

THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION

EXPANDING THE AGENDA FOR COOPERATION BETWEEN THE
UNITED STATES AND REPUBLIC OF KOREA

Washington, D.C.

Tuesday, January 5, 2010

PARTICIPANTS:

Introduction:

[RICHARD C. BUSH III](#)
Director, [Center for Northeast Asian Policy Studies](#)

SCOTT SNYDER
Senior Associate and Center Director, Center for U.S.-Korea Policy, The Asia Foundation

Panelists:

HEEJUN CHANG
Associate Professor, Portland State University

PETER BECK
Pantech Research Fellow, Walter H. Shorenstein Asia-Pacific Research Center, Stanford University

MICHAEL FINNEGAN
Senior Research Associate, The National Bureau of Asian Research

Discussant:

SCOTT SNYDER
Senior Associate and Center Director, Center for U.S.-Korea Policy, The Asia Foundation

* * * * *

P R O C E E D I N G S

MR. BUSH: Why don't we go ahead and get started. I'm Richard Bush. Happy New Year to all of you. Thank you for coming today. I'm glad I just had to come down four floors instead of come across town. This weather is miserable.

But it's our great pleasure to have you here for a second session on expanding the agenda of the U.S.-ROK alliance. And as we look forward to a very complex and multifaceted world, it's a worthy objective to explore the ways in which the alliance can be adapted to new missions. And this raises questions of whether these new missions are a good use of resources, whether they will make a difference.

And on that, I'm very pleased that Scott Snyder has taken the initiative to undertake this project and bring it to what is now successful conclusion. That's enough from me. I would like to now invite Scott to talk a little bit about the project, to set the context for this morning's discussions. Thank you.

Scott?

MR. SNYDER: Well, thank you, Richard, for your hospitality in co-hosting this with us and for your generosity to bring such a wonderful crowd out.

The Center for U.S.-Korea Policy, this is really our first major project. The focus and objective of our center is to promote new ideas for consideration by policymakers with the goal of promoting the effective development of stronger alliance cooperation between the U.S. and South Korea. And to that end, our first project has examined new areas of cooperation in the alliance.

Some of you, I think, were here in October, at which time we had a first meeting of this project. We also had a series of presentations in November. Essentially, what we have done is to use a list of areas identified in the joint vision statement that was released last June by the two Presidents in their White House meeting as a litmus test for

making an initial assessment about the prospects for expanded cooperation in a range of areas that were identified in that statement.

Frankly, as you will hear today, the results, I think, have been mixed. But I think it's been a very interesting exercise that has illustrated a whole new range of ways in which the United States and South Korea may be able to cooperate more effectively with each other.

I just want to mention the areas that we covered last October. We had presentations on pandemic diseases. Jim Schoff wrote that. We had a presentation on counterterrorism cooperation by Kevin Shepherd. And we had a presentation on space cooperation.

And then last November in Seoul, we had papers presented by Mike McDevitt on Naval cooperation between the United States and South Korea. We've covered the topic of peacekeeping; Balbino Wong wrote a piece on that. And our Korea representative of the Asia Foundation, Ed Reed, has written a paper on overseas development assistance. And then also, we've commissioned a paper by Fred McGoldrich on U.S.-South Korea nonproliferation cooperation.

Today, we're going to be examining three topics together that I think each pose separate but unique challenges to expanding a common vision for alliance cooperation: climate change, human rights, and post-conflict stabilization. The examination of prospects for U.S.-Korea cooperation on climate change issues should provide a basis upon which to judge the extent to which the alliance is equipped to engage in political and technical cooperation on a nontraditional or human security issue. The discussion on human rights is a lens through which to examine, front and center, whether the joint vision statement really means what it says when it talks about alliance cooperation on the basis of common values. And the question of post-conflict stabilization in Afghanistan provides an

understanding of whether or not it is really possible to extend alliance-based cooperation off the peninsula in ways that suit our mutual interests.

I'm grateful to each of our authors today, and I'm also grateful to you, the audience, for coming to attend this symposium. Thank you.

MR. BUSH: Our first speaker, as advertised, is Professor Heejun Chang from Portland State University.

Professor Chang, you can speak from here or there, whichever you want. I think you have a PowerPoint.

MR. CHANG: Thank you for introducing me here. And it is my great pleasure to see everyone in this early morning. Today, I'm going to talk about the climate change issues, why U.S. and ROK should cooperate, and how we can expand the relationship in the future.

Last slide, okay. Here is a brief outline of my talk. First, I'm going to talk about the science of climate change, what is causing the climate change, why we should care about climate change. And there are two different areas we can cope with the situation: one is climate mitigation, and the second, climate adaptation. How they are different and how we can cooperate with each other in each area?

And from there I'm going to draw some strategies, how U.S. and ROK can make more closer relationship. And finally, I draw some conclusions.

This is a graph showing temperature change in the past 150 years. It's taken data from the UK, Hadley Center, starting from 1850 up to 2008. The blue indicates the temperature anomalies around the world, each averaged over land. And the solid black line shows the temperature anomalies in Korea.

As you see, this is the departure from the base year period, which is 1961 and 1990. And world temperature has risen about .7 degrees Celsius per decade. But in

Korea, the warming rate is much higher; it's about 1.7 degrees Celsius per century (SIC). So, it indicates if this trend is going to continue, the world temperature -- and particularly in Korea -- there will be some significant impacts on both a physical system and societies.

And what is causing these climate change? You can see the two factors. The climate can change by nature. For example, the Earth's X tier and the Earth's wobble changes a long time period, like 21,000 years or 46,000 years. So, based on the changes in X tier, the exposure to a certain part of the Earth to the sun also changes as it reach Earth, the climate can shift for a long period.

But also humans are contributing to this climate change, particularly for short-term period. And the main cause of these climate change is increasing concentrations of greenhouse gasses, such as carbon dioxide or methane and so forth. And these greenhouse gasses primarily emitted by a lot of human activities, including combustion of fossil fuels, as well as changes in land cover. Once we clear out forests, the carbon can be released, which will add to the concentrations of greenhouse gasses on Earth.

So, some people argue that climate also has changed over the history of the Earth. So what is unique about the climate change the past two centuries or so, as you see from this graph, there is a close relationship between the concentration of carbon dioxide and/or temperature. And if you look at the first figure, you can see since the Industrial Revolution about -- which happened around 1750 (SIC), the concentration of carbon dioxide has risen exponentially.

So, the Earth can actually absorb these carbon dioxide, either in forests or the oceans. Once the oceans or forests cannot absorb additional carbons, the concentration will increase. Lower diagram which illustrates the process of greenhouse gas effect, which shows that the Earth receives incoming shortwave radiation, but also releases outgoing long wave radiation. But these greenhouse gasses trap these outgoing long wave

radiation, and re-radiate heat back to the surface. That is why the Earth's lower atmosphere has warmed up in recent years.

So, there have been efforts in terms of measuring carbon dioxide concentration, and the first figure shows the carbon dioxide concentration measured in remote island in Hawaii. So, they have been measuring these carbon dioxides since 1958. As you see, the carbon dioxide concentration has risen from 315 ppm to close to 400 ppm in 2008.

You can also see the seasonal cycle, which reflects -- in summertime, when trees have full leaves, they can absorb carbon. By winter, when they loose these leaves, the carbon dioxide is released. That's why you can see the fluctuations within a year.

But the bottom graph shows the carbon dioxide concentration in Korea, which shows a much faster increasing rate, based on eight years of data since 1999. So, some people argue that this may be also associated with not only what's happening in Korea, but also what's going on in adjacent countries, such as China. Because all these carbon dioxide, the pollutants may be transported from adjacent countries by Westerlies.

And this figure illustrates there's a close relationship between temperature and carbon dioxide levels since 1880. As carbon dioxide concentration increases, the global temperature increases as well, although there is some natural fluctuations in the past century or so.

So, a lot of scientists project what's going to happen in the future. So the current carbon dioxide concentration rate is around 375 ppm based on the year 2007. And then if we continue the current industrial or economic activities, the carbon dioxide concentration could reach up to close to 1,000 ppm. But you can also have different scenarios based on whether we introduced more efficient energy, which consumes less

fossil fuels.

So, this is based on all these different economic and social development scenarios.

And this picture is taken from the IPCC report, the latest report, based on three different sets of climate change scenarios. The A to illustrate the high emission scenarios and B-1 is the low emission scenario and A-1-b is a middle. So, B illustrates -- the A-1-b, the lower letter B, illustrates the source of energies balanced, which means that you have both fossil fuels, but also more cleaner energy.

It shows changes in some extreme events, such as change in precipitation intensity, which is measured by the number of the -- the amount of precipitation divided by the number of precipitation days. And the consecutive number of dry days, which all increase in the future as we continue emitting greenhouse gasses.

But the impacts of these changes on Earth are not spatially the same. So, for example, I just highlight the Pacific Northwest of U.S., where I live. You can see the precipitation intensity is going to rise in the future. This is based on nine different climate change model means compared to the previous period, which is 1980 to 1999, and what's going to happen by the end of 21st century.

But at the same time, the number of dry days is going to increase as well. It looks counterintuitive, but you can speculate you have a very heavy torrential rainfall days, but, in the meantime, more dry days. So although the mean condition may not change necessarily, the more extreme events are likely to happen.

But notice that the impacts on each region may be very different from one place to the other. That's why we need a spatially explicit climate impact assessment.

So, there are two areas we can consider. One is climate mitigation and adaptation. Mitigation is you can reduce the source of these greenhouse gas emissions.

For example, you control these power plants, which -- and ask them to use more clean energy, or you can introduce hybrid cars or electricity cars, which you can minimize the source of emissions.

But at the same time, we have to concede the adaptation, which means we have to change the human behavior or any equal system we have to adapt to these changes. The bottom figure shows, like amphibian house, which have been introduced in some Western European countries such as Germany or the Netherlands, because they now have to accept we have to live with water. So, make space for water. So you can see, people have to live with water, whether they are trying to combat with floods. But also, birds can migrate to other areas.

So, I identify these five different areas in terms of how U.S. and ROK can make a strong collaboration. And one is carbon trading, and the renewable energy and the urban spatial structure, transportation, and forestation. I will discuss these each one by one.

So these are some figures how we have to address all these, all together. So, forest. And we'll talk about the carbon trading and how these two countries have been implementing these carbon trading. So, we can consider these carbon trading are different levels. We can first consider the federal level, the central government level, and the state provincial level in Korea and the local.

So, for example, in the U.S. in 2009, the U.S. Climate Action Partnership, they recommended we have to make a national cabinet and trade registration, which still have not passed yet. And the auto, okay, in the meantime, they just have released this news last week. They have been trying to implement a pilot, a carbon emission trading system, which will be launched as early as late 2010.

At the same time, the Ministry of Knowledge Economy, they also introduced a carbon cash bag point system. So, basically the consumers or private industry, which

reduce the carbon dioxide emissions, they can get some credits.

At the state level, the U.S., they are doing some regional partnerships established in 10 Northeastern states, from New Hampshire to down in Maryland, and 7 Western United States. And also there are four Canadian provinces joined this Western initiative as well.

But interestingly, some states, like West Virginia or Pennsylvania, they were not part of these partnerships. Guess what. They have a lot of coal power plants to -- their politicians are very sensitive about these issues. And California is one of the leading states in terms of reducing these greenhouse gasses. They also pursue the Global Warming Solution Act, which have been implemented since 2006.

In Korea, there are over 100 municipalities participating in the carbon point system, which has been introduced since 2008. So basically, if consumers use less energy compared to the previous period, they can get some credit back. So they can get either cash back or they can get some gift cards.

And so the difference between the U.S. and the ROK is, basically, the U.S. is primarily lead by some state level because states have some autonomy, and then you can make some changes. But in ROK, it's primarily driven by a top-down approach from the central government, and still the voluntary emission is the case. But also, notice that there are some very fast movement of some private sector. Because they consider now this is the place they can make some also profits, as well.

And the second topic is renewable energy. This figure illustrates some energy consumption rate by type. The U.S., the renewable energy is about 7 percent. And out of that, the biomass is a major portion of this renewable energy, over 53 percent. But in Korea, the renewable energy portion is less than the U.S., which is about 2 percent. And about three-quarters of them are coming from wastes.

So, both companies have ambitious goals. The U.S. Department of Energy, they announced that they are going to reduce about 50 -- over 50 percent of total electricity comes from the renewable energy by 2030. But also, the ROK government, they announced they are going to reduce about 6 percent of total energies by 2020, and there has been addressed by the 5-year Green Growth Plan.

At the national level, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, they also create some state climate and energy partnership program. This is a voluntary relationship among -- between the federal government and 16 states.

And also in the Obama administration, they introduced the Loan Guarantee Program. They can construct wind power plants.

And the Korean governments have been searching for new sources of renewable energy, particularly since 2008, when oil price skyrocketed. And they also tried to introduce some incentives to private sectors. This has been also announced as part of the package last week.

And so they also introduce more foreign investments, some U.S. companies such as JP Morgan. And also they also want to collaborate with other developing countries, such as Indonesia, in terms of biofuel generation.

But at the state and local level, once again the U.S. -- the state has autonomous power. They can also develop their own clean energy plan. They also introduced a lot of these tax incentives and the rebates and some requirements for new constructions.

And the city of Seoul, they attempt to do -- the first climate friendly city in Korea, and they also have some plans. They're going to reduce -- they're going to use more renewable energy. They're going to increase their portion by 20 percent. And also, because of the compact nature of the city development, they can also use some building materials to

generate some energy.

And the other area we can also consider, urban spatial structure, urban development. So, we need to consider the different history of the development in both countries. The U.S. has relatively new cities, less -- most cities are less than 200 years of history compared to Korea is much older cities. For example, the city of Seoul has more than 600 years of history.

And the typical U.S. cities you can see the sparseness of urban development, which people have to travel a lot. For example, people living come here; you may have to commute more than 10 miles one way. But the inner city has new challenge for the redevelopment. So, in the past, there was some vacancy in inner cities. But nowadays, people try to use that space more wisely.

But also in Korea, there are some new towns surrounding the city of Seoul. But the new trend in U.S. and also somewhere else, they introduce a new urbanism. In other words, they use less energy and water and they're going to do some smart growth. This is a new concept in urban planning, and they will now make their neighborhood more livable so they can walk around and then they can shop and they can talk with the neighbors more closely.

And one thing that you can also notice, in Korea they are very well-developed public transportation system: the subway and public bus, and they also have some bus lane only so that you cannot -- you're not allowed to enter that lane.

And so in terms of some policy aspects. Again, urban planning is mostly managed at the municipal level or the city level. So, basically the city can do what they are going to achieve. And so there is a trend toward a more denser development. And there are some U.S. cities that they have been implemented this denser development. And as a result, they found that there is a substantial decrease in miles for travel; as a result, the

carbon dioxide emission has been reduced as well.

So, you need to integrate these land use planning and transportation more closely. But also there have been -- when they have new plans, they also invite the citizens to solicit their input.

And in Seoul, also the Ministry of Land and Transportation and Maritime Affairs in Korea, they announced they are going to build some more energy efficient on the urban planning so they use zero energy construction by 2025. And they are going to regulate the energy consumption for all the buildings in 2010.

So, as you see, the transportation sector is one of the leading causes of greenhouse gas emissions in both countries, accounting for over 20 percent of emissions. So, there are two different strategies you can think of. One is you have to reduce the vehicle travel distance. And also, you have to increase the renewable source of energy. So, both countries introduced hybrid car purchase. They can -- the consumers have tax rebates. And also we have to encourage this public transportation system. And then when they construct new roads or bridges they can use more eco-friendly technologies. So basically, when you want to implement any policy in transportation, you have to integrate with the land use planning.

And forestation, as you see, the forest can absorb more than 10 percent of carbon uptake in both countries. And we have to give some financial incentives to preserve the agri-forestry that have been already implemented in the state. For example, the U.S. Department of Agriculture, they can buy some forest or farms and they can pay for the farmers to preserve that land.

So, you have -- there is a growing concept of how we can make some payment for this ecosystem services, which have been developed by environmental economies, and then how we -- where are the most appropriate places to preserve these

lands. This is one of the questions we have to address.

And so -- but also, we have to consider the forest may have some changes, particularly this more drought, severity, we have more forest fires. You have to consider these potential changes on the climate change when you make some compensating plans.

And there are some areas we can incorporate in terms of adaptation. So, one way we can do this, we have to make more decentralized system of both production and consumption. Maybe people have to produce their own foods or relying on water in the local land rather than importing people -- foods from distant miles.

And we have to also consider preserving these natural lands, particularly maintaining for these ecosystem services. For example, the urban forest, they have -- they can mitigate some urban heat island effect. We have to maintain those lands. And in terms of implementing adaptation, it is the local level. At the municipal level, they can make changing more dramatic way.

And the citizen participation is crucial. And the scientists and the policymaker, they have to communicate with each other. The one way we can consider, make alliances maybe at the municipal level. Maybe you can use some sister cities between U.S. and Korea and they can exchange some ideas and technologies.

So, I want to draw some common areas that we have interest. So first, we can provide more incentives to reduce these greenhouse gas emissions. Unless there is some tax credits, it might be hard to implement this. And we also have to expand both safe and convenient public transportation system, because people will travel more. There is no doubt about that, regardless what's going to happen. So we have to use a more efficient system.

And also we have to continue to invest in alternative forms of renewable energy. And you have to consider more compact or dense, livable urban development. And

forestation.

And then at the municipal level, we can also provide more place-specific adaptation strategies, what each city can learn from each other. There's also increasing city alliance in U.S., partially supported by NOAA, how the -- each municipalities can adapt to these potential climate change.

So, this is a more general level how we can make this tighter cooperation between U.S. and ROK. So, we have to first foster a more open dialogue between -- not only business, but also government. Without communication between these two agents, it might be hard to implement. Because the climate of security is essentially associated with economic security and eventual human security. And you can also -- I mentioned about there are many different strategies working at different levels, so we have to consider what strategy might be the most appropriate at different levels.

And the other thing is, we have to also consider what other countries, such as China and Japan -- and these countries are doing, and there's also been alliance established between like Japan and Korea, and China and India. So we have to consider those other cooperations as well.

So, thank you. (Applause)

MR. BUSH: Thank you very much, Professor Chang. I'm sure that your presentation generated a lot of questions, but I ask you to hold your questions. We'll have probably a full hour to get -- hear from you.

Our next speaker is Peter Beck with the Walter H. Shorenstein Center for Asia-Pacific Research at Stanford University. He'll speak about human rights, a subject on which he knows a lot.

Peter.

MR. BECK: I guess it's very appropriate that I'll have a picture of polar

bears behind me while I'm giving my presentation. I've forgotten how cold it can get here now that I'm out in California.

I want to congratulate Scott and Richard for putting this program together and tell them what an honor it is to be the weak link in the strong chain that they've put together of papers on areas of cooperation that we don't typically look at when we think of U.S.-Korea relations. And I really think this is a project that thinks outside of the box about issues that we should be concentrating on.

And one of those issues is human rights. It's something that gets a lot of attention in our press; it gets a lot of attention in the Korean press. But -- and often there's not much that we can do about it, but we're certainly not doing much bilaterally. And so there's a lot of area for potential cooperation.

As Scott mentioned in his -- in introductory remarks, in the joint vision statement that our two Presidents agreed on last June here in Washington, there's a statement: We will work together to promote respect for the fundamental human rights of the North Korean people.

And it's a fairly short document, and they said this. But it's not clear what they actually intend to do in terms of cooperation. As you may know, our -- we have a new special envoy for North Korean human rights, Robert King, who is going out to Seoul next week. And this is -- one, it's welcome that we now have a full-time envoy and I have every expectation that he will do a wonderful job.

But he has a big job because I think almost everyone agrees that his predecessor was an unmitigated disaster. Not only was he invisible most of the -- Jay Lefkowitz was invisible most of the time, but then when he did get attention, it was not so much for North Korean human rights, it was for criticizing the Bush administration's approach towards North Korea. So, I think we're definitely making progress in the right

direction. The -- our, too -- we have a human rights envoy for North Korea, South Korea has a human rights envoy. They've never met each other before. And so, there's a lot -- there's going to be a lot for them to talk about.

One of the challenges that we faced is that we had -- for the previous 10 years, until 2008, we had liberal governments in Seoul. And liberals in Seoul take this very hypocritical approach of focusing only on human rights in South Korea and no -- and virtually no attention to human rights in North Korea. They're silent on the issue, for a variety of reasons. And at the governmental level as well. There was a reluctance in Seoul to take up the human rights issue, and -- you know, abstaining from votes in the United Nations, for example.

And there's this fear that by pursuing human rights and raising the issue too prominently, that it would bring a chill in North/South relations. And that's still a concern today. And as you may be reading about, rumors of a North/South summit that could take place sometime this year, I'm sure that human rights will take a back seat in any discussions -- in any public discussions that the government -- Korean government has.

But I think we do have areas for -- real areas for potential cooperation because I think we have two Presidents that take a fundamentally similar approach to human rights. My paper's looking at human rights more broadly, but I'll focus my discussion on North Korea, since that is the area where I think there's the most potential cooperation.

But if we look at the positions of the two governments on the Dali Lama, for example, of both Presidents making decisions to not meet with him for fear of upsetting China, that there is a recognition that global politics and international security and national interest takes priority, sometimes, over human rights as much as we may think that they are important. So, I think they have a fundamentally compatible approach to dealing with human rights issues. Putting the nuclear issue first, that we have to try and negotiate with

North Korea; that that has to take priority over pressing human rights concerns.

So, I think -- you know, with governments with fundamentally similar world views, particularly when it comes to dealing with human rights and human rights in North Korea, I think there's great areas for cooperation.

Unfortunately, when we look at the experience in South Korea in the United States, South Korea remains very polarized on the issue of human rights, that you have liberals remaining largely silent on the issues, and it's conservatives that take up the cause of North Korean human rights. And here in the United States, I would say that it's increasingly becoming a bipartisan issue. particularly when we had the passage of the 2004 North Korean Human Rights Act. It was unanimous vote and it was renewed again recently, and unanimous once again. So, there's no real fundamental disagreement between liberals and conservatives in the United States when it comes to the human rights situation in North Korea, but there is still a big divide in South Korea.

So, at the governmental level, it's certainly possible to work more closely together. And really this wasn't possible until we had the election of Lee Myung-bak as President.

And so human rights in North Korea remains a polarizing issue for the minority of Koreans who care about politics. Besides impeding North/South reconciliation past governments in South Korea have left -- on the left have relied on two main arguments to justify their hands-off approach.

One columnist in the liberal Hankyoreh newspaper insisted that he had too few facts about what was happening in North Korea, that he couldn't really write authoritatively on the issue, which I don't find very plausible.

And also the -- and the second is the fear that raising an issue will make negotiations -- North/South reconciliation impossible. And the second justification that the

