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Executive Summary

From 31 January through 1 February 2018, Stanford University’s U.S.-Asia Security Initiative (USASI) and the Sasakawa Peace Foundation (SPF), gathered in Tokyo representatives from the government, defense, and academic sectors of the United States and Japan for the second workshop of the U.S.-Japan Security and Defense Dialogue Series. The purpose of the workshop was to facilitate frank discussions between academic scholars, subject matter experts, government officials, and military leaders on the current strategic and operational security challenges to the U.S.-Japan security alliance. The goal of the dialogue was to establish a common understanding of the problems facing the U.S.-Japan security alliance and to develop actionable policy recommendations aimed at addressing these issues.

The conference dialogue was divided into three sessions that analyzed key trends and challenges currently facing the U.S.-Japan security alliance. During the first session, participants assessed the security trends in East Asia and throughout the Indo-Pacific region. In the second session, participants examined the overall status of the alliance itself, to include evaluations of U.S.-Japan training, operations, and strategic planning. In the final session, participants focused their attention on trying to determine what effective security cooperation measures between the United States, Japan, and the Republic of Korea (ROK) might be created and implemented in a manner that would best counter the growing threat that North Korea poses to the stability of the Korean Peninsula, the Indo-Pacific region, and the world.

The workshop discussions were candid and cordial, leading to frank analyses of current trends and challenges. Participants came to a consensus on significant issues from each of the sessions as well as on important policy recommendations derived from these open conversations. The policy recommendations, workshop findings, and other important observations, are detailed in the following sections for consideration and review.

From Japan, participants included members of Japan’s Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Ministry of Defense, and Self-Defense Forces (both active and retired), scholars, and researchers. From the United States, the participants included representatives from the State Department and Department
of Defense, scholars, researchers, and uniformed service members (both active and retired) from U.S. Pacific Command (USPACOM), U.S. Forces Japan (USFJ), and U.S. Forces Korea (USFK), as well as participants from service component commands of both USPACOM and USFJ.

Created by the U.S.-Asia Security Initiative, the U.S.-Japan Security and Defense Dialogue Series began in May 2016 with the inaugural workshop. With the security environment in the Indo-Pacific growing increasingly tense, the U.S.-Japan Security Workshop was reconvened with a new partner, the Sasakawa Peace Foundation, and with the Carnegie Corporation of New York sponsoring the U.S.-Asia Security Initiative’s lead role in organizing the second workshop. For the 2018 event, Ambassador and Lieutenant General (U.S. Army, Retired) Karl Eikenberry, Director of the U.S.-Asia Security Initiative at Stanford University led the U.S. delegation, while International University of Japan Dean and Lieutenant General (Japan Ground Self-Defense Force, Retired) Noboru Yamaguchi, Senior Advisor at the Sasakawa Peace Foundation led the Japan delegation.

The U.S.-Asia Security Initiative is a policy research program established under the auspices of Stanford University’s Walter H. Shorenstein Asia-Pacific Research Center (APARC) at Stanford University. Its parent organization is the Freeman Spogli Institute for International Studies (FSI). The Initiative facilitates interdisciplinary, policy-relevant research on security and international cooperation in the Indo-Pacific region and seeks to offer practical steps for stakeholders seeking to strengthen regional security cooperation measures. The Sasakawa Peace Foundation is a private Japanese foundation that strives to strengthen cooperation at all levels between Japan and countries abroad. Together, USASI and SPF co-hosted the successful 2018 workshop at the International House of Japan in Tokyo.

A summary of the conference discourse, findings, and policy recommendations is published here with the aim of contributing to ongoing research and policy discussions on the critical issues currently impacting the U.S.-Japan security alliance and their allies and partners in East Asia and throughout the Indo-Pacific region. It is hoped that this report and any ensuing conversations it inspires contributes significantly to any and all efforts focused on enhancing the prospects for maintaining the peace and stability in Asia for many decades to come.
Policy Recommendations

Derived from the 2018 workshop discussions, the following is a list of policy recommendations offered for consideration. In addition, the summary of the workshop session dialogues (below) provides both greater insight into the discussion details and also clarifies the rationale for offering the policy recommendations listed here.

- The United States and Japan should coordinate the development and implementation of alliance strategies throughout the Indo-Pacific, including cooperation vis-à-vis Taiwan, India, and friends or partner countries in Southeast Asia in the areas of military cooperation, capacity building, and economic initiatives.
- The United States and Japan should create opportunities for Japanese and American security officials and experts to have frank dialogues about the People’s Republic of China (PRC), clearly identifying the sources of threats and potential allied responses to such dangers.
- The United States and Japan should maintain progress on the Alliance Coordination Mechanism (ACM), clarifying its functions to members throughout the two governments, while placing additional emphasis on normalizing use of the ACM to handle operational coordination.
- The United States and Japan should continue fostering U.S.-Japan joint operability through bilateral mission sets. Japan’s Ministry of Defense should consider creation of a permanent Joint Headquarters for the Japan Self-Defense Force. The United States military should support this initiative with appropriate counterpart identification.
- The United States and Japan should develop a “playbook” for addressing potential gray zone crises, which would allow for rapid decision-making and quick execution of alliance responses.
- The U.S. and Japan Governments must maintain close strategic coordination with the Republic of Korea government to ensure unity of effort and cohesive policy implementation. In particular, the Government of Japan must avoid regression of progress made in bilateral ties with South Korea, and the United States should take every possible opportunity to encourage closer diplomatic and security relations between Japan and South Korea.
• The United States and Japan should pursue greater military cooperation between American, South Korean, and Japanese forces focused on conflict scenarios on the Korean Peninsula. Specific options include coordination of trilateral field training and tabletop exercises; forming and employing operational ties between Japan and United Nations Command; and deployment of a Japan liaison officer to United Nations Command-Rear headquarters.

• The United States and Japan should continue deterrence efforts while seeking new opportunities for the containment of the North Korean threat, including activities aimed at improving sanctions enforcement.
American and Japanese Assessments of Security Trends in East Asia and the Indo-Pacific

The 2018 U.S.-Japan Security and Defense Dialogue opened with a wide-ranging discussion on the security trends in East Asia in particular, but later also reviewed the situation in the Indo-Pacific region overall. Several U.S. participants noted that Japan appears to have emerged a willing, engaged, and more capable security partner for promoting and securing mutual interests in Asia. Japanese participants in the workshop spoke about Japan’s role in the alliance in clear and confident terms and felt comfortable asking for more active support from the United States.

The workshop participants were in clear consensus on what they viewed as the two most pressing security challenges in East Asia and the Indo-Pacific: China’s increasingly assertive behavior and North Korea’s aggressive nuclear and missile development programs. Additionally, the participants noted a resurgence of Russian activity and interest in Asia that has the potential to affect American and Japanese security interests in the region. However, the participants highlighted that India’s growing role in Asia’s security architecture has the potential to bolster U.S. and Japan security interests. The key task, the participants agreed, is how to respond effectively to these challenges and opportunities.

Grounding this discussion was broad agreement by both Japanese and American participants that the new National Security Strategy (NSS) and National Defense Strategy (NDS) released by the Trump administration provide a cogent framework from which to address these challenges. They noted that reframing China and Russia as “strategic competitors” more accurately depicts their actions to date and allows the United States to shift its approach to a more proactive one in response to these threats. Indeed, the NSS addresses the PRC in all domains, space and cyber included, and as a consideration in all regions of the world, not just in Asia.

Nonetheless, the optimism inherent in the overall tone of the strategy belied concerns about follow-through. Some Japanese participants expressed concern over how the United States would carry out those strategies. In other words, how the Trump administration’s overall Asia strategy will play out in practical terms remains an open question. Meanwhile, some U.S. participants expressed concerns over whether existing resources
would be sufficient for executing the strategies as laid out in the NSS and NDS. This discussion dovetailed into a lengthy dialogue on the nature of the Chinese threat.

In historical context, a U.S. participant noted that the United States and Japan have often been out of synch with regard to their China policies. While one side sought warmer ties, the other kept its distance, and vice-versa. The participants indicated the necessity for the partners to form a clear conception of the problems posed and how to address these challenges stemming from China’s regional and global activities, noting that focusing on specific PRC capabilities and activities could help narrow the gap between the two nations’ strategies. This idea helped shape the ensuing discussion. The participants observed that the widely held view that economic growth and modernization in China would bring about political liberalization has not come to pass. Rather, China’s leadership has become entrenched, buoyed by their success, and determined to expand their influence regionally and globally.

Many participants noted that China is increasingly and openly flouting international norms, oftentimes in coordination with its systematic plans for global expansion. Indeed, the PRC is attempting to subvert the very system that enabled its rise. The participants agreed that this is a serious short-term challenge, but China’s own demographics may limit its influence in the long-term. It was noted that China’s population is peaking at around 1.4 billion, and will soon begin to decline, leaving it with significant internal demographic challenges. By comparison, India’s population will reach 2 billion by 2050, with no signs of slowing. Moreover, the participants generally agreed not to overstate the PRC’s capabilities. To be sure, China’s growing influence remains a significant challenge, partic-
ularly to smaller regional states. However, as one participant noted, China remains a largely land-based power, with open ocean access restricted through major chokepoints in the South and East China Seas. Another participant emphasized that the People’s Liberation Army (PLA) is undergoing significant reforms to modernize its forces, but is still hampered by large-scale corruption and politicization of its forces. Finally, participants highlighted that the PLA is developing new high-end capabilities, but is often delivering them on legacy equipment.

An additional major security concern the participants discussed was North Korea. Everyone agreed that the Kim Jong Un regime’s frenetic pace of missile and warhead testing is destabilizing to the region. The participants also agreed that the People’s Republic of China could play a larger role in addressing the North Korean threat. However, the degree to which the United States and Japan would be able to leverage the PRC to pressure North Korea remained under debate. There were also many differing views on how to address North Korea in the context of divergent American and Japanese policies toward China. Some thought that while it would be ideal to address North Korea on its own without issue-linkage vis-à-vis China, doing so would likely be difficult to negotiate since China would undoubtedly want to leverage any cooperation on its part for concessions in other areas.

Many Japanese participants were concerned about North Korea’s missile tests in 2017 that overflew Japan. Some were even concerned that North Korea’s missile testing regime could lead to “de-coupling” between the United States and Japan. These concerns arose from the fact that, with all of Japan now within North Korean missile range, Japan could no longer consider itself to be in the “rear-area” support zone. One participant suggested that since Tokyo is likely to be a North Korean target, it must be protected now and that the United States should not exclude the possibility of a preventive nuclear strike against North Korea—a view with which most disagreed.

At the same time, some Japanese participants pointed out that the Trump administration’s hardline stance has significantly raised tensions and the risk of preventive war has never been higher. The challenge, all participants agreed, was how to balance both countries’ policies toward China as they relate to the near-term strategic problem of North Korea. While there was no clear consensus, one proposed solution attempted to strike a balance between open conflict and open-ended engagement by advocating for multilateral measures aimed at containing the North Korean threat.
Finally, woven into the discussion about the two threats described above was a robust conversation on the larger regional framework of the U.S.-Japan alliance and its interests in places such as Southeast Asia, Taiwan, and India. Participants from both sides raised concerns over China’s behavior, noting the need for the two allies to examine the evolving situation closely and determine appropriate strategies vis-à-vis Taiwan. A Japan participant highlighted Taiwan’s importance to the U.S.-Japan alliance as the anchor island in both the first and second island chains. A U.S. participant noted the positional challenges taking place in Southeast Asia, identifying the need to step up engagement in the region. China successfully manipulated the Philippines to weaken its ties with the United States, particularly with regard to the South China Sea. As such, the PRC’s growing assertiveness throughout Southeast Asia has demonstrably muted the voices of other regional actors. However, China’s aggressive behavior has also encouraged other states, such as Vietnam, to seek closer ties with the United States. The participants agreed that, given U.S. and Japan strategic alignment, the alliance should continue to advance a robust, comprehensive security cooperation and engagement program to build partner capacity and advance mutual interests in the region, including through deeper relations with India.
During the second session, participants analyzed the adequacy of U.S.-Japan combined training, operations and strategic planning, examining the alliance’s ability to respond together to regional challenges. They also reviewed the progress in combined training, operations, and strategic planning since Japan revised its security legislation in 2015.

The first major issue discussed was implementation of the 2015 Guidelines for U.S.-Japan Defense Cooperation (hereafter, “Defense Guidelines”). Conference participants unanimously agreed that the Defense Guidelines have served as the foundation for significant progress in alliance cooperation. In particular, U.S. participants acknowledged the importance of the Alliance Coordination Mechanism (ACM), identifying how its use following North Korean provocations, the 2016 Kumamoto earthquake, and potential gray zone crises in the East China Sea were effective demonstrations of the benefits of this channel for alliance management. Multiple U.S. respondents acknowledged how far the alliance has progressed. Still, respondents on both sides recognized that this additional capacity for coordination has also revealed new challenges for the alliance.

The first challenge is in the form of overall effectiveness of operational coordination. While both American and Japanese participants noted that ACM-facilitated coordination at the policy level was progressing well, multiple Japanese participants questioned the timeliness and effectiveness of ACM linkages in producing execution of operational responses. Two participants specifically cited the lack of decision-making authorities as a potential root cause for this problem. One Japanese respondent identified the gap in authorities which exists between U.S. Forces, Japan (USFJ) and U.S. Pacific Command, noting that the Ministry of Defense and Japan Self-Defense Forces had difficulty distinguishing which command was more relevant for producing operational responses in a crisis situation. With only about 150 personnel, one American participant questioned the capacity for USFJ to handle the level of responsibility that the ACM levies. By comparison, the only other Sub-Unified Command in the U.S. military, U.S. Forces Korea, maintains a much more robust staff capable of exercising operational control of over 600,000 combined forces. A Japanese participant raised concerns related to this question, offering the example
of the U.S. military deploying leadership cadre from USPACOM to manage Operation TOMODACHI (the U.S. military response to the Great East Japan Earthquake in 2011) rather than relying on existing in-country leadership. A U.S. respondent indicated that USFJ is sufficiently staffed to handle bilateral coordination through the ACM, but cannot sufficiently manage Joint Task Force Operations.

Next, some U.S. participants identified specific institutional progress made in the ACM. One highlighted that Standing Operating Procedures (SOPs) for the operational levels of the ACM were near completion, while another noted the progress witnessed through observation of bilateral exercises. Both suggested that continued training would offer further improvements of ACM coordination. However, that prompted discussion of a secondary concern associated with the ACM: a lack of clarity on the specific functions of the mechanism. While some American participants envisioned it as a bridging mechanism for other Alliance management activities (like the Extended Deterrence Dialogue and Roles, Missions, and Capabilities Working Group), Japanese respondents noted that the ACM is but one channel for alliance management among many, and that it is still appropriate to maintain other existing channels. In order to overcome this problem and improve overall effectiveness, U.S. and Japan participants recommended that both sides continue efforts to improve ACM processes, clarifying its mission as well as its functions to relevant officials throughout the two governments while placing additional emphasis on normalizing operational use of this important mechanism in both real-world and exercise scenarios.

The second challenge that emerged during this session was the need to maintain progress on improving bilateral and joint interoperability. Participants were reminded that constitutional limitations prevent Japan from participating in a combined force (as exists in the U.S.-South Korea alliance relationship), which leads instead to separate chains-of-command executing bilateral missions. As one Japanese participant put it, the NATO alliance and the U.S.-ROK combined command are not a model for U.S.-Japan security cooperation.

Both Japanese and American participants started this discussion by emphasizing the significance of the parallel operations of Joint Task Force TOHOKU and Operation TOMODACHI as a watershed moment for improving bilateral interoperability. A U.S. participant noted that continuing to use those operations (and others like it) as a model for exercises would be helpful in advancing that interoperability. However, this discussion prompted U.S. and Japan participants to question whether the prior-
ity should be placed on improving bilateral ties between the JSDF and U.S. military or improving joint operability among the JSDF’s three services. U.S. participants suggested that it could be possible to do both by targeting specific mission sets. Amphibious operations were one specific example offered, as amphibious operations have seen related improvements in both bilateral and joint capabilities in recent years.

Meanwhile, Japanese participants highlighted obstacles to joint operability in JSDF institutions. Critics noted that the Joint Staff Office operates more as a liaison between the Self-Defense Force and Japanese political leadership and not as a potential Joint Task Force headquarters. Those participants suggested that the establishment of a permanent joint headquarters with specific mission sets (namely, Southwest Islands defense) could serve as the basis for improving inter-service operability. U.S. participants echoed those sentiments, offering the British Permanent Joint Headquarters as a potential model for the Japanese to replicate. While the Japanese participants did not comment on the feasibility of using the British model, both the U.S. and Japan participants agreed that the Japan Ministry of Defense should consider creation of a permanent Joint Headquarters for the Japan Self-Defense Force. Finally, they noted that the United States military can support establishment of a Joint Headquarters by identifying counterpart organizations to support future cooperation.

The final challenge identified in this session was the elevated need for preparedness of U.S.-Japan counter-provocation activities and response to gray zone crises. After discussing the mechanisms for coordination and progress in fostering interoperability, both U.S. and Japanese participants raised concerns over the U.S.-Japan alliance’s ability to execute rapid responses to provocations or gray zone crises. One Japanese participant reminded the group of the challenges associated with transition from law enforcement to military operations, highlighting this as a key concern in the gray zone. Another emphasized that there is a perception in Japan of a disconnect on gray zone policy between USPACOM and USFJ, and that those differences may hinder an operationally effective bilateral response to fast-developing contingencies. A U.S. participant added that the
Japanese government should consider incorporating the National Police Agency and Japan Coast Guard in bilateral discussions on these issues.

Continuing this discussion, a U.S. participant raised the question of the U.S.-South Korea “counter-provocation” plan, its effectiveness, and whether something like it could serve as a model for the U.S.-Japan alliance. Another U.S. participant responded with affirmation that the counter-provocation plan on the Korean Peninsula is excellent, noting the example of North Korea’s November 29, 2017, ballistic missile test, when South Korea launched a missile in response just minutes after the DPRK missile was airborne. Participants from both sides agreed that the best method for posturing the U.S.-Japan alliance for gray zone crises and counter-provocations was not necessarily an entire counter-provocation plan, but a “playbook” with a pre-coordinated set of bilateral options that would allow for rapid decision-making and execution of alliance responses.
The participants completed the day with an in-depth discussion of the dangerous situation on the Korean Peninsula. The conversation largely pertained to the strategic and operational levels of deterrence and conflict. Both American and Japanese participants agreed that North Korea is attempting to drive a wedge between the U.S. and South Korea and the U.S. and Japan. However, differing threat perceptions between the United States, Japan, and South Korea are challenging the strategic imperative for maintaining alliance unity. One perception is that America is primarily concerned with North Korean development of a nuclear-tipped ICBM that can reach the continental United States. Meanwhile, a competing perception is that Japan’s concerns are focused on existing medium-range missiles that could carry chemical, biological, or even conventional warheads and target major cities or military bases within its borders. At the same time, a third perception is that South Korea feels most threatened by the conventional artillery stationed along the demilitarized zone. All participants agreed that the Kim Jong Un regime is well aware of these differing perceptions and is actively working to take advantage of them, particularly by attempting to force the United States to choose between allies.

In this context, the participants agreed that ongoing U.S.-Japan-South Korea efforts to deter North Korea have utility and are a worthy goal to continue to pursue. However, there also needs to be more discussion on containment of the North Korean threat. The participants recognized that increased emphasis on containment reflects the reality of the situation on the peninsula, particularly in light of the fact that complete, verifiable, and irreversible dismantlement of the North Korean nuclear program is very unlikely to be entertained by the Kim Jong Un regime.

It was pointed out, however, that the efficacy of possible alliance containment strategies is an open question given the dichotomy of approaches to North Korea. Several participants noted that, on the one hand, South Korean President Moon Jae-in and his progressive administration’s attempts to engage North Korea harken back to the Sunshine Policy late-1990s and early-2000s. One participant observed that the Moon administration is fundamentally predisposed to engagement, no matter what North Korea does. On the other hand, the participants agreed that the
Abe and Trump administrations are in strategic alignment on the “maximum pressure” campaign. As such, they will likely continue to ratchet up sanctions to bring North Korea to the negotiating table. Reconciling these differing approaches is made more difficult by the uncooperative role that China plays in this situation.

Participants spent a fair amount of time discussing the extent to which the PRC can be counted on as a negotiating partner to deescalate tensions and enforce international sanctions against the North Korea. While there was acknowledgment that recent indications suggest China is generally stepping up sanctions enforcement and is losing patience with North Korea, the participants had a wide range of views on how far China is willing to go. A U.S. participant observed that while Beijing understands that its future on the Korean Peninsula is with the ROK and not the North Korea, the PRC is unlikely to force the situation prematurely. A Japan participant observed that Beijing’s support of Pyongyang is exasperated, if not already completely exhausted. Still others observed that Beijing’s willingness to enforce sanctions is a factor in peninsular stability. In other words, China will only do as much as necessary to prevent the chaos that is concomitant with regime collapse. Moreover, China will continue to impose significant economic costs on countries that appear to infringe on its strategic interests, such as the economic costs imposed on South Korea following THAAD deployment. Consequently, the participants agreed that it is imperative to increase multilateral coordination between Washington D.C., Seoul, and Tokyo to align a common strategy toward North Korea to maximize its effectiveness for Japan, South Korea, and the United States, regardless of the PRC’s stance.

Stepping down one level, the participants discussed at length significant operational considerations involving conflict on the Korean Peninsula. Attendees noted the often-sensitive political relations between Tokyo and Seoul, and agreed that it is a complicating factor that inhibits increased operational coordination. More fundamentally, though, one Japan participant argued that the United States’ entire command structure in Asia is an outdated legacy of the Korean War. This point found resonance with many of the Japanese participants, noting that as Japan has come under greater threat from North Korea’s increasingly advanced ballistic missile capabilities, realistically any contingency on the Korean Peninsula will significantly affect Japan. Given the threat threshold today, the idea of having a Korean Theater of Operations divided from the “rear area” support zone in Japan is antiquated. U.S. and United Nations Command-Rear bases in Japan will undoubtedly be critical to supporting operations
on the peninsula. Many of the Japanese participants commented that because Japan will have such a large role in supporting operations, it is imperative for Japan to have greater access to operations on the peninsula. Nonetheless, several American participants commented that specific operational plans would likely be hard (if not impossible) to share directly with the Government of Japan because they are exclusive bilateral plans between the United States and South Korea.

Participants agreed that a possible means for Japan to address its concerns is through the United Nations Command. They suggested that the Japanese government should explore greater participation in the UN Command staff structure as a vehicle to advance access to operational plans and intelligence. The group recommended that a good first step would be to assign a permanent liaison officer to the UN Command-Rear headquarters, which is actually located in Japan. Several participants suggested that this has the potential to address the issues with which Japan is most concerned: North Korea–related intelligence, non-combatant evacuation operational plans, and general logistical support to a renewed conflict on the Korean Peninsula. One participant also suggested using the General Security of Military Information Agreement (GSOMIA) between Japan and South Korea as another tool to develop better awareness. In addition, a second participant suggested that expanding trilateral tabletop exercises and conducting field training between the U.S. military, ROK military, and the Japan Self-Defense Forces is another method with rich potential to increase cooperation between the three countries while also strengthening deterrence. The Japanese participants in attendance indicated that the Government of Japan would likely be quite amenable to considering ways to pursue such activities.

Finally, it should be noted that several Japanese participants expressed to their American counterparts concerns about the danger of “Korea Fatigue,” which they describe as a frustration at a perceived pat-
tern of repeatedly returning to discussions related to a difficult historical wartime memory at the expense of developing a forward-looking, cooperative relationship. There was notable concern about the tense political status between Tokyo and Seoul based on historical issues as an obstacle to developing stronger security ties between the two countries going forward. A few of the Japan participants reminded the group of the relatively warm and cordial ties between the two governments in the 1990s, and lamented that political relations have since cooled. By contrast, some U.S. participants noted the progress made in recent years in dealing with those historical issues and the need to maintain momentum already made in that regard. The group acknowledged the challenges inherent in an incipient relationship, but stressed the critical need to work harder on bifurcating the immediate operational challenges from the longer-term political challenges between the two countries.
Additional Findings from the Workshop

Additional observations from the conference are also worth noting. These were derived from conversations on topics not specifically targeted in the individual sessions, but are matters that arose as important on their own merits. These findings are listed below.

- Without prompting, both sides utilized the term “Indo-Pacific” and repeatedly acknowledged the importance of viewing regional security through a prism that recognizes a more comprehensive perspective on Asia.

- U.S. participants lauded the leadership of the Government of Japan in moving forward with the Comprehensive Financial Trans-Pacific Partnership (CFTPP, or simply, TPP-11) after the withdrawal of the United States. All participants recognized the strategic importance of this regional initiative.

- The role of identity and reputation in China’s rise emerged as a common theme in the conference. Several participants highlighted that while some states (such as Russia) are willing to bear the reputational costs of undermining the collective efforts of international coalitions, China is not. Therefore, engaging in efforts that degrade China’s reputation in the international system is a plausible method to influence and counter the PRC’s behavior.

- A common theme was the need for the United States and Japan to cooperate on global security initiatives across the full spectrum of instruments of national power—specifically, in military, economic, political, and diplomatic issue areas.
(Nov. 19, 2014) U.S. Navy and Japan Maritime Self-Defense Force ships steam in formation at the conclusion of Keen Sword (KS) 15. KS15, a joint/bilateral field training exercise involving U.S. military and Japan Self-Defense Force (JSDF), is designed to increase combat readiness and interoperability of U.S. forces and the JSDF. CREDIT: U.S. NAVY PHOTO BY MASS COMMUNICATION SPECIALIST 3RD CLASS CHRIS CAVAGNARO.
Workshop Agenda

We provide the workshop agenda here to facilitate an understanding of the dynamics of each session. Remarks made to open each session of the conference were solely for the purpose of focusing and encouraging discussion and dialogue. As such, no part of the summary information presented in this report is attributable to any of the moderators, session presenters, or discussion facilitators whose names are provided in the workshop agenda.

DAY ONE—31 JANUARY 2018 (WEDNESDAY)

0845–0900 Welcoming Remarks

United States: Karl Eikenberry—Director of the U.S.-Asia Security Initiative, Shorenstein Asia-Pacific Research Center, Stanford University; Former U.S. Ambassador and Lieutenant General (Retired), U.S. Army

Japan: Noboru Yamaguchi—Senior Advisor, Sasakawa Peace Foundation; Dean, International University of Japan; Lieutenant General (Retired), Japan Ground Self-Defense Force

0900–1030 Session I: American and Japanese Assessments of Security Trends in East Asia

Presenters from the United States and Japan provide assessments of the current security situation in East Asia and in the greater Indo-Asia-Pacific region, taking note of the most significant security challenges and areas of growing concern. The analyses will include a review of the implications for the U.S.-Japan security alliance as well as the implications for security cooperation measures throughout the region.

Topics of Discussion:

• Korean Peninsula (ballistic missile and nuclear proliferation)
• People’s Republic of China (maritime and territorial disputes; Taiwan)
• Influence of Russia-China cooperation
• India (its growing role in Indo-Asia-Pacific security and stability)
  ○ India’s views toward increased U.S.-Japan regional security cooperation
  ○ Border dispute tensions with China
• Southeast Asia (potential flashpoints for increased tensions or conflict; post-TPP economic/trade competition; maritime and territorial disputes)
  ○ Southeast Asian views toward increased U.S.-Japan regional security cooperation
United States: Christopher Twomey—Associate Professor of National Security Affairs, Naval Postgraduate School

Japan: Sugio Takahashi—Chief, Policy Simulation Division, National Institute for Defense Studies


Participants analyze the adequacy of U.S.-Japan joint training, operations, and strategic planning, examining the Alliance’s ability to respond jointly to regional challenges and exploring prospects for strengthening combined security cooperation measures throughout the region. Participants will also review the progress in training, operations, and strategic planning since Japan revised its security legislation in 2015.

Topics of Discussion:
• Command and control
• Combined planning
• Interoperability of systems
• Joint access and use of base facilities in Japan
• Effectiveness of force integration and security cooperation measures in response to external crises (i.e., Joint Defense Guidelines, Alliance Coordination Mechanism, Bilateral Planning Mechanism, Defense Trilateral Talks, etc.)

United States: James Schoff—Senior Associate, Asia Program, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace

Japan: Jun Nagashima—Lieutenant General, Japan Air Self-Defense Force; Commandant, Center for Air Power Strategic Studies and Air Staff College

1215–1345 Lunch and Keynote Address

Introduction: Junko Chano—Executive Director, Sasakawa Peace Foundation

Speaker: Nobukatsu Kanehara—Assistant Chief Cabinet Secretary, Office of the Prime Minister

1400–1600 Session III: Security Cooperation and Instability on the Korean Peninsula

With each new demonstration of North Korea’s growing nuclear weapons and ballistic missile capabilities, the U.S.-Japan Alliance faces an expanding array of security challenges. Participants will examine the strengths and shortfalls of the current approach for countering the growing threat from North Korea (and, in the event of conflict, the potential involvement of the People’s Republic of China, and possibly Russia).

Topics of Discussion:
• Best approaches to alliance signaling for strengthening Extended Deterrence
• Trilateral security cooperation and the Korean Peninsula
  ○ Defense trilateral talks and the status of Japan-U.S.-Korea Defense cooperation measures
• Joint contingency planning—defending against North Korea
• Missile defense—the challenges of combined defense
  ○ Regional alliances and partners: pursuing the integration of
    missile defense systems and other security cooperation measures
    in the face of growing threats from North Korea and Chinese
    opposition to THAAD
• Crisis Management
  ○ Alliance responses to a security or humanitarian crises on
    the Korean Peninsula, including non-combatant evacuation
    operations
• Consequence management (nuclear and chemical)

**United States:** Vincent Brooks—General, U.S. Army; Commanding
  General of United States Forces Korea, United Nations
  Command, and Republic of Korea United States Combined Forces Command

  David Straub—Sejong-LS Fellow, The Sejong Institute;
  Senior Foreign Service Officer (Retired), U.S. Department
  of State

**Japan:** Noboru Yamaguchi—Senior Advisor, Sasakawa Peace
  Foundation; Dean, International University of Japan; Lieutenant
  General (Retired), Japan Ground Self-Defense Force

**1600–1630** Conference Summary and Closing Remarks

**United States:** Karl Eikenberry—Director of the U.S.-Asia Security Ini-
  tiative, Shorenstein Asia-Pacific Research Center, Stanford
  University; former U.S. Ambassador and Lieutenant Gener-
  al (Retired), U.S. Army

**Japan:** Noboru Yamaguchi—Senior Advisor, Sasakawa Peace
  Foundation; Lieutenant General (Retired), Japan Ground
  Self-Defense Force; Dean, International University of
  Japan

**1630–1745** Closing Reception for Workshop Participants and Observers

**Location:** International House Conference Room

**1830** Closing Dinner for Select Conference Participants

**Location:** Matsubaya, Akasaka
DAY TWO—1 FEBRUARY 2018 (THURSDAY)

Post-Workshop Tokyo Meetings
(For Core Japan and U.S. Participants Only)

0900–1100 Synthesis of workshop discussions (core participants only)
• Report on the Conference Deliberations (Rapporteurs)
• Review of Workshop Findings
• Development of Policy Recommendations

Location: International House of Japan

1300–1400 Meetings at the Institute for International Strategy, Japan Research Institute

1430–1600 Meeting with Ambassador William Hagerty and U.S. Embassy Country Team

Location: Residence of the U.S. Ambassador to Japan

1700–1740 Meeting with Foreign Minister Kono, Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Location: Residence of the U.S. Ambassador to Japan

DAY THREE—2 FEBRUARY 2018 (FRIDAY)

Schedule of Yokosuka Meetings

U.S. Forces Japan Orientation Tour: U.S. Fleet Activities Yokosuka & Japan Maritime Self-Defense Fleet Funakoshi
(For core U.S. and select Japanese participants only)

0815 Depart International House of Japan, Minato-ku, Tokyo

0900 Enter Fleet Activities Yokosuka

0900–0945 Windshield Tour escorted by Commander Leadership Fleet Activity, Public Affairs Officer Yokosuka Navy Captain Jeffrey J. Kim and the Commander, Naval Forces Japan
• Carrier, Submarine, Cruiser, Destroyer Piers

1000–1045 Office Call with Vice Admiral Phillip G. Sawyer (Yokosuka)

1100–1230 Visit U.S. Navy Warship Chancellorsville (CG-62)
• No-Host Lunch
• Roundtable Discussion with Senior Staff from
  ○ JMSDF (Japan Maritime Self Defense Force)
  ○ C7F (Commander, U.S. Seventh Fleet)
  ○ CTF-70 (Commander, Battle Force, Seventh Fleet)
  ○ CNFJ (Commander, Naval Forces Japan)
• OPS/INTEL Brief Followed by Open Discussion (Q&A)
1245   Transition to Funakoshi Facility
1310   Enter Funakoshi Facility
1315–1345 Office Call with Vice Admiral Kazuki Yamashita, Commander-in-Chief (CINC), Japanese Maritime Self-Defense Fleet
1430   Depart Funakoshi—Transition to Tokyo
1545   Arrive International House of Japan, Minato-ku, Tokyo
1545   End Of U.S. Forces Japan Orientation Tour
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