution of mechanisms for peaceful solution of disputes, and collective management of power. Communication and transparency will help lift the

Variables,” *International Organization*, Vol. 36, No. 2 (Spring 1982), p. 186.

3) Robert O. Keohane and Joseph S. Nye, Jr., *Power and Interdependence: World Politics in Transition* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1977), p. 19.

4) Andrew Mack and John Ravenhill, “Economic and Security Regimes in the Asia-Pacific Region,” in Andrew Mack and John Ravenhill(eds.), *Pacific Cooperation: Building Economic and Security Regimes in the Asia-Pacific Region* (Boulder: Westview Press, 1995), p. 1.

5) See Robert Jervis, “Security Regimes,” *International Organization*, Vol. 36, No. 2 (Spring 1982), p. 357.

fog of suspicion, enable a more accurate reading of the intentions of other states, and prevent the misperception and unintended escalation of tension and conflict.

Such security regimes have been elaborated under the concept of "cooperative security," which refers to explain the newly developed security cooperation since the end of the Cold War. The proliferation of nuclear arsenals and the rise of environmental issues these days have been faced with the necessity to attain peace and security in the world through the common efforts of all states, not a sole effort of one state. In this urgent situation, cooperative security is based upon the idea of accomplishing common security by building mutual confidence through dialogue and cooperation among states. Thus, cooperative security places great stress on preventive diplomacy---a proactive non-military approach to security which seeks to prevent conflicts from reaching the stage where resort to military force will appear necessary.⁶⁾ Cooperative security also prefers a multilateral relationship to bilateral one and puts an emphasis on practicing and institutionalizing dialogue among states.

Forming regular dialogue among states as well as official mechanisms such as multilateral pacts and arrangements are making the practice of dialogue under the framework of cooperative security. It can be called a building process of security cooperative regimes if such a process is specified and institutionalized. For instance, the ARF(ASEAN Regional Forum) and the CSCAP(Council for Security Cooperation in the Asia Pacific) which had been developing in the Asia-Pacific region are typical security cooperative regimes.

2. Why do we need a Multilateral Security Council in Northeast Asia?

Firstly, it is due to the aggravating uncertainty of security in Northeast

6) See Gareth Evans, *Cooperating for Peace: The Global Agenda in the 1990s and Beyond* (Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 1993).

Asia even after the end of the Cold War. Though the United States has committed to play the leading role of security guarantor in Asia during the post-Cold War era, it would be uncertain that the U.S. can play such role under the situation of loosening the threat of Russia and China and deteriorating America's economy.

Even if the United States increases defense spending and strengthens a hegemonic leadership as a world police, declaring the "war against terror" after the events of September 11, 2001, it is likely to result in a relative decline of the American economy due to the expansion of the defense budget. It seems that the American will of hegemonic leadership is getting worse under the deteriorating economy for the following two reasons:

One is a generational change of American political elite.⁷⁾ As demonstrated in the President Bill Clinton and George W. Bush elections, the chances are good that the next twenty years or so of American politics will be dominated by figures whose views were shaped by the events of the 1960s and 1970s (the civil rights movement and Vietnam) rather than the 1940s and 1950s (World War II and the opening phase of the Cold War). Such people are likely to be more skeptical of foreign entanglements and more optimistic about the prospects for domestic reform than those who came before or went after. Thus, American politics leading such elites will be less involved in world affairs, even though this does not mean that the United States is necessarily on the verge of a new era of isolationism.

The other reason is as follows: It is worth recalling that for most of past century an active, extensive, and continuous US role has been motivated and justified by the existence of a communist threat to the nation's survival. But it is becoming more difficult to justify an American hegemonic role since the end of the Cold War. Now it is true that only the "war against terror" is America's rationalized global role. The US hegemonic leadership

7) See Aaron L. Friedberg, "The Future of American Power," *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol. 109, No. 1 (Spring 1994), pp. 18-19.

based upon moral legitimacy necessary to support of the other nations is rather decreasing in the sense that Iraq war has been carried out by America's unilateral power without consent of the UN security council, in spite that American hegemonic unipolarity in terms of military power is much stronger than before. For this reason, maintaining and strengthening US foreign roles are becoming more and more difficult to support by both Americans as well as foreigners. Furthermore, growing anxiety about relative economic decline has eroded the sense that the United States has a unique capacity and responsibility for global leadership. Thus, the national policy that the US should pursue a continuous hegemonic leadership will be met with great challenges in obtaining national consensus, due to the hegemonic costs in order to provide international public goods.

As a result, it is true that a fierce arms race in Northeast Asia has been aggravating since the end of the Cold War. The pursuit of a political and military normal power of Japan and the ambition of regional hegemonic power of China, which takes advantage of power vacuum in case of diminishing American involvement in this region, have been growing these days. For instance, there are many factors increasing security uncertainty in East Asia, such as the territorial disputes between China and Southeast Asian countries over the Sparty Islands, conflicts between Japan and Russia in relation to the return of four islands in Northern Japan, and the instability on the Korean Peninsula by North Korean nuclear issues. Therefore, it is necessary to build a multilateral security council in Northeast Asia in order to solve these problems, because this council can diminish security uncertainty by way of mutual confidence and transparency among states.

Second, the current issues we face can be solved only by a trans-national cooperation, not by one nation. The proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction like nuclear weapons, sea lane, anti-terror, environmental issues, SARS, HIV/AIDS, and drug trafficking activities, cannot be reduced by one nation's effort. For this reason, the current security concept has been transformed from

military strategy to “cooperative security” dealing with non-political economic and environmental issues comprehensively. Thus, the existing security mechanisms based upon bilateral alliance would fall short of coping with a new phase of security challenges in Northeast Asia. A multilateral security council broadly dealing these issues is certainly needed.

III. The methods to pursue the Multilateral Security Council

Robert Jervis insists upon the following conditions for the establishment of the security regime.⁸⁾ First, the major powers should purpose to establish the security regime. In other words, all nations should desire to coordinate as a team as opposed to acting as an individual nation. That implies that all nations must be satisfied with the maintenance of the status quo. Second, all players should believe that the other players share the values of mutual security and cooperation. Third, no one player holds that security can be achieved through expansion. Fourth, wars and the pursuit of individual national security should be regarded as costs. In other words, as a tremendous amount of money is spent on wars and the increase in armaments, all players should agree that it is profitable to reduce these kinds of costs and invest them in their own economic development.

The security environment in Northeast Asia after the Cold War seems to meet these 4 conditions to some degree. As shown in the efforts to resolve the North Korean nuclear issue within the framework of the multilateral talks of 6 nations, the major powers aligned with countries in Northeast Asia have not given a negative response on the establishment of the multilateral security council. No one country desires to break up the current status quo. Moreover, to a certain degree they admit the value of the cooperative security.

8) Jervis, *op. cit.*, pp. 360-362.

This means that all nations value their domestic economic growth and they agree that too much money has been spent on the security. Therefore, the establishment of a multilateral security council in Northeast Asia is highly possible.

Then, how it can be pursued?

First, as mentioned before, the nations with the hegemonic leadership should play an active role in the establishment of the regime. The former US Clinton administration showed a positive response on the multilateral security council, even suggesting the name of the "New Pacific Community." The Bush administration is trying to resolve the North Korean nuclear issue within the frame of multilateral talks. Therefore, the atmosphere to cultivate this frame of reference is critical. To this end, it is needful that a nation like Korea without the ambition of hegemony exerts its entrepreneurial or intellectual leadership.

Korea should continuously emphasize the necessity of the establishment of the multilateral security council and put forward ideas based on the principles, norms, rules, and decision-making procedures in order to solidly establish the council. In particular, in terms of the agendas dealt with in the council, the resolution of issues shared by all participating nations is necessary. For instance, non-political issues including refugees, terror prevention, drugs, environment preservation, pollution prevention, coast safety guard, joint marine development, and elimination of pirates should be proposed first. Through the resolutions of these issues, a history and system of cooperation would be accumulated gradually. Then, the political and military issues such as territory arbitration, disarmament, and nuclear proliferation prevention can be brought to the table. In this respect, it is desirable if the establishment of the collapse of the USSR, the tenuous relationship between Japan and the United States, the aggressive diplomacy towards Asia and the attempt to expand the influence in the South China Sea area of China, and the possibility of the power vacuum following the reduction in the number of

American forces.

Given that this unstable security environment is present in Northeast Asia as well, it is imperative to begin the multilateral security talks similar to the ARF in Northeast Asia. It is necessary that annual high level talks like the ARF foster and build up the pattern of constructive discussion on the mutual political and security matters in Northeast Asia. Moreover, it is desirable to attract the participation of those countries that want to participate as observers rather than to strictly limit the membership like the ARF. For example, regarding the role of Canada as it proposed the multilateral security talks in Northeast Asia, its participation to exert the intellectual leadership would be effective. It would be very useful to establish a permanent department that deals with this matter in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade.

Fourth, it is desirable that the multilateral security council in Northeast Asia would complement rather than harm existing bilateral relationships. The US and Japan have taken a wait and see attitude on the establishment of the multilateral security council in part because they may believe that this multilateral security council would replace the Mutual Security Treaty between the US and Japan. To eliminate this concern, the multilateral security council must not deny or encroach upon the existing bilateral relationships or the importance of the future bilateral talks in Northeast Asia.

There are many instances in which the establishment of the multilateral security council or the drive for the security cooperation does not have a negative impact. One example of a mutually complementary relationship is the US and the UK maintenance of their traditional friendship within the frame of the NATO. The formation of the EU did not fully replace the various existing bilateral relationships between member countries. There is the potential for the co-existence of the existing bilateral relationships and the multilateral security council.⁹⁾ Fifth, in order to establish the multilateral

9) See James E. Goodby, "Cooperative Security in Northeast Asia," *Disarmament and Security Issues in the Asia-Pacific Region*, United Nations Disarmament Topical

security council in Northeast Asia, a series of regular meetings to build the foundation of the multilateral security council could include regular summit talks of participating countries, security and diplomatic ministerial level talks, and diplomatic and security senior working level meetings. The establishment of the secretariat and the establishment of the conflict prevention center could be also pursued. Moreover, it is desirable that these matters be stipulated in the form of the "Agreement on the Basic Relation between Northeast Asian Countries." In addition, a secretariat which would handle all regional security matters would be established and the conflict prevention center, the conflict arbitration court, the disarmament committee, and the verification and inspection team would be formed. Similar to the OSCE (Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe), it would be valuable for the secretariat, the conflict prevention center, the conflict arbitration court, and the disarmament committee to be distributed among the member countries to closely promote the multilateral cooperation on the security related matters between member countries.

If the establishment of a multilateral security council in Northeast Asia follows these guidelines, it would be a firm base for stability and peace in Northeast Asia. The regime makes the establishment of the mutual confidence possible by increasing the transparency among the stake holders. As well, the establishment of the multilateral security council in Northeast Asia would be a base for the economic council development. Therefore, through the establishment of this council, the future possibilities for the Northeast Asian Community would increase steadily.

IV. A Korean Perspective

In the opening address at the twenty-sixth PBEC(Pacific Basin Economic

Committee) meeting held in Seoul, 1993, the Korean government expressed the willingness of multilateral security cooperation. Foreign minister Han Soong-Joo, demonstrated Korea's positive position on forming a multilateral security council by expressing that a regional security cooperation would be one of the five key foreign policies.

The Rho Moo-Hyun government also has a positive posture toward a multilateral security council which is loosening security uncertainty due to planning the rise of the Northeast Asian hub state as a key national policy. Namely, the Korean government recognizes the necessity of a multilateral security cooperation preventing military tensions and building mutual confidence in Northeast Asia and argues that a multilateral security council institutionalizing peace and stability is necessary to maximize economic potentials in this region and achieve economic growth.¹⁰⁾

The Korean government has been exploring how to develop "six-party talks" into a security dialogue framework in Northeast Asia in search of a peaceful solution to the North Korean nuclear issue. It is also planning to persuade the North to participate in a multilateral security cooperation through the South-North dialogue.

It seems that the Korean government should try hard to establish a multilateral security council for the following reasons:

First, a multilateral security council in this region has been greatly contributing to the peaceful solution of the North Korean development of nuclear weapons and long range missiles. North Korea's second round nuclear crisis was the result of the conflict between North Korea's clandestine development of nuclear weapons and the Bush administration's hawkish posture toward it.

As now the six-party talks maintain a dialogue-oriented solution, the previous second round talks have not proceeded well except for agreeing on the

10) See National Security Council, *Peace Prosperity and National Security: the Plan of Security Policy of Participatory Government* (in Korean), 2004. 3, p. 55.

peaceful and diplomatic solution of the North Korean nuclear crisis. Namely, the fundamental difference on the issue between the North and the US blurs the prospect of solving the problem peacefully. While North Korea remains unchanged in its stand to demand the "security guarantee" from the US before the dismantling of its nuclear programs and by the way of simultaneous action, the US also basically remains unchanged in its position that the North should abandon all its nuclear programs including a secret uranium enrichment program by way of C.V.I.D.(complete, verifiable, and irreversible dismantlement of the program).

However, the US position changed to a little moderate direction in the third round six-party talks held in Beijing on June 23, 2004. The US presented a proposal offering the North the possibility of energy aid from South Korea, security assurances and other benefits during a three-month test period if it promises to disclose and end its nuclear weapons programs.

The North Korean nuclear crisis is the most important factor to affect the stability on the Korean Peninsula as well as in Northeast Asia. Thus, it is highly desirable that the nuclear crisis should be solved peacefully through multilateral cooperation. If successful, it will play a leading role in improving relations between the two Koreas as well as in forming a good atmosphere for unification.

Second, a multilateral security council in Northeast Asia would be needed in the sense that the alliance between South Korea and the US is aggravated due to the friction over the North Korean nuclear issues and the rise of anti-American sentiment etc.

The Bush administration's hawkish posture on North Korea, labeling it as a member of the "axis of evil", has significantly damaged the relationship between South Korea and the US as well as North Korea and the US. Whereas the Bush administration looks at North Korea as a serious security threat not only to South Korea and Japan, but also the US homeland via WMD material transfer, the Kim and Rho governments tend to long for

national cooperation with the North toward unification. The perception gap about North Korea between the two alliance partners is sure to exist.¹¹⁾

The rise of anti-American sentiment among the youth is deeply connected with the conflicts between South Korea and the US. The democratization and economic success of Korea have caused Korean youth to have strong nationalistic sentiments and national pride. They have begun to question the US on its unfair treatment of G.I. crimes. The loosening of security sensitivity mainly due to inter-Korean rapprochement effects more demand for equality and fairness from the US forces in Korea. For this reason, the Roh Moo-Hyun government wants to have a more balanced alliance with the US with more self-reliant defense power.

In this situation, the US declared that 12,500 soldiers of USFK will be reduced by the end of next year, dispatching 3,600 American soldiers in Korea to Iraq. It would certainly be related to the friction between the two countries, in spite of America's saying that it is performed as a part of a redeployment plan of the US forces abroad, because preconsultation did not take place before the force reduction.

Therefore, in view of such a rapidly changing security circumstance, it is really necessary to build a multilateral security council in this region for security and prosperity on the Korean peninsula as well as in Northeast Asia.

Nothing is more important than mutual confidence and cooperation among related countries for a regional community building. Koreans are suspicious of and afraid of the future of Japan. Japan is now the second economic super power and is trying to pursue a political-military "normal" power. Where is Japan going?

Fundamentally speaking, nations which are invaded and colonized by a

11) Chaesung Chun, "South Korea's Foreign Policy in the 21th Century," paper presented at the 4th Thai-Korean Political Scientists' Dialogue organized by the Political Science Association of Thailand, the Korean Political Science Association, and the Institute of Peace Studies, Cheju National University (June 20, 2004), p. 98.

foreign aggressor receive not only serious damages but also deep pains, if the aggressor is their neighbor with whom there existed long close relations. Such pains can neither be forgotten nor forgiven. Only the cruel past can be overcome in the process of common effort for the future with the Japanese people. But in order to start such common effort, a precondition is necessary. This is the recognition of the past and expression of remorse and apology from the side of the Japanese government and the Japanese people. For the discussion of a regional community based upon real friendship and confidence, the remorse and apology of Japan should precede.

V. Conclusion

As I mentioned above, I have examined the necessity, strategy and the Korean perspective of a multilateral security council as a prerequisite for building a security community in Northeast Asia. The “anti-terror declaration” was included as an agenda limited to economic and non-political issues in the APEC summit meeting at Bangkok last year. It is very meaningful in putting forward dialogues in the Asia-Pacific region.

If the North Korean nuclear crisis is settled by a diplomatic solution through dialogue, it will give us good experience and lessons for security cooperation among nations in Northeast Asia. The peaceful measures such as multilateral pacts and agreements as well as the formation of periodic meetings among states and the regularization of non-governmental exchanges are designed to learn dialogue customs within the framework of “cooperative security.” If this process could be more embodied and institutionalized, that would be the process of building a multilateral security council. The official dialogue among Northeast Asian countries could be developed in the case of building mutual confidence by promoting dialogue on the civilian level. To accumulate dialogue customs and learn cooperation among states are the

most important factors for peaceful order in Northeast Asia, because this area has little experience of multilateral dialogue and cooperation.

It is necessary to propose ideas about principles, norms, rules and decision-making procedures of a regime in order to build a security cooperation regime in Northeast Asia. Namely, “the intellectual leadership” which suggests such ideas, is required to form the regime. It can be exerted by weak states without structural power. Furthermore, it would be more effective if middle powers like Korea, which have no aspiration of hegemon, play a major role in conducting such a leadership. Thus, the Korean government should suggest, on the one hand, fresh ideas and flexible strategies for the peaceful settlement of the North Korean nuclear crisis ; on the other hand, it should make various diplomatic efforts for it to develop a multilateral security council in Northeast Asia.

In the era of interdependence and localization, such an intellectual leadership can be exerted by the local government, university and NGOs as well as states. As they can propose more fresh ideas than states, I imagine that they can play a great role for the formation of security dialogue. Thus, a multilateral cooperation council in Northeast Asia can be attained more due to their ideas and efforts. Intellectuals, NGOs, and the local government in this region can find common interests by building mutual confidence through mutual exchange and cooperation. Let me suggest a “Northeast Asia intellectuals Union,” promoting the formation of the East Asian Community. It can create the “community culture” for building the East Asia Community by way of mutual exchange and mutual study among intellectuals.

The Jeju local government has actively propelled the Jeju “Peace Island” plan to meet with this situational change. The Jeju “Peace Island” plan at the early stage aims at performing the role of an exchange center for the reconciliation and cooperation between the South and the North as well as the role of a dispute settlement center for peaceful cooperation in Northeast Asia. At the next stage, it should suggest fresh ideas to bring about peaceful

order on the Korean Peninsula and in Northeast Asia, not being satisfied with the place of summit talks. It seems necessary that the “peace study institution” which can learn peace cooperation and research the strategy for it should be founded to accomplish that end. As a part of this, “Jeju Peace Forum” has been held every year since 2001 by the sole effort of the Jeju local government. They have a great plan for Jeju Peace Forum to make an “East Asian Davos Forum.”

The Jeju “Peace Island” plan is the movement that can participate in and contribute to important trends of change of civilization at this transitional period of the century. The Asia-Pacific Ocean could be viewed as the center of political and economic activity in the whole world. Thanks to this change, Northeast Asia will rise to be the heart area of world civilization and trade. It will also be clear that the ocean can play a more important role in the future. On this point, the geographical location of Jeju is the most important of all, which gives us much responsibility. The Jeju people view the fact that Jeju, located in the core of Northeast Asia, provides the opportunity of rising splendidly as the leading actor of world civilization according to their efforts.

The Jeju “Peace Island” plan is the movement that islands should actively contribute to cease the conflicts between the continental and sea powers and build a peaceful order, not to repeat the past miserable history, such as being exploited and victimized by the disputes between the two powers. Therefore, this movement will be more fruitful if it is proceeded by islands in Northeast Asia such as Okinawa, not only by Jeju Island. If islands including Jeju become the mecca of peace and perform the role of the centers of peaceful exchange and learning places of peaceful cooperation, not only tourist places, such hopes of expecting peaceful order will diffuse the whole world as well as Northeast Asia.