

Value of Trilateral Cooperation for the Indo-Pacific Strategy & the Ghost of History: The Case of US-Japan-South Korea Alliance

Aakriti Sethi

Abstract

The trilateral alliance of America, Japan and South Korea has long been desired by Washington to become the backbone of the US alliance system in Asia due to similar interests and values, especially in the face of common threats. Originally fostered with the aim to counter North Korea and later institutionalized in 1999, the US-Japan-South Korea trilateral alliance has been successful in establishing a coordinated mechanism for cooperation. However, in 2017 when US President Trump pushed ahead with FOIP, the opposing response by Japan and South Korea exposed perception gaps in the trilateral grouping. Even as Japan welcomed this development, South Korea's hesitation towards FOIP highlighted the dilemma of supporting US initiatives without being entangled in the US-China power struggle. Furthermore, FOIP's Japanese origins have been associated with South Korea's slow embrace of the new strategic concept. At the same time, waning Japan-South Korea relations due to debates over historical narratives have weakened the post-Cold War bonhomie developed by the neighbouring states.

This paper assesses the American rationale for attaching importance to the trilateral alliance and its position within the Indo-Pacific construct. Most importantly, the paper addresses the evolution of the triad amidst evolving regional geopolitics.

Keywords: US-Japan-South Korea Trilateral Alliance; Free & Open Indo Pacific; Japan-South Korea Relations

Background of the Trilateral Cooperation

The US-Japan-South Korea trilateral alliance stems from the bilateral ties fostered by the US with each of these countries in the years following World War II. American bilateral interactions were the basis for the hub-and-spoke alliance network, or *San Francisco system*, which helped the US play an instrumental role in constructing modern-day Asian regional security architecture. During the Cold War, the US cultivated tightly-knit bilateral ties with specific states ("spokes") and acted as the central hub with little to no interaction between these spokes (Cha). At the time, America was considering the idea of an Asian organization that would be established on the principle of collective security in the backdrop of the intensifying ideological war of influence with USSR in the Asian theatre. However, the deep mistrust and fear towards Japan and the rise of nationalism within the region hindered these plans (Snyder). These hub & spoke ties were asymmetric, with America holding far greater influence over the states. Japan and South Korea remained two important states in this bilateral US alliance network; however, their relations with one another were somewhat strained, even as they normalised relations in 1965. America acted as the central

INDO-PACIFIC REVIEW

Council for Strategic and Defense Research

hub, whereas the two Asian countries (Japan and South Korea) had limited connection with each other, creating an unofficial alliance network; a stark contrast to the US-led alliance system existing in Europe (NATO) (Cha).

The hub and spoke alliance system gave Japan and South Korea two guarantees: US commitment to defend these states through mutual security treaties; and, their addition to the US nuclear umbrella (i.e. American willingness to use nuclear weapons to protect these allies) (Roehrig). Treaties signed in 1951 and 1953, with Japan and South Korea respectively, led to America gaining forward base access in the Pacific as America stationed troops in these states. The close nature of these security ties has not only led to providing bases to the American troops, but also intelligence sharing, closer defense cooperation, logistics support and assistance to US led defense initiatives. One of the important Cold War characteristics in East Asia was the ideological confrontation between the two triangles (i.e., Washington DC-Tokyo-Seoul and Moscow-Pyongyang-Beijing). Over the years, the convergence of values like democracy and freedom made the US-Japan-South Korea triad an important pillar of East Asian security (Jo and Mo).

As the world transitioned towards a post-Cold War era, deriving a new meaning and scope for the US alliance structure in Asia became a point of focus for various administrations. The region moved towards greater autonomy, economic prosperity, democratisation and interdependence. As the post-Cold War years witnessed an era which was relatively devoid of superpowers competing for greater influence, attention towards security ties relaxed for a while. Particularly, with the commencement of the dot com revolution and globalisation, Asia geared its focus towards strengthening its economic potential. However, North Korea's string of missile tests in 1993-1994 and the Taiwan Strait crisis of 1995-1996 brought a renewed sense of realism regarding the emerging security challenges facing the region. Especially, the nuclear threat unfolding on the Korean peninsula propelled the three countries to not only strengthen their security ties, but also institutionalise them, and creating better negotiating mechanism for coordinating respective strategies (US Department of State).

The 1994 Defense Trilateral Talks (until 2002) involved mid-level ministers from these three countries with the nuclear threat as the main agenda. But it was the 1999 Trilateral Coordination & Oversight Group (TCOG) that formally established a diplomatic channel for reviewing the nuclear situation of DPRK and reaffirmed the importance of coordination between the three countries and upholding Agreed Framework between US and DPRK of 1994 (US National Archives and Records Administration). The TCOG policy was actively led by the US as a means to involve Japan and South Korea in key regional initiatives. The trilateral relationship began to be viewed as a "virtual alliance" that would rely more on the bilateral partnerships with US, in the absence of a "formal official trilateral security alliance", and would be instrumental in maintaining long term stability within the region (Cossa). America's role in steering the direction of the trilateral group became more important than ever.

Eventually, domestic factors strained the trilateral consensus on DPRK, for example the "Sunshine Policy" of South Korea which focused on greater engagement with North Korea. In the face of limited reciprocity by Pyongyang, this move by Seoul risked exacerbating the task of managing relations with US and Japan (Levin and Han). As the threat from Pyongyang increased, the rationale for greater defense cooperation and reassessing strategies crystallised at various levels. The Bush administration decided to: "*...undertake serious discussions with North Korea on a broad agenda*

INDO-PACIFIC REVIEW

Council for Strategic and Defense Research

to include: improved implementation of the Agreed Framework relating to North Korea's nuclear activities; verifiable constraints on North Korea's missile programs and a ban on its missile exports; and a less threatening conventional military posture.” (The White House)

The Bush administration opted for the multilateral approach to counter North Korea's growing nuclear ambitions. In 2003, the Six Party Talks officially commenced, involving the US, North Korea, South Korea, Japan, China and Russia, as it focused on the objective of “complete, verifiable, and irreversible dismantlement of North Korea's nuclear programs...(including) plutonium and uranium enrichment-based programs” (US Department of State). This forum not only replaced TCOG but also witnessed China in a proactive diplomatic role. However, throughout the 2000s, the Bush administration led the dynamism for cooperation as tackling multi-layered threats from terrorism took top priority. As America focused on proactively engaging with global threats and welcomed greater participation of troops stationed in various parts of the world, the need for the two important Asian allies to deeply engage in these plans became evident. Within this context, the trilateral cooperation gained attention from the US due to Japan and South Korea's critical defense role in addressing a plausible crisis emanating from North Korea's recurring missile tests. Even though Japan and South Korea faced domestic challenges in their bilateral relations stemming from conflicting historical narratives, the comfort women issue and territorial disputes (Dokdo/Takeshima islands), the two countries were able to sustain regular bilateral defense cooperation. The American push for closer defense coordination led to a working level trilateral interaction. The three countries began Defense Trilateral Talks in 2008 which involved defense representatives of all the three countries, though at the time these meeting were off radar (Sneider, Sohn and Soeya).

This decade was also the time when the US began to keep a watchful eye on China's rise. However, unlike the North Korean issue, there was a difference of opinion between the three countries. Throughout the 2000s, even as Japan-China relations were plagued with issues related to historical injustice and territorial disputes (Senkaku/Diaoyu Islands), deeper economic ties with Beijing and revolving door politics obstructed Tokyo from undertaking a stern stance towards China. Whereas, South Korea was hesitant to use its alliance with US to balance China with the fear of being stuck between two powerful states (Sohn).

Reducing the focus of US foreign policy on the Middle East region and shifting its attention towards the Asia Pacific, the Obama administration launched the “pivot” (later rebalancing) to Asia that aimed at devoting greater US resources and attention. Viewing the region as the “key driver of global politics”, the administration focused on investing in the region- diplomatically, economically and strategically (Clinton). During this time, the focus of the trilateral relationship began widening beyond North Korea. The 2010 Trilateral statement included issues like climate change, proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMD), maritime security, freedom of navigation and increasing trilateral coordination (US Department of State). However, even as the triad formed consensus on security matters, Japan-South Korea relations reached new lows during the decade of 2010s. The impact of these bilateral disagreements was felt by the triad.

The August 2011 ruling, by a South Korean constitutional court that the nation needs to do more to settle disputes on behalf of comfort women, challenged Japan's official position that all these issues were addressed under the 1965 Treaty of Basic Relations (Yonhap News Agency). During

INDO-PACIFIC REVIEW

Council for Strategic and Defense Research

Japan's rule over Korean peninsula, thousands of Korean women were forced into sexual slavery by the Imperial Japanese government. Survivors and civic groups have recurrently protested against the Japanese government for the lack of resolution of past war crimes. This issue remains sensitive to date as it deals with collective identity, collective memory, and colonial experiences. The 2011 verdict led to pressure by public and judiciary on South Korea and Japan, creating a complex diplomatic challenge for bilateral relations. In 2012, as Shinzo Abe and Park Geun-hye were respectively elected as Japan and South Korea's heads of governments, political disagreements over the issues of history worsened. Japan's colonial aggressions in South Korea and China have always been a delicate subject even though their relations with Tokyo normalised in 1965 and 1972, respectively. PM Abe entered office with the intention of rewriting Japan's pacifist constitution and rebuilding Japan, militarily and economically. The Prime Minister's visits to Yasukuni Shrine which was established to honour Japanese soldiers who died in World War II (including convicted war criminals) became a constant bone of contention between Japan and its East Asian neighbours.

In 2013, PM Abe made a statement in the Japanese parliament that:

"The definition of what constitutes aggression has yet to be established in academia or in the international community...Things that happened between nations will look differently depending on which side you view them from." (McCurry)

Such statements not only added to the worries of a resurgence of Japanese nationalism, but were also viewed to be insensitive by the public in South Korea (Bong). On the other hand, in the quest to strengthen her domestic foothold, President Park Geun-hye held an anti-Japan stance throughout her term and refused to hold a formal summit with her Japanese counterpart (Moon and Won). The president believed that there was little impetus for holding summits unless Japan did not apologize for its war time "wrong doings" (Williamson). Eventually, during the 2014 Nuclear Security Conference in Hague, the three countries were able to hold a meeting due to American intervention (The White House), the first such talk between PM Abe and President Park. President Obama was successful in maintaining this momentum as they signed the Trilateral Information Sharing Arrangement the same year that created an avenue for authorities from the three countries to share classified information, especially on missile and nuclear activities of Pyongyang (US Department of State). The next year as well, ministers from the three countries met for two-day security talks and recommitted to working level consultations for intelligence sharing (US Department of State).

In a bid to repair the strained relations, Tokyo and Seoul came to an understanding on the comfort women issue in December 2015. The Japanese government expressed:

"...sincere apologies and remorse to all the women who underwent immeasurable and painful experiences and suffered incurable physical and psychological wounds as comfort women." (Japan Ministry of Foreign Affairs)

The government also decided to pay \$8.3 million to South Korea as a way to fund the victims (BBC). The Obama administration had placed pressure on both the countries to resolve the comfort women issue through diplomatic channels and hence was pleased when a consensus was reached (Moon and Won). However, domestically President Park Geun-hye faced a storm of criticisms as public believed that the accord was flawed and lacked sincerity (Kim). Furthermore, as President

INDO-PACIFIC REVIEW

Council for Strategic and Defense Research

Park was embroiled in a corruption scandal and the public continued to stage protests^[1], the bilateral ties failed to recover. The lack of political will in South Korea to improve ties with Japan after the accord was signed, and public disapproval of the accord, was viewed as a breach of trust, eventually leading to Japan cancelling talks with South Korea on currency swap in January 2017 (Reuters).

The Indo-Pacific Strategy and Diverging Opinions

In comparison to Hillary Clinton, President Donald Trump's experience or vision for US foreign policy was not only limited but also guided by the domestic motto of "America First". In the early months of his presidency, US foreign policy was reactionary in its approach and focused on fulfilling campaign promises like quitting the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA), Paris Agreement, and the Trans Pacific Partnership (TPP). Still, the president and his team of experts had zeroed in on two threats that faced America- China and North Korea. Economically, Trump considered China as the greatest US threat that had become a powerhouse at the expense of American industries. Furthermore, a possible Chinese order that would utilise its economic and military assets to displace the US-led order was seriously considered by the administration (US National Security Strategy 2017). At the same time, North Korea's growing nuclear ambitions and its missile capabilities of targeting American cities was viewed as a plausible concern. However, at the same time, the Trump administration lacked a cohesive overarching strategy that could incorporate these specific national security and foreign policy agendas.

Out of the many US allies, Japan was the most proactive in fostering a personal relationship with President Trump. Prime Minister Abe was the first foreign counterpart that met the President elect in 2016 to build confidence, before he took the oath in January 2017 (Japan Ministry of Foreign Affairs). These interactions helped in softening Trump's critical stance on issues like Japan free riding the security alliance and unfair trade practices over the course of his presidency. Most importantly, PM Abe was successful in gaining Trump's support for the Indo-Pacific strategy that had been his brainchild since the "confluence of two seas" speech in 2007 (Fodale) (Japan Ministry of Foreign Affairs). During President Trump's 2017 trip to Vietnam, he stated:

"...vision of a free and open Indo-Pacific (FOIP), a place where sovereign and independent nations, with diverse cultures and many different dreams, can all prosper side-by-side, and thrive in freedom and in peace" (US Embassy & Consulate in Vietnam)

FOIP became the missing strategy needed by the Trump administration to execute their plans which were not only in sync with their goal of countering China's growing influence but also being more effective than its predecessor's Pivot/Rebalancing Asia strategy. Understandably, Japan's reaction to FOIP was positive and welcomed by Tokyo. As relations with China continued to sour over the Senkaku/Diaoyu island dispute with increased maritime presence of the former in Sea of Japan, apart from consistent nuclear tests of North Korea (2016-2017), Japan saw FOIP as a moment to strengthen the alliance with US. The two leaders met and cemented their understanding on FOIP particularly in three areas: 1) establishing values of rule of law and freedom of navigation; 2)

INDO-PACIFIC REVIEW

Council for Strategic and Defense Research

pursuing economic prosperity by improving regional connectivity; and, 3) committing towards peace & building maritime law enforcement (Japan Ministry of Foreign Affairs). Furthermore, as an important strategic facet to the FOIP strategy, America, Australia, Japan and India renewed the Quadrilateral Security Dialogue or Quad 2.0 in 2017 to “form a (security) diamond to safeguard the maritime commons stretching from the Indian Ocean region to the western Pacific” (Abe). For America, FOIP’s success deeply depended on the resilience of its alliance network. Some of the aims laid out by the Trump administration were: to strengthen capabilities and will of Quad countries & South Korea; create a quadrilateral security framework in the region with US, Japan, Australia & India as hubs; encourage South Korea to play bigger role in the region beyond the Korean peninsula; and, empower Japan to become a pillar of the Indo-Pacific security architecture (The White House).

However, South Korea had reacted in a reserved manner to FOIP. The Moon Jae-in administration prioritised North Korea and found FOIP detrimental to inter-Korea relations (Kang). Also, Seoul preferred to have greater autonomy in drafting its policies on China, South Korea’s largest trading partner (Kang). FOIP shared many tenets with President Moon Jae-in’s New Southern Policy (NSP). Announced in 2017, NSP aimed to bolster South Korea’s ties with ASEAN and India based on the 3P’s (people, prosperity and peace) which were later upgraded to New Southern Policy Plus addressing the “changes in regional and global environment” (South Korea Ministry of Foreign Affairs). Irrespective of the similarities, the Indo Pacific Strategy’s security outlook was in contrast to NSP which was more focused on trade and economics. In the wake of China’s economic coercion as a response to Seoul’s participation in US’ Terminal High Altitude Area Defense Missile Program (THAAD) in 2016, NSP represented a geostrategic and geo-economic shift in South Korean foreign policy as it tried to hedge ties with US and China (Lim) (Seo). Furthermore, some analysts viewed the Indo Pacific Strategy’s Japanese roots as being one of the reasons that prevented Seoul’s early participation (Yeo). As Japan intensified its association with US, South Korea recognised the vulnerabilities that could follow by being involved in a US-China competition (Yeo and Koga, Pacific Forum). Ultimately, with the risk of being isolated in the region, South Korea cautiously decided to work with the US and strengthen compatible factors of FOIP and NSP. With the goal of creating synergy between the two policies that focused on transparency, inclusiveness and openness, South Korea and United States vowed to cooperate on a wider range of issues (South Korea Ministry of Foreign Affairs).

As US-Japan and US-South Korea relations progressed at differing pace, Japan-South Korea relations hit a new low. This time, the issue of historical grievances and conflict over narratives not only created a diplomatic challenge but also spilled over in trade and security relations of the two countries. In 2018, a court in Seoul passed an order stating that Nippon Steel Corporation and Sumitomo Metal Corp (5401.T) should compensate four surviving South Koreans for forced labour during Japanese rule over the Korean peninsula (Shin).

Japan, in response, removed Seoul as a preferred trade partner from the white list, the only Asian country on the list (Pham). South Korea accused Japan of initiating a trade war with President Moon Jae-in citing that, “if Japan, even though it has great economic strength, attempts to harm our economy the Korean Government also has countermeasures with which to respond” (Pham). South Korea removed Japan from the list of trusted trade partners furthering the trade row (Seung). In December 2018, Japan accused ROK navy destroyer of allegedly locking its target radar on a Japanese P-1 surveillance plane. Japan called this incident as “extremely dangerous that could

INDO-PACIFIC REVIEW

Council for Strategic and Defense Research

cause an unexpected situation” (Kajimoto and Shin). In January 2019, South Korea accused Japan of conducting a flight which was at a low altitude over its naval vessels and called it a “provocative act” (VOA News). The same year South Korea voiced its desire to withdraw from the General Security of Military Information Agreement (GSOMIA) with Japan, a crucial intelligence sharing pact and further deepened the wedge between Seoul and Tokyo. Japan protested and accused South Korea of letting trade disputes impact security relations (Shin and Takenaka, Reuters). GSOMIA has been a major symbol of the US-Japan-South Korea trilateral defense cooperation amidst growing Chinese aggression and North Korea’s escalating nuclear impulses. Due to heavy American pressure, South Korea decided to save the GSOMIA with Japan, at the eleventh hour before the agreement was due to expire (Yoshida and Sugiyama) (Hyung).

Since 2018, the understanding that demarcated converging aspects of Japan-South Korea bilateral relations from historical disagreements was deeply compromised. Domestic politics and downward spiralling of public opinion has played a role in the erosion of this understanding, unlike seen in the history of the relations since normalisation. Anti-Japan sentiments in South Korea become an important source of nationalism, pivotal for electoral politics, and President Moon Jae-in incorporating this in his domestic agenda not only impacted Japan-South Korea relations but also the triad (Schoff and Lee). Furthermore, even as FOIP aimed to create a better geo-strategic environment for strengthening the alliance, President Trump’s failure to recognise certain key threat perceptions of the two Asian countries also hampered trilateral cooperation. For example, President Trump playing down North Korea’s short range missile tests and only considering long range ballistic missiles as the reigning source of the North Korean threat presented a cause for concern and a looming perception gap between Washington DC and its Asian allies (Browne). Also, even though PM Abe tried to utilize diplomacy to gain heightened agreement with President Trump, Japan was continuously side-lined whenever the Japanese abduction issue was brought up during Trump-Kim meetings signalling the limits of US-Japan bonhomie (Japan Ministry of Foreign Affairs).

Renewing the Trilateral Alliance & Forging Possibilities

President Joe Biden entered office with the intent to rectify American missteps during the Trump era, even though the administration decided to continue the Indo Pacific Strategy (IPS), albeit with some changes. Firstly, the officials polished the language of their message to the region that was not solely focused on likeminded countries, as some viewed the Quad as an exclusionary (democratic) grouping (Grossman). The willingness to cooperate with allies and partners was reiterated. Also, recognising flaws of American democracy helped in creating an inclusive Indo-Pacific narrative (US Department of Defense). Secondly, the Biden administration reduced IPS’ attention to partnering with likeminded countries to counter China, but rather addressed the pressing threats faced by countries in the region. One of the first visits made by the top officials of the administration was to Japan and South Korea as a way to mend diplomatic bridges, re-instilling faith of allies in their alliance with US, and reinvigorating the trilateral cooperation. Secretary of State, Anthony J Blinken, and Secretary of Defense, Lloyd J Austin, participated in US-Japan Security Consultative Committee (2+2) and US-ROK Foreign & Defense Ministerial (2+2) talks with the Indo-Pacific region as an important point of discussion (US Department of State). Thirdly, building on the collective abilities of allies and partners while focusing on shaping the regional architecture became a bigger agenda than solely focusing on China (Phua). The administration was able to gauge the regional anxiety of countries like South Korea and ASEAN over the binary policy

INDO-PACIFIC REVIEW

Council for Strategic and Defense Research

options for them as a result of US-China competition. The administration paid particular attention to rectifying its past rhetoric by stating that the “Indo Pacific is not against one country or designed to make choose (anyone) countries”, aimed at dousing regional suspicion about IPS (The White House). And lastly, Biden elevated the strategic position of trilateral alliance within the IPS and committed to:

“...cooperate closely through trilateral channel on DPRK...we will also work together on regional development and infrastructure, critical technology and supply chain issues and women’s leadership & empowerment. Increasingly, we will seek to coordinate our regional strategies in a trilateral context” (The White House)

Since the early months of the presidency, mending relations between Tokyo and Seoul became one of the top foreign policy priorities for the Biden administration. When President Moon Jae-in met President Biden in 2021, the joint statement voiced the: *“...importance of ROK-US-Japan trilateral cooperation for responding to DPRK’s challenges, protecting shared security and prosperity, upholding common values, and bolstering the rules based international order” (The White House)*

According to experts, the mention of the trilateral relationship in the joint statement was unusually long, signalling America’s backhanded pressure on Seoul and Tokyo to resolve their bilateral matters in a way that does not impact the triad (Glosserman). Moreover, the change of leadership in Japan and South Korea created a hope for better bilateral relations. In comparison to Shinzo Abe’s hard-line approach, the new Japanese PM, Fumio Kishida, held a moderate ideology even though the party (LDP) he belongs to remains right wing (Harris). At the same time, South Korea’s new conservative President, Yoon Suk-yeol, entered office advocating for a “future oriented approach towards South Korea-Japan bilateral relations,” a vast difference from his moderate predecessor (The Mainichi). After symbolically inviting the Japanese foreign minister to his inauguration ceremony with the desire to reset the relations, the two-

“...shared a view that bilateral and trilateral strategic collaboration also involving the United States is needed more than ever in the current international situation where the rules-based international order is being threatened, and they have no time to spare in improving Japan-South Korea relations” (Kyodo News)

These developments helped in creating a favourable diplomatic environment for President Biden’s maiden trip to South Korea and Japan in May 2022. President Yoon Suk-yeol’s pro-US stance and intention to deepen ties with likeminded countries in the Indo-Pacific further helped in making the visit a success. South Korea’s intention to “positively review” any invitation to join the Quad and considering participation in the US-led Indo-Pacific Economic Framework (IPEF) as “obvious” are some significant shifts undergoing in the Korean policy towards the Indo Pacific strategy (The Korea Times) (Yonhap News Agency). During Biden’s visit to Japan, the two countries reiterated their joint commitment towards FOIP with Tokyo showcasing interest for joining the IPEF. The trip was also important as US succeeded in gaining Japanese commitment to a “substantial increase” in their defense budget, a step to make the alliance more equitable (The Mainichi).

Within the context of Russia waging war in Ukraine, China’s increased grey zone maritime activities in the East China Sea, and reports of North Korean plans for testing its seventh nuclear weapon, the need for boosting ties between trans-Atlantic and Asian partners was realised by US

INDO-PACIFIC REVIEW

Council for Strategic and Defense Research

and NATO countries. In a rare move, South Korea, Japan, Australia and New Zealand, or the Asia Pacific Partners 4 (AP4), were invited to attend the 2022 NATO summit in Madrid (The Japan Times). Recognizing the importance of the Indo-Pacific region for global affairs amidst intensified strategic competition between US, China and Russia, this invitation was beyond the optics of messaging. NATO-AP4 meeting focused on the Ukraine war and strengthening ties between the Indo-Pacific and NATO with an understanding that their “security is indivisible” (Japan Ministry of Foreign Affairs). This meeting was also an opportunity for Japan and South Korea to gather greater European support in tackling the North Korean threat.

Parallel to the NATO gathering, US-Japan-South Korea held trilateral talks for the first time since 2017. With an eye to deepen the security relationship, the leaders acknowledged that the “deterrence capabilities of the US-Japan and US-South Korea alliances need to be upgraded as part of the essential effort to strengthen the trilateral partnership” (The Japan Times). President Biden highlighted the significance of the trilateral cooperation for achieving the “shared objective of denuclearization of the Korean peninsula and free and open Indo Pacific” (Tanaka). Beefing up the deterrence ability of the trilateral alliance amid the shifting geopolitics of the region was the larger takeaway of the meeting.

Conclusion

The trilateral alliance has been a product of navigating disagreements and building the logic for cooperation over the years as the regional security landscape evolved. In many ways, the US-Japan-South Korea trilateral alliance became a reality when US-Japan and US-South Korea defense relations managed to develop common security perceptions. The alliance came to life in the years after the Cold War era with the need to respond to regional threats, particularly North Korea’s nuclear ambitions. For the US, since the Korean War, forging closer ties with Japan and South Korea has been a foreign policy goal vis-à-vis strategic pursuits in Asia. American security commitments to the region are interlinked to Japan and South Korea, not only from a conceptual standpoint, but also on an operational level (D. Sneider). During the Cold War years, America saw the issues embedded in the historical relationship of Japan and South Korea as a hurdle for greater security cooperation. With the hope that these bilateral differences would be sorted out over the years, America avoided intervening and being pressurised to side with either of the allies. However, Washington realised that addressing these matters is critical for the better functioning of the triad. But as these wartime issues flared and the political will to resolve them weakened, America’s role as a hesitant mediator became more imperative than ever. The American diplomatic nudge for resolving these issues, and occasionally steering the triad towards their shared security understanding, have helped in the sustenance of the trilateral. Furthermore, as the scope of the triad expanded beyond North Korea, it has been viewed as a critical framework within the US Indo-Pacific strategy.

For Japan and South Korea, their security interests have overlapped much more than that with United States, and yet there persists a lingering mistrust in the relationship. North Korea remains their top threat, particularly North Korea’s short range missile abilities which were downplayed by the Trump administration over the threat of long range missiles and nuclear tests. On China, the

INDO-PACIFIC REVIEW

Council for Strategic and Defense Research

two countries have differing approaches as Tokyo considers Beijing's emboldened maritime activities as a matter of serious national threat, whereas Seoul has struggled to mould a policy that is immune to the great power politics. As domestic politics continue to leverage historical animosity for building the tenets of nationalism, and widening public perceptions of each other, rebuilding the trust within the Japan-South Korea relation remains a challenge for the trilateral alliance. Japan has made a clear distinction between security and history issues but has time and again been surprised by Seoul's difficulty to do the same. For South Korea, the wartime issues remain integral to their socio-political history that encompasses larger debates on national identity and represents collective national desire for war crimes resolution. Hence, insightful political leadership by the two countries, that could balance these matters while upholding core security agreements, would be critical for the ongoing momentum within the triad. At the same time, there remains wide areas of convergence for the two countries apart from the North Korea threat like interest at maintaining a rules-based order, strengthening democratic resilience in the region, finding the means to bolster regional infrastructure, and freedom of navigation. Importantly, the Biden administration's decision to rebuild the Indo-Pacific strategy beyond the China narrative and adopting an inclusive discourse has helped in making FOIP palatable for countries like South Korea.

Irrespective of the difference of opinion regarding FOIP, the multilateral facet of the concept furthers the objective of the triad. As the three countries continue to forge the fate of the trilateral, this era marks a test for the resilience of the US alliance network in the region.

REFERENCES

- Abe, Shinzo. "Asia's Democratic Security Diamond." Project Syndicate . 27 December 2012. <<https://www.project-syndicate.org/onpoint/a-strategic-alliance-for-japan-and-india-by-shinzo-abe> >.
- "Comfort Women: Japan and South Korea hail agreement." BBC. 28 December 2015. <<https://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-35190464> >.
- Bong, Youngshik. "ROK and US Views on the Foreign Policy of Abe Administration." Rozman, Gilbert. Asia's Alliance Triangle: US-Japan-South Korea at a Tumultuous Time . Palgrave Macmillan : New York , 2015. 265.
- Browne, Ryan. "New North Korea missile poses threat to allies, but doesn't bother Trump." CNN. 16 August 2019. <<https://edition.cnn.com/2019/08/16/politics/north-korea-us-missile-improve/index.html> >.
- Cha, Victor. Powerplay: The Origins of the American Alliance System in Asia . New Jersey : Princeton University Press, 2016.
- Clinton, Hillary. "America's Pacific Century." Foreign Policy . 11 October 2011. <<https://foreignpolicy.com/2011/10/11/americas-pacific-century/> >.
- Cossa, Ralph A. "US-ROK-Japan: A "Virtual Alliance" Makes Sense ." Korean Journal of Defense (2000): 67-86.
- Fodale, Hannah. "Resolved: Abe's Investment in his Relationship with President Trump has advanced Japanese interests." CSIS. 30 January 2020. <<https://www.csis.org/analysis/resolved-abes-investment-his-relationship-president-trump-has-advanced-japanese-interests>>.
- Glosserman, Brad. "What was unsaid hovers over the Biden-Moon summit." Japan Times . 25 May 2021. <<https://www.japantimes.co.jp/opinion/2021/05/25/commentary/world-commentary/biden-moon-summit/>>.
- Grossman, Dennis. "Biden's Indo-Pacific Policy Blueprint Emerges." RAND. 23 August 2021. <<https://www.rand.org/blog/2021/08/bidens-indo-pacific-policy-blueprint-emerges.html>>.
- Harris, Tobias. "Fumio Kishida's principles are about to be put to the test." Foreign Policy. 4 October 2021. <<https://foreignpolicy.com/2021/10/04/fumio-kishida-new-japanese-prime-minister-ldp/>>.
- Hyung, Kim Tong. "South Korea will keep its military intelligence pact with Japan-for now." The Diplomat. 23 November 2019. <<https://thediplomat.com/2019/11/south-korea-will-keeps-its-military-intelligence-pact-with-japan-for-now/> >.
- "Japan-ROK Foreign Minister's Meeting." Japan Ministry of Foreign Affairs". 28 December 2015. <https://www.mofa.go.jp/a_o/na/kr/page4e_000365.html>.
- "Prime Minister Abe Held a Meeting with the President-Elect of the United States." Japan Ministry of Foreign Affairs . November 18 2017. <https://www.mofa.go.jp/mofaj/na/na1/us/page3e_000622.html>.

INDO-PACIFIC REVIEW

Council for Strategic and Defense Research

"Confluence of Two Seas Speech by H.E Mr Shinzo Abe, Prime Minister of Japan at the Parliament of the Republic of India." Japan Ministry of Foreign Affairs . 22 August 2007.
<<https://www.mofa.go.jp/region/asia-paci/pmv0708/speech-2.html> >.

"Japan-US Working Lunch and Japan-US Summit Meeting." Japan Ministry of Foreign Affairs . 6 November 2017. <https://www.mofa.go.jp/na/na1/us/page4e_000699.html >.

"Abductions of Japanese Citizens by North Korea." Japan Ministry of Foreign Affairs . 1 June 2022.
<https://www.mofa.go.jp/region/asia-paci/n_korea/abduction/index.html >.

"NATO Asia-Pacific Partners (AP4) Leaders' Meeting." Japan Ministry of Foreign Affairs . 29 June 2022. <https://www.mofa.go.jp/a_o/ocn/ki/page1e_000413.html >.

Jo, Hyeran and Jongryn Mo. "Does the United States Need a New East Asian Anchor? The Case for US-Japan-South Korea Trilateralism ." Asia Policy (2010): 67-100.

Kajimoto, Tetsushi and Hyonhee Shin. "Japan accuses South Korea of 'extremely dangerous' radar lock on plane." Reuters . 21 December 2018.
< <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-japan-defence-southkorea-idUSKCN1OK11O> >.

Kang, Song. South Korea and France's Indo Pacific Strategies: Potential Partnership and Challenges . pARIS: IFRI , 2021.

Kim, Jack. "South Korean comfort women protest against accord with Japan." Reuters . 30 December 2015. <<https://www.reuters.com/article/southkorea-japan-comfortwomen-idINKBN0UD0I620151230>>.

"Japan's Foreign Minister, next South Korean counterpart vow to mend ties," Kyodo News. 20 May 2022.
<<https://english.kyodonews.net/news/2022/05/4d0035f501ba-update1-japan-foreign-minister-in-s-korea-for-president-yoons-inauguration.html> >.

Levin, Norman D and Yong Sup Han. Sunshine in Korea: The South Korean Debate over Policies Toward North Korea. Santa Monica: RAND, 2002.

Lim, Darren J. "Chinese Economic Coercion during the THAAD Dispute." The Asan Forum . 28 December 2019. <<https://theasanforum.org/chinese-economic-coercion-during-the-thaad-dispute/>>.

McCurry, Justin. "Japan will not revise apologies for past military conduct in Asia, officials say." The Guardian . 8 May 2013. <<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2013/may/08/japan-apologies-military-conduct-asia>>.

Moon, Chung In and Young hur Won. "A South Korean Perspective: Trilateral Cooperation: The Devil's in Domestic Politics." Global Asia (2017): 46-50.

Pham, Sherisse. "South Korea accuses Japan of waging economic war." CNN. 2 August 2019.
<<https://edition.cnn.com/2019/08/02/business/japan-south-korea-trade-war/index.html>>.

Phua, Amanda Trea. "Biden's Indo-Pacific strategy flips the switch on geopolitical rivalry." East Asia Forum . 3 March 2022. <<https://www.eastasiaforum.org/2022/03/15/bidens-indo-pacific-strategy-flips-the-switch-on-geopolitical-rivalry/> >.

"South Korea says will monitor situation after Japan suspends FX swap talks." Reuters . 6 January 2017.
<<https://www.reuters.com/article/us-southkorea-japan-swaps-idUKKBN14Q087>>.

INDO-PACIFIC REVIEW

Council for Strategic and Defense Research

Roehrig, Terrence. Japan, United States and South Korea Nuclear Umbrella: Deterrence After the Cold War. New York: Columbia University Press, 2007.

Schoff, James and Paul K Lee. "Navigating Rocky Japan-South Korea Relations." Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. 25 June 2019. <<https://carnegieendowment.org/2019/06/25/navigating-rocky-japan-south-korea-relations-pub-79367>>.

Seo, Andrew. "South Korea's new Southern Policy and ASEAN-ROK Relations." The Diplomat. 28 July 2020. <<https://thediplomat.com/2020/07/south-koreas-new-southern-policy-and-asean-rok-relation/>>.

Seung, Kang Yoon. "Seoul drops Tokyo from list of trusted trade partners." Yonhap News Agency. 18 September 2019. <<https://en.yna.co.kr/view/AEN20190917008500320>>.

Shin, Hyonhee and Kiyoshi Takenaka. "South Korea to scrap intelligence-sharing pact with Japan amid dispute over history." Reuters. 22 August 2019. <<https://www.reuters.com/article/us-southkorea-japan-labourers-idUSKCN1VC0WR>>.

Shin, Hyonhee. "Friction likely as Korean court orders Nippon Steel to compensate WWII workers." Reuters. 30 October 2018. <<https://www.reuters.com/article/us-southkorea-japan-laborers-idUSKCN1N32TS>>.

Sneider, Dan. "Advancing US-ROK Trilateral Cooperation: A US Perspective." National Bureau of Asian Research. 2016 March 2016. <<https://www.nbr.org/publication/advancing-u-s-japan-rok-trilateral-cooperation-a-u-s-perspective-brief/>>.

Sneider, Daniel, Yul Sohn and Yushihide Soeya. US-ROK-Japan Trilateralism: Building Bridges and Strengthening Cooperation. Washington : The National Bureau of Asian Research, 2016.

Snyder, Daniel. "The United States and Northeast Asia: The Cold War Legacy." Shin, Gi Wook and Daniel Sneider. Cross Currents: Regionalism and Nationalism in Northeast Asia. California: Walter H Shorstein Asia Pacific Center, 2007. 312.

Sohn, Yul. "Relocating Trilateralism in a Broader Regional Architecture: A SOUTH Korean Perspective." The National Bureau of Asian Research. 2016 March 2016. <<https://www.nbr.org/publication/relocating-trilateralism-in-a-broader-regional-architecture-a-south-korean-perspective-brief/>>.

"ROK-ASEAN Relations Overview." South Korea Ministry of Foreign Affairs. 2022. <https://www.mofa.go.kr/eng/wpge/m_5466/contents.do>.

"ROK-US Discuss New Southern Policy, and Indo Pacific Strategy." South Korea Ministry of Foreign Affairs. 24 August 2018. <https://www.mofa.go.kr/eng/brd/m_5676/view.do?seq=320040>.

Tanaka, Miya. "Japan, South Korea eye deeper security ties in 1st summit in five years." Kyodo News. 30 June 2022. <<https://english.kyodonews.net/news/2022/06/2ffd70487d6e-japan-s-korea-us-hold-1st-3-way-summit-since-2017.html>>.

"Japan to join NATO Summit for the first time as China challenge looms." The Japan Times. 29 June 2022. <<https://www.japantimes.co.jp/news/2022/06/29/national/japan-nato-china/>>.

"Japan, US, South Korea eye deeper security ties in first summit in five years." The Japan Times. 29 June 2022. <<https://www.japantimes.co.jp/news/2022/06/29/national/japan-sk-us-talks/>>.

INDO-PACIFIC REVIEW

Council for Strategic and Defense Research

"Yoon says will positively review joining Quad if invited: Report." The Korea Times . 2022 April 26.
<https://www.koreatimes.co.kr/www/nation/2022/04/120_328012.html>.

"South Korea, Japan business leaders call for future oriented ties." The Mainichi . 9 May 2022.
<<https://mainichi.jp/english/articles/20220509/p2g/00m/0in/039000c>>.

"Japan may need to boost defense costs to \$80 bil: Think Tank." The Mainichi . 31 May 2022.
<<https://mainichi.jp/english/articles/20220531/p2g/00m/0na/067000c>>.

"Final Declassified US Strategic Framework for the Indo-Pacific." The White House. 5 January 2021.
<<https://trumpwhitehouse.archives.gov/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/IPS-Final-Declass.pdf>>.

"Statement by the President." The White House . 13 June 2001. <<https://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2001/06/20010611-4.html>>.

"Remarks by the President, President Park of Republic of Korea, and Prime Minister Abe of Japan." The White House . 24 March 2015.

<<https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2014/03/25/remarks-president-obama-president-park-republic-korea-and-prime-minister>>.

"Remarks by Vice President Harris on the Indo-Pacific Region." The White House . 24 August 2021.
<<https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/speeches-remarks/2021/08/24/remarks-by-vice-president-harris-on-the-indo-pacific-region/>>.

"Review of United States Policy toward North Korea: Findings and Recommendations." US Department of State. 12 October 1999. <https://1997-2001.state.gov/regions/eap/991012_northkorea_rpt.html>.

"US Indo Pacific Strategy." The White House . February 2022. <<https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/02/U.S.-Indo-Pacific-Strategy.pdf>>.

"US-ROK Leaders' Joint Statement." The White House . 21 May 2021.
<<https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/statements-releases/2021/05/21/u-s-rok-leaders-joint-statement/>>.

"Secretary of Defense Remarks at the 40th International Institute for Strategic Studies Fullerton Lecture." US Department of Defense . 27 July 2021.
<<https://www.defense.gov/News/Speeches/Speech/Article/2708192/secretary-of-defense-remarks-at-the-40th-international-institute-for-strategic/>>.

"US-Japan-South Korea Hold Trilateral Talks." US Department of State. 17 April 2015.
<<https://www.defense.gov/News/News-Stories/Article/Article/604481/igphoto/us-japan-south-korea-hold-trilateral-security-talks/>>.

"Remarks by Assistant Secretary for East Asian and Pacific Affairs." US Department of State . 2 March 2004. <<https://2001-2009.state.gov/p/eap/rls/rm/2004/30093.htm>>.

"Trilateral Statement Japan, Republic of Korea and United States." US Department of State . 6 December 2010. <<https://2009-2017.state.gov/r/pa/prs/ps/2010/12/152431.htm>>.

INDO-PACIFIC REVIEW

Council for Strategic and Defense Research

"Signing of Trilateral Information Sharing Arrangement Concerning the Nuclear and Missile Threats Posed by North Korea." US Department of State . 28 December 2014.

<<https://www.defense.gov/News/Releases/Release/Article/605331/signing-of-trilateral-information-sharing-arrangement-concerning-the-nuclear-an/>>.

"Travel to Tokyo, Seoul and Anchorage." US Department of State . 15-21 March 2021.

<<https://www.state.gov/secretary-travel/travel-to-tokyo-seoul-and-anchorage-march-15-19-2021/>>.

"Remarks by President Trump at APEC CEO Summit." US Embassy & Consulate in Vietnam. 10

November 2017 . <<https://vn.usembassy.gov/20171110-remarks-president-trump-apec-ceo-summit/>>.

"Trilateral Coordination and Oversight Group Meeting." US National Archives and Records Administration . 1999. <<https://catalog.archives.gov/id/10504977>>.

"US National Security Strategy 2017." The White House. 18 December 2017.

<<https://trumpwhitehouse.archives.gov/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/NSS-Final-12-18-2017-0905.pdf>>.

"South Korea: Japanese Warplane made Threatening Pass Over Naval Vessel." VOA News . 23 January 2013. <<https://www.voanews.com/a/south-korea-says-japanese-warplane-made-threatening-pass-over-naval-vessel/4755261.html>>.

Williamson, Lucy. "South Korea President Park: 'No Purpose' to Japan talks." BBC. 4 November 2013.

<<https://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-24768298>>.

Yeo, Andrew and Kei Koga. "Japan and South Korea's Alternative Paths in the Indo-Pacific." Pacific Forum. 25 March 2021. <<https://pacforum.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/PacNet17-2021.03.25.pdf>>.

Yeo, Andrew. "South Korea and the Free and Open Indo Pacific Strategy." CSIS. 20 July 2020.

<<https://www.csis.org/analysis/south-korea-and-free-and-open-indo-pacific-strategy>>.

"Court says Seoul's inaction over formedr comfort women unconstitutional." Yonhap News Agency . 30 August 2011. <<https://en.yna.co.kr/view/AEN20110830007951315>>.

"Yoon says South Korea's participation in IPEF is only natural." Yonhap News Agency . 23 May 2022.

<<https://en.yna.co.kr/view/AEN20220523004200315>>.

Yoshida, Reiji and Satoshi Sugiyama. " South Korea to scrap intelligence sharing pact with Japan amid dispute over history." Reuters. 22 November 2019. <<https://www.reuters.com/article/us-southkorea-japan-labourers-idUSKCN1VC0WR>>.