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**South Korean-Japanese Relations 1969-1979: Is There More Beyond Emotionalism?**

**Victor D. Cha**

INTRODUCTION

Japan and the Republic of Korea (ROK) exhibit one of the more enigmatic relationships in East Asian international relations. Despite a commonality of interests, conflict has persistently marred this relationship since its normalization in 1965. This study addresses the need to develop a systematic model for explaining the puzzlesome interaction between these two key states in the Asia-Pacific region. It looks at the historical enmity that has pervaded Japanese and Korean attitudes toward one another, and questions whether these basic human emotions can actually determine the behavior of states. As an alternative explanation, this study tests the relevance of a strain of international relations theory, known as alliance theory, to the dynamics of the relationship.1 Modification of this theory gives rise to a model of “quasi-alliance structures” for explaining contentious and cooperative foreign policy behavior in Seoul-Tokyo relations. “Quasi-alliance structures” is defined as: The relationship between two states that remain non-allied but share a third party as a common ally.

Framing the relationship in this manner yields two basic findings. First, despite the fact that Japan and the ROK are not allied, the friction they exhibit is typical of an asymmetrically dependent alliance. And second, the degree to which the two states allow this friction to dominate their relations is not only a function of bilateral interaction and issues, but also a function of each state’s alliance with the United States.
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OVERVIEW OF THE ENIGMA

There is a basic puzzle in the Japan-ROK relationship. The two states have generally similar domestic-political systems and ideologies, as well as generally complementary economic needs. In addition, as a result of geographic proximity and a common alliance with the U.S. the two states share convergent security objectives in the region. Given these similarities, one would logically conjecture that cooperative relations should ensue. This has however, been far from the case. The Japan-ROK relationship has undergone periods of intense friction.2 Instances of this friction have surfaced in all aspects of the relationships

For example, it took fourteen years of protracted and caustic negotiations before the two government signed a normalization treaty in June 1965. Despite this treaty, there was a conspicuous absence of executive-level diplomatic summits for nineteen years until the meetings between President Chun and Prime Minister Nakasone in 1983 and 1984. The main channel of official political dialogue in Japan-ROK relations—the annual joint ministerial conference—has either been suspended or postponed on numerous occasions. Furthermore, diplomatic relations since 1965 nearly ruptured on three separate occasions. In August 1973, the two governments clashed over the abduction from Japan of South Korean opposition politician Kim Dae Jung. In August 1974, an assassination attempt on President Park Chung Hee by a pro-North Korean resident of Japan brought the two goverments close to permanently recalling their ambassadors. And in September 1980, the Chun Doo Hwan regime’s levying of an execution order on Kim Dae Jung again took relations to the brink. Moreover, in the security arena, despite their prominence and proximity in the region, the two states are not party to a bilateral defense treaty. In addition, there was virtually no contact between defense ministries until 1978. Polemics also surround the economic aspect of the relationship over such issues as the trade imbalance, transfer of technology, and foreign aid and investment programs. The above observations, therefore, beg the following question: If cooperation better serves the interests of Japan and the ROK (as well as the U.S.), why does conflict persistently mar the relationship?

HISTORICAL ANIMOSITY

The prevailing explanation for these difficult relations has focused on the historical enmity and psychological barriers that separate Koreans and [page 41] Japanese as the primary causal variable. This mutual animosity is largely the product of the negative images and attitudes cultivated during Japan’s 36-year occupation of Korea. For Koreans, this negative attitude is manifested in a direct association of Korean nationalism with anti-Japaneseism. At a deeper, psychological level, it is also manifested in a victim’s complex prevalent within the South Korean psyche known as “Hahn,” or “unredeemed resentment for past injustices.” For Japanese, these negative attitudes surface in a superiority complex toward Koreans. Augmenting this is a general uneasiness among Japanese in contending with their nation’s past aggressive actions, and a general annoyance at Korean attempts to hold the Japanese eternally responsible for their history.

The clash of these negative attitudes gives rise to the “han-il ung-orri” (Korea-Japan Knot)—an atmosphere between Koreans and Japanese charac-terized by distrust, contempt, and a lack of mutual understanding (“sangho ihaeshim”)3. This lack of understanding becomes particularly severe whenever bilateral issues arise that invoke memories of the colonial past.

Friction over such issues abound. For example, constant bickering between the two governments continues to this day over the sincerity of Japan’s apology for past aggressions against Korea. South Koreans have been generally dissatisfied with the text of the 1965 normalization treaty as it omits any reference to Japanese repentance for the occupation period.4 Moreover, the ambiguous wording of the late Emperor Showa’s apology in 1984 did little to quell resentment. Japan’s historical recollection of the occupation period has also been a source of contention. One illustration of this is the Mon-busho’s alleged revision of Japanese history textbooks in 1982 to reflect a more conservative interpretation of past Japanese aggression in Asia. This issue not only raised emotional protests from the South Korean government, but also stalled concurrent bilateral loan negotations.5 Moreove, statements by Japanese leaders that hint even slightly at justification for the occupation period illicit strong protests from the South. For example, in 1953, Japan’s chief delegate to the normalization negotiations, Kubota Kanichiro, responded to South Korean demands for colonial reparations by stating that Japan’s occupation policies provided many benefits to Korea. This statement precipitated a four-year rupture in normalization talks.6 Finally, the revelations in January 1992 regarding the Imperial Japanese governent’s involvement in the conscription of Korean “comfort women” (chongsintae) during the Second World War are sure to re-ignite memories of the colonial past between the two governments and peoples.

In each of the above cases, dialogue reverts to polemics, and resolution [page 42] becomes infinitely more difficult because of the historical-emotional baggage attached to these issues. In sum, a systematic rendering of this “psycho-histor- ical” explanation for Japan-Korea friction could be expressed as follows: His-torical animosity gives rise to systematic biases (of a cognitive or affective nature) on the part of the Japanese and Korean government leadership as well as the general public. These biases essentially make compromise or concession in bilateral relations synonymous with treason (particularly for the Koreans), which in turn, precludes the possibility of amiable or rationally-based negotiations.

THE PSYCHO-HISTORICAL ARGUMENT: NECESSARY BUT NOT SUFFICIENT

The “psycho-historical” (or historical animosity) argument is undoubtedly integral to an understanding of Japan-Korea relations. Indeed, many Koreans and Japanese still carry vivid memories of having lived through this period of Japanes colonization from 1910 to 1945. As a systematic explanation of foreign policy behavior between the two states, however, this argument exhibits some severe faults.

One glaring shortcoming of the historical animosity argument is its inability to account for change in the Japan-Korea relationship. In the terminology of International Relations theory. systematic explanations of behavior among states must be capable of explaining not only one type, but variable types of foreign policy outcomes.7 While the historical animosity argument may be useful in explaining instances of conflict between Japan and Korea, it does not prove useful in explaining instances of cooperative behavior As a result the argument is essentially static—it suffers from the use of a constant, i.e. mutual enmity, to explain a variable i.e. cooperation/ friction.

Those who advocate the historical animosity argument have tried to cir-cumvent this criticism by embedding these negative images and psychological barriers in the belief systems of the key individuals who compose the leadership of each government. In this manner, they can then account for changes in foreign policy outcomes (i.e. cooperation/friction) by citing changes in the leadership.8 A brief look at the 1965 normalization treaty provides an illustration of this argument. As stated earlier, this treaty came into effect only after fourteen years of difficult negotiations. Advocates of the historical animosity argument attribute the inability to normalize relations, particularly during the period from 1951 to 1960, to the negative images and atti-[page 43] tudes held by the leadership in Tokyo and Seoul at the time.9 For example, South Korean president Syngman Rhee held strongly negative images of Japan. Intensely nationalist, Rhee’s entire political career before attaining the presidency was devoted to liberating Korea from the colonial yoke of Japan.10 Similarly, Japanese Prime Minister Yoshida Shigeru (1948-1954) held not only negative images of Korea, but also an intense personal dislike of Rhee.11 Mutual enmity held at the highest levels of government consequently precluded the possibility of amiable or rationally-based normalization negotiations.

Similarly, advocates of this argument attribute the ability to normalize relations in 1965 to the more pargmatic and positive attitudes that accompanied a change in leadership. In particular, the Park Chung Hee government held images of the Japanese directly contrasting with those of its predecessor.12 Park himself had been raised during the Japanese occupation, spoke Japanese, and attended a Japanese military academy. As interviews with some of Park’s personal secretaries have confirmed, the former president, although strongly nationalistic, held an affinity and respect for Japan manifest in his belief that South Korean economic growth could best be accomplished by following the Japanese model of development. As a result, the relatively less severe psychological barriers during the Park regime compared with that of the Rhee period facilitated the signing of a normalization agreement in 1965.

This seems like a plausible explanation, but if one tests the argument more stringently, it leads to some implausible propositions. For example, if one accepts the psycho-historical argument for Japan-Korea normalization as true, then one would expect that if a leader other than Park had been in power—particularly one with negative images of Japan—then normalization would not have occurred in 1965. A cursory review of this period, however, finds such a proposition highly unlikely. By the mid-1960’s, American policy makers viewed the Cold War environment in the Northeast Asian region to be quite intense. The situation in Indochina was rapidly deteriorating and the Chinese communist threat loomed large. As a result, the immediate need for a stable relationship between America’s two major allies in the region, Japan and Korea, became a priority in the U.S. strategy of establishing an anti-com-munist defense network in the region. Secretary of State Rusk and Assistant Secretary Bundy made numerous trips to Tokyo and Seoul specifically for this purpose from 1961 to 1964.13 Within Korea, the Park government was confronted with a near-desperate economic situation. On the one hand, it was in dire need of foreign capital to implement its Second Five-Year Development Plan; on the other hand, U.S. foreign economic assistance to South Korean was steadily declining. These factors made Japan an increasingly [page 44] attractive and indispensible source of capital and investment.14 Within Japan， there was increasing pressure on the Sato government by the U.S. to burden- share in the region by providing economic support to the ROK. Premier Sato faced additional pressure from the powerful Japanese business lobby for access to the South Korean market. Voices within the Gaimusho also saw Park’s need for foreign capital and domestic legitimacy as an opportune time to extract a normalization agreement at the lowest cost to Japan. Given these trends and factors, one is led to believe that normalization between Japan and Korea would have occurred during this period regardless of the leadership.15 The historical animosity argument, therefore, is integral to an understanding of Japan-Korea relations, but as a systematic explanation of state behavior, it alone is not sufficient.

QUASI-ALLIANCE MODEL OF JAPAN-KOREA RELATIONS

As stated at the outset, “quasi-allies” is defined as the relationship between two states that remain non-allied but share a third party as a common ally. In order to understand the application of this concept to Japan-Korea relations, it is first necessary to introduce some basic elements of alliance theory.16

Alliance theory frames foreign policy behavior between states within the context of a “game” The degree to which each state “cooperates” or “defects”, i.e. shows a stronger or weaker commitment to the alliance, depends on its relative assessment of its ^abandonment” and “entrapment” concerns. “Abandonment” is the fear that the ally may leave the alliance or may not fulfill obligations to it. In the extreme case，abandonment means dealignment or realignment, but it generally occurs when the ally:

…may fail to make good on his explicit commitments; or may fail to provide support in contingencies where support is expected. In both of the latter two variants，the alliance remains intact but the expectations of support which underlie it are weakened17

“Entrapment” generally occurs when a commitment to an alliance ends up being detrimental to one’s interests:

Entrapment means being dragged into a conflict over an ally’s interests that one does not share, or shares only partially. The interests of allies are generally not identical; to the extent they are shared, they may be valued in different degree.18 [page 45]

These anxieties constitute the twin horns of the security dilemma in alliance politics. The two are inversely related as a high fear of one usually means a lower fear of the other with regard to a particular ally and adversarial threat. Two types of behavior generally emerge from these anxieties of abandonment and entrapment. First, if a state experiences a high fear of abandonment relative to its ally, then one of the responses it will choose to alleviate this fear is to show a stronger commitment to the alliance in order to get the ally to reciprocate. Conversely, if a state experiences a high fear of entrapment with respect to an ally, then it will generally show a weaker commitment to the alliance in order to avoid further entanglement.

The final element of the alliance game is the strategy. The optimal strategy is to maximize one’s benefits and minimize one’s costs. Within the terms of the alliance game, this means states aim to maximize their security from the alliance while minimizing their obligations to it.

Based on these elements, we can deduce two hypotheses for explaining conflictual and cooperative behavior between states:

Hypothesis A: If relations between states X and Y reflect an asymmetrical structure of abandonment and entrapment concerns, then there will be friction between X and Y.

This is because the asymmetry or imbalance of abandonment/entrapment concerns gives rise to the employment of opposite strategies in the game. For example, if state X has a higher fear of abandonment relative to state Y, then X will show a stronger commitment to the alliance in order to get Y to reciprocate. This lowers Y’s abandonment fear, but it also increases Y’s incentive to defect. Since Y desires maximum security at minimum obligation, Y’s rational option is to show a weaker commitment—it can still preserve its interests due to X’s assured commitment; it can also minimize its entrapment fears by minimizing obligations to the alliance. X, therefore, remains unsatisfied, and friction results.

Hypothesis B: If relations between states X and Y reflect a symmetrical structure of abandonment concerns, with respect to each other or with respect to a third party Z, then cooperative relations should ensue.

By “symmetry” we mean that the two states share the same or mutual fear of abandonment. Two variants of this dynamic are possible. First, states X and Y may share abandonment fears with respect to each other. This mutual fear of abandonment causes each state to show a stronger commitment to the [page 46] alliance; moreover it will expect, and receive, a similar commitment from its ally. As a result, relations run relatively smoothly. Second, states X and Y may share abandonment fears with respect to a third party Z. In this case, X and Y will each show a stronger commitment to Z to alleviate this fear However, an additional option X and Y will exercise, particularly if Z does not show reciprocation, is to show a stronger commitment to another As a result, abandonment fears with respect to Z can give rise to more cohesive relations between X and Y.

APPLICATION OF THE MODEL TO JAPAN-KOREA RELATIONS

In order to tests these two hypotheses against the Japan-Korea case study, it is first necessary to define and assess abandonment and entrapment fears for the two governments. Research of the 1969-1979 period in Japan-Korea relations, as well as interviews with policy makers intimately involved in decision making at this time, have found that the ROK generally experiences a higher fear of abandonment while Japan experiences a higher fear of entrapment across bilateral issues.

A survey of issues in the bilateral security arena well illustrates this point. As previously stated, Japan and Korea are not party to a mutual defense treaty; as a result of geographic proximity, however, their prominence in the region, and their common alliance with the U.S., the two states exhibit de facto bilateral security ties and these play an important part in the overall relationship.

Within this security relationship, South Korea generally fears abandonment when Japan does not acknowledge the severity of the North Korean security threat. These fears become particularly acute whenever the Japanese government permits trade with North Korea in goods deemed security-sensi- tive by the South19 or when Tokyo engages in “flirting” political relations with Pyongyang which imply de facto recognition of the Kim II Sung regime as a legitimate government on the peninsula.20 Seoul also fears abandonment when Japan does not admit to a direct security link between the two countries as originally stated in the 1969 Korea Clause. First appearing in the Nixon-Sato summit conference joint communique of November 1969, this clause stated that the security of the ROK was essential to Japan’s own.21

Minimizing these abandonment fears serves two basic interests for the ROK. First, it enhances the containment of the North Korean security threat. Second, by getting Japan to admit to a direct security link with the ROK, [page 47]

Seoul ensures U.S. access to American bases in Okinawa for South Korean defense.22 Moreover, Japanese acknowledgement of the Korea Clause affords Seoul bargaining leverage over Tokyo with regard to certain forms of economic aid. The logic behind this leverage is known as the “bulwark of defense” argument. This essentially states that Japan should provide economic aid as a form of ‘‘security rent” to the ROK as the latter bears the burden of undergirding stability on the peninsula and in the region.23

Japan fears of entrapment center on similar issues. An overcommitment to Japan-ROK security ties could lead to an acknowledged dependence on South Korea for Japan’s national defense. In addition, although the region is relatively stable, an overcommitment to Japan-ROK defense ties could actually create a more volatile situation on the peninsula by increasing North Korean fears of encirclement.24

Minimizing these entrapment fears serves two Japanese interests. First, Tokyo avoids becoming vulnerable to the “bulwark of defense” argument and ROK demands for Japanese “security rent.”25 Second, by maintaining the status quo on the peninsula, Japan avoids having to contend with politically difficult domestic issues associated with increased security concerns.26

An analysis of the alliance dynamics in the Japan-ROK relationship would be incomplete without brief consideration of the adversary game. The alliance and adversary games are interconnected. Strategies in one necessarily affect the other.27 In Japan-ROK relations, strategies in the adversary game reinforce the asymmetry of abandonment/entrapment fears in the alliance game. For example, the ROK strategy in the adversary game (vis a vis North Korea) is to “stand firm.” This reinforces abandonment fears regarding Japan as it increases the value that the ROK places on strong support from Japan in opposing the North. On the other hand, Japan’s strategy in the adversary game has been less hard line. An illustrative example of this attitude is the Japanese government’s “equidistance” policy toward Korea. This policy aims to promote relations with the two Koreas rather than siding solely with the regime in the South. In this manner, Japan preserves its own security by maintaining the continued balance of power on the peninsula, which in turn, promotes regional stability. Such a policy reinforces the Japanes entrapment desire to avoid entanglement in strong ties with the ROK.

1972-1974: PERIOD OF FRICTION

Japan-ROK relations, therefore, reflect an asymmetrical structure of [page 48] abandonment and entrapment concerns. According to Hypothesis A, this imbalance should result in friction between the two states. The 1972-1974 period in Japan-ROK relations confirms this. Abandonment fears experienced by members of the Park government caused them to push for closer defense ties with Tokyo; moreover, reciprocity was expected. Despite the relaxation of Cold War tensions in the region occasioned by the rapprochement between the U.S. and China, U.S.-Soviet detente, Japan-China normalization and the opening of North-South Korean dialogue, the Park government persistently pressed Japan to reaffirm its commitment to defend against and isolate the North Korean security threat. For example, Seoul vehemently opposed the expanding volume of Japanese-North Korean trade during this period.28 The South Korean Foreign Ministry also filed numerous protests with the Tanaka government over visits by various Japanese politicians to Pyongyang.29

On the other hand, the Japanese government’s fears of entrapment caused it to show weaker support for strong security ties with its neighbor. In 1972, Prime Minister Sato declared that the 1969 Korea Clause was not to be interpreted as a bilateral defense treaty.30 His successor, Tanaka Kakuei, went one step further and reinterpreted the Korea Clause to read that it was the security of the entire Korean peninsula (not just that of the ROK) that was essential for Japan’s security. This reinterpretation in turn cast doubt on whether Japan would allow American access to the bases in Okinawa for South Korean defense.31 Finally, in August and September 1974, Foreign Minister Kimura Toshio made statements to the effect that the ROK was not necessarily the only legitimate government on the peninsula. In addition, he stated that Japan did not perceive a security threat from the North.32 As explained earlier, these statements were reflective of an “equidistance” policy being implemented by the Tanaka government. This aimed to provide for Japan’s security by maintaining a balance of power between the two Koreas rather than siding solely with the South.

Therefore, during the 1972-1974 period, the asymmetrical structure of abandonment and entrapment concerns caused each state to employ opposite strategies in the game. The natural result was contentious Japan-ROK interaction. Nowhere was this friction arising from the juxtaposition of strategies more apparent than in three major instances of Japan-ROK friction during this period. In August 1973, South Korean intelligence operatives forcibly abducted opposition politician Kim Dae jung from a hotel room in Tokyo and placed him under house arrest in Seoul. In April 1974, the Park government arrested and sentenced two Japanese nationals to 20 years imprisonment in Korea. And in August 1974, Mun Se Kwang, a Korean resident of Japan, attempted[page 49] to assassinate President Park.33 Each of these incidents caused a major breakdown in relations. The two governments recalled their ambassadors during these crises, delayed the 1973 annual joint ministerial conference for four months, and outright cancelled the 1974 ministerial conference. Japanese economic aid to South Korea dramatically dropped during this period, and public protests in both countries over the incidents resulted in the ransacking of each government’s embassy compounds in Seoul and Tokyo.

The underlying conditions that gave rise to this unprecedentedly caustic period in Japan-ROK relations can be traced to asymmetrical abandonment/ entrapment concerns and differing strategies in the alliance and adversary games. At the center of each dispute was the South Korean government’s demand that Japanese authorities monitor and curb political activities in Japan by pro-North Korean groups in Japan aimed at subverting the Park regime. For example, in the Kim Dae Jung incident, the justification for the abduction was Kim’s unrestricted conducting of anti-government activities from Japan. Similarly, the two Japanese nationals were arrested for acting as operatives for the pro-North Korean Chosoren organization in Japan, and for conspiring with radical South Korean student elements. Finally, in the case of Mun Se Kwang，the ROK government vehemently criticized the Japanese government as Mun had received instructions for the assassination from North Korea through elements of the Chosoren in Japan; had entered South Korea posing as a Japanese national; and had killed President Park’s wife with a gun stolen from an Osaka police box.34 These differing attitudes toward the North Korean security threat exacerbated South Korean abandonment fears and caused them to denounce the Japanese government as a “relay station” for North Korean aggression.

1969-1971: PERIOD OF COOPERATION

Instances of Japan-Korea cooperation can also be explained by this theo-retical framework. While Japan and Korea have asymmetrical fears of aban-donment and entrapment with respect to each other, they also share the same or mutual fear of abandonment regarding the U.S. defense commitment to the region. As interviews with current and former policy makers have confirmed, it is in the supreme interests of Tokyo and Seoul to keep the U.S. actively engaged in the region. Without this U.S. presence, the ROK would carry the burden as the primary deterrent force in the region. Japan would also be forced into either massive remilitarization or extreme dependence on the [page 50] ROK for security. Therefore, when this fear is salient—i-e., when Tokyo and Seoul perceive U.S. policies of disengagement from the region—the two governments are more willing to put aside friction arising from conflicting abandonment/ entrapment concerns and show greater cooperation in bilateral relations.

The 1969-1971 period in Japan-Korea relations exhibited such dynamics. The American intention to reduce defense commitments to the region was manifest in several policies. The Guam Doctrine (July 1969) clearly stated that the U.S. would no longer bear the primary defense burden of its Asian allies.36 The Nixon administration followed through on this policy with troop reduction and reorientation programs at bases in Japan as well as a massive drawdown of ground troops in the Vietnam conflict.37 Regarding Korea, in July 1970, the U.S. announced the decision to withdraw the 7th Infantry Division from the peninsula.38 In addition, Washington responded relatively passively to a number of North Korean provocations, most notably the attempted commando raid on the Blue House in January 1968, the seizure of the USS Pueblo in January 1968, and the shooting down of a U.S. EC-121 reconnaissance plane in April 1969.

All of these policies instituted acute fears of U.S. abandonment in Tokyo and Seoul. These concerns prompted both governments to improve bilateral relations. Japan acknowledged a direct security link with the ROK in the 1969 Korea Clause. In addition, Prime Minister Sato agreed to grant the U.S. unconditional access to bases in Okinawa for South Korean defense.39 Japan also extended massive amounts of economic aid to the ROK during this period Termed “positive economic cooperation,” these funds were largely to promote the development of South Korean heavy industry and infrastructure.40 In August 1970, the two governments also agreed on the assignment of a second Japanese defense attache to the ROK. This decision came not only one year ahead of schedule, but also made the ROK the only Asian country with two Japanese attaches.41

Cooperation between the two governments was also exhibited at the annual ministerial conferences during this period. The joint communiques and press conference statements for the 3rd (1969) and 4th (1970) ministerial conferences both stressed the strong defense link between Japan and Korea.42 In addition, the communiques included clauses specifically designating North Korea as a security threat, and jointly opposing U.S. withdrawal from the region. These conferences directly contrast with those that took place during the more contentious 1972-1974 period. For example, the joint communiques and press statements released after the 5th and 6th ministerial conferences[page 51] make no mention of a Japan-ROK defense link, nor did they refer to North Korea as a security threat.43 Moreover, the negotiations over these communiques were marked by contention as the Japanese delegation argued strongly for a clause stating the need for improved Japan-North Korea relations.44

Additional evidence of Japan-Korea cooperation during this period takes the form of “non-events.” This term refers to the absence of friction despite the existence of potentially contentious issues. Research and interviews have found numerous instances of these non-events during the 1969-1971 period; for brevity’s sake, two incidents suffice as clear illustrations. In 1969, protests by political activists in Japan against the unconstitutionality of Park’s bid for a third consecutive presidential term resulted in a storming of the South Korean embassy in Tokyo. In spite of the severity of this act, the South Korean government remained conspicuously silent and deliberately avoided allowing this incident to cloud relations. It neither lodged a protest with the Gaimusho, nor publically denounced the act. Similarly in 1971, South Korean protests against Premier Sato’s scheduled attendance at Park’s inauguration ceremony resulted in substantial damage to the Japanese embassy in Seoul and burning of the Japanese flag. Again, in the interests of maintaining cooperation, the Japanese government did not lodge a protest over the issue.45 This behavior starkly contrasts with the acerbics that followed similar incidents at the two embassies in the 1972-1974 period.46

1975-1979: PERIOD OF COOPERATION

American policies of disengagement from Asia again influenced Japan- ROK state behavior during the 1975-1979 period In particular, the US pull-out from Vietnam, and President Carter’s plan for total troop withdrawal from Korea raised acute concerns in both Tokyo and Seoul about the integrity of U.S. defense commitments. In addition, the large scale Soviet naval exercises (OKEAN) in April 1975 demonstrating the saliency of the Soviet threat, and statements by Secretary Vance in the summer of 1977 affirming U.S. intentions to withdraw from Korea reinforced anxieties about the reliability of America’s future role as the security guarantor in the region.47 These mutually-held fears of US abandonment prompted both states to improve bilateral relations markedly from the less cooperative 1972-1974 period.

For example in 1975, Prime Minister Miki discarded Tanaka’s reinterpre- tation of the Korea Clause, and reaffirmed the importance of South Korean security to Japan. In line with this policy, Miki also confirmed that the U.S. [page 52]

would have access to bases in Okinawa for South Korean defense. In order to promote greater bilateral coordination over security issues, the two governments in 1978 also established a joint consultative defense council; in additio, they began a program of exchange visits among middle-level defense officials.

Both governments also expressed strong opposition to Carter’s plan for troop withdrawal from Korea. In particular, Tokyo officials lobbied adamantly against the plan.48 The Japanese leadership expressed great apprehension through various U.S.-Japan bilateral channels, and urged the Carter Administration to consider a reduction of troops rather than a full-scale withdrawal. To express their opposition, Diet members in 1977 presented Vice President Mondale with an anti-pullout petition. These efforts by the Japanese were particularly appreciated by Seoul officials as South Korea’s lobbying efforts at this time were largely emasculated by revelations regarding the Koreagate scandal.49

CONCLUSION: QUASI-ALLIANCE MODEL FOR JAPAN-ROK RELATIONS

Should research and interviews continue to confirm this argument, this study arrives at a two-step quasi-alliance model for analyzing Japan-Korea relations. The model consists of an “inner core” and an “outer layer.” The inner core is the purely bilateral aspect of the relationship. At this level, the relationship is characterized by asymmetrical abandonment/entrapment concerns and friction (1972-1974 period and Hypothesis A). The outer layer is the multilateral aspect of the relationship. This layer highlights Japan and the ROK’s common alliance with the U.S. At this level, the relationship is characterized by symmetrical abandonment fears and cooperation (Hypothesis B and 1969-1971, 1975-1979 periods). The primary determinant of the relation- snip is the fear of US abandonment. If this fear is high, i.e., perception of a weak U.S. defense commitment, then there is cooperation. If this fear is low, then Japan and the ROK are more likely to allow contentious issues at the “inner core” to dominate their bilateral interaction.

An essential criterion for theoretical models of state behavior is the ability to determine the causal forces that underlie foreign policy outcomes. In this manner, models of International Relations (IR) theory aim to explain systematically, rather than historically describe, the policies of nation-states.50 In analyzing the causes of conflict and cooperation in Japan-Korea relations from 1969 to 1979, this model has attempted to fulfill such criteria. It has [page 53] deliberately avoided a historical chronology of the relationship; instead, it has drawn attention to the underlying structure of the Japan-ROK bilateral relatio- ship, as well as the role of the U.S., as key causal variables in explaining Japan-ROK interaction. While not denying the importance of the history that has passed between the two nations and the emotionalism that continues to plague interaction, it does challenge the view that such variables are the sole determinant of Japan-ROK behavior This quasi-alliance model does not profess to explain each and every idiosyncratic wrinkle in Japan-ROK state behavior，but as a systematic, generalizable model that makes a theoretical first-cut at analyzing foreign policy outcomes in the relationship, it might prove useful.
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