

This article was translated by JIIA from Japanese into English as part of a research project to promote academic studies on the international circumstances in the Asia-Pacific.

JIIA takes full responsibility for the translation of this article.

To obtain permission to use this article beyond the scope of your personal use and research, please contact JIIA by e-mail (jdl_inquiry@jii.or.jp).

Citation: International Circumstances in the Asia-Pacific Series (China), Japan Digital Library (March 2016), http://www2.jiia.or.jp/en/digital_library/china.php

Xi Jinping's "New Model of Major-Power Relations" and South Korea: The Park Geun-hye Administration's "Equilibrium Policy"*

Hideya Kurata

I. Identifying the Problem: The "New Model of Major-Power Relations" and South Korea

Looking back over the past 10 years, the United States has been insisting that China's external conduct be in keeping with international norms, as seen in the "responsible stakeholder" concept put forward by Deputy Secretary of State Robert B. Zoellick during the George W. Bush administration, or the "strategic reassurance" concept espoused by Deputy Secretary of State James B. Steinberg during the first Barack Obama administration.

Xi Jinping's "new model of major-power relations" is a concept put forth from the Chinese perspective, probably in response to these propositions from the United States. The term "new model of major-power relations" was originally used in the latter part of the Hu Jintao administration,¹ so it would be difficult to say that it is peculiar to the Xi administration, but clearly the Xi administration is using it as a concept for defining its relations with the United States. This concept belongs to the category of "major-power concert" and derives from the realism brought about by the balance of power, but as explained by the "stability-instability paradox," strategic "stability" among the major powers does not necessarily result in stability at the regional level and may instead bring about instability.

Of course, although China has been markedly strengthening its armaments, starting with nuclear missiles, US-China relations are not building the type of "strategic stability" that was once seen in US-Soviet relations. Although China is no longer keeping a "low profile" (*taoguang yanghui* in Chinese), it has shown a cooperative posture toward the United States. It will take time for China to build an equal relationship with the United States, and so its need to maintain that "low profile"—at least in terms of US relations—has not diminished.² However, it should be noted that at the same time China is calling for a "new model of major-power relations," it has stipulated that the South China Sea is one of its "core interests." If, as a result of its military buildup, China becomes increasingly active in the South China Sea and

* This article was originally published as 倉田秀也「習近平『新型大国関係』と韓国—朴槿恵政権の『均衡論』—」『主要国の対中認識・政策の分析』(日本国際問題研究所2014年度研究報告書)、2015年、29-43頁(http://www2.jiia.or.jp/pdf/resarch/H26_Views_and_Policies_vis-a-vis_China/H26_Views_and_Policies_vis-a-vis_China.php)

thereby increases the cost of any use of force by the United States and its allies who seek countervail that activity, then perhaps one could say that the “stability–instability paradox” is evident in US-China relations in its primordial form.

Conversely, when it comes to the nuclear development issue of the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea (DPRK, or North Korea), both the United States and China are trying to jointly manage the problem as a form of “major-power concert.”³ However, North Korea has certainly not acquiesced to that US-China “major-power concert,” and has instead continued to seek a resolution through its bilateral relationship with the United States. For the North Koreans, the only remaining means to shift the principal axis for dispute resolution from the US-China relationship to the US-DPRK relationship was to use force against the Republic of Korea (ROK, or South Korea) using conventional weapons. In particular, North Korea thought that the use of force against the ROK would be effective to proclaim the “illegality” and “fictitiousness” of the Northern Limit Line (NLL) that was unilaterally declared by the United Nations Command (UNC) in the Yellow Sea immediately following the armistice cease-fire and to justify direct negotiations with the United States.

Originally, it was thought that while it might not be possible for the US-ROK alliance to deter the North Koreans from using all forms of force, including irregular warfare, against the South, it would be able to deter the use of force by the DPRK’s regular armed forces. However, in two cases where force was used—the sinking of ROK Navy corvette, *Cheonan* (March 26, 2010), and the artillery attack on the island of Yeonpyeong (November 23, 2010)—both times the attacks were carried out by regular forces. These two incidents signaled that attacks on South Korea by the North—the types of attacks that were supposed to be deterred by the US-ROK alliance—could no longer be deterred. Of course, that period marked the succession to power of Kim Jong-un, and there was undeniably a domestic rationale for the military action, as seen in the domestic political campaign painting Kim Jong-un as an “artillery genius” in order to justify his ascension to leadership within North Korea. However, considering that at that point North Korea had already carried out two nuclear tests and was also testing missiles that would put the part of the American mainland within range, the background for the two attacks on South Korea mentioned above was the deepened trust in North Korea’s own “nuclear deterrence capability” toward the United States. If the United States and South Korea hesitated to launch a retaliatory strike in response to North Korea’s use of force out of concern for the costs of such a move, then North Korea’s “nuclear deterrence capability” vis-à-vis the United States must be deemed successful to a certain degree.

Shortly before becoming president, Park Geun-hye referred to South Korea’s relationship with the United States as being a “value alliance,” while the relationship with China was “ties in humanities,”⁴ but clearly China-ROK ties are now progressing into the security realm. This article will examine how South Korea perceived its relations with China within the context of US-China relations, and will clarify what limitations exist in that respect.

II. “Periphery Diplomacy” and “Thucydides’s Trap”: Multilateral Talks and South Korea

Until recently, South Korea perceived the necessity to improve relations with China in the context of its relationship with North Korea. In the late 1990s, North-South dialogue was nonexistent and North Korea was demanding a bilateral US-DPRK peace agreement under a “new peace arrangement.” The Four-Party Talks (South Korea, North Korea, the United States, and China) were held when South Korea secured the involvement of the United States and China. The talks were a multilateral arrangement aimed at inducing North Korea to engage in dialogue with the South, which was achieved by having both the United States

and China—as parties concerned with the armistice agreement from a practical perspective, and as countries that shared the view that establishing a North-South peace agreement was necessary—work cooperatively, with South Korea then joining as a participant.⁵

In the Six-Party Talks that began in 2003 as well, China confirmed that it had a shared interest with the United States in ensuring a non-nuclear North Korea, and at the start of the year, while rejecting deliberations in the UN Security Council on this issue, the United States and China attempted to resolve the issue through regional talks including North Korea. That led to the successful tripartite talks between the United States, North Korea, and China, with Japan, South Korea, and Russia participating *ex post facto*. This established the contours of the Six-Party Talks, with China serving as the chair country.⁶ The Six-Party Talks themselves were the product of US-China concert, and it could be said that South Korea secured its influence in the process by jumping on that bandwagon.

Even though the Six-Party Talks subsequently stalled, China's recognition that the North Korean nuclear development issue is an area where collaboration with the United States is possible remained unchanged. Cui Tiankai, who was deeply involved in the Six-Party Talks and has been serving as Chinese Ambassador to the United States since April 2013, has also raised the North Korean nuclear development issue as an area where US-China cooperation is possible.⁷ At the June 2013 US-China Summit held at Sunnylands in California, Xi Jinping referred to a “new model of major-power relations” and expressed his intent to cooperate with the United States. Interestingly, President Obama also raised the North Korean nuclear issue as an issue on which the United States and China could cooperate.⁸ According to the post-summit explanation by National Security Advisor Thomas E. Donilon, while Xi Jinping used the phrase “new model of great-power relations,” Obama referred to a relationship that is not destined for conflict.⁹

The fact that China is taking a “low profile” posture only toward the United States while positioning North Korea's nuclear issue as an area of possible US-China cooperation is something that Foreign Minister Wang Yi addressed candidly in a September 2013 speech at the Brookings Institution. In that speech, Wang noted that since the 15th century, there have been 15 cases of the rise of emerging powers, and in 11 of those cases it led to confrontation and war between the emerging and the ruling powers. Perhaps taking a lesson from the research carried out by Graham T. Allison Jr. and Joseph Nye Jr. at Harvard University's Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs on “Thucydides's Trap,” Wang questioned whether an armed conflict along the lines of the war between Athens and Sparta in ancient Greece (the Peloponnesian War) would really be inevitable if the hegemonic United States were to be challenged by a rising China. On this point, Wang Yi noted that although it may seem probable based on past experience that the United States and China will end up going to war, they are not destined to do so,¹⁰ and he offered a similar explanation as Donilon had. While touching on the “new model of major-country relationship,” he stressed the need to “expand common ground and dissolve differences” with the United States, and in the top of the list of issue areas where the United States and China could cooperate, he included the North Korean issue. When we recall that Wang was serving at the time as the chair of the Six-Party Talks, it is probably natural that he spoke at length on the Korean issue. But Wang also mentioned that North Korea had intention to recommit to the “Leap Day Deal” it signed with the United States (February 29, 2012) and to return to the Six-Party Talks.¹¹

As noted above, in contrast to the South China Sea, the North Korean nuclear issue is considered to be an area in which if anything, the United States and China can cooperate. China's “periphery diplomacy” is not guided by consistent principles or actions, but its relations with North Korea are receiving special treatment within the context of Sino-American relations, and at the very least, there is no indica-

tion that China is leading to the destabilization of the North Korean nuclear issue.

III. China and the “Regionalization” of the US-ROK Alliance: The Utility of ROK-China Military Exchanges

As described above, North Korea’s enhanced “nuclear deterrence capability” has made it easier for them to use force against the South, and that naturally has an impact on the US-ROK alliance. However, there is some doubt as to whether the US military realignment carried out under the George W. Bush administration effectively addressed that problem. In retrospect, throughout the Cold War, the US-ROK alliance was essentially a “localized alliance” with the mission of the US troops stationed in South Korea being limited to deterring North Korea, and so it did not pose a direct threat to China. As long as North Korea could be deterred, then it was difficult for South Korea to imagine that it would ever go to war with China, and thus it determined that there was room for improving relations with China. However, when the Bush administration began relocating its troops stationed in South Korea to provide “strategic flexibility,” it was thought that the US-ROK alliance might be developing into a “regional alliance” that would include dealing with China, which was becoming more prominent.

At that time, the administration of President Roh Moo-hyun was seeking to regain “wartime” operational control (OPCON) of the South Korean military, and there was agreement that the US forces in Korea would give the Korean military its own command structure, while at the same time shifting its own operations southwards. In February 2007, it was decided that wartime OPCON would be returned to South Korea on April 17, 2012, but after the sinking of the *Cheonan*, President Lee Myung-bak secured an agreement from President Obama at the G20 meeting (June 26, 2010) to delay the transfer of OPCON until December 1, 2015. In addition, the 42nd US-ROK Security Consultative Meeting (SCM) held in Washington, DC on October 8, 2010, approved a strategic document called the “Strategic Alliance 2015.” This document sought to create parallel US and ROK command structures and “synchronize” this with the relocation of the US forces in Korea, setting the target for the return of wartime OPCON as December 1, 2015, and calling for the relocation of the US forces to be completed by the same time.¹²

However, China did not readily accept the transformation of the US-ROK relationship from a “localized alliance” to a “regional alliance.” Above all, following the artillery attack on Yeonpyeong Island, the United States dispatched the USS *George Washington* Carrier Strike Group to the Yellow Sea for joint exercises with the ROK air and naval forces. This meant that China permitted the US forces to enter the Yellow Sea, and this signified to South Korea that it was being “drawn into” the situation between the United States and China.¹³ Certainly, the trigger for that was North Korea’s use of force against the South, which was an act that neither South Korea nor China could control. It could be said that North Korea skillfully utilized the differences in understanding between the United States and South Korea on the one hand and China on the other.¹⁴ However, these military exercises, although confined to the limited waters of the Yellow Sea, reaffirmed the common interests of South Korea and China. Avoiding such circumstances as the joint US-ROK military exercises that took place following the attack on Yeonpyeong was unquestionably in the interests of both South Korea and China. Even though the United States was realigning its military in order to provide its troops in South Korea with “strategic flexibility,” South Korea became even more reluctant than before to have the US-ROK alliance take on “regional” responsibilities that would include China, and they began carrying out military exchanges with the navy of the Chinese People’s Liberation Army (PLA).

Given the geographical conditions with the South Korean forces and PLA forces facing one another across the Yellow Sea, it is natural that the two sides would undertake confidence-building measures

(CBMs), and even prior to the US-ROK joint exercise, there was a progressive development of China-ROK military exchanges from exchanges between their armies to exchanges between their air and naval forces as well. In 2005, South Korea's 3rd Field Army Command signed a partnership agreement with the Jinan Military Region. At that time, China was not positively inclined toward exchanges of air force and naval personnel, but following an agreement reached to establish a hotline between the defense authorities of South Korea and China in April 2007, memoranda of understanding (MOUs) were exchanged in November 2008 and hotlines were set up between the ROK Navy 2nd Fleet Headquarters (in Pyeongtaek) and China's PLA North Sea Fleet Headquarters (in Qingdao), and between the ROK Air Force's 2nd Master Control and Reporting Center (in Daegu) and the Air Command in China's Jinan Military Region.¹⁵

In addition, after the November 2010 US-ROK military training exercises, an agreement was reached at a meeting of South Korean and Chinese defense ministers held in Beijing on July 15, 2011, under which the 1st Sino-ROK Defense Strategic Dialogue was held on the 27th of that month in Seoul. There, Vice Minister of National Defense Lee Young-geol and Deputy Chief of the PLA General Staff Ma Xiaotian discussed an MOU on rescues at sea.¹⁶ Moreover, on July 31, 2012, the two countries held the 2nd Defense Strategic Dialogue in Beijing, where they concluded the MOU on sea rescues and, in addition, agreed to establish a hotline between their defense ministries. In doing so, China was supposed to be the third country with which South Korea has set up defense ministry hotlines, following the United States and Russia.¹⁷

However, China's military exchanges with South Korea were not necessarily limited to just those objectives. Around that time, China was strengthening its military presence in the Yellow Sea and in September 2012, it commissioned the PLA Navy's newly acquired aircraft carrier *Liaoning*, which was based at Qingdao. If China's goal was to "make the Yellow Sea an inland sea," then rather than the military exchanges with South Korea being strictly intended as CBMs, it could be said that China viewed them as a form of anti-access/area-denial (A2/AD), born from an attempt to draw in South Korea in response to the US "rebalance."

IV. Between "New Model of Major-Power Relations" and "Rebalance": Conditions for Sino-ROK Military Relations

1. Strengthening the alliance with the United States: Room to strengthen ties with China

Following Park Geun-hye's victory in the presidential election of December 2012, North Korea succeeded in launching a ballistic missile that was thought to be an improved model of the Taepodong-2 missile to put a satellite into polar orbit, and just prior to President Park's inauguration, on February 12, 2013, they pushed ahead with their third nuclear test. As noted above, North Korea's improved capability to attack the part of the US mainland made it easier to use force against the South, and the enhancement of the DPRK's "nuclear deterrence capability" toward the United States was the cause of its military offensive on the South in the spring of that year.

On March 5, 2013, following North Korea's third nuclear test, a statement from the spokesperson for the Supreme Command of the Korean People's Army stated that on March 11, the day that the "war maneuvers" were to enter the "full-dress stage," they would declare to "make the Korean Armistice Agreement totally nullified." The timing of the start of the "full-dress stage (of) war maneuvers" coincided with the "Key Resolve" US-ROK joint command post exercises, which were also to begin on March 11. The statement also announced that North Korea would "totally stop" the activities of the Representative of the Korean People's Army at Panmunjom and would "cut off" the Panmunjom "DPRK-US military

telephone,” and subsequently they began preparations for the launch of a medium-range ballistic “Musudan” missile. North Korea’s attack was also aimed at South Korea. On March 8 of that same year, a statement from the Committee for the Peaceful Reunification of the Fatherland (CPRF) stated that the DPRK declares to abrogate “all agreements on nonaggression reached between the North and the South,” and the Supreme Command proclaimed the “top combat-ready posture,” which signifies the highest alert level.¹⁸

In response, Wang Yi held a phone conference with UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon in which he said, China would “not allow troublemaking on its doorstep.”¹⁹ In the back of Wang’s mind was probably the November 2010 US-ROK joint military exercises. If a North Korean attack on South Korea faced on the Yellow Sea, the United States and China could end up confronting each other again in the Yellow Sea. And if the ROK forces were to cooperate with the US forces, then China could also find itself in a conflict with them. China was keeping Park Geun-hye in check in terms of allowing the US-ROK alliance to extend to the Yellow Sea. Yang Xiyu, who was deeply involved in North Korean issues, criticized the US-ROK alliance following Park’s election for transforming into a “regional alliance,” and China was working to contain that alliance so that it would not be aimed at China itself.²⁰

On the other hand, it was natural that Park would seek to strengthen the alliance with the United States when the latter was advocating a “rebalance,” and that was accompanied by a reconsideration of the timing of the return of wartime OPCON. It has become clear that, having already experienced a North Korea “spring offensive,” Park conveyed to the United States a desire to once again extend the date for the return of wartime OPCON.²¹ In May 2013, Park traveled to the United States for a summit meeting with Obama. The two leaders released a joint statement commemorating the 60th anniversary of the US-ROK alliance, and at a joint press conference, Park stated, “The President and I noted that it is important that we continue to strengthen our deterrence against North Korea’s nuclear and *conventional weapons threat*, and shared the view that in this respect, the transition of wartime operational control should also proceed in a way that strengthens our combined defense capabilities and preparations being made toward that way as well” [emphasis added by the author].²² However, if Park had at that time proposed to the United States that they once again postpone the return of wartime OPCON, then the “combined defense capabilities” referred to here would mean the maintenance of the existing US-ROK combined forces mechanism. Furthermore, if the relocation of the US forces in Korea southward to provide “strategic flexibility” was “synchronized” with the transfer of wartime OPCON, as noted above, then the delay of that transfer would mean a reconsideration of the “strategic flexibility” of the US forces in Korea.

At the same time, despite the US “rebalance,” this would mean a freeze on the “regionalization” of the US-ROK alliance. In June 2013, Park paid a visit to China even before she visited Japan, and she held summit talks with Xi Jinping. The two leaders announced the “China-ROK Joint Statement for the Future” and the “Action Plan to Enrich China-ROK Strategic and Cooperative Partnership.”²³ South Korea had already announced the “Joint Vision for the Alliance of the Republic of Korea and the United States of America” on June 16, 2009, during the early days of Lee Myung-bak’s administration, and so the “China-ROK Joint Statement for the Future” was intended to create a balance between the United States and China in South Korean diplomacy. Also in China-ROK relations, early during the Lee administration the “China-ROK Strategic and Cooperative Partnership” was agreed upon, and Park Geun-hye succeeded in deepening that partnership during her visit to China. If Park thought that she could propose to the United States that the transfer of wartime OPCON be postponed and that the “strategic flexibility” of the US troops based in South Korea would be revised, then by freezing the “regionalization” of the US-ROK alliance, it would afford South Korea the opportunity to improve relations with China.

Around the time that the China-ROK Joint Statement for the Future was announced, military exchanges between the two countries became increasingly frequent. Already, immediately before the announcement of the Joint Statement, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the ROK Armed Forces Jeong Seung-jo paid a visit to China (the first visit at such a level in seven years since 2006), where he not only had a meeting with Chief of the General Staff Fang Fenghui²⁴ and Vice Chairman of the Central Military Commission Fan Changlong,²⁵ but also Tian Zhong, commander of the North Sea Fleet.²⁶ In addition, on July 10, 2013, following the announcement of the China-ROK Joint Statement for the Future, Admiral Choi Yoon-hee, chief of Naval Operation, visited China. Subsequently, an agreement was reached for cooperation on a periodic basis via telephone calls between the ROK chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the chief of the General Staff of the PLA, and they also held consultations about regular meetings at the rear admiral level, reciprocal observation of military training exercises, and so on.²⁷ What is more, despite China's announcement of an air defense identification zone (ADIZ) in the East China Sea, ROK Air Force Chief of Staff Sung Il-hwan visited China at the end of November, and at the end of the year, the first China-ROK Diplomatic and Security Dialogue—a meeting at the director-general level—was held in Beijing.²⁸ This was a commitment made in the China-ROK Joint Statement for the Future, and although South Korea had announced that it would expand its ADIZ in response to China's announcement, it did not significantly damage China-ROK relations.

However, the United States had not abandoned the idea of “regionalizing” the US-ROK alliance. When Naval Chief of Staff Choi Yun-hee visited China in June, he toured a North Sea Fleet submarine, and on a direct call, he is said to have told the commander of the ROK's 2nd fleet, “The ROK and Chinese militaries must pursue the same operation in the West Sea [Yellow Sea],” which would undoubtedly be difficult for the United States to accept.²⁹ If we assume that China perceived military exchanges with South Korea as one element of its A2/AD strategy, then if South Korea and China both “pursued the same operation” in the Yellow Sea, it would signify the exclusion of US forces from those waters. It was in that context that Vice President Joe Biden, during his visit to South Korea at the end of the year, said to President Park, “It has never been a good bet to bet against America.”³⁰

2. Rebalancing the “Rebalance”: CICA and South Korea

While South Korea and China certainly have shared interests in the Yellow Sea, there is a possibility for China-ROK relations to be interpreted as one element of China's A2/AD approach. By responding to this, South Korea could contribute to the Chinese resistance to the US “rebalance.” However, Xi Jinping was clearly greatly encouraged by the progress in China-ROK relations since the start of the Park administration. Against the US “rebalance,” Xi's stance on excluding the US military presence from the region was shown in diplomatic terms at the 4th Summit of the Conference on Interaction and Confidence-Building Measures in Asia (CICA), held in Shanghai in May 2014. As is well known, the concept for CICA dates back to a proposal made in October 1992 at the 47th UN General Assembly by President Nursultan A. Nazarbayev of Kazakhstan, and following a series of meetings among foreign ministers, the first meeting of CICA heads of state was held in 2002 in Almaty. Since that time, summits have been held once every four years, and South Korea has formally added its name to the list of member countries. In 2014, China hosted the CICA Summit, where Xi gave a speech on May 21.

During the speech, Xi directly expressed his resistance to the US “rebalance.” Above all, his line, “In the final analysis, it is for the people of Asia to run the affairs of Asia, solve the problems of Asia and uphold the security of Asia,” was seen as a criticism of the US military presence in the Asia-Pacific region.³¹ Moreover, the criticism was also directed at the US allies that supported the “rebalance.” On this

point, Xi stated, “To beef up and entrench a military alliance targeted at a third party is not conducive to maintaining common security.”³² If we assume that the “third party” is referring to the United States, then we can say that China viewed CICA as a conference organization that would oppose the US “rebalance.” Originally, CICA was created as an organization for discussing CBMs in Asia, but when one considers that Xi spoke directly of excluding the US military presence from the region, it signifies that China was calling for CBMs in the form of not only reducing mutual distrust and promoting transparency with regard to armaments, but also excluding contending forces.

Xi’s speech certainly could not have been acceptable to South Korea, given that it had US forces stationed in Korea and was giving wartime OPCON to the ROK-US Combined Forces Commander, even though China and South Korea had confirmed their common interests in the Yellow Sea. Even if South Korea was inevitably more negative with regard to the “regionalization” of the US-ROK alliance, they were also trying to postpone the reversion of wartime OPCON and to strengthen the US-ROK alliance in light of North Korea’s 2013 “spring offensive.” Attending the CICA Summit from South Korea was Unification Minister Ryoo Kihl-jae, and based on the text of his speech, while he refrained from touching on the US-ROK alliance, neither were there any instances that seemed to resonate with Xi’s speech.³³ It is difficult to imagine that Ryoo would have actively agreed with Xi on the spot. In fact, *Renmin Ribao* (People’s Daily) and *Jiefangjun Bao* (People’s Liberation Army Daily), through Xinhua, listed the delegations that had praised Xi’s speech, and there was no mention of Minister Ryoo.³⁴ That shows the Chinese displeasure with the South Koreans for not having expressed their agreement with Xi’s speech.

In the end, the 4th CICA Summit released the “Shanghai Declaration” that pledged members would “stay committed to building a security environment in Asia based on confidence, mutual trust, good neighborliness, partnership and cooperation among all States deeply rooted in the heart of the Asian people” (Article 1.2), and included one line stating, “We maintain that no State will strengthen its security at the expense of security of other States” (Article 1.3), and the emphasis was clearly different from the Istanbul Declaration released after the 3rd Summit, which stressed efforts against terrorism, separatism, and nuclear proliferation.³⁵ Despite that, it is said that South Korea initially rejected the proposals made by the Chinese side and did not publish the original text of the Shanghai Declaration.³⁶

Admittedly, South Korea was not able to ignore the Chinese diplomatic efforts that were concentrated on the CICA Summit. When Wang Yi visited South Korea immediately after the CICA Summit, President Park commended him on the “successful hosting” of the meeting.³⁷ One could perhaps say that the fact that President Park congratulated Wang on the success of CICA, while distancing her country from Xi’s CICA speech out of consideration for US-ROK relations, shows her sense of “equilibrium.” Subsequently, Xi visited South Korea in July 2014, during which time he gave a speech at Seoul National University, stating, “Asia is an Asia for Asians and a global Asia,” while also noting, “We welcome the participation of countries from outside the region who agree with cooperation among Asians,” retreating somewhat from the CICA Summit speech.³⁸

V. The Debate on the Deployment of THAAD: The Challenge of a US-China “Equilibrium”

The 46th SCM, held in Washington, DC on October 23, 2014, sheds a great deal of light on South Korea’s subsequent foreign policy toward China. The Joint Communiqué indicated that the two sides had officially decided to postpone the transfer of wartime OPCON, and while it did not negate the plan to relocate the US forces in Korea, the US-ROK Combined Forces Command was to be maintained for the time being. Moreover, while emphasizing the North Korean nuclear weapon and missile threat, not only did

they authorize a newly formed US-ROK Combined Division, but they also agreed that the artillery brigade that was expected to move to Pyeongtaek would instead remain in Dongducheon, north of Seoul.³⁹ This would appear to be a response to the dynamics of North Korea's enhanced "nuclear deterrence capability" toward the United States, which led to its use of force against the South. Also, while maintaining the current US-ROK command structure for the time being, this also froze the "strategic flexibility" of the US forces in Korea, even if just partially.

Certainly this agreement went according to President Park's plan, returning the US-ROK alliance at least partially to the original alliance structure, and strengthening the US-ROK alliance at least in terms of the threat from North Korea's conventional forces. Given that it was accompanied by a freeze on "strategic flexibility," President Park may have determined that this agreement expanded the room available to her to improve China-ROK relations.

However, Park faced a major challenge in terms of her foreign policy handling of China and the United States; namely, the question of deploying the Terminal High Altitude Area Defense (THAAD) missile system. Initially, it was unofficially pointed out that THAAD was likely to be deployed in Pyeongtaek, to which the main units of the US forces in Korea were to be moved. THAAD was originally known as the Theater High Altitude Area Defense missile system, with the "T" standing for "Theater." It would appear that just as the previously differentiated National Missile Defense (NMD) for the defense of American mainland and Theater Missile Defense (TMD) for the defense of allied nations were consolidated into "Missile Defense" (MD) at the start of the George W. Bush administration, "Theater" was changed to "Terminal" during the process of dividing missile defense system into different phases by the trajectory of the enemies' ballistic missiles.

A look back at previous administrations shows that the issue of deploying interceptor missiles in South Korea had an impact on that country's relations with China. When participation in TMD was debated during the Kim Dae-jung administration, it was noted that if that system was used in part to defend the American mainland from Chinese ballistic missiles, then that deployment would contribute to the management of South Korea's alliance with the United States, but it would also mean that China would lose its nuclear deterrence capability vis-à-vis the United States. China was concerned about whether South Korea would participate in TMD, and the South Koreans could not help but to perceive it in relation to US-China relations as well. After some wavering, the decision reached by the Kim administration was "nonparticipation" in TMD. However, while South Korea publicly announced nonparticipation in TMD, it later acquired the Patriot PAC-2 (Patriot: Phased Array Tracking Radar Intercept on Target; PAC: Patriot Advanced Capability) lower-tier interceptor missile system that the German air force had been using, along with 48 missiles, and two PAC-3 battalions were introduced to the US forces in Korea. Lower-tier interceptor missiles form one critical part of TMD, and there were probably objections to the fact that South Korea had professed to be "nonparticipating" in TMD while deploying the PAC-2. In fact, in Taiwan, the deployment of lower-tier interceptor missiles was taken as being roughly the same as participation in TMD. The term TMD itself can be thought to connote Chinese missiles.⁴⁰

Nonetheless, South Korea was able to explain that because of its altitude (approximately 24 km), the lower-tier defense system within TMD in South Korea—regardless of its efficacy—was focused on North Korean ballistic missiles, and Chinese ballistic missiles were not targeted. In fact, when Chinese Defense Minister Chi Haotian visited South Korea in January 2000, ROK's Ambassador to China Kwon Byonghyon stated that his country's nonparticipation in TMD "provided new information on which China could base its policy toward South Korea." In this way, while managing its alliance with the United States, South Korea regarded itself as not viewing China as an enemy because of TMD.⁴¹

In contrast to that, the deployment of THAAD made it more difficult to balance South Korea's relationships with the United States and China. When the possibility of THAAD deployment in South Korea was first indicated, Qin Gang, spokesperson for the Chinese foreign ministry, stated that it would damage the peace and stability in the region and he called on the United States to take into consideration the "reasonable concerns" of relevant countries in the region.⁴² THAAD itself is an interceptor system, but China's apprehensions were caused by the radar system (Army Navy/Transportable Radar Surveillance and Control Model, or AN/TPY-2) that could detect launched missiles.⁴³ The detection range had reached more than 1,000 km, and so if it were deployed in Pyeongtaek, while it might be difficult to detect missile launches on the Chinese inland, some of China's launched missiles could be tracked.

At the present time, the deployment of THAAD in South Korea is becoming an urgent challenge for the United States and South Korea. In June 2014, General Curtis M. Scaparrotti, commander of the US Forces Korea, made clear that the United States had proposed the deployment of THAAD to South Korea,⁴⁴ and in late September of that year, US Deputy Secretary of Defense Robert O. Work commented that the United States was considering putting THAAD in South Korea.⁴⁵ According to Secretary of Defense Chuck T. Hagel, the United States and South Korea had not held any formal discussions on THAAD,⁴⁶ but while Qiu Guohong, Chinese ambassador to South Korea, clearly stated his government's opposition,⁴⁷ South Korea committed itself to the Tailored Deterrence Strategy that was mentioned in the 45th SCM Joint Communiqué of October 2013. The Tailored Deterrence Strategy was limited to use "against key North Korean nuclear threat scenarios,"⁴⁸ and the term "tailored" implied that it was not targeting Chinese ballistic missiles and therefore would not sacrifice China's nuclear deterrence capability. Currently, the outline of the Tailored Deterrence Strategy is being developed through the Korea Air and Missile Defense (KAMD) and Kill Chain concepts, but given that the ROK government is being undecided on THAAD on the one hand while at the same time stressing the development of the Tailored Deterrence Strategy, one can see the struggle that the Park administration is experiencing as it tries to balance its relations with the United States and China.⁴⁹

VI. Conclusion: A Comparison with the "Balancer in Northeast Asia" Doctrine

Since the normalization of diplomatic relations, China-ROK ties have been viewed as an inseparable bilateral relationship for inducing North Korea, which prefers to hold talks with the United States, to enter into talks with South Korea—as seen in the Four-Party Talks. In the Six-Party Talks as well, by taking advantage of cooperation between the United States and China, which are countries that believe that the denuclearization of North Korea is essential, South Korea tried to gain influence in the process. That type of dynamic still exists. However, as China-ROK relations have evolved, in addition to those dynamics, the separate dynamics related to US-China relations have factored in, and the relative weight of the latter has gradually been increasing. This is clearly shown by the China-ROK military exchanges and the debate surrounding the deployment of THAAD in South Korea. In other words, it could be said that China-ROK relations are becoming a "dependent variable" of US-China relations.

Within that context, the foreign policy philosophy of the Park administration was a type of US-China "equilibrium policy," but currently, President Park is cautiously avoiding the use of that term. That may be because it calls to mind the "balancer in Northeast Asia doctrine" of the Roh Moo-hyun administration, which drew criticism even from those within South Korea at the time. The Roh administration called on the United States to transfer wartime OPCON back to South Korea, and was able to get the George W. Bush administration to agree. Against that backdrop, he championed a self-reliant military, and in the fall of 2007, he successfully arranged to have a summit with Kim Jong-il. On the other hand,

Roh claimed that given the improvement in relations with the North, South Korea could also play more of a leading role in its relations with China and the United States and could create a “balance” in US-China relations. As seen in the agreement on transferring wartime OPCON, South Korea during the Roh administration was decreasing its reliance on US forces for security. It should probably be described as having set the equilibrium point slightly closer to China in terms of US-China relations.⁵⁰

When comparing the “equilibrium policy” of Park Geun-hye with the “balancer in Northeast Asia doctrine” of Roh Moo-hyun, several notable differences can be seen. To start with, in contrast to Roh’s position, Park did not presume a lessening of the country’s reliance on the US military for security. In terms of the transfer of wartime OPCON, while the Roh administration reached an agreement with the Bush administration, the Lee administration postponed that date, and the Park administration requested a second postponement of the transfer, to which the Obama administration agreed. Accordingly, Park has not sacrificed US relations for the sake of making progress in China relations, and it has not set the equilibrium point closer to China in US-China relations.⁵¹ Moreover, she has not advocated a “self-reliant military” through the transfer of wartime OPCON for achieving progress in North-South dialogue, and it would be difficult to imagine that she conceives of creating “equilibrium” in relations with major powers by improving South Korea’s relationship with the North. Rather, Park has shifted the goal of South Korean diplomacy to that of attaining an “equilibrium” in its relations with China and with the United States, independent of its relationship with North Korea. Park seems to have determined that by strengthening the country’s relationship with the United States through the postponement of the transfer of wartime OPCON, it can make further progress in its relations with China.

If that is the case, there are two situations that South Korea must avoid. One would be for North Korea to use force in the Yellow Sea and for the United States and China to then confront each other in those waters, as happened during the November 2010 US-ROK joint military exercises, which would lead to a situation in which the South Korean forces would have to side with the US military. If China views the recent China-ROK military exchanges as part of its A2/AD, then the South Korean forces would become “drawn into” a US-China confrontation. Another situation to be avoided is to have US-China tensions in the South China Sea and other regions spill over to the Korean Peninsula. As Wang Yi stressed, China is proposing a “new model of major-power relations” and considers the Six-Party Talks to be one area in which the two countries can avoid “Thucydides’s Trap.” However, if the impact of US-China tensions in the South China Sea were to spill over to the Korean Peninsula, then one would imagine that South Korea, which has attempted to bandwagon on US-China cooperation, could find itself like the “tragedy of Melos,” ensnared in “Thucydides’s Trap.” If that were the case, then the restarting of the Six-Party Talks, which were initiated through US-China cooperation, would also be difficult. Although China placed the North Korean nuclear issue at the top of the list of potential areas of cooperation with the United States, there is no guarantee that the momentum would be sustained if the impact of a US-China conflict in another area were to spill over to the Korean Peninsula.

1. According to Yuan Peng, in February 2012, when Xi Jinping visited the United States as vice president, he called for the creation of a “new model of major-power relations for the 21st century” (Xi Jinping, “Gongchuang zhongmei hezuo huoban guanxi de meihao mingtian: Zai Meiguo youhao tuanti huanying wuyan shang de yanjiang” [Let’s Create a Wonderful Future for US-China Cooperation and Partnership: Speech at a Luncheon to Welcome American Friendship Organizations], Renmin Ribao [People’s Daily], February 17, 2012). Also, for the speech by Hu Jintao, see Hu Jintao, “Tuijin huli gongying hezuo, fazhan xinxing daguo guanxi” [Promoting Cooperation for Mutual Benefits and Coexistence, Developing a New

- Model of Major-Power Relations], Renmin Ribao [People's Daily], May 4, 2012. For the factual context, see Yuan Peng, "Guanyu goujian Zhongmei xinxing daguo guanxi de zhanlue xikao" [Strategic Thinking on Creating a New Model of US-China Major-Power Relations], Xiandai guoji guanxi [Contemporary International Relations], vol. 5 (2012): 1; and Da Wei, "Goujian Zhongmei daguo guanxi de lujing xuanze" [Choosing the Path to Building a New Model of US-China Major-Power Relations], Shijie jingji yu zhengzhi [World Economics and Politics], vol. 7 (2013): 5.
2. Wang Jisi expresses it more directly, stating that the use of that low profile by China is "reserved only for when it is talking about its stance toward the United States" ("Chūgoku wa naze Beikoku fushin nanoka" [Why Doesn't China Trust the US?], Asahi Shimbun, October 5, 2012). In addition, for an examination of the new model of major-power relations on the basis of US-China relations, see Seiichirō Takagi, "Chūgoku no taikokuka to Beikoku: Ribaransu to 'shingata taikoku kankei ron' e no taiō" [China's Emergence as a Great Power and the United States: Responding to the Rebalance and the "Doctrine of New Model of Major-Power Relations"], in Japan Institute of International Affairs (JIIA), ed., Heisei-25-nendo kenkyū purojekuto "Shuyōkoku no tai-Chū ninshiki, seisaku no bunseki" Bunseki repōto [Analytical Report on the FY2013 Research Project: Analysis of Key Actors' Views and Policies vis-à-vis China].
 3. See Wang Junsheng, Chaohe wenti yu Zhongguo jiese: Duoyuan Beijing xia de gongtong guanli [The North Korean Nuclear Issue and China's Role: Joint Management under a Multilateralized Background] (Beijing: Shijie Zhishi Chubanshe, 2012); and "Chaohe wenti: Zhongmei liangguo de liyi junheng yu zhanlue boyi" [The North Korea Nuclear Issue: US and China's Balance of Interests and Strategic Games], in Sun Zhe, Zhou aming, and Zhang Xudong, eds., Xinxing daguo guanxi: Zhongmei xiezuo xin fanglüe [New Model of Major-Power Relations: A New Plan for China-US Cooperation] (Beijing: Shishi Chubanshe, 2013).
 4. Dong-A Ilbo [East Asia Daily], February 22, 2013.
 5. For more on the process of establishing the Four-Party Talks, see Hideya Kurata, "Chōsen-hantō heiwa taisei juritsu mondai to Chūgoku: Hokutō Ajia chiiki anzenhoshō to 'takokukan gaikō'" [China and the Problem of Establishing a Peace Arrangement for the Korean Peninsula: Northeast Asian Regional Security and "Multilateral Diplomacy"], in Seiichirō Takagi, ed., Datsu-reisenki no Chūgoku gaikō to Ajia-taiheiyō [Post-Cold War Chinese Diplomacy and the Asia Pacific] (Tokyo: JIIA, 2000).
 6. See Hideya Kurata, "Rokusha kaidan no seiritsu katei to Bei-Chū kankei: 'Hikakuka' to 'anpojō no ke'nen' o meguru sōgo sayō" [The Process of Establishing the Six-Party Talks and US-China Relations: The Interaction between "Denuclearization" and "Security Concern"], in Seiichirō Takagi, ed., Bei-Chū kankei: Reisengo no kōzō to tenkai [US-China Relations: Post-Cold War Structure and Developments] (Tokyo: JIIA, 2007): 78-79.
 7. Cui Tiankai and Pang Hanzhao, "Xin shiqi Zhongguo waijiao quanju zhong de Zhongmei guanxi: Jianlun Zhongmei goujian xinxing daguo guanxi" [Comprehensive China-US Relations in a New Era of Chinese Diplomacy: With an Argument for China-US Cooperation in Building a New Model of Major-Power Relations], Zhongguo guoji zhanlue pinglun [China International Strategic Review] (2012). See also, "Beijing's Brand Ambassador: A Conversation with Cui Tiankai," Foreign Affairs, vol. 92, no. 4 (July/August 2013): 13.
 8. White House, Office of the Press Secretary, "Remarks by President Obama and President Xi Jinping of the People's Republic of China after Bilateral Meeting at Sunnylands Retreat, Rancho Mirage, California" (June 8, 2013), <https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2013/06/08/remarks-president-obama-and-president-xi-jinping-peoples-republic-china->.
 9. White House, Office of the Press Secretary, "Press Briefing by National Security Advisor Tom Donilon" (June 8, 2013), <https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2013/06/08/press-briefing-national-security-advisor-tom-donilon>.
 10. "Toward a New Model of Major-Country Relations between China and the US" (Speech by Foreign Minister Wang Yi at Brookings Institution, September 20, 2013). It can be assumed that the basis for Wang's reference to the fact that since the 15th century war has been the result 11 of the 15 times where an emerging power has challenged an existing power was also the research by Allison and his colleagues. Just over a year prior to Wang Yi's statement, Allison had made a similar statement in an article published in a British newspaper (Graham Allison, "Thucydides's Trap Has Been Sprung in the Pacific," Financial Times, August 21, 2012), and he had made similar statements in subsequent articles as well (Graham T. Allison Jr., "Obama and Xi Must Think Broadly to Avoid a Classic Trap," New York Times, June 6, 2013), which can be attributed to the results of that research as well. There is a strong possibility that Wang Yi or those around him referred to those articles. Robert Zoellick, who had previously proposed the responsible stakeholder doctrine, also mentions this research (see Robert B. Zoellick, "U.S., China and Thucydides," National Interest, July, 2013: 22). Even the Chinese literature as well, having noted that this research was carried out at Harvard, emphasized the need to avoid Thucydides's Trap in US-China relations. See Peng Guangqian, "Can China and the US Transcend Thucydides's Trap?," China-US Focus Digest, vol. 1 (April 2014): 19. Xi

- Jinping also referred to Thucydides's Trap in an interview at the 2014 World Economic Forum in Davos (see "How the World's Most Powerful Leader Thinks," http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2014/01/21/xi-jinping-davos_n_4639929.html).
11. Brookings Institution, John L. Thornton China Center, "Wang Yi Dinner Q&A Session," Washington, DC (September 20, 2013): 12. Immediately prior to that, a symposium was held in Beijing to commemorate the 10th anniversary of the first meeting of the Six-Party Talks, and in addition to Wang Yi of course attending, First Vice Minister of Foreign Affairs Kim Kye-gwan attended, representing the North Korean leader. It is thought that the content of the exchange between Wang Yi and Kim Kye-gwan in Beijing is what he officially announced in Washington.
 12. Hideya Kurata, "Bei-Kan rengōgun shireibu no kaitai to 'senryakuteki jūnansei': Reisen shūketsu-go no genkei to henso-kuteki tenkai" [The Dissolution of the US-ROK Combined Forces Command and "Strategic Flexibility": The Post-Cold War Platform and Irregular Development], in Fumiaki Kubo, ed., *Amerika ni totte dōmei towa nani ka* [What Does Alliance Mean to the United States?] (Tokyo: Chūōkōron-Shinsha, 2013): 180. In addition, Lee Myung-bak states in his memoir, "South Korea and the United States are allies, but if the United States were to try to attack a nation in Northeast Asia, we would probably be opposed. If there had been no provocation from North Korea, we would have opposed the entry of the George Washington into the West [Yellow] Sea." See Lee Myung-bak, *Daetonglyeong ui sigan: 2008–2013* [President's Time: 2008–2013] (Seoul: RHK, 2015): 283. On Chinese criticism during this time of the regionalization of the US-ROK alliance, see Qi Jianhua and Wang Qingdong, *Dongya anquan yu zhu Han Meijun* [East Asian Security and US Forces in Korea] (Beijing: Shijie Zhishi Chubanshe, 2009): 272–73; and Sun Ru, "The Prospects of the United States' Asia-Pacific Alliance System," *China International Studies* (July/August, 2012).
 13. On the military exercises carried out in response to North Korea's use of force against the South, see Kurata, "Bei-Kan rengōgun shireibu no kaitai to 'senryakuteki jūnansei': 177–79; Hideya Kurata, "Chiiki' o mosaku suru Bei-Kan dōmei: Dōmei henkaku to ribaransu" [The US-ROK Alliance in Search of a "Region": The Reforming Alliance and the Rebalance], *Tōa* [East Asia], vol. 555 (September 2013): 24–25; Yang Yi, "Navigating Stormy Waters: The Sino-American Security Dilemma at Sea," *China Security*, vol. 6, no. 3; and Scott Snyder and See-Won Byun, "Cheonan and Yeonpyeong: The Northeast Asian Response to North Korea's Provocations," *RUSI Journal* vol. 156, no. 2 (April/May 2011): 78.
 14. See-Won Byun, "North Korea's Provocation and Their Impact on Northeast Asian Regional Security," Center for U.S.-Korea Policy (December 2010): 10.
 15. Kookbang Ilbo [National Defense Daily], November 25, 2008. On China-ROK military exchanges during this period, see Hwang Jaeho, "Jungguk ui gunsaoegyo" [China's Military Diplomacy], in Kim Heungkyu, ed., *Jungguk Sin Oegyo Jeonlayg gwa Dangmyeonhan Isyudeul* [China's New Foreign Policy Doctrine and the Issues It Faces] (Seoul: Oreum, 2013): 232–33; and "Mijung Gwangye ui Dae Hanbando Yeonghyang" [The Impact of US-China Relations on the Korean Peninsula], in Park Chang-kwon, Kim Chang-soo, et al., eds., *Mijung Gwangye Jeonmang gwa Hanguk ui Jeonlyagjeog Daeung Banghyang* [The Outlook for US-China Relations and the Direction of South Korea's Strategic Response] (Seoul: KIDA Press, 2010): 331–33.
 16. Kookbang Ilbo [National Defense Daily], July 29, 2011.
 17. Kookbang Ilbo [National Defense Daily], August 1, 2012.
 18. For more on North Korea's 2013 spring offensive, see Hideya Kurata, "Paku Kune 'shinrai purosesu' to Kita-chōsen: Anzenhoshō-jō no seiyaku no naka no nanboku taiwa" [Park Geun-hye's "Trust Process" and North Korea: North-South Dialogue in the Context of Security Constraints], in JIIA, *Chōsen-hantō no shinario puranningu* [Scenario Planning for the Korean Peninsula] (FY2013 Ministry of Foreign Affairs foreign policy and security studies) (Tokyo: JIIA, March 2014): 70–72.
 19. This was distributed by Xinhua and also published in Jiefangjun Bao [People's Liberation Army (PLA) Daily]. See "Yixie guojia ge guoji zuzhi bu dasuan cong Chaoxian chechu gongzuo renyuan" [A Number of Countries and International Organizations Have No Intention of Withdrawing Their Staff from North Korea], Jiefangjun Bao [PLA Daily], April 7, 2013.
 20. Sunny Lee, "China Asks Whom South Korea-US Alliance Targets," *Korea Times*, December 31, 2012.
 21. On the May 2013 US-ROK discussions surrounding the transfer of wartime OPCON, see Kurata, "Paku Kune 'shinrai purosesu' to Kita-chōsen": 74–75; and Hideya Kurata, "Zaikan-Beigun saihen to shiki taikei no saikentō: 'Senryaku dōmei 2015' shūsei no rikigaku" [Reexamination of the US Forces Realignment and Command Structure in Korea: Dynamics of "Strategic Alliance 2015"], in *Kokusai anzenhoshō* [Journal of International Security] vol. 42, no. 3 (December 2014): 39.
 22. White House, Office of the Press Secretary, "Remarks by President Obama and President Park of South Korea in a Joint Press Conference" (May 7, 2013), <https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2013/05/07/remarks-president-obama-and-president-park-south-korea-joint-press-confe>.

23. “Zhonghan mianxiang weilai lianhe shengming” [China-ROK Joint Statement for the Future], Jiefangjun Bao [PLA Daily], June 28, 2013.
24. “Fang Fenghui yu Hanjun canlianhui zhuxi huitan” [Fang Fenghui Holds Talks with Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the ROK Armed Forces], Jiefangjun Bao [PLA Daily], June 5, 2013.
25. “Fan Changlong huijian Hanjun canlianhui zhuxi Zheng Chengzhao” [Fan Changlong Meets with Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the ROK Armed Forces Jeong Seung-jo], Jiefangjun Bao [PLA Daily], June 6, 2013.
26. Chosun Ilbo [Korea Daily News], June 6, 2013.
27. “Hanjung Gansa Bunya Jeonlyagjeog Hyeoblyeog Cheje Ganghwa” [Strengthening the Framework for China-ROK Strategic Cooperation in the Military Field], Kookbang Ilbo [National Defense Daily], June 7, 2013.
28. Jiefangjun Bao [PLA Daily], December 25, 2013.
29. Chosun Ilbo [Korea Daily News], June 6, 2013.
30. White House, Office of the Vice President, “Remarks by Vice President Joe Biden and Republic of Korea President Park Geun-Hye in a Bilateral Meeting” (December 6, 2013), <https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2013/12/06/remarks-vice-president-joe-biden-and-republic-korea-president-park-geun->.
31. “Jiji shuli yazhou anquan shi, Gongchuang anquan hezuo xin jumian: Zai Yazhou xianghu xiezuo yu Xinren cuoshi huiyi di si ci fenghui jianghua,” Renmin Ribao [People’s Daily], May 22, 2014. Japanese translation: “Ajia anzenkan o sekkyokuteki ni juritsu shi anzen kyōryoku no shinkyokumen o tomoni sōshutsu shiyō: Ajia sōgo kyōryoku shinrai jōsei kaigi dai-4-kai samitto de no enzetsu, 2014-nen 5-gatsu 21-nichi” [Let’s Proactively Establish an Asian View of Security and Work Together to Create New Dimensions of Security Cooperation: Speech at the 4th CICA Summit, May 21, 2014], in Xi Jinping: Kokusei un’ei o kataru [Xi Jinping: A Discussion of Government Administration] (Beijing: Waiguowen Chubanshe, 2014): 396. For a review of Xi Jinping’s speech, see Seiichirō Takagi, “Xi Jinping’s New Asian Security Concept,” Association of Japanese Institute of Strategic Studies, AJISS Commentary, no. 204 (August 27, 2014).
32. “Ajia anzenkan o sekkyokuteki ni juritsu”: 395.
33. Opening remarks, 4th CICA Summit.
34. “Yaxinfenghui yuhui lingdaoren ji daibiao gaodu pingjia fenghui chenguo” [Leaders and Their Representatives at the CICA Summit Praise the Impact of the Summit], Jiefangjun Bao [PLA Daily], May 22, 2014.
35. “Yazhou xianghu xiezuo yu xinren cuoshi huiyi di si ci fenghui shanghai xuanyan: Jiaqiang duihua, xinren yu xiezuo, gongjian heping, wending yu hezuo de xin yazhou” [Shanghai Declaration of the 4th CICA Summit: On Enhancing Dialogue, Trust and Coordination for a New Asia of Peace, Stability and Cooperation], Jiefangjun Bao [PLA Daily], May 22, 2014.
36. Mike Green, “Korea in the Middle,” Korea JoongAng Daily [Korea Central Daily], June 10, 2014.
37. “Daetonglyeong, Wang-i Jungguk Oegyo Bujang Jeobgyeon,” http://www1.president.go.kr/news/newsList.php?srh%5Bview_mode%5D=detail&srh%5Bseq%5D=5927; English translation: “President meets Chinese Foreign Minister,” http://english1.president.go.kr/activity/headlines.php?srh%5Btext%5D=meeting+with&srh%5Btype%5D=2&srh%5Bpage%5D=7&srh%5Bview_mode%5D=detail&srh%5Bseq%5D=5964.
38. “Gongchuang Zhonghan hezuo weilai, tong xiang Yazhou zhenxing fanrong: Zai Hanguo guoli shouer daxue de yanjiang” [China and Korea Must Cooperate to Build the Future Together; Together Let’s Help Asia’s Growth and Prosperity: Speech at Seoul National University], Renmin Ribao [People’s Daily], July 5, 2014.
39. Joint Communiqué of the 46th ROK-US Security Consultative Meeting, October 23, 2014, Washington, DC.
40. See Hideya Kurata, “Misairu bōei to Kankoku: Sono sentakuteki dōnyū to ‘misairu fukinkō’” [Missile Defense and South Korea: Selective Deployment and “Missile Imbalance”], in Satoshi Morimoto, ed., Misairu bōei: Atarashii kokusai anzen-hoshō no kōzu [Missile Defense: A New International Security Framework] (Tokyo: JIIA, 2001): 139.
41. For an example of Chinese opposition to South Korean participation at that time, see Liang Ming, “Hanguo yuanhe shiwan TMD” [Why Does South Korea See Hope in TMD?], Jiefangjun Bao [PLA Daily], May 3, 1999. For further details, see Kurata, “Misairu bōei to Kankoku”: 137–39 and 148.
42. “2014-nian 5-yue 28-ri wajiaobu fayannren Qin Gang zhuchi lixing fizhehui” [Regular Press Briefing with Qin Gang, Spokesperson for the Chinese Foreign Ministry, May 28, 2014], http://www.fmprc.gov.cn/mfa_chn/fyrbt_602243/jzhsl_602247/t1160383.shtml. Qin’s remarks were made in response to a report the same day that touched on the possibility of THAAD deployment in South Korea. See Julian E. Barnes, “Washington Considers Missile-Defense System in South Korea: The US Begins This Week a New Push to Expand Cooperation in Asia to Counter the Threat of North Korean Missiles,” Wall Street Journal, May 28, 2014.
43. Missile Defense Agency Fact Sheet: Army Navy/Transportable Rader Surveillance (AN/TRY-2).

44. Ashley Rowland, "Top US General Backs New Missile Defense in South Korea," *Stars and Stripes*, June 4, 2014. However, this is thought to be something that Scaparrotti referred to in the Q&A portion of the speech. It was not included in the text of the speech. ("Korea Institute for Defense Analyses Defense Forum Speech," June 3, 2014, <http://www.usfk.mil/Media/SpeechesTranscripts/tabid/12695/Article/588009/korea-institute-for-defense-analyses-kida-defense-forum-speech.aspx>.) This statement was also probably in response to the above-mentioned report on the possibility of THAAD deployment in South Korea.
45. "Deputy Secretary of Defense Robert Work on the Asia-Pacific Rebalance: A Conversation with Robert Work," <http://www.cfr.org/defense-and-security/deputy-secretary-defense-robert-work-asia-pacific-rebalance/p33538>. See also, Ashley Rowland, "Official: THAAD Missile Defense System Being Considered for South Korea," *Stars and Stripes*, October 1, 2014.
46. "Press Briefing by Secretary Hagel and ROK Minister of National Defense Han Min Koo in the Pentagon Briefing Room," October 23, 2014, <http://www.defense.gov/Transcripts/Transcript.aspx?TranscriptID=5524>.
47. JoongAng Ilbo [Central Daily News], October 20, 2014. In addition, Chinese Defense Minister Chang Wanquan visited South Korea, where he met his South Korean counterpart, Han Min-goo, and expressed his opposition to the deployment of THAAD in South Korea (see Kookbang Ilbo [National Defense Daily], February 5, 2015).
48. "Joint Communiqué: 45th ROK-US Security Consultative Meeting" (October 2, 2013, Seoul): 3. For more on the Park administration's missile defense, see Hideya Kurata, "Bei-Kan yokushi taisei no saichōsei: 'Senji' sakusen tōseiken henkan saienki no kōyō" [Reconfiguring the US-ROK Deterrence Posture: The Utility of Deferring the Transfer of "Wartime" OPCON Again], in JIIA, Chōsen-hantō no shinario puranningu [Scenario Planning for the Korean Peninsula] (FY2014 Ministry of Foreign Affairs foreign policy and security studies) (Tokyo: JIIA, March 2015).
49. While there are some in South Korea who hold a positive view of THAAD deployment irrespective of China relations (see Hong Woo-Taek, "Proposal for the Controversy Regarding THAAD," Online Series, 2014.12/8/ CO14-16, KINU), South Korea's National Defense Ministry holds the position that it has not received any decision or demand from the United States regarding THAAD deployment, and there have been no US-ROK discussions on the issue (see Kookbang Ilbo [National Defense Daily], February 9, 2015).
50. Hideya Kurata, "Kankoku no 'jishu kokubō ron' to takokukan kyōgi ron: Dōmei riron to sōkan kankei ni kansuru kaishakuteki kentō" [South Korean Policies on "Self-Reliant National Defense" and Multilateral Agreements: Interpreting Their Relationship from an Alliance Theory Perspective], in Kokusai anzenhoshō [Journal of International Security] vol. 33, no. 4 (March 2006): 80. Also, see Hideya Kurata, "Kankoku no kyōdōtai kōsō to anzenhoshō: 'Fusen no kyōdōtai' kōsō no kansei" [South Korea's Community Concept and Security: The Trap of the "No-War Community" Concept], in Satoshi Amako and Takehiko Yamamoto, eds., Higashi Ajia kyōdōtai no kōchiku (1): Arata na chiiki keisei [Designing an East Asian Community (1): Forming a New Region] (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 2007):133.
51. See Chun Chaesung, "New Model for Major Power Relations between United States and China, and South Korean Foreign Strategy," *Foreign Relations*, vol. 16, no. 1 (October 2014): 40–58.