The Korean-American Alliance and the "Rise of China": A Preliminary Assessment of Perceptual Changes and Strategic Choices

Jae Ho Chung

February 1999

About the Author

Jae Ho Chung is assistant professor of international relations at Seoul National University, Korea. After receiving his Ph.D. in political science from the University of Michigan, Chung taught at the Hong Kong University of Science and Technology during 1993–96. He is currently a foundation fellow and member of the international advisory board of the Centre for Research on Provincial China (Sydney) and editorial committee member of *Provincial China* (Sydney) and *China Perspectives* (Hong Kong). He is the author and editor of five books, including *Interpreting Implementation* (Oxford University Press, forthcoming), *Cities in China* (Routledge, 1999), and *Provincial Strategies of Economic Reform in Post-Mao China* (M.E. Sharpe, 1998). He is currently working on two books on Korea–China relations and the regionalization of property rights in China's civil aviation industry.

Acknowledgments

I would like to express my gratitude to Youngsun Ha, Takashi Inoguchi, Taeho Kim, Michel Oksenberg, Wu Xinbo, and Young-kwan Yoon for their constructive comments on earlier versions. Thanks are also due to twenty interviewees who shared with me their knowledge and perceptions of the United States and China. The laborious assistance of Chul Hyun Park as the second coder is also duly acknowledged.

The Korean-American Alliance and the "Rise of China": A Preliminary Assessment of Perceptual Changes and Strategic Choices

> *"The priority order of Chosun's external strategy should first be to side with China, second to align with Japan, and then to connect with America."*—Huang Zunxian (1880)[1]

> *"China has moved to cultivate close relations with the government in Seoul—perhaps in anticipation of an eventual United States withdrawal....The United States must make special efforts to sustain its close alliance ties to South Korea."*—Zbigniew Brzezinski et al. (1996)[2]

Does history repeat itself? It appears so for Korea as an unfortunate geopolitical pawn of its stronger neighbors for the last century or so. History does not seem to repeat in quite the same way, however. As Chinese diplomat Huang Zunxian recommended in 1880 that Chosun (Korea's official designation during the Yi Dynasty) "side with the Qing" (*qinzhong*) while relegating the relative importance of Japan and the United States to the levels of "aligning and connecting" (*jieri and lianmei*), respectively, Korea remained for the most part the most loyal subsystem of the Sinic world order, thereby missing out on opportunities for self-strengthening and realignment and eventually becoming a Japanese colony. More than a hundred years later, the Republic of Korea (hereafter Korea) may now be about to confront a similar dilemma, but this time with a reversed order of preferences. That is to say, the rise of China, with which Korea has already accomplished diplomatic normalization, may gradually force the Seoul government to reconfigure its Cold War–based strategic thinking and reassess its half-century alliance relationship with the United States.

The Korean-American alliance relationship has been sustained for the last half century, albeit with the occasional ebbs and flows expected of a "tight alliance" between two states with markedly different capabilities, and the majority of studies and reports on the alliance

over the years have determined that Korea's alliance with the United States has largely been stable and desirable and will most likely remain durable for a long time to come.[3] If the "post–Cold War" discourses of the 1990s constitute anything more than a habitual cliché, the peculiar absence of concrete efforts on the part of the Korean government to reassess its alliance relationship in tandem with the changing strategic environments of Northeast Asia begs to be addressed. Furthermore, almost all of the discussions in Korea concerning the "rise of China" and its regional ramifications, of which there have so far been very few, have exclusively adopted the perspectives of U.S.-China relations, devoid of Korea's own assessments and prescriptions.[4]

This study does not address what constitutes the Korean-American alliance and how it has evolved over time.[5] Instead, it constructs inside-out pictures of the alliance relationship by decoding the Korean perceptions of the United States, Seoul–Washington relations, and China as an increasingly crucial intervening variable, and by exploring Korean prescriptions for its security maintenance in the changing strategic environments of Northeast Asia. Specifically, this study tackles two questions. First, if we flip the notion that the Korean-American alliance will remain durable—i.e., if it should become problematic in the future—where will the problems come from and where should troubleshooting efforts be focused? This seems an indispensable question if Seoul and Washington are to sustain long-term strategic cooperation rooted in the principles of mutual benefit and reciprocity beyond mere rhetoric. Second, for the first time in this century, Korea might have found a widened window of meaningful opportunities to create some breathing space of its own by forming partnerships of economic, diplomatic, and even military cooperation with countries other than the Cold War allies the United States and Japan. Given that Korea was traditionally—for over two millennia—inseparable from China in geopolitical, cultural, and economic terms and that China may be at loggerheads with the United States, how the "China factor" will fit into the future Korean-American alliance is a critical question. Will "strategic bifurcation" become a serious possibility for Korea in the future? If so, what factors would propel it? And if not, what would be the likely constraints?

This paper consists of five sections. The first presents some theoretical observations concerning alliance maintenance in terms of perceptions, costs, and flexibility; an overview of Korea's relations with China as an increasingly crucial intervening variable in the Korean-American alliance; and the research design adopted in this study. The second section delineates the Korean public perceptions of the bilateral alliance with the United States and of China as manifested in nationwide opinion surveys for 1988–97. The third decodes the perceptions of the Korean media toward the United States and China by way of content analyses of the editorials of two major newspapers, *Chosun Ilbo* (Chosun Daily) and *Hankyoreh* (Hankyoreh News), for 1990–97. The fourth, based on interviews, provides a sketch of how opinion leaders—government officials, journalists, and academic experts—view Korea's alliance relationship with the United States in the context of the "rise of China," and of what they prescribe to be Korea's future strategic options. The final section explores the intricate issues of the Korean government's perceptual inertia, IMF-induced structural constraints, and uncertainties surrounding China as crucial factors that would sustain the Korean-American alliance relationship.

Alliance Maintenance, Perceptions, and Strategic Choices: Theory, Context, and Research Design

The general literature on alliance disproportionately focuses on its formation at the expense of pertinent discussions of alliance maintenance. Moreover, the majority of studies deal with alliances among great powers, lending little help to the understanding of alliances between states with markedly different capabilities. Since this study is not concerned with the origins of the Korean-American alliance, the "primary alliance dilemma" of whether or not to ally is beyond its purview. On the other hand, the "secondary alliance dilemma"—i.e., how firmly to commit oneself to the alliance partner—constitutes a crucial question. Generally speaking, Korea's postwar strategic environment and economic conditions had been such that it had few options but to choose and maintain a preference for "external balancing" (allying with the United States) as opposed to "internal balancing" (arming). As a result, Korea's strategic and military dependence on the United States increased dramatically but the autonomy costs of the alliance were deemed largely inevitable or acceptable given the tense military confrontation on the Peninsula.[6]

Korea did not remain simply a loyal "client" of the United States. Even during the Cold War era, as the Korean economy grew at an extraordinary pace, the Seoul government often tried to transform itself into an "agent" with more discretion and issue-based roles commensurate with its enhanced power.[7] Yet such efforts proved largely futile due not only to the structural constraints inherent in the asymmetric alliance but also to the clear and present danger emanating from North Korea. The "legitimacy debts" of the successive authoritarian regimes in Korea also contributed to the perceptual inertia that the costs of dependency were largely expendable so long as the ultimate security objectives could be accomplished. Furthermore, the consolidation of the military ties continually reinforced the politico-economic influence of the United States over Korea.[8]

Much of the durability of the Korean-American alliance has been attributed to the "vivid memories" of U.S. support during the Korean War and afterwards. With the passing of the older generations, however, those fond memories may be fading fast. Instead, unpleasant recollections may surface that cast doubts on U.S. intentions for and commitment to Korea. In the Cold War era, its military confrontation with the North and domestic preoccupation with economic development were such that Korea was rarely willing or able to ponder the alternatives of arms and realignment or the alliance-induced autonomy costs. In the post–Cold War context, however, more possibilities and options may become available to compound the Korean-American alliance dynamics. Most importantly, Korea's geographical exposure to an ascending, possibly "revisionist," power (i.e., China) may provide it with an inevitable opportunity to reassess its strategic position.[9]

Since the post–Cold War environment generally provides a context in which additional alternatives may become available for realignment, strategic interests may vary among the alliance partners. Furthermore, the "integrative spiral," in which allies move progressively closer out of their mutual fear of abandonment, may also get broken.[10] With Korea's near-complete democratization, its government no longer faces the problem of "omnibalancing" typical of Third World alliances. With little internal threat to regime stability, the Seoul government in theory can focus more explicitly on "external balancing."[11] A critical question remains as to whether the strategic judgments of Korean leaders should and could break out of the Cold War perceptual inertia. By simple logic, a strong commitment not only forecloses

one's own options of realignment but also tends to solidify the adversary alliance by increasing the level of potential threat to it.[12]

Normally, the alliance-induced risks of abandonment and entrapment vary inversely.[13] In the case of the Korean-American alliance, however, such an inverse relationship may not necessarily hold for its post–Cold War context. That is to say, as the weight of the Korean-American alliance gradually shifts from defending Korea to supporting the United States–Japan division of security responsibilities in East Asia—possibly against China—Seoul's risks of abandonment (i.e., the United States abandoning Korea's primary strategic interests for the sake of reducing its own burden by enhancing Japan's regional strategic position) and of entrapment (i.e., Korea being sucked into a United States–Japan alliance possibly against China) may become positively correlated.[14]

Regarding the post-unification phase, the continuation of the Korea–United States alliance has been preferred by both sides, though with some modifications in force structure and deployment. Yet, the projected transformation of the Korean-American alliance from a "robust peninsular alliance" against North Korea to a "regional security alliance" for the maintenance of regional stability poses an unavoidable question.[15] Given that alliances are "formal associations of states for the use of military force...against specific other states, whether or not these other states are explicitly specified," against whom is the new Korean-American alliance as a regional security alliance to be poised?[16] If China should become its potential target, where should Korea stand? In order to avoid the "bad" and "ugly" consequences of the tight alliance, it seems, the Seoul government must closely scrutinize the levels and contingencies of Korea's future commitment to the bilateral alliance with the United States.[17]

The ever-expanding relations between Seoul and Beijing compound the question. Since Korean-Chinese economic exchanges began in the late 1970s, the size of the bilateral trade has increased 1,249 times in eighteen years from US$19 million in 1979 to US$23.7 billion in 1997. The pace at which the Korean-Chinese trade has expanded is extraordinary since it took thirty-two years (1955–87) for the Korean–United States trade to reach a comparable level. That much of the expansion had already occurred prior to the 1992 diplomatic normalization further highlights the special nature of the bilateral relationship. By 1997, Korea and China became the third largest trade partner for each other after only the United States and Japan.[18] Additionally, Koreans seem to regard Korea's trade with China as much more fair than Korea's trade with the United States.[19]

In terms of capital investment, Korea's investment in the United States, with an accumulated total of US$4.7 billion, far exceeds that in China, at US$3.4 billion.[20] In spite of the gap, which seems rather small given the amount of time available for Korea to invest in China, China has already become the second largest recipient of Korean investment. In 1997, about six hundred thousand Koreans visited China and roughly a hundred thousand Chinese visited Korea. As of 1997, 1,439 Korean corporate offices were stationed in China. Also, as of 1997, over 35,000 Koreans were long-term residents in China, which included about 10,000 students. Considering that educational exchanges were officially permitted only in 1993, the number of Korean students in China rose dramatically in just four years.[21] Furthermore, almost two million Korean-Chinese (*chaoxianzu*)—the only national minority group in China that has an independent state neighboring China—provides another source of strong emotional attachment.

In sum, with the ending of the Cold War at the global and regional levels—although the resilience of North Korea prohibits the diffusion of the full post–Cold War logic—Korea's strategic environments have changed and will continue to evolve. While North Korea's nuclear

threat has helped to sustain the Cold War alliance pattern during much of the 1990s, it may become necessary to reassess Korea's future alignment posture if we accept that the strategic environments in Northeast Asia will continue to change with the "rise of China" and that Korea's strategic interests may diverge from those of the United States. Particularly, the "Japan question"—what it will become and how its relationship with the United States will evolve vis-à-vis China—is a critical variable to consider.[22]

Rather than speculating on the future of the Korean-American alliance, the configurations of which remains opaque, this study instead focuses on the Korean perceptions of the United States and China. Two questions are pertinent: (1) How do Koreans view the Korean-American alliance? and (2) How do they perceive China as possibly the most critical variable that will condition the future bilateral alliance between Korea and the United States? Whether Korea opts for the maintenance of the status quo or chooses to realign itself, how can that critical choice be explained and justified on perceptual grounds? Perceptual changes may not necessarily be translated immediately into policy reversal, but perceptions do often work as a crucial propellant or restraint for foreign-policy restructuring.

Perceptions should be decoded as carefully as possible to enhance their representativeness and to allow replication of the procedures involved. One methodological issue concerns whose perceptions to decode. Foreign policies are formulated by the government very often independently of societal perceptions and opinions. This does not necessarily mean that societal perceptions and opinions do not matter, however. Whether and to what extent foreign-policy making should accommodate popular perceptions is a normative question. Nevertheless, it seems essential to explore the "climate of popular perceptions" which may operate as a constraint or a catalyst for foreign-policy changes.[23]

If public perceptions and opinions constitute the "outer circle" of the foreign-policy determinants, the "inner circle" consists of the government officials in charge of foreign-policy making as well as nongovernmental experts and advisors in close affiliation with the state apparatus. While the "inner circle" would normally be composed of politicians, bureaucracies, and various institutional and informal linkages among them, here the concept is operationalized more broadly as the elite grouping consisting of government officials in state bureaucracies, influential journalists, and academic experts linked with the government.[24] An additional concept, the "middle circle," is utilized also, which links the "inner" and "outer" circles. The "middle circle" refers in this study to the media, which work as the two-way transmission belt between the government and the society at large. Since meanings are exchanged by the government and society through the media, examining how the media perceive foreign-policy issues seems an endeavor both worthwhile and interesting for this study.[25]

Another methodological issue concerns how to identify and measure the perceptions held by each of these three circles. First, as for the perceptions of the "outer circle," a dozen nationwide public-opinion surveys conducted by academic and public research institutions were utilized. Second, as for the foreign-policy discourses reflected in the "middle circle" of the media, rigorous content analyses of the United States- and China-related editorials in *Chosun Daily* and *Hankyoreh News* were conducted to see whether and how their views of the United States and China diverge or converge.[26] Third, in order to chart the strategic perceptions and prescriptions of the "inner circle," select government officials, journalists, and academic experts were interviewed with structured questionnaires regarding how they would assess the Korean-American alliance and the China variable.[27]

Perceiving the Korean-American Alliance and the "Rise of China": Views from the Grassroots

The formation and sustenance of alliances are foreign-policy decisions that more often than not are made without due regard for popular perceptions and societal consensus. The Korean-American alliance was formed and maintained on the basis of situational urgency and mutual need during the Cold War era. Alliances, however, often generate serious problems of penetration and dependency which provoke resentment among the citizens of the weaker partner. Anti-Americanism, one crucial derivative of asymmetric alliances, was not unique to Korea but ubiquitous in a wide variety of countries dependent on U.S. protection and assistance.[28] Of particular interest is the trend, shown below, that the Korean-American relationship and the bilateral alliance may be gradually losing its "special" meaning among Koreans.

The Institute of Population and Development (IPD) of Seoul National University conducted nationwide opinion surveys in 1989, 1990, and 1993 in cooperation for the first two years with the Korea Broadcasting System (KBS) and for the third with the Seoul Broadcasting System (SBS). These surveys (hereafter IPD survey) asked the respondents how positively or negatively they felt toward the United States, China, Japan, and Russia.[29] Survey results concerning the United States and China, presented in Table 1, suggest that a pro-American stance was no longer dominant among Koreans and that an increasingly large number of Koreans felt positively toward China.[30]

Table 1. Attitudes toward the U.S. and China, 1989–90 (%)

	very positively	positively	neutral	negatively	very negatively
Toward US					
1989	6.8	29.9	29.7	26.3	7.2
1990	7.8	30.9	31.6	23.8	5.8
Toward China					
1989	4.7	28.4	42.6	19.5	4.4
1990	4.2	32.5	40.6	19.5	2.9

Source: 1989 IPD survey, pp. 66–67, and 1990 IPD survey, p. 48.
Note: The balance stands for no responses.

According to Table 1, for both 1989 and 1990, the gap between those feeling positively about the United States (36.7 percent and 38.7 percent) and those feeling positively about China (33.1 percent and 36.7 percent) is rather small. On the other hand, the difference between those feeling negatively about the United States (33.5 percent and 29.6 percent) and those feeling negatively about China (23.9 percent and 22.4 percent) is much larger. If we put these figures into the context that, at the time of these surveys, Korea had not yet normalized its diplomatic relationship with China, it seems that certain perceptual undercurrents were already shared among Koreans with regard to China.[31] If we break down the figures in Table

1 into age groups, we find interesting aspects of Korean popular perceptions toward the United States and China.

Table 2. Attitudes toward the U.S. by Age Group 1989–90 (%)

	20s	30s	40s	50s and older
positive	28.2/29.5	30.0/34.1	44.3/47.8	54.2/48.6
neutral	26.8/27.3	33.5/33.1	32.1/30.8	26.2/35.9
negative	44.9/43.2	36.5/32.6	23.6/21.4	19.7/15.3

Sources: 1989 IPD survey, p. 153, and 1990 IPD survey, p. 181
Notes: The figures on the right of slash refer to those of 1989 and those on the left to those of 1990. The balance stands for no responses.

Table 3. Attitudes toward China by Age Group 1989–90 (%)

	20s	30s	40s	50s and older
positive	43.9/46.3	31.6/36.6	28.9/33.8	22.3/26.8
neutral	36.1/35.7	45.2/37.8	41.6/44.8	51.4/46.6
negative	20.0/17.7	23.3/25.1	29.5/21.0	26.3/26.4

Sources: IPD survey 1989, p. 153, and IPD survey 1990, p. 184.
Notes: The figures on the right of slash refer to those of 1989 and those on the left to those of 1990. The balance stands for no responses.

According to Tables 2 and 3, favorable perceptions of the United States by Koreans are positively correlated with age, while those toward China are inversely correlated. Those with more immediate experiences and memories of the Korean War (in which China had participated as an adversary) and the Cold War expressed more affinity toward the United States, while the younger generations tended to feel more negatively toward the United States and more hopeful about China. What merits our attention is that the size of variation among the different age groups with negative perceptions toward the United States was large (see the bottom row in Table 2)—the standard deviations are 11.7 and 12.3 for means of 31.2 and 28.1 for 1989 and 1990, respectively. On the other hand, the size of variation among the different age groups with negative perceptions toward China (see the bottom row in Table 3) was very small, with standard deviations of only 4.1 and 4.0 for the lower means of 24.9 and 22.6. In other words, unlike the negative perceptions toward the United States which varied inversely with age and, therefore, cast a shadow over the future, Koreans' negative perceptions toward China remained relatively much lower and more consistent among the different age groups.

The above observation was confirmed by the 1993 IPD survey, which asked Koreans which of nine countries and country groupings (e.g., EU and ASEAN) they thought Korea should cooperate most with in the twenty-first century. The United States was rated the highest, with 36.6 percent, closely followed by China, with 32.8 percent.[32] While similar to the 1989–90 survey findings the selection of the United States as the highest-ranked partner was positively correlated with age, the selection of China was hardly age-related with the exception of those in their fifties or older (see Table 4). Three years later, the Ministry of Information conducted a nationwide opinion survey (hereafter the MOI survey) asking to which country Korea would become closest in ten years.[33] In this survey, 46.9 percent of the respondents chose China, while only 24.2 percent selected the United States. Here, too, the selection of the United States as the closest future partner was positively correlated with age, while the choice of China was hardly related to it (see Table 5).

Table 4. Choice of Cooperative Partner for the 21st Century by Age Group (1993)

	chose US	chose China
20s	22.8%	34.8%
30s	36.4%	34.4%
40s	39.0%	36.4%
50s and older	54.8%	27.7%

Source: 1993 IPD survey, p. 158.

Table 5. Closest Partner for 2006 by Age Group (1996)

	chose US	chose China
20s	19.3%	46.6%
30s	21.3%	50.4%
40s	26.5%	50.2%
50s and older	32.1%	41.0%

Source: 1996 MOI survey, p. 354.

The Sejong Institute has conducted three annual nationwide opinion surveys since 1995.[34] These surveys (hereafter Sejong survey) produced some interesting results with reference to more recent popular attitudes toward the United States and China. Table 6 presents Korean perceptions of the four major powers as potential security threats. Russia was viewed as the least threatening, while Japan was seen as the most threatening. While the second most threatening country was China in the 1995 survey, it was replaced by the United States in the 1997 survey. These findings seem to contradict the answers to a question concerning the importance of the four powers in the promotion of Korea's interests (see Table 7). Regarding Japan, popular perceptions were consistent in that it was regarded as the most threatening to Korea's security and, therefore, its role in the promotion of Korea's interests was considered minimal (though deemed more important than Russia).[35] China, on the other hand, was regarded as much less threatening than Japan and the United States and capable of perform-

ing a significant role in promoting Korea's interests. Concerning the United States, however, popular perceptions were ambivalent and contradictory in that the role of the United States was the most highly valued in the promotion of Korea's interests but, at the same time, it was also viewed as a crucial source of security threat second only to Japan.[36]

Table 6. Attitudes toward Major Powers (I) (%)

(Which country do you feel is most threatening to Korea's security?)

	US	China	Japan	Russia
1995	15.3	23.9	53.1	7.7
1997*	16.1	8.1	26.7	2.9

Source: 1995 Sejong survey, p. 78; and 1997 Sejong survey, p. 11.
* The 1997 survey provided five scales (very threatening, fairly threatening, average, not so threatening, and no threat at all) and the figures represent those for "very threatening."

Table 7. Attitudes toward Major Powers (II) (%)

(Which country do you think is most important in the promotion of Korea's interests?)

	US	China	Japan	Russia
1995	26.9	24.3	15.7	10.3
1996	20.5	17.1	10.2	9.3
1997	41.1	33.8	21.0	14.6

Source: 1995 Sejong survey, p. 81; 1996 survey, p. 59; and 1997 survey, p. 11.

Public attitudes toward what needs to be done in Korea's relations with the four powers also demonstrate that the United States is not necessarily viewed most positively (see Table 8). Nearly 9 percent of the respondents in the 1997 survey recommended that Korea weaken its relationship with the United States, while the comparable figure for China was a mere 1.3 percent. Thirty-one percent called for the strengthening of Korea–United States relations, while those advocating further consolidation of Korea–China relations reached 56 percent. There seems to be a trend emerging in the populace of higher priority being assigned to new neighbors like China as opposed to the United States and Japan.[37]

Table 8. Recommendations for Future Relations with Major Powers (%)

	weaken relationship	maintain status quo	strengthen relationship	no opinion
with US	8.7	59.9	30.7	0.7
with China	1.3	41.9	55.6	1.1
with Japan	11.1	62.8	25.3	0.9
with Russia	2.9	49.3	45.2	2.6

Source: 1997 Sejong survey, p. 12.

Despite the relatively declining popularity of the United States among Koreans, the public attitudes toward the necessity of the stationing of the U.S. forces have gradually become more positive, as illustrated in Table 9. While 74.5 percent of the respondents in the 1988 IPD survey preferred the withdrawal of the United States forces sooner or later, the comparable figure gradually but seemingly irreversibly dropped to 60.2 percent in 1990, 51.5 percent in 1995, and 37.4 percent in 1997.[38] Whether the decline reflects the heightened security concerns generated by the North Korean nuclear crisis in the first half of the 1990s remains uncertain. It may be speculated that the Korean attitudes toward the United States may have become more "pragmatic" in that the Koreans might have begun to differentiate perceptual dispositions from their practical needs.

Table 9. Attitudes toward the U.S. Forces in Korea (%)

	for early withdrawal	gradual withdrawal	maintain status quo	further reinforcement	no opinion
1988*	10.0	64.5	25.1	--	.4
1989*	9.8	61.7	28.2	--	.3
1990*	12.0	48.2	38.9	--	.9
1995**	5.9	45.6	36.8	4.7	6.9
1996**	4.8	41.6	38.7	7.3	7.6
1997**	2.9	34.5	49.1	8.9	4.6

Source: 1989 IPD survey, p. 70; 1990 IPD survey, p. 49; 1995 Sejong survey, p. 68; 1996 Sejong survey, p. 56; and 1997 Sejong survey, p. 9. The 1993 IPD survey did not ask the question about the US forces.

Notes: *denotes the IPD survey series which did not have the "status quo" or "reinforcement" categories. Therefore, the figures for "withdrawal unacceptable" were listed under "status quo."

**denotes the Sejong survey series.

Where does the populace assign highest priority in terms of Korea's foreign-policy goals? The 1997 Sejong survey listed eleven goals on its questionnaire. Among the top four choices, three were economic goals—the expansion of export markets (69.8 percent of the respondents), global environmental protection (55 percent), and securing a stable overseas energy supply (52.4 percent)—and the remainder was the maintenance of peace on the Korean Peninsula (64.2 percent). Concerning the military-related goals, the highest priority was given to the prevention of militarization by Japan (51.2 percent), followed by a self-reliant defense for Korea (50.7 percent) and an expanded role at the United Nations for Korea (36.1 percent). As shown in Table 10, preventing Japanese militarization was viewed as much more crucial than checking the rise of China (34.4 percent). Most interesting is the popular aspiration for a self-reliant Korean defense, the priority assigned to which closely corresponded to that for the prevention of Japanese militarization.

Table 10. Prioritizing Korea's Foreign-Policy Goals (%)

	not important at all	not so important	fairly important	very important	no opinion
preventing Japan's militarization	0.6	5.7	39.9	51.2	2.6
self-reliant defense	0.5	7.6	38.9	50.7	2.3
checking the rise of China	0.4	8.7	53.5	34.4	3.1

Source: 1997 Sejong survey, p. 12.

In sum, the following observations can be offered. First, Korean perceptions of the United States have generally deteriorated over the years. The age-based dispositions toward the United States suggest that Korean memories of American "benevolence" are slowly fading away with the passing of the older generations. This posits a crucial question as to what the United States can do to improve its image. Second, despite the generally declining popularity of the United States, the importance of its forces stationed in Korea continues to be recognized. This reveals the most intricate dimension of the Korean-American alliance relationship: the Koreans seem to hold a dual view in that they regard the United States as increasingly threatening to their autonomy and integration but nevertheless recognize the indispensability of U.S.-provided protection. A logical question would then be under what circumstances this perceived indispensability would be severely tested. One possibility concerns the post-unification arrangement. According to a 1995 survey, 65.1 percent of the respondents said that a unified Korea would not need the U.S. forces.[39] Another possibility concerns China as a reliable partner for not only economic but strategic cooperation as well.[40] China's rapidly improving image in Korea, despite (or because of) the limited range of contact in security-related areas, may reinforce the hopeful expectations that China will be potentially more reciprocal and appreciative of mutual cooperation than the "ever-imposing" United States. The age-indiscriminate distribution of positive attitudes toward China renders further support for this observation.[41] Still another possibility concerns the contingency that an expanded military-strategic role will be created for Japan by itself or by the United States. Given the Korean public's constant concern with Japan's militarization, such a contingency will invariably draw Korea closer to China.[42]

All of these possibilities would make sense only if the Korean government should become willing and able to accommodate the essence of what the populace feels about these issues. Of course, whether and to what extent popular perceptions should be reflected in foreign-policy making are normative questions with no simple answers.[43] It is possible that the Korean government may continue to assume, rightly or wrongly, that public opinion will follow the direction in which it is steered by the media in close cooperation with the regime in power. In the future, however, there is ample possibility that popular perceptions may increasingly differ from the government's policy priorities toward the United States and China.[44]

Assessing the United States and China: Perceptions of the Media

In order to examine attitudes of the Korean media, two newspapers were selected: *Chosun Daily*, widely viewed as representing "conservative" views, and *Hankyoreh News*, well known to assume "progressive" stances. The core assumption is that the conservative *Chosun* is status-quo oriented and therefore would view the Korean-American alliance more positively and the "rise of China" as destabilizing. On the other hand, the progressive *Hankyoreh* is viewed as change-oriented and therefore would be more critical of the Korean-American alliance and more open to alternative strategic thinking. A total of 302 United States–related editorials and 129 China-related editorials for the period 1990–97 were content analyzed by two coders. This exercise was designed to discern to what extent the editorials' coverage of and perspectives on the United States and China diverge.[45]

Media Perceptions of the United States and the Korean-American Alliance

Three subject categories were established for the codification of the United States–related editorials: (A) United States in Northeast Asia/United States and multilateralism; (B) United States and North Korea; and (C) United States and South Korea. Each of these three categories was further divided into several subcategories. The distribution of 302 editorials among sixteen subcategories is shown in Table 11.

Table 11. Distribution of U.S.-Related Editorials by Subject Category

Categories	Chosun	Hankyoreh
A-a	29	5
A-b	6	3
B-a	20	22
B-b	5	3
B-c	5	0
B-d	7	1
C-a	2	14
C-b	1	5
C-c	12	6
C-d	4	3
C-e	6	5
C-f	4	17
C-g	3	7
C-h	27	39
C-i	2	2
C-j	19	18
Total	152	150

There are seven issue areas on which at least one newspaper produced more than ten editorials (A-a, B-a, C-a, C-c, C-f, C-h and C-j). The two newspapers demonstrated stark disparities in their coverage of four of these seven issue areas. Regarding the U.S. role in the security of Northeast Asia and the Korean Peninsula (A-a), *Chosun* produced twenty-nine editorials while *Hankyoreh* published only five. It seems that the former highly valued the

role of the United States and its military forces in the maintenance of regional security, while the latter placed more stress on self-reliant defense and conflict resolution between the two Koreas.[46] Concerning the Status of Forces Agreement (SOFA; C-a), *Hankyoreh* produced fourteen critical editorials while *Chosun* published only two. It seems logical that *Chosun*, which regarded the Korean-American alliance as indispensable, had fewer quarrels with the SOFA. As for defense burden sharing (C-c), *Chosun* produced more editorials than *Hankyoreh*, directly reflecting the government's concern. Regarding food and agricultural imports from the United States (C-f), *Hankyoreh* was much more vocal with seventeen editorials to *Chosun*'s four.

Table 12. Directional Codification for Commonly Sensitive Issues

	B-a	C-h	C-j
Chosun	X: a^1: 6/1/0 (n=7) a^2: 2/4/3 (n=9) a^3: 1/3/0 (n=4) Y: a^1: 6/1/0 a^2: 4/1/4 a^3: 0/4/0	X: 15/11/1/0 (n=27) Y: 10/14/3/0	X: 15/3/1/0 (n=19) Y: 11/7/1/0
Hankyoreh	X: a^1: 6/4/0 (n=10) a^2: 0/0/6 (n=6) a^3: 0/0/6 (n=6) Y: a^1: 3/7/0 a^2: 0/0/6 a^3: 0/0/6	X: 39/0/0/0 (n=39) Y: 36/3/0/0	X: 18/0/0/0 (n=18) Y: 16/2/0/0
C.R. (C/H)	--	.81/.92	.79/.89

Note: X and Y refer to the first and second coder, respectively.

The two newspapers devoted a similar degree of coverage (see Table 12) to the remaining three issue areas: the U.S. policy toward and role in the prevention of North Korea's nuclearization (B-a), the U.S. pressures to open Korea's markets (C-h), and the U.S. interference with Korea's foreign and domestic policy (C-j). The B-a issue was further divided into B-a^1, B-a^2, and B-a^3. Regarding B-a^1, both newspapers held that it was necessary to hold on to the principle of denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula. Concerning B-a^2, some critical differences were revealed. While *Chosun* was willing to consider a variety of options, including military strikes, to prevent the North's nuclearization—quite in line with the U.S. positions over time—*Hankyoreh* was highly consistent in opposing non-diplomatic measures against the North. Similarly, regarding B-a^3, *Chosun* was open to the option of relying on foreign powers to resolve the crisis while *Hankyoreh* maintained that the issue should be resolved by the two Koreas themselves.

The remaining two columns in Table 12—C-h and C-j—indicate that the two newspapers were almost unanimously critical of the U.S. pressure to open Korean markets and of U.S. interference with Korea's domestic and foreign policy. Given the high coding reliability coefficients for both categories, the editorials of *Chosun* and *Hankyoreh* were very critical, although *Hankyoreh* was much more so than *Chosun*. If we accept that the economic, political, and diplomatic relationships are crucial underpinnings of the bilateral alliance, then these are the issue areas on which future troubleshooting efforts should perhaps be concentrated.

In four (A-a, C-a, C-c, and C-f) of the seven issue areas on which at least one newspaper produced more than ten editorials, the two newspapers demonstrated significant disparities in their coverage (Table 13). Regarding A-a, *Chosun* devoted twenty-nine editorials of which more than twenty assessed the role of the United States in the maintenance of security in the region very or fairly positively. On the other hand, *Hankyoreh* produced only five editorials, all of which viewed the U.S. role negatively. As for the three remaining issue areas, despite the significantly unequal coverage both newspapers were critical of the SOFA, the defense burden-sharing arrangement, and agricultural imports from the United States.[47] The codification results show that *Hankyoreh* was much more critical than *Chosun* regardless of the number of editorials produced on the respective issues.[48]

Table 13. Directional Codification for Issues with Differing Coverage

	A-a	C-a	C-c	C-f
Chosun	X: 10/12/6/1 (n=29) Y: 11/13/4/1	X: 0/2/0/0 (n=2) Y: 0/2/0/0	X: 1/2/9 (n=12) Y: 2/1/9	X: 0/0/4 (n=4) Y: 0/0/4
Hankyoreh	X: 0/0/4/1 (n=5) Y: 0/0/4/1	X: 13/1/0/0 (n=14) Y: 9/5/0/0	X: 0/0/6 (n=6) Y: 0/0/6	X: 0/0/17 (n=17) Y: 0/0/17
C.R. (C/H)	.62/1.0	1.0/.71	.92/1.0	1.0/1.0

Three additional issue areas deserve mention despite the fact that neither newspaper published more than ten editorials on any of them. They are C-b (U.S. military bases in Korea), C-d (transfer of operational control), and C-e (arms purchases from the United States). As Table 14 illustrates, both newspapers produced all critical editorials regarding the rights and use of U.S. military bases in Korea. Concerning the current division of operational control, *Chosun*'s editorials displayed mixed assessments while *Hankyoreh*'s all regarded it to be insufficient from the Korean perspective. Similarly, with regard to Korea's purchase of U.S.-made weapons, *Chosun* displayed mixed attitudes while *Hankyoreh* was predominantly critical of the highly dependent and concentrated nature of Korea's weapon purchases.

Overall, the codification results generally confirm the prior expectations that *Chosun Daily*, as a status-quo-oriented newspaper, would view the United States and the Korean-American alliance more positively than the progressive *Hankyoreh News*, which clearly was much more critical of the U.S. role and of various facets of the Korean-American alliance. Two issues seem pertinent. First, *Chosun* seems to base its assessment of the Korean-American relation-

Table 14. Directional Codification for Issues with Limited Coverage

	C-b	C-d	C-e
Chosun	X: 1/0/0/0 (n=1) Y: 0/1/0/0	X: 0/2/2/0 (n=4) Y: 0/3/1/0	X: 2/2/2 (n=6) Y: 1/3/2
Hankyoreh	X: 4/1/0/0 (n=5) Y: 4/1/0/0	X: 0/0/1/2 (n=3) Y: 0/0/3/0	X: 4/1/0 (n=5) Y: 4/1/0
C.R. (C/H)	0/1.0	.75/.33	.83/1.0

ship solely on the inter-Korean dynamics, about which it holds the pessimistic view that Pyongyang will not voluntarily respond to the "carrot-based" strategy and change its anti-South posture. Therefore, it is necessary to maintain a hawkish position against the North and view positively the role of the United States in resolving the Korean question.[49] On the other hand, *Hankyoreh* (literally "one nation") stresses the necessity and feasibility of cooperating with the North by marginalizing the role of foreign powers, including the United States. Second, the circulation of the papers differs rather significantly, with 2.3 million for *Chosun* and .4 million for *Hankyoreh* as of 1997. How to interpret this gap is an intricate question. One possibility is simultaneous readership—given the very short history of *Hankyoreh* (founded in 1988), many may read both at the office although they may not subscribe to *Hankyoreh* at home. Another possibility is that the public believes *Chosun* to reflect government policies and positions more accurately than *Hankyoreh*, viewed to be generally critical of government policy. Given the high value of accurate information about government policy, commercial subscription is naturally higher for *Chosun*.[50] If we accept that government policy can and often does differ significantly from societal perceptions, American Korea-watchers should not overlook the wide range of perceptions and opinions available in different Korean newspapers.

Media Perceptions of China and the Korean-Chinese Relationship

Four subject categories were established for the codification of the China-related editorials: (A) China in the security of Northeast Asia and the Korean Peninsula; (B) Taiwan; (C) China and North Korea; and (D) China and South Korea. Each of these four categories was further divided into fifteen subcategories.[51] The distribution of 129 China-related editorials is shown in Table 15. Unlike the U.S.-related editorials, the number of which was relatively similar between the two newspapers, the number of China-related editorials differed rather significantly: 409 and 265 that were key-word searched, 199 and 85 that had some coverage of China-related issues, and 95 versus 34 that were content-analyzed, respectively, for *Chosun* and *Hankyoreh*.[52]

Given that the number of China-related editorials in *Chosun* was three times larger than that in *Hankyoreh*, *Chosun* proportionately produced more editorials than *Hankyoreh* on three issue areas (A-a, D-a, and D-f). Regarding the role of China in the security of Northeast

Table 15. Distribution of China-Related Editorials by Subject Category

Categories	Chosun	Hankyoreh
A-a	14	1
A-b	8	3
A-c	4	6
A-d	4	1
A-e	3	1
B-a	4	3
B-b	3	2
B-c	3	2
C-a	6	6
D-a	23	2
D-b	5	3
D-c	3	0
D-d	4	0
D-e	5	3
D-f	8	1
Total	95	34

Asia and the Korean Peninsula (A-a), *Chosun* produced fourteen editorials while *Hankyoreh* published only one. *Chosun*'s assessment of China's role in regional security is mixed, however: eight positive and six negative editorials (Table 16). Compared with its assessment of the U.S. role in regional security (see Table 13), *Chosun* clearly placed much greater weight on the role of the United States. Regarding Seoul's rapprochement with Beijing (D-a), a predominant majority of *Chosun*'s editorials (87 percent) took negative positions, while *Hankyoreh* remained silent with two editorials.[53] Recently *Chosun* may be shifting its position toward positively considering bilateral cooperation on all fronts.[54]

Table 16. Directional Codification for the Issues Prioritized by *Chosun*

	A-a	D-a	D-f
Chosun	A: 2/6/6/0 (n=14) B: 1/7/6/0	A: 11/9/2/1 (n=23) B: 5/15/3/0	A: 0/0/3/5 (n=8) B: 0/0/3/5
Hankyoreh	A: 0/1/0/0 (n=6) B: 0/1/0/0	A: 1/1/0/0 (n=2) B: 0/2/0/0	A: 0/0/1/0 (n=1) B: 0/0/0/1
C.R. (C/H)	.93/1.0	.65/.5	.75/0

Note: A and B refer to the first and second coder, respectively.

Table 17 shows the codification results for the three issue areas on which a total of ten or more editorials were produced by the two newspapers. Regarding A-b, both newspapers uniformly viewed China's military buildup negatively. *Chosun* and *Hankyoreh* diverged significantly, however, over A-c—whether their editorials were relatively supportive of the U.S. or the Chinese position on the bilateral issues. While *Chosun*'s editorials (75 percent) were generally more supportive of the U.S. position, *Hankyoreh*'s (67 percent) sided with China. Concerning C-a, the majority of the editorials of both *Chosun* and *Hankyoreh* maintained that China was capable of exerting influence over the North and such actions were deemed desirable. This suggests that the Korean media possess hopeful expectations for China's role in the resolution of the Korean question.

Table 17. Directional Codification for Issues with Similar Coverage

	A-b	A-c	C-a
Chosun	A: 0/0/3/5 (n=8) B: 0/0/2/6	A: 0/1/3 (n=4) B: 0/1/3	A: 4/2/0 (n=6) B: 5/1/0
Hankyoreh	A: 0/0/2/1 (n=3) B: 0/0/1/2	A: 4/1/1 (n=6) B: 4/1/1	A: 4/2/0 (n=6) B: 3/2/1
C.R. (C/H)	.88/.67	1.0/1.0	.83/.67

Interesting is the fact that, compared with the U.S.-related editorials, eighty-seven of which addressed Korea–U.S. economic relations, *Chosun* and *Hankyoreh* produced only fifteen concerning Korea–China economic relations. According to Table 18, regarding Sino-Korean economic cooperation (D-b) *Chosun*'s assessment was mixed, while *Hankyoreh*'s was negative. A close reading of these editorials reveals that both view the bilateral economic cooperation in a generally positive light, but they were critical of issues surrounding patenting, "boomerang effects," and Korea's "excessive" imports of agricultural products from China (in the case of *Hankyoreh*). Given that editorials usually deal with issues in which key problems need to be identified and appropriate policy recommendations made, the numerical paucity of the editorials concerning Korea–China economic cooperation may indicate the two newspapers' generally positive assessments. The contrast drawn earlier between the number of editorials concerning Korea's economic relations with the United States versus with China is further supported by a survey finding shown below.[55]

The codification of the China-related editorials suggests that *Chosun* and *Hankyoreh* did not diverge on their views of China as much as they did on the United States. Four observations may be made. First, *Chosun* produced many more editorials on China than *Hankyoreh*, and it seems that *Chosun*, more strongly oriented toward the United States, had to adopt somewhat negative postures toward China. On the other hand, while more critical of the United States and the Korean-American alliance, *Hankyoreh* nevertheless remained cautious and sober about taking China as a strategic alternative.[56]

Table 18. Directional Codification for Korea–China Economic Relations

	D-b	D-c	D-d
Chosun	A: 2/0/3/0 (n=5) B: 2/1/2/0	A: 3/0/0/0 (n=3) B: 2/1/0/0	A: 3/1/0/0 (n=4) B: 4/0/0/0
Hankyoreh	A: 2/1/0/0 (n=3) B: 3/0/0/0	A: -- (n=0) B: --	A: -- (n=0) B: --
C.R. (C/H)	.8/.67	.67/--	.75/--

Table 19. Rating the Fairness of Major Powers' Trade with Korea (%)

	Fair*	Unfair**
US	23.1	76.9
China	56.9	43.1

Source: 1995 Sejong survey, p. 83.
Notes: *represents those who chose "very fair" and "fair."
**represents those who selected "unfair" and "very unfair."

Second, concerning the key issues of U.S.-China relations, as expected *Chosun* generally sided with the United States, while *Hankyoreh* more often supported the Chinese position. Third, with regard to the role of China in the resolution of the Korean question, however, both newspapers considered China to be capable of influencing the North and believed such actions to be desirable. This posits a crucial possibility that the role of China, despite its avowed position of nonintervention, may continue to enlarge in the years to come. Fourth, both *Chosun* and *Hankyoreh* viewed Korea–China economic cooperation generally positively while taking issue with some minor problems. Compared with the predominant share of economic issues in the bilateral conflicts between Korea and the United States, the media's perceptions of Korea–China economic relations can be said to have so far been both positive and appreciative.

Evaluating the Korean-American Alliance with the China Variable: A Sketch of Elite Perceptions

Compared with public opinion and media perceptions, the role of elites is clearly more important in foreign-policy making, even if it is very difficult to gain access to their perceptions

and strategic maps. Furthermore, what constitutes the foreign-policy elite and how to sample it are intricate questions in any empirical analysis. For this study, the selection of interviewees was based on the following considerations. First, given the study's purpose of providing a "sketch" of elite perceptions and prescriptions, the total number of interviewees was limited to twenty people known to be influential, formally or informally, in the foreign-policy community. Second, a sectoral distribution was also considered to include key personnel of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, Ministry of National Defense, researchers at key government-affiliated think tanks, university professors, and high-level staff members of *Chosun Daily*, *Hankyoreh News*, and *Joong-ang Daily*.[57] Third, as for government officials and researchers and university professors, a determination was also made that those with different geographical responsibilities (i.e., America and China specialists) and of various age groups were to be interviewed.[58]

Elite Cleavages over the United States and China: An Anecdotal Episode

As it has elsewhere, foreign-policy making has been mostly shrouded in secrecy in Korea, as its foreign policies have had significant ramifications for inter-Korean relations. Furthermore, few career diplomats have written memoirs from which their strategic thinking can be deciphered. For instance, details of the process of Seoul's diplomatic normalization with Beijing still remain classified. Generally speaking, the Sino-Korean normalization proceeded with few internal conflicts among the policy elites. Although there was some bureaucratic bickering regarding which institutional leg should be put in charge of dealing with the Chinese, a majority of the policy elites seem to have reached a consensus on the desirability of normalization.[59]

In the post-normalization phase, however, there was discord over how much weight should be assigned to China in noneconomic issues. While very little is known on this crucial question, one anecdotal episode offers a clue to the divergence of opinions among the elites. At the height of the North Korean nuclear crisis, an "episode" during President Kim Young Sam's visit to China shed light on the possibility of a bifurcated Korean diplomatic allegiance to the United States and China. The episode began the night of March 29, 1994, with a press briefing by Hwang Byung-Tae, Korea's ambassador to China, on the accomplishments of President Kim's visit. He reportedly commented that "Korea's cooperation and consultation with China over the issue of North Korea's nuclearization must go beyond the current level of simply notifying Beijing of what has been decided between Seoul and Washington....Korea's diplomacy should break out of its excessive reliance solely on the United States." In less than two hours, however, at the strong request of the foreign minister and the national security advisor, the ambassador hurriedly retracted his remark and commented that it merely represented his personal opinion.[60]

This incident was widely publicized in the Korean media, which provided a source of debates with regard to the intentions and implications of the remarks of Ambassador Hwang. *Chosun Daily* put out an editorial two days later saying: "[H]ow dare an ambassador preempt the President and the Foreign Minister by replacing the Korea–United States alliance with the Korea–China axis in such a fashion?" Interestingly, *Hankyoreh News* devoted its editorial to something else. Despite most of the media's one-sided characterization of the incident as a "diplomatic gaffe," some did endorse Ambassador Hwang's act as justifiable. The core of their argument was that if the resolution of the nuclear crisis was the top priority, what was wrong with actively soliciting China's support and influence over the North? After

all, they contended, President Kim at the time made it clear that the primary goal of his visit was to ask Beijing to exert influence over Pyongyang. Many Koreans—including diplomats, policy analysts, and journalists—also endorsed the ambassador's view privately.[61]

A Sketch of Elite Perceptions of the Korean-American Alliance and China

Deciphering Korean elite perceptions toward the United States and China and their prescriptions for Seoul's strategic alternatives is a daunting task. Although the use of interviews—utilizing both structured and open-ended questions—with twenty people may seem not to provide a solid base for generalization, it may nevertheless suffice to generate a rough sketch.[62] Fairly interesting results were produced by the interviews, as described below, around three themes: (1) elite views of the Korean-American alliance; (2) perceived concerns about the "Japan factor"; and (3) Korea's long-term strategic alternatives in the event of a United States–China collision.

Concerning the Korean-American Alliance

As for the U.S. role in maintaining regional security in Northeast Asia, all interviewees regarded it as absolutely necessary. Concerning whether such a role will continue in the future, eighteen of the twenty interviewees replied that it would certainly change within ten to thirty years, and twelve of them specifically attributed the expected change to the "rise of China."[63] Sixteen of the twenty interviewees suggested that the U.S. forces be stationed in Korea even after reunification. However, most of them (13/16) attached specific conditionalities that their force structure be reconfigured in such a way that the U.S. ground forces should be reduced to a symbolic or minimum size with reinforced air and naval capabilities and that, more importantly, their deployment should be confined to the south of the current DMZ line (preferably near Suwon or Daejon) lest unnecessary concerns be generated on the part of China.

Concerning some contentious aspects of the Korean-American alliance, divergent perceptions were revealed. Thirteen of the twenty interviewees believed that the United States applies excessive pressure to open up Korea's markets by taking advantage of the alliance relationship. But only one-half of the interviewees agreed that the United States intervenes in Korean domestic politics and foreign-policy making by utilizing its alliance leverage.[64] Regarding burden sharing for the maintenance of the alliance, eight of the nineteen interviewees believed Korea's overall costs to be excessive. And concerning Korea's cost bearing for KEDO, fourteen of the nineteen characterized it as "unequal" as opposed to "equal" (none) or "fair" (five). Thirteen of the twenty perceived the level of the Korean military's informational dependency on the United States to be increasing and ten of the seventeen interviewees felt that the Korean military should not immediately recover wartime operational control from the United States. Nevertheless, twelve of the eighteen interviewees recommended that the highly "unequal" nature of the SOFA be amended as soon as possible.[65] Fourteen of the seventeen interviewees also felt the Korean government should renegotiate with the United States the bilateral agreement on missile development, which, in their view, was both shortsighted and detrimental to Seoul's long-term security interests. Thirteen of the seventeen interviewees also perceived the predominantly army-oriented structure of the Korean armed forces to be highly undesirable. Ten gave priority to a reinforced air force, seven to a stronger navy.

Concerning the "China Threat" and the "Japan Factor"

Ten of the seventeen interviewees chose China as potentially most threatening to the unified Korea, while six selected Japan (one for Russia). This is in sharp contrast to the perceptions of the Korean public toward China and Japan (see Tables 6 and 10). It can also be compared with the Japanese case, in which elites are much less concerned with China than is the public.[66] One explanation may be that the Korean elites take America's role in restraining Japan for granted. The interview results show that the Korean policy elites do share serious security concerns regarding Japan. Fifteen of the eighteen interviewees concurred that Japan would eventually turn itself into a power-projecting military state. Thirteen of the seventeen interviewees also predicted that Korea was more likely to come into maritime conflict with Japan than with China in the foreseeable future. Twelve of eighteen believed that the Korean government had not been fully consulted on the revision of the United States–Japan defense guidelines. While all but two of the seventeen interviewees agreed that some type of multilateral security arrangement would be desirable for the security of the Korean Peninsula, none was willing to assign any critical role to Japan.[67]

Similarly, while seven of the seventeen interviewees suggested that the principle of denuclearization be implemented with flexibility (i.e., the remaining ten were in favor of unconditional denuclearization), six specifically pointed out the Japan-related contingencies for which Korea should reserve the right to go nuclear.[68] As for the question of what Korea should do in the event Japan becomes an aggressive power, seven supported the "arms" option, including the selective development of strategic platforms like submarines, and three favored the inducement of China into a multilateral framework designed specifically to check Japan. Most importantly, with regard to what Korea should do if the principal function of the U.S.-Japan alliance should become checking China, only five of the seventeen interviewees favored actively cooperating with the United States and Japan against China, while five opted for a considerable detachment of Korea from the U.S.-Japan axis and seven recommended other alternatives including maximum neutrality, issue-variant support, and so on.

Concerning Korea's Strategic Choices between the United States and China

Ten of the eighteen interviewees agreed that the international relations of Northeast Asia will eventually become a source of conflict between the United States and China. The interviewees were then asked what Korea's strategic choice should be if such a scenario should materialize. Their answers varied considerably, reflecting perhaps an absence of consensus among the elites on this critical question. Basically, five propositions were offered. Of the eighteen interviewees, five chose the unification-contingency option: that is, before unification (i.e., so long as the North Korean threat is present) it is necessary to maintain the status quo; after unification, however, certain modifications of the Korean-American alliance may be inevitable. Seven opted for issue-based support. That is, Korea should not take fixed positions on either of the two powers but rather render support for the side whose issue-specific interests more closely parallel those of Korea. Two held that maintenance of the status quo would be necessary until China becomes stronger than the United States. Another two suggested that the Korean-American alliance be modified as soon as possible to avoid a tragic entrapment that would jeopardize Seoul's improving relations with Beijing. Two proposed a multilateral framework of security and diplomatic coordination among the parties of the region.

Two additional questions were posed. One was whether the interviewees thought China perceives Korea to be wholly sovereign. Nine out of the eighteen said no, implying that Korea might not be viewed by China as fully sovereign.[69] Whether such a highly "dependent" image

of Korea will continue to perform a positive role in supporting the U.S. strategy toward post–Cold War Northeast Asia remains uncertain. The other question is whether expanding military exchanges between Korea and China is deemed desirable. Fourteen of the sixteen said yes, and the scope of the bilateral military cooperation suggested varied from high-level personnel and informational exchange to the establishment of a Seoul–Beijing security dialogue and the limited observation of military exercises.

Seoul between Eagle and Dragon: Structural Constraints, Strategic Uncertainties, and Perceptual Inertia

Will the "rise of China" affect the Korean-American alliance in the future? This paper has sought an answer to this question by surveying Korean perceptions of the United States and China at the societal, media, and elite levels.[70] The answer suggested by this study is manifold. First, the public-opinion surveys indicated that the popularity of the United States has been declining and favorable attitudes toward China increasing. Given the age-based dispositions toward the United States, *ceteris paribus*, this trend may accelerate with the passing of the older generations. Without the vivid memories of the Korean War and American aid during the postwar years of desperation, the younger generations may focus more on the alliance-induced costs of autonomy and sovereignty which, in their view, have been excessively compromised for the strategic interests of the United States. Until they are proven otherwise, Koreans may continue to hold high expectations for positive roles that China can perform. Despite such perceptions toward the United States, a majority of Koreans prefer the U.S. forces to remain prior to reunification. It remains unclear whether their preference is rooted in economic reasons, fears of the North, or concerns over Japan's militarization. One thing is clear: given the survey findings, the expansion of Japan's military-security role in the region may undermine the perceptual base of a durable Korean-American alliance.

Second, the media perceptions of the United States varied considerably. *Chosun Daily* represented status-quo orientations and viewed the security role of the Korean-American alliance generally positively. On the other hand, *Hankyoreh* displayed a much more critical stance toward the United States even in the security-related realms, by calling for self-reliant defense, conflict resolution by the two Koreas themselves, and the marginalization of foreign intervention. Despite these differences, the newspapers were united in their criticisms of the United States on a wide range of issues (SOFA, military bases, defense burden sharing, and U.S. pressure to open Korean markets) in which U.S. impingement on Korea's sovereignty was deemed excessive and detrimental to the sustenance of the alliance. The perceptions of *Chosun* and *Hankyoreh* toward China were not as divergent as those toward the United States. Overall, *Chosun* more often sided with the U.S. position while *Hankyoreh* was more supportive of the Chinese position. While both newspapers regarded China's military buildup as alarming, they nevertheless recognized the potentially crucial role China could play in resolving the Korean question. In sum, the Korean media seem to view the U.S. question as more controversial than the China issue at the moment.

Third, the findings of the interviews suggest that policy elites possess temporally conditioned views of the Korean-American alliance. For the present as well as for the foreseeable future (within ten to thirty years), the Korean-American alliance is viewed to remain desirable and durable. Yet once reunification is accomplished, certain modifications of the alli-

Table 20. Variations in the Extent of the Korea-U.S. Alliance

Period	North Korean threat	Domestic economy	US benevolence	Japan factor	China factor	**Alliance with US**
1950–70	high	weak	high	weak	weak	**tight**
1970s	high/moderate	moderate	moderate	weak	weak	**moderate**
1980s	moderate	strong	moderate	weak	weak	**moderate**
1990s	moderate/low	stagnant	moderate	moderate	moderate	**moderate/tight**
2000–	low	moderate	?	strong	strong	**?**

For some insights here I am indebted to Michael N. Barnett and Jack S. Levy, "Domestic Sources of Alliances and Alignments: The Case of Egypt, 1962–73," *International Organization* 45, no. 3 (Summer 1991), pp. 394–395.

ance relationship are considered unavoidable. In the meantime, there seem to be quite a few issue areas where the United States could improve its image in order to maintain a healthy and robust alliance relationship with Korea. Elites view China not as an imminent security threat but as an increasingly critical variable in Korea's strategic equation and prescribe flexibility and discretion as virtues that Korea must cultivate in the years to come. Most importantly, the "Japan contingency" as well as the possible divergence of strategic interests between the U.S.-Japan alliance and the U.S.-Korea alliance may create some room for Seoul to find China as a meaningful strategic supplement, if not an alternative, for the purpose of avoiding a fatal entrapment.[71]

Going back to the question posed earlier, will "strategic bifurcation" become a serious possibility for Korea? If so, what factors would propel it? And if not, what would be the likely constraints? Overall, five factors may determine the tightness and durability of the future Korean-American alliance, most of which are perhaps more perceptual than substantive in nature: perceived threats from North Korea, the extent of U.S. benevolence toward Korea, the factor of Japan as a security threat, the strategic uncertainties of China, and Korea's domestic economy (see Table 20).

During the 1950s and 1960s, the Korean-American alliance was tight because the North Korean threat was grave, Korea's domestic economy fragile, the United States willing to be benign, and neither Japan nor China constituted a significant variable. During the 1970s and 1980s, the level of perceived threat from the North became lower, the Korean economy stronger, and the United States less benign, thus making the alliance relationship bumpier than before. In the first half of the 1990s, North Korea's nuclear blackmail tightened the alliance relationship. In the second half of the 1990s, given the economic crisis Pyongyang has been facing, the "security gap" between the two Koreas will be bridged quickly, lessening the perceived threat from the North. Yet, the military-strategic role of Japan has been enhanced with significant ramifications for Korea, and China is emerging as a key regional player to be reckoned with. On the other hand, Korea's domestic economy entered into a crisis situation in 1997 from which it cannot possibly escape without active support from the United States. In this respect, considerable structural and resource constraints still remain to sustain the Korean-American alliance in the short run.[72]

Once out of the IMF crisis, whether Seoul will search for an augmented strategic bilateralism with China more independently remains uncertain. In the short run—as long as the North Korean threat is present—an explicit strategic bifurcation is highly unlikely.[73] The strategic uncertainties surrounding China's regional intentions pose another question. At this point, both the Korean public and elites seem to view China's future posture as "assertive" but not necessarily "aggressive" toward Korea. On the other hand, how Japan will behave toward Korea may constitute a more crucial variable given the widely shared memories and perceptions of the Koreans. Given the starkly different Korean perceptions toward China and Japan, the "rise of China" may perhaps be deemed more acceptable to Koreans than the "rise of Japan." In that case, the strategic interests of the U.S.-Japan alliance may diverge from those of the U.S.-Korea alliance.

Generally speaking, if an existing alliance between a great and small power is healthy and reciprocal, the small power has little incentive to break out of the relationship.[74] The key question is what would make Korea devise an alternative strategic map. Seoul's desire to create a foundation for its own security without perpetual dependence on Washington may play a crucial role, especially given that the degree of Korea's dependence on the U.S. shield has been constantly subject to the latter's changing strategies and perceptions regardless of those of the former.[75] Alternatively, if the United States fails to establish a "benign unipolarity" in East Asia and, subsequently, bumpy U.S.-China and Sino-Japanese relations ensue, Korean leaders must be ready to consider a wide range of strategic options.[76] Despite such changes in external environments, however, there is ample possibility that Korean elites will continue to act out of a psychological dependency on U.S. protection often characterized as "separation anxiety."[77]

What is interesting about the perceptual inertia of the Korean elites is that, despite the fact that Korea has made a fairly successful transition from a "client state" of the United States to an "agent state," Seoul's pursuit of a security role commensurate with its economic capabilities has been sporadic and largely unsuccessful. Particularly considering its eye-catching economic growth and democratization, which enhanced regime legitimacy and liquidated its "external moral debts," Seoul's strategic soul-searching has been less than sufficient. As an analyst aptly put it, "[L]eaders in Seoul display a new appreciation that security means more than perpetuating the United States connection....[I]t still remains vital, but so are Seoul's new-found diplomatic levers."[78] At this juncture, elite perceptual inertia is still such that the Korean-American alliance relationship may continue to be deemed desirable and durable, with some disagreements and confusion over the "China factor" occasionally surfacing.

Considering the unescapable fact that so much of the Korean issue (i.e., reunification in the short run and security planning for a unified Korea in the longer run) is contingent upon the capabilities of the leadership in Seoul—as opposed to what other countries may intend to do on the basis of their perceived interests—what Korea really needs is to carry out serious independent assessments of its security environment and of a wide range of future contingencies in order to come up with a long-term grand strategy of its own.[79] Without such serious efforts of "strategic soul-searching," Korea may soon find that it has learned very little indeed from the history of the nineteenth century. It may be a truism that "the real is rational" but, after all, what is rational for Korea should be determined by the Koreans themselves if what is real cannot be.

Appendix 1

List and Descriptions of the Opinion Surveys Used

In this study, a total of thirteen opinion surveys were utilized for the years 1989, 1990, 1993, 1995, 1996, and 1997. The nationwide surveys for the years 1989, 1990, and 1993 were conducted by the Institute of Population and Development (IPD) of Seoul National University. The surveys for the first two years were carried out with sample sizes of 1,545 and 1530, respectively. The survey for 1993 was conducted with a sample size of 1,545. The survey results and interpretations were all published and deposited in IPD as well as in the Central Library of Seoul National University. Their formal citations are as follows:

Chonhwangi ui han'guk sahoe: '89 kungmin uisik chosa [The Korean Society in Transition: 1989 National Perception Survey] (Seoul: IPD, January 1990).

Chonhwangi ui han'guk sahoe: '90 kungmin uisik chosa yonku [The Korean Society in Transition: 1990 National Perception Survey] (Seoul: IPD, January 1991).

Han'guk sahoe: onulkwa naeil: 21segi dole'e daleun kungmin uisik chosa yonku [Korean Society's Today and Tomorrow: National Perception Survey for the 21st Century] (Seoul: IPD, October 1993).[80]

Another nationwide survey series for the years 1995–1997 was carried out by the Sejong Institute in cooperation with Dongseo Research Co. The sample size of this yearly nationwide survey was 1,800, 1,200, and 1,500, respectively. The 1995 and 1996 survey results were published by the Institute and the 1997 results are available as a draft report. Their formal citations are as follows:

95 kungmin uisik chosa [1995 National Perception Survey] (Seoul: Sejong Research Institute, June 1995).

96 kungmin uisik chosa [1996 National Perception Survey] (Seoul: Sejong Research Institute, July 1996).

97 seyon chosa bokoso [1997 Survey Report for the Sejong Research Institute] (Seoul: Dongseo Research Co., October 1997).

Another nationwide—though one-shot—survey is that conducted by the Ministry of Information in 1996 with 1,500 respondents. The detailed summaries, commentaries, and data were published in two volumes: *Hangukin ui uisik kach'igwan chosa* [Survey of National Consciousness in Korea] (Seoul: Ministry of Information, December 1996).

Though not a nationwide survey, the Korea Broadcasting System (KBS) and Yonsei University conducted a public value survey in three capital cities—Seoul, Beijing, and Tokyo—in cooperation with *Mainich Shimbun* and China International Trust and Investment Corporation (CITIC). The results were published in *Hanguk, chungguk, ilbon kungmin uisik chosa baekso* [White Papers on the National Consciousness Survey in Korea, China and Japan] (Seoul: KBS and Yonsei University, December 1996).

Additionally, three nationwide surveys conducted by daily newspapers were utilized. Their findings are published in *Dong-a Ilbo* [Dong-a Daily], January 1, 1990; *Chosun Daily*, August 15, 1995; and *Hankyoreh News*, August 15, 1995.

Regarding popular perceptions of different news media, particularly daily newspapers, *Sinmun chosa pokoso* [Newspapers Survey Report] (Seoul: Gallup Korea, December 1997) was utilized.

Finally, there is a more specialized one-shot survey conducted with retired high-ranking (colonel or above) military officers. Conducted by Mok Jin-hew in cooperation with the Korea Institute of Military Studies, this survey was conducted in 1995 with a sample size of 262 officers. The formal citation is *Yebiyok gogeup changgyodul'eui gukbang hyon'an e daehan insik yonku* [Study of Defense-Related Perceptions of Retired High-Ranking Military Officers] (Seoul: Korea Institute of Military Studies, December 1995).

Appendix 2

Notes on the Methods and Procedures of Content Analyzing the Editorials of *Chosun Daily* and *Hankyoreh News* for 1990–97

I. Database and Access

The Korean Press Institute (KPI) maintains an excellent database—called KINDS (Korean Integrated Newspapers Database System)—for major newspapers published in Korea. For the period of 1990–93, the database is in the form of four CD-ROMs, and for the period of 1994–97, the database is accessible through the World Wide Web (http://www.kpi.or.kr).[81]

II. Data Sorting Processes

By using the search word "the United States," a total of 1,056 and 969 editorials were identified for *Chosun Daily* and *Hankyoreh News*, respectively, for 1990–97. With the search word "China," a total of 409 and 264 editorials were found for the same period.[82] Given that many of the editorials searched touch upon certain aspects of the United States or China without significant ramifications for Northeast Asia or Korea, the first step in sorting was to screen the editorials on the basis of their significant coverage of (i.e., at least one paragraph fully devoted to) issues explicitly related to Korean-American or Korean-Chinese relations and their subsidiary issues. The screening produced 503 U.S.-related editorials (47.6 percent of the total pool) for *Chosun Daily* and 413 (42.7 percent) for *Hankyoreh News*. With regard to China-related editorials, the screening produced 199 (48.7 percent) for *Chosun Daily* and 85 (33.3 percent) for *Hankyoreh News*. The second step of sorting was a careful reading of these 916 United States–related editorials of the two newspapers. The final number of the U.S.-related editorials selected for coding was 152 for *Chosun Daily* (30.2 percent of 503) and 150 for *Hankyoreh News* (36.3 percent of 413).

The screening of 674 China-related editorials produced 199 editorials (48.7 percent) for *Chosun Daily* and 85 (32 percent) for *Hankyoreh News*. The next step of sorting was a careful reading of these 284 China-related editorials. Finally, the number of China-related editorials selected for coding was 95 for *Chosun Daily* (47.7 percent of 199) and 34 for *Hankyoreh News* (40 percent of 85).

The sorting process is shown in Tables A-1 and A-2 as follows.

Table A-1. Sorting Process of U.S.-Related Editorials (number)

Year	*Chosun Daily*			*Hankyoreh News*		
	key-word search	actually read	content analyzed	key-word search	actually read	content analyzed
1990	92	39	24	86	41	28
1991	96	41	19	103	57	30
1992	137	64	15	105	33	12
1993	132	67	14	149	59	19
1994	179	106	22	208	106	24
1995	160	71	23	144	56	20
1996	130	61	17	117	39	10
1997	130	54	18	57	22	7
Total	1056	503	152	969	413	150

Table A-2. Sorting Process of China-Related Editorials (number)

Year	*Chosun Daily*			*Hankyoreh News*		
	key-word search	actually read	content analyzed	key-word search	actually read	content analyzed
1990	28	20	10	17	7	4
1991	32	23	10	22	8	1
1992	68	37	22	32	7	5
1993	60	25	8	38	10	3
1994	66	24	11	59	16	5
1995	54	26	11	37	11	5
1996	42	18	5	35	15	6
1997	59	26	18	24	11	5
Total	409	199	95	264	85	34

III. Establishing Subject and Direction Categories

A. For United States–Related Editorials

Three subject categories were established for the codification of the final pool of editorials. In the case of editorials regarding the United States, the following subject categories were adopted.

A. United States in Northeast Asia/United States and multilateralism

B. United States and North Korea

C. United States and South Korea

Each of these three subject categories was further divided into sixteen subcategories. Category (A) contained two subcategories: (a) the role of the United States in the security of Northeast Asia and the Korean Peninsula; and (b) the role of the United States in the cultivation of multilateralism in the region, including APEC. For these two subcategories, the same direction category was created for codification: Was the role or policy of the United States in these areas assessed: i) very positively; ii) fairly positively; iii) fairly negatively; or iv) very negatively?

Category (B) was divided into four subcategories: (a) the role of the United States in the resolution of the North Korean nuclear crisis; (b) the role and policy of the United States in improving relations with North Korea; (c) the role of the United States in the Four-Party Talks; and (d) the role of the United States in the provision of food relief for North Korea.[83] Directional categories are provided as follows.

> For (a), three directional categories were created. First, is the denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula deemed i) absolutely necessary? ii) necessary with some conditions? or iii) unnecessary? Second, which measure was prioritized by the United States among i) all possible means including military retaliation? ii) economic sanctions only? iii) diplomatic negotiations? Third, is the role of the United States in preventing North Korea's nuclearization deemed i) absolutely critical? ii) other countries also important? iii) to be solved by the two Koreas themselves?
>
> For (b): Is the policy of the United States to improve relations with North Korea assessed i) very positively? ii) fairly positively? iii) fairly negatively? or iv) very negatively?
>
> For (c): Is the role of the United States in the Four-Party Talks viewed i) very positively? ii) fairly positively? iii) fairly negatively? or iv) very negatively?
>
> For (d): Is the policy or the role of the United States in the provision of food relief for North Korea viewed i) positively? ii) necessary but with some conditions? iii) critically?

Theme (C) was divided into ten subcategories: (a) SOFA; (b) the issue of United States military bases; (c) Korean-American defense burden sharing; (d) the transfer of operational control; (e) arms purchases from the United States; (f) food and agricultural imports from the United States (including quarantine procedures); (g) U.S.-made automobile imports; (h) U.S. pressure to open up Korea's market in general (except those covered in f and g); (i) the Korean-American issue; and (j) U.S. interference with Korea's foreign and domestic policies. For each of these ten subcategories, one directional category was provided.

> For (a), is the current SOFA viewed i) very critically? ii) fairly critically? iii) as fairly acceptable? or iv) as highly acceptable?
>
> For (b), are the issues surrounding the right and use of military bases by the United States forces viewed i) very critically? ii) fairly critically? iii) as fairly acceptable? iv) as highly acceptable?
>
> For (c), is the defense burden sharing between Korea and the United States regarded i) as highly acceptable? ii) acceptable? or iii) unacceptable?
>
> For (d), is the division of operational control between Korea and the United States regarded i) as highly sufficient? ii) fairly sufficient? iii) fairly insufficient? or iv) highly insufficient?

For (e), are arms purchases from the United States by Korea viewed i) to be overconcentrated (or very critically)? ii) fairly concentrated (or somewhat critically)? or iii) acceptable?

For (f), are the food and agricultural imports (and quarantine procedures) from the United States viewed i) positively (i.e., to be further expanded)? ii) neutrally (the status quo should be maintained), or iii) critically (i.e., to be prevented or reduced)?

For (g), are automobile imports from the United States (or U.S. pressures for it) regarded i) positively (i.e., to be further expanded)? ii) neutrally (the status quo should be maintained), or iii) critically (i.e., to be prevented or reduced)?

For (h), are U.S. pressures on Korea to open its markets regarded i) very critically? ii) fairly critically? iii) as fairly acceptable? or and iv) as very acceptable?

For (i), are the rights of Korean-Americans regarded as i) fully protected? ii) fairly protected? iii) fairly vulnerable? or iv) very vulnerable?

For (j), is U.S. interference with Korea's foreign and domestic policy (or U.S. neglect of Korean interests) assessed i) very critically? ii) fairly critically? iii) as fairly acceptable? or iv) as very acceptable?

B. For China-Related Editorials

Four subject categories were established for the coding-based content analysis of the final pool of China-related editorials. These categories are:

A. China in Northeast Asia

B. Taiwan

C. China and North Korea

D. China and South Korea

Each of these subject categories was further divided into fifteen subcategories. Category (A) contains the following five subcategories: (a) China's role in the security of Northeast Asia and the Korean Peninsula; (b) China's military buildup; (c) United States–China relations; (d) Hong Kong's return to China; and (e) human rights in China. For each of these subcategories, one directional category was provided:

For (a): is the role of China in the security of the region viewed (i.e., compared with that of the United States) i) very positively? ii) fairly positively? iii) fairly negatively? or iv) very negatively?

For (b): is China's military buildup viewed i) very positively? ii) fairly positively? iii) fairly negatively? or iv) very negatively?

For (c): is the Chinese position relatively more supported than that of the United States (in the issues of WTO, MFN, and so on)? i) yes; ii) difficult to judge; iii) no

For (d): is the return of Hong Kong to China and its impact viewed i) positively? ii) difficult to judge? or iii) critically?

For (e): are human-rights conditions in China viewed i) very positively? ii) fairly positively? iii) fairly negatively? or iv) very negatively?

Category (B) is divided into three subcategories: (a) the role of China in relations with Taiwan (including the cross-strait missile tests); (b) Seoul's policies toward Taipei at the time of diplomatic normalization with Beijing; and (c) Taiwan's plan to export nuclear waste to North Korea. Directional categories are as follows.

For (a): is the role or policy of China toward Taiwan (in cross-strait rapprochement and missile crises) assessed i) very positively? ii) fairly positively? iii) fairly negatively? or iv) very negatively?

For (b): is Seoul's handling of relations with Taipei at the time of Sino-Korean diplomatic normalization and its aftermath evaluated i) very positively? ii) fairly positively? iii) fairly negatively? or iv) very negatively?

For (c): is Taiwan's plan to export nuclear waste to North Korea viewed i) very positively? ii) fairly positively? iii) fairly negatively? or iv) very negatively?

Theme (C) has one subcategory: (a) the extent of China's influence over North Korea.[84]

For (a): is China's influence over North Korea (generally and regarding the nuclear issue) viewed as i) capable and desirable? ii) capable but not desirable or desirable but not capable? or iii) neither desirable nor capable?

Theme (D) is divided into six subcategories: (a) Korea's approach to and handling of China, including the issues of timing and procedures of diplomatic normalization; (b) economic cooperation between Korea and China (including trade, investment, technology transfer, and the exchange of trade representative offices); (c) the issue of direct flight routes; (d) fishery and exclusive economic zone issues; (e) the issue of the Korean Chinese; and (f) the issue of environmental contamination (air pollution and the contamination of the Yellow Sea) caused by China. For each of these subcategories, one directional category was provided.

For (a): is Seoul's handling of China regarding the timing and procedures of the diplomatic normalization and its aftermath viewed i) very critically? ii) fairly critically? iii) as fairly acceptable? or iv) as highly acceptable?

For (b): is South Korea's economic cooperation with China viewed i) very critically? ii) fairly critically? iii) fairly positively? or iv) very positively?

For (c): is China's policy toward direct flight routes between Korea and China viewed i) very critically? ii) fairly critically? iii) fairly positively or iv) very positively?

For (d): is China's position on the fishery and exclusive economic zone issues regarded i) very critically? ii) fairly critically? iii) fairly positively? or iv) very positively?

For (e): is Korea's policy toward the Korean-Chinese issue viewed i) very critically? ii) fairly critically? iii) as fairly acceptable? or iv) as very acceptable?

For (f): are the measures taken by China to mitigate the environmental problems viewed i) very positively? ii) fairly positively? iii) fairly critically? or iv) very critically?

Appendix 3

Profile of Interviewees

I. Sectoral Distribution

	government officials	journalists	government-affiliated research institutes	university professors
N=20	7	4	5	4

II. Functional Distribution of Government Officials and Researchers at the Government-Affiliated Think-Tanks

	presidential aides	foreign affairs	security affairs	military
N=12	1	4	3	4

III. Age Distribution of Interviewees

	30s	40s	50s	60s
N=20	3	8	5	4

Appendix 4

List of Interview Questions

I. Backgrounds

— Which newspaper(s) do you read most and why?

II. Views on the Role of the United States in Northeast Asia

— The role of the United States in the maintenance of regional security in Northeast Asia is most important and absolutely necessary: Yes/No

— (in the case of Yes) Such a role will change in the long term: Yes/No (if so, in how many years?)

— “The rise of China” may suffice to change the U.S. role in the region in any fundamental way: Yes/No

III. Views on Multilateral Security Mechanisms in Northeast Asia

— For the sake of security on the Korean Peninsula, it is necessary to establish a multilateral security regime: Yes/No

— (in the case of Yes) Which country should be assigned the most critical role?

IV. Views on the Denuclearization and Strategic Environments of the Korean Peninsula

— The denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula is Unconditionally necessary/Necessary with some conditions/Not necessary.

— (in case of conditionality) What conditions would they be?

— (in the case of recurrences) Which measure would you recommend to prevent North Korea from going nuclear?: Diplomatic Means Only/Up to Economic Sanctions/Even Military Strikes

— The cost-bearing arrangement for KEDO viewed to be: Equal/Fair/Unequal

— Korean-American relations after diplomatic normalization between the United States and North Korea viewed to: Improve/Unchanged/Worsen

— After reunification, which country would you point out to be potentially most threatening to Korea’s security?

V. Views on the Korean Military

— Do you perceive the level of the Korean military’s informational dependence on the United States to be Increasing/Decreasing?

— The Korean military’s force structure is predominantly army-based. Do you think this is Desirable/Undesirable?

— If a change should be made in the Korean military’s force structure, would you strengthen Navy/Air Force?

— In maintaining the Korean-American alliance, do you think Korea’s cost bearing is excessive? Yes/No

— Do you think it necessary for the Korean military to obtain wartime operational control from the United States as soon as possible? Yes/No

— Do you think Korea should diversify its arms supplier? Yes/No (in case of Yes) Which country should Korea seek to purchase arms from?

— In order to maintain the Korean-American alliance, problems with SOFA and military bases can be dispensed with: Yes/No

— Do you think Korea should stick to its bilateral agreement with the United States regarding missile development? Yes/No

— Do you think that the Korean military possesses sufficient will to become self-reliant? Yes/No

— (in case of No) What do you think to be the most critical obstacle?

— Do you think U.S. forces should be stationed in Korea after reunification? Yes/No (in case of Yes) In what force size and how should they be deployed? (in case of No) What would be the alternative security guarantee?

VI. Views on Korean-American Relations in General

— The United States uses the alliance relationship to apply excessive pressure to open Korea's markets. Yes/No

— The United States intervenes in Korean domestic politics and foreign-policy making by taking advantage of the alliance relationship: Yes/No

— The critical problem resides in the Korean side, which lacks appropriate capabilities to cope effectively with U.S. pressure: Yes/No

— The various politico-economic problems will accumulate to the point where they will eventually adversely affect Korean-American alliance relations: Yes/No

— Grassroots attitudes and perceptions toward the United States should be reflected in foreign-policy making: Yes/No

VII. Views on United States–China Relations and Korea's Strategic Choices

— International relations of the Northeast Asian region will become a structure of conflict between the United States and China: Yes/No

— (in case of Yes) If this happens, what should Korea do?

— Do you think China perceives Korea to be a state that is fully sovereign? Yes/No

— Japan will eventually become a power-projecting military power: Yes/No

— (in case of Yes) What should our response measure be?

— If the main function of the United States–Japan alliance becomes checking China, what should we do? Detach ourselves from the United States/Join the United States–Japan axis against China/Other alternatives

— In the process of revising United States–Japan defense guidelines, the Korean government was fully consulted: Yes/No

— With which country do you think it more feasible that Korea will come into maritime conflict? China/Japan

— Expanding military exchanges between Korea and China is Desirable/Undesirable (If desirable, up to what level?)

Notes

[1] Huang Zunxian, *Chaoxian celue* [The Strategy for Korea] (Seoul: Kunkook University Press, 1977), p. 47 for the original Chinese text.

[2] Zbigniew Brzezinski, Lee Hamilton, and Richard Lugar (eds.), *Foreign Policy into the 21st Century: The United States Leadership Challenge* (Washington, DC: CSIS, 1996), p. 49.

[3] The literature on this topic, particularly in English, is simply too numerous to list. The Korean literature, however, entails more variations as both academic assessments and casual commentaries draw somewhat more critical conclusions. See, for instance, Moon Ch'anggeuk, *Hanmi galdung ui haebu* [Anatomy of Korean-American Conflicts] (Seoul: Nanam, 1994); Lee Samsung, *Mirae ui yoksa eso miguk un huimang'inga* [Will the United States Remain a Hope for Korea's Future?] (Seoul: Dangdae, 1995); Lee Yongsoo, *Nolago malhalsu yinnun hanguk* [A Korea That Can Say No] (Seoul: Sallim, 1996); and Kim Ilkyom, *Dongbuk'a byonhwa wa hanminjok ch'aeklyak* [Changes in Northeast Asia and the Strategies for Korea] (Seoul: Chijong, 1997), pp. 161–194.

[4] See, for instance, Tae-Hwan Kwak and Melvin Gurtov (eds.), *The Future of China and Northeast Asia* (Seoul: Kyungnam University Press, 1997); and a collection of eight papers written by Korean scholars for the first-of-its-kind project in Korea on "The Emergence of China and the Political and Economic Order in East Asia," later published in *Hyondae chungguk* [Contemporary China], no. 1 (1997). For an exemplary policy report, see Institute of Foreign Affairs and National Security, "The Current Situation and Prospects of United States–China Strategic Relations," *Chuyo kukje munje bunsok* [Analysis of Key International Issues], May 20, 1998.

[5] Concerning these issues, refer to the chapters by Byung-joon Ahn, Murata Koji, Nancy Bernkopf Tucker, and Jianwei Wang and Xinbo Wu in Daniel Okimoto (ed.), *America's Alliances with Japan and Korea* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1999).

[6] For the trade-offs between these two options, see James D. Morrow, "Arms versus Allies: Trade-Offs in the Search for Security," *International Organization* 47, no. 2 (Spring 1993), pp. 207–233.

[7] For President Park Chung Hee's "arms for allies" bargaining with the United States, see Don Oberdorfer, *The Two Koreas: A Contemporary History* (Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1997), pp. 85–94, 101–108.

[8] For the entanglements of political, economic, and military ties as the derivative of the great power's military assistance to smaller powers, see Marshall R. Singer, *Weak States in a World of Powers: The Dynamics of International Relationships* (New York: The Free Press, 1972), p. 279.

[9] On this logic, see Dan Reiter, "Learning, Realism and Alliances: The Weight of the Shadow of the Past," *World Politics* 46, no. 4 (July 1994), pp. 494, 503.

[10] See Glenn H. Snyder, "The Security Dilemma in Alliance Politics," *World Politics* 36, no. 4 (July 1984), pp. 477, 485–487.

[11] On "omnibalancing," see Steven R. David, "Explaining Third World Alignment," *World Politics* 43, no. 2 (January 1991), pp. 233–256.

[12] For this logic, see Snyder, "The Security Dilemma in Alliance Politics," pp. 467–468; and Morrow, "Arms versus Allies," p. 214.

[13] For the dilemma of abandonment and entrapment, see Snyder, "The Security Dilemma in Alliance Politics," pp. 466–474.

[14] The revised United States–Japan defense guidelines as well as a majority of American policy recommendations suggest a much enhanced security role for Japan generally as well as in Korea-related realms. See, for instance, Morton I. Abramowitz, James T. Laney, and Michael J. Green, *Managing Change on the Korean Peninsula* (New York: Council on Foreign Relations, 1998), pp. 32–33.

[15] For such a recommendation, see Jonathan D. Pollack and Young Koo Cha, *A New Alliance for the Next Century: The Future of United States–Korean Security Cooperation* (Santa Monica, CA: RAND, 1995).

[16] The definition is adapted from Glenn H. Snyder, "Alliance Theory: A Neorealist First Cut," *Journal of International Affairs* 44, no. 2 (1990), p. 104.

[17] The "bad" refers to the possibilities of entrapment due to tight alliance commitments, while the "ugly" denotes the possibilities of escalation of conflicts due to the inability to rein in the actions of the alliance partner. The implication is that state leaders should not take a fixed position on alignment irrespective of changing strategic environments. See Charles W. Kegley, Jr., and Gregory A. Raymond, "Networks of Intrigue? Realpolitik, Alliances, and International Security," in Frank W. Wayman and Paul F. Diehl (eds.), *Reconstructing Realpolitik* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1994), pp. 190–194.

[18] For Sino-Korean economic cooperation since 1979, see Jae Ho Chung, "South Korea–China Economic Relations: The Current Situation and Its Implications," *Asian Survey* 28, no. 10 (October 1988), pp. 1031–1048; *idem*. "The Political Economy of South Korea–China Bilateralism: Origins, Progress and Prospects" in Ilpyong Kim and Hong Pyo Lee (eds.), *Korea and China in a New World: Beyond Normalization* (Seoul: The Sejong Institute, 1993), pp. 274–288.

[19] According to a nationwide survey, 57 percent of the respondents viewed China's trade practices to be fair while the comparable figure for U.S. trade was only 23 percent. See *95 kungmin uisik chosa* [1995 National Perception Survey] (Seoul: The Sejong Institute, June 1995), p. 83.

[20] The data presented in this paragraph are from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade and the Bank of Korea.

[21] This figure is roughly comparable to the total number of Korean students (about 15,100) who studied in the United States between 1953 and 1980.

[22] For a similar concern in Europe regarding the "German question," see Joyce Marie Mushaben, "A Search for Identity: The 'German Question' in Atlantic Alliance Relations," *World Politics* 40, no. 3 (April 1988), pp. 395–417. For the East Asian context, see Aaron Friedberg, "Ripe for Rivalry: Prospects for Peace in a Multipolar Asia," *International Security* 18, no. 3 (1993–94), pp. 5–34.

[23] For the importance of public opinion in foreign-policy making, see Herbert C. Kelman, "The Role of the Individual in International Relations: Some Conceptual and Methodological Considerations," *Journal of International Affairs* 24, no. 1 (Summer/Fall 1970), pp. 10–

14. For a study on United States–Japanese mutual perceptions, see Everett Carll Ladd and Karlyn H. Bowman, *Public Opinion in America and Japan: How We See Each Other and Ourselves* (Washington, DC: The AEI Press, 1996).

[24] The members of such groupings belong to what Russett and Starr have termed the "mobilizables," who constitute a minute portion of the population but may exert enormous influence on the making of foreign policy. See Bruce Russett and Harvey Starr, *World Politics: The Menu for Choice* (New York: W. H. Freeman and Co., 1992), pp. 244–245. For the roles of academic experts in foreign-policy making, see Keith Webb, "Academics and Practitioners: Power, Knowledge and Role," in Michel Girard et al. (eds.), *Theory and Practice in Foreign Policy-Making: National Perspectives on Academics and Professionals in International Relations* (London: Pinter, 1994), pp. 13–25.

[25] I have adapted the concept of three circles from John T. Rourke, *Making Foreign Policy: United States, Soviet Union, and China* (Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing Co., 1990), chapters 7–9. My usage of the "middle circle," however, differs from Rourke's. For a similar conceptualization, though using the term "rings" instead of "circles," see Roger Hilsman et al., *The Politics of Policy Making in Defense and Foreign Affairs: Conceptual Models and Bureaucratic Politics* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1993), 3rd ed., chs. 8–17.

[26] *Chosun Daily* is assessed to be very influential in government policy making, which may also imply that it is vulnerable to government pressure. It is also generally considered to take a relatively pro-American stance. On the other hand, *Hankyoreh* differs in many aspects from *Chosun*. For evaluations of the orientations of these two newspapers, see *Chosun Daily*, April 9, 1998, and *Daehak sinmun* [University News], April 13, 1998. For a very positive assessment of *Chosun Daily*'s role in mitigating anti-American sentiments in Korea, see *New York Times*, February 17, 1998.

[27] For details of the procedures of data collection and analysis, refer to the relevant footnotes in each section as well as the four appendixes.

[28] Alvin Z. Rubinstein and Donald Smith, "Anti-Americanism: Anatomy of a Phenomenon," in Alvin Z. Rubinstein and Donald Smith (eds.), *Anti-Americanism in the Third World* (New York: Praeger, 1985), pp. 1–30.

[29] They are *Chonhwangi ui han'guk sahoe: '89 kungmin uisik chosa* [The Korean Society in Transition: 1989 National Perception Survey] (Seoul: IPD, January 1990); *Chonhwangi ui han'guk sahoe: '90 kungmin uisik chosa yongu* [The Korean Society in Transition: 1990 National Perception Survey] (Seoul: IPD, January 1991); and *Han'guk sahoe: onulkwa naeil: 21segi dole'e daleun kungmin uisik chosa yonku* [Korean Society's Today and Tomorrow: National Perception Survey for the 21st Century] (Seoul: IPD, October 1993). For details of these survey series, see Appendix 1.

[30] According to an opinion survey conducted by the United States Information Agency in 1965, 68 percent of the respondents felt very positively toward the United States. See *Joongang Ilbo* [Joong-ang Daily], August 24, 1998.

[31] Considering the potential impact of the Tiananmen incident on the Korean perceptions of China, the figures are quite impressive.

[32] The next three were Japan (10.7 percent), EU (7.8 percent), and ASEAN (5.2 percent). See 1993 IPD survey, p. 52.

[33] *Hangukin ui uisik kach'igwan chosa* [Survey of National Consciousness in Korea] (Seoul: Ministry of Information, December 1996), Vol. 2, p. 354.

[34] See *95 kungmin uisik chosa* [1995 National Perception Survey] (Seoul: Sejong Institute, June 1995); *96 kungmin uisik chosa* [1996 National Perception Survey] (Seoul: Sejong Institute, July 1996); and *97 seyon chosa pogoso* [1997 Survey Report for the Sejong Institute] (Seoul: Dongseo Research Co., October 1997).

[35] According to a public opinion poll conducted by the *Yomiuri Shimbun* in 1995, 56 percent of Koreans perceived Japan to have already become a major military power and 85 percent felt that Japan would also become a nuclear power. See *The Daily Yomiuri*, May 23 and 24, 1995, cited from Radha Sinha, "Sino-American Relations: An Asian Perspective," in Y. Y. Kueh (ed.), *The Political Economy of Sino-American Relations: A Greater China Perspective* (Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 1997), p. 270.

[36] How the United States generates security concerns for Korea remains unclear from these surveys. One possibility may be the concern for the U.S. policy of assigning to Japan a vital security role for the region. According to a survey, only 10.1 percent of Koreans and 22.9 percent of Chinese believed that Japan had been sincerely repentant for its past military atrocities. Such shared perceptions may possibly push Korea more closely toward China if the United States were to abandon Korean interests for the sake of enhancing Japan's regional strategic position. For the results of the survey, see *Hanguk, chungguk, ilbon kungmin uisik chosa baekso* [White Paper on the National Consciousness Survey in Korea, China and Japan] (Seoul: KBS and Yonsei University, December 1996), p. 436.

[37] These findings are in line with two earlier surveys. One, conducted in 1990, found that only 28 percent of the respondents wished to see the Seoul-Washington relationship further strengthened. See "Survey of Korean Society and Civil Consciousness after 45 Years of Liberation," cited in Gi-Wook Shin, "South Korean Anti-Americanism: A Comparative Perspective," *Asian Survey* 36, no. 8 (August 1996), p. 795. According to the other survey, conducted by *Hankyoreh News* in 1995, those who called for the strengthening of Korea–United States relations amounted to 33.6 percent, while those for the further consolidation of Korea-China relations reached 71.4 percent. See *Hankyoreh News*, August 15, 1995.

[38] This trend is also confirmed by two independent surveys by *Dong-a Daily* in 1990 and *Chosun Daily* in 1995. While the former survey found that 65.2 percent of the respondents preferred withdrawal, the comparable figure from the latter survey was 46.2 percent. See *Dong-a Daily*, January 1, 1990 and *Chosun Daily*, August 15, 1995.

[39] See *Hankyoreh News*, August 15, 1995.

[40] According to a 1996 survey, 77.9 percent of the respondents (all from the Seoul metropolitan area) replied that Korean-Chinese strategic relations would improve in the future. The comparable figure for the Tokyo respondents on the same question was only 36.9 percent, while that for the Beijing respondents was 62.7 percent. See *Hanguk, chungguk, ilbon kungmin uisik chosa baekso*, p. 431.

[41] This forms a stark contrast with the Japanese public's view of China as a serious threat. See Hideo Sato, *Japan's China Perceptions and Its Policies in the Alliance with the United States,*

Discussion Paper Series, Asia/Pacific Research Center, Stanford University, September 1998, p. 10.

[42] Perhaps the United States has been much less sensitive than it should to the history-induced emotions Koreans have toward Japan, which belong to the category of "intergenerational transmission of historical enmity." See Rita R. Rogers, "Intergenerational Transmission of Historical Enmity," in Vamik D. Volkan et al. (eds.), *The Psychodynamics of International Relationships* (Lexington, MA: Lexington Books, 1990), pp. 91–96. For the U.S. insensitivity to such emotional undercurrents, see Nicholas D. Kristof, "The Problem of Memory," *Foreign Affairs* 77, no. 6 (November/December 1998), pp. 37–49.

[43] Of the sixteen interviewees, eleven replied that public perceptions need be reflected in foreign-policy making to a certain extent.

[44] For a view that the Korean government policy is overly conservative due mainly to the highly conservative orientations of the policy elites, see Samsung Lee, "The Korean Society and Foreign Policy," Yong Soon Yim and Ki-Jung Kim (eds.), *Korea in the Age of Globalization and Information: Direction of Korea's Diplomacy and Broadcasting toward the 21st Century* (Seoul: Korean Association for International Studies, 1997), pp. 110–122.

[45] For details of the database and codification procedures, see Appendix 2. Regarding the United States–related editorials, the coding reliability coefficient (C.R.) was .89 for the *Hankyoreh* and .7 for the *Chosun*. Concerning the China-related editorials, the coefficient was .59 for the *Hankyoreh* and .73 for the *Chosun*. Coding reliability was calculated as follows: C.R.= $2M/(N_1 + N_2)$ where M stands for the number of agreed directionalities, and N_1 and N_2 refers to the number of directionalities coded by the first and second coders, respectively. For this "index of crude agreement," see E. Rogot and J. D. Goldberg, "A Proper Index for Measuring Agreement in Test-Retest Studies," *Journal of Chronic Disease* 19 (1966), pp. 991–1006.

[46] Compare, for instance, the *Hankyoreh* editorials of July 23, 1991, July 8, 1993, November 17, 1994, March 2, 1995 and March 3, 1996, with the *Chosun* editorials of December 6, 1992, July 9, 1993, and September 13, 1994.

[47] In 1981–89, only .6 percent of the criminal cases involving United States military personnel under the primary jurisdiction of the Korean court were prosecuted. The comparable figures for the NATO member states and the Philippines were 32 and 21 percent. In 1994, among the 711 crimes committed by United States military personnel, only 17 (2.5 percent) were handled by the Korean court. The figures for NATO member states and Japan were 52 and 32 percent. *Hankyoreh News*, March 14, 1990 and May 24, 1995.

[48] Judging from the number of editorials on different issue areas, *Hankyoreh*'s concerns seemed more grassroots oriented—its position on SOFA was related to concern for the victims of the crimes committed by American soldiers who were not appropriately compensated, and its position on agricultural imports from the United States was tied to concerns for the well-being of farmers.

[49] In an interview, a member of *Chosun*'s editorial board commented that "the paper's position is formulated principally around its view of the North as the aggressor and, therefore, it assigns critical importance to the United States as the chief provider of security for the South."

[50] According to a recent survey, *Chosun* was rated the highest for accurately reflecting government policy lines. See *Sinmun chosa pokoso* [Newspapers Survey Report] (Seoul: Gallup Korea, December 1997), p. 10. Of the sixteen interviewees (excluding the four representing the media), eleven chose *Chosun* as their first choice for the same reason. Considering the large number of Korean politicians who were previously journalists (many at *Chosun*), the scope of cooperation between the government and the press is wide. On the other hand, *Hankyoreh* as a progressive newcomer may have had much less room for cooperation with government elites before the Kim Dae Jung presidency. See Yongho Kim, "The Influence of the Media on Foreign Policy: The Case of Korea," in Yim and Kim (eds.), *Korea in the Age of Globalization and Information*, pp. 152–153.

[51] For details of these subcategories, see Appendix 2.

[52] According to a study that traced newspaper coverage of the United States, USSR, China, and Japan during 1986–90, coverage of the United States and Japan was consistently greater than that of the USSR and China, although the gap between the two was being narrowed. Still, the unequal coverage of China between *Chosun* and *Hankyoreh* remains to be answered. See Chang Ikjin, "Wuri nara chuyo ilganchi e natanan miguk, soryon, ilbon, chungguk kwankye news bunsok" [Analysis of the News on the United States, USSR, Japan and China That Appeared in Korea's Major Daily Newspapers], *Sinmun yonkuso hakpo* [Journal of Media Research], no. 30 (1993), pp. 139–140.

[53] A careful reading of these editorials suggests two rationales for *Chosun*'s position on China. First, given the unique relationship between China and North Korea, *Chosun* maintained that Seoul's overture had been too hasty and full of false expectations of China's influence over the North. See the editorials of June 13, August 2, September 23 and 24, October 21, 1990; July 30, August 28, November 14, 1991; March 22, April 14, August 21 and 27, October 11 and 17, 1992; and November 1 and 8, 1994. Second, *Chosun* was also critical of China's military buildup as a crucial obstacle to regional security. See the editorials of August 8, 1992; September 3 and November 5, 1994; March 11, 1996; and April 11, 1997.

[54] In 1994 *Chosun* had recommended that Korea confine its relations with China to the economic dimension. In 1997, several editorials stressed Korean cooperation with China as a possible alternative to Korean diplomacy's exclusively dependency on the United States–Japan axis. Compare, for instance, the editorial of November 5, 1994 with those of September 21, October 31 and November 10, 1997.

[55] In a 1990 survey, 57.8 percent of the respondents considered the United States to be faithful only to its own interests, while only 29.5 percent regarded it as helpful to Korea. See "Survey of Korean Society and Civil Consciousness after 45 Years of Liberation" conducted in 1990, cited from Shin, "South Korean Anti-Americanism," pp. 795–796.

[56] In an interview, a member of the *Hankyoreh*'s editorial committee commented that their newspaper's principal focus was Korea's domestic developments, with international-relations issues of secondary importance. In fact, after the financial crisis in 1997, *Hankyoreh*'s Beijing bureau was the first to close.

[57] The interviewees from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade included those of both the North American Affairs Bureau and Asia-Pacific Affairs Bureau. The government-affiliated research institutes included the Korean Institute for Defense Analysis (KIDA), Institute for

Foreign Affairs and National Security (IFANS), Korean Research Institute for National Unification (KINU), Research Institute for International Economics (RIIE), and Sejong Institute.

[58] Anonymity was pledged to all interviewees not only because doing so was believed to elicit more candid opinions on sensitive issues but also because some of the interviewees (particularly those holding offices in the government) explicitly requested that their names be withheld. For profiles of the interviewees' functional affiliations and age distribution, see Appendix 3.

[59] For the bureaucratic bickering, see Jae Ho Chung, "Sino–South Korean Economic Cooperation: An Analysis of Domestic and Foreign Entanglements," *Journal of Northeast Asian Studies* 9, no. 2 (Summer 1990), pp. 68–69. Regarding the low risks of normalization for Korean policy elites, see Lee, "The Korean Society and Foreign Policy," Yim and Kim (eds.), *Korea in the Age of Globalization and Information*, p. 116.

[60] For an hour-by-hour description of the incident, see *Chosun Daily*, March 31, 1994.

[61] For a strong endorsement of Ambassador Hwang's view, see *Sisa Journal*, April 14, 1994, p. 112. Recently, *Dong-a Daily* positively characterized it as a "meaningful incident." See the issue of September 8, 1998. Author's interviews with some Korean diplomats revealed that they sympathized with the position taken by Ambassador Hwang.

[62] For the structured questionnaire, see Appendix 4.

[63] While the total number of interviewees is twenty, the respective total for each question varies due to some interviewees' preference for "no opinion."

[64] Those who disagreed held that the level of U.S. intervention had dramatically declined since the late 1980s after the democratic transition in Korea.

[65] This is also in line with the findings of the survey of 262 retired generals. Only 14.4 percent of the respondents viewed the SOFA to be equal. See Korea Institute of Military Studies, *Yebiyok gogeup changgyodul eui gukbang hyon'an e daehan insik yonku* [Study of Defense-Related Perceptions of Retired High-Ranking Military Officers] (Seoul: Korea Institute of Military Studies, December 1995), p. 38.

[66] See Sato, *Japan's China Perceptions and Its Policies in the Alliance with the United States*, pp. 10, 23.

[67] Eleven chose the United States and six selected China as the principal player in any form of multilateral security arrangement for Korea.

[68] Of the 262 retired generals, 82.6 percent felt that Japan would become a nuclear power and 76.9 percent recommended that Korea follow suit in such a case. See *Yebiyok gogeup changgyodul'eui gukbang hyon'an e daehan insik yonku*, p. 16.

[69] This, to a considerable degree, matches what the Chinese perceive Korea to be. While it may be true that China no longer sees Korea as a U.S. springboard to attack it, that does not necessarily mean that Beijing's skepticism toward Korea as an American "vassal state" has totally evaporated. See the contrast made between the Chinese perceptions of the United States–Japan alliance and of the United States–Korea alliance in Jianwei Wang and Xinbo Wu, *Against Us or with Us? The Chinese Perspective of America's Alliances with Japan and Korea*, Discussion Papers of the Asia/Pacific Research Center, Stanford University, May 1998, pp. 34–35.

[70] Certainly, inevitable limitations exist as to the conclusion derived from this study as Korea does not command a "rule making" power in the Northeast Asian system. If, however, Korea's interests are to be reflected in the future reconfiguration of the regional security arrangements, the conclusion derived here may offer a basis for further consideration and discussions.

[71] President Kim Dae Jung's visit to China in November 1998 may have been a step in this direction as the bilateral relationship was upgraded to that of a "cooperative partnership for the next century." Further, President Kim's remark in Hong Kong on the possibility of a trilateral security dialogue among Seoul, Pyongyang, and Beijing may also constitute another indicator in this regard. See the Korea–China Joint Statement published in *Chosun Daily*, November 14, 1998. For President Kim's remark on the trilateral security dialogue, see *Chosun Daily*, November 20, 1998.

[72] For the importance of resource webs as a key constraint in foreign-policy restructuring, see Thomas J. Volgy and John E. Schwarz, "Foreign Policy Restructuring and the Myriad Webs of Restraint," in Jerel A. Rosati et al. (eds.) *Foreign Policy Restructuring: How Governments Respond to Global Change* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1994), pp. 30–32. There is no need to elaborate on the role the United States is playing in rescuing Korea from its financial crisis. See Lawrence B. Krause, *The Economics and Politics of the Asian Financial Crisis of 1997–98* (New York: Council on Foreign Relations, June 1998), pp. 24–25, 28–30. U.S. benevolence was recently demonstrated in that a favorable exchange rate (United States$1=W908) was applied to a significant portion (US$ 224 million) of the Korean share in the maintenance of the alliance for 1998. See *Chosun Daily*, June 20, 1998. On the other hand, China has curiously remained silent on possible measures to help Korea in stark contrast with its offer of a US$1 billion rescue package to Thailand in 1997.

[73] In fact, Korea should actively induce the United States to persuade other regional players to agree on a formula for peaceful reunification or smooth post-collapse management that can guarantee the formation of a unified Korea. For this idea, I am indebted to Young-kwan Yoon, who introduced to me Philip Zelikow and Condoleezza Rice, *Germany Unified and Europe Transformed: A Study in Statecraft* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1995).

[74] Mustafa Chaudhary, "Dynamics of Superpower–Small Power Relationship," Syed Farooq Hasnat and Anton Pelinka (eds.), *Security for the Weak Nations: A Multiple Perspective* (Lahore, Pakistan: Izharsons, 1986), p. 33.

[75] See, for instance, Joo-Hong Nam, *America's Commitment to South Korea* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), pp. 153, 158.

[76] For the difficulties associated with the U.S. establishing a "benign unipolarity" in East Asia, see Charles A. Kupchan, "After Pax Americana: Benign Power, Regional Integration, and the Sources of a Stable Multipolarity," *International Security* 23, no. 2 (Fall 1998), pp. 63–69.

[77] See the editorials of June 16, 1992, October 1 and December 24, 1995, in *Chosun Daily*; and October 10, 1992, July 8, 1993, December 2, 1994, and April 12, 1997, in *Hankyoreh News*. Eleven of the nineteen interviewees pointed out that the Korean military lacks the will to become self-reliant. Furthermore, eleven of thirteen interviewees commented that the most critical problem with Korea's external relations lay in the bureaucracy's lack of leadership

and capabilities to cope effectively with pressures from the outside in a gain-maximizing and cost-minimizing manner.

[78] Edward A. Olsen, "Korean Security: Is Japan's Comprehensive Security Model a Viable Alternative?" in Doug Bandow and Ted Galen Carpenter (eds.), *The United States–Korean Alliance: Time for A Change* (New Brunswick: Transactions Publishers, 1992), pp. 146–148.

[79] For the calls for strategic "soul searching" in Korea including public debates, see Ralph Cossa, *Korea: The Achilles' Heel of the United States–Japan Alliance*, Discussion Papers of the Asia/Pacific Research Center, Stanford University, May 1997, p. 9; and Young-kwan Yoon, "Saejongbu eui oegyo chonllyok kwa kwaje" [Suggestions and Prescriptions for the New Government's External Relations] in *Kyegan sasang* [Ideas Quarterly], Winter 1997, pp. 58–80.

[80] For details of sampling procedures of these surveys, see 1990 issue, pp. 6–20; 1991 issue, pp. 8–20; and 1993 issue, pp. 7–21.

[81] *Hankyoreh* was founded in May 1988 but its 1988–89 issues were not systematically incorporated into KINDS. Thus, the starting point of our content analysis was January 1, 1990, and the end point December 31, 1997.

[82] Originally, the content analyzing of "specialist columns" was also considered. However, since there is the conditionality clause that "columns do not necessarily represent the opinions of the publishing establishment," it was decided to analyze the editorials only.

[83] Originally, an additional category concerning the role of the United States in promoting human rights in North Korea was included. There were only two editorials from *Hankyoreh News* and one from *Chosun Daily* touching on the issue, however, and subsequently the category was dropped.

[84] Originally, a category concerning the role of China's economic and food support for North Korea was included. However, not a single editorial was found in the screened pool and subsequently the category was dropped.

Selected Publications of the Asia/Pacific Research Center

Occasional Papers currently in print may be ordered at $7.50 per copy (including postage and handling) and Working Papers and Discussion Papers at $5.00 per copy through the Asia/Pacific Research Center. For further information, call (650) 723-9741 or fax (650) 723-6530. A complete publications list and the complete texts of many of the papers are also available on the A/PARC Web site: http://www.stanford.edu/group/APARC.

Special Reports

Daniel I. Okimoto, Henry S. Rowen, Michel Oksenberg, James H. Raphael, Thomas P. Rohlen, Donald K. Emmerson, Michael H. Armacost. *A United States Policy for the Changing Realities of East Asia: Toward a New Consensus.* 1996. $10.

Occasional Papers

C.H. Kwan. *The Yen, the Yuan, and the Asian Currency Crisis: Changing Fortune between Japan and China*. December 1998.

Michel Oksenberg and Elizabeth Economy. *China's Accession to and Implementation of International Environmental Accords 1978–95*. February 1998.

Daniel I. Okimoto. *The Japan-America Security Alliance: Prospects for the Twenty-First Century*. January 1998.

Michael May. *Energy and Security in East Asia.* January 1998.

The Walter H. Shorenstein Distinguished Lecture Series: Korea in the 21st Century. Lawrence B. Krause, *Korea's Economic Role in East Asia*; James Lilley, *The "Great Game" on the Korean Peninsula*; and Bruce Cumings, *Japanese Colonialism in Korea: A Comparative Perspective.* October 1997.

K.C. Fung and Lawrence J. Lau. *China's Foreign Economic Relations*. 1997.

Ronald McKinnon, Kenichi Ohno, and Kazuko Shirono. *The Syndrome of the Ever-Higher Yen, 1971–1995: American Mercantile Pressure on Japanese Monetary Policy*. 1996.

K. C. Fung and Lawrence J. Lau. *The China–United States Bilateral Trade Balance: How Big Is It Really?* 1996.

Chas. W. Freeman, Jr. *Managing U.S. Relations with China.* 1996.

Working Papers

Sang-Mok Suh. *The Korean Economic Crisis: What Can We Learn From It?* May 1998.

Jennifer A. Amyx. *Sankin Kotai: Institutionalized Trust As the Foundation for Economic Development in the Tokugawa Era.* 1997.

Reprints

Lawrence J. Lau. "Gain Without Pain: Why Economic Reform in China Worked." Reprint from *China's Political Economy* (Singapore: World Scientific Publishing Co. Pte. Ltd. and Singapore UP Pte. Ltd., 1998). October 1998.

Michel Oksenberg, Pitman B. Potter, and William B. Abnett. "Advancing Intellectual Property Rights: Information Technologies and the Course of Economic Development in China." Reprint from *NBR Analysis* 7, no. 4 (March 1998).

Michel Oksenberg. "Taiwan, Tibet, and Hong Kong in Sino-American Relations." Reprint from *Living with China: Relations in the Twenty-first Century*, ed. Ezra F. Vogel (New York: W.W. Norton, 1997). February 1998.

Michel Oksenberg. "Will China Democratize? Confronting a Classic Dilemma." Reprint from *Journal of Democracy* 9, no. 1 (January 1998).

Henry S. Rowen. "The Political and Social Foundations of the Rise of East Asia: An Overview." Reprint from *Behind East Asian Growth*, edited by Henry S. Rowen (London: Routledge, Inc., 1998).

James H. Raphael and Thomas P. Rohlen. "How Many Models of Japanese Growth Do We Want or Need?" Reprint from *Behind East Asian Growth*, edited by Henry S. Rowen (London: Routledge, Inc., 1998).

Lawrence J. Lau. "The Role of Government in Economic Development: Some Observations from the Experience of China, Hong Kong, and Taiwan." Reprint from *The Role of Government in East Asian Economic Development: Comparative Institutional Analysis*, edited by Masahiko Aoki, Hyung-Ki Kim, and Masahiro Okuno-Fujiwara (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996). October 1997.

Henry S. Rowen. "Off-Center on the Middle Kingdom." Reprint from *The National Interest* (Summer 1997). 1997.

Lawrence J. Lau. "The Sources of Long-Term Economic Growth: Observations from the Experience of Developed and Developing Countries." Reprint from Ralph Landau, Timothy Taylor, and Gavin Wright, eds., *The Mosaic of Economic Growth* (Stanford University Press 1996). 1996.

America's Alliances with Japan and Korea in a Changing Northeast Asia Project Discussion Papers

Andrew F. Krepinevich. *Future Prospects for the U.S. Defense Budget and Their Implications for Our Asian Alliance Commitments*. 1997.

Ralph Cossa. *Korea: The Achilles' Heel of the U.S.-Japan Alliance*. 1997.

Yu Bin. *East Asia: Geopolitique into the Twenty-first Century—A Chinese View*. 1997.

Paul Giarra. *U.S.-Japan Defense Guidelines: Toward a New Accommodation of Mutual Responsibility*. 1997

Bates Gill. *Proliferation and the U.S. Alliances in Northeast Asia*. 1997.

Bonnie Glaser and Banning Garrett. *China and the U.S.-Japan Alliance at a Time of Strategic Change and Shifts in the Balance of Power*. October 1997.

Richard Danzig. *Asian Futures, Naval Futures: How Do They Intersect?* William J. Perry. *Asian-Pacific Security Issues in the Post-Deng Era*. November 1997.

Wu Xinbo. *Integration on the Basis of Strength: China's Impact on East Asian Security*. February 1998.

Marcus Noland, Sherman Robinson, and Li-gang Liu. *The Costs and Benefits of Korean Unification*. March 1998.

Charles Wolf, Jr., and Michele Zanini. *Benefits and Burdens: The Politically Dominated Economics of U.S. Alliances with Japan and Korea*. April 1998.

Jorn Dösch. *The United States and the New Security Architecture of the Asia Pacific—A European View*. April 1998.

Yoshihide Soeya. *Japan's Dual Identity and the U.S.-Japan Alliance*. May 1998.

Mike M. Mochizuki. *Security and Economic Interdependence in Northeast Asia*. May 1998.

Jianwei Wang and Xinbo Wu. *Against Us or with Us? The Chinese Perspective of America's Alliances with Japan and Korea*. May 1998.

Nancy Bernkopf Tucker. *The Origins and Evolution of the Korean American Alliance: An American Perspective*. June 1998.

Byung-joon Ahn. *The Origins and Evolution of the Korean-American Alliance: A Korean Perspective*. July 1998.

Koji Murata. *The Origins and Evolution of the Korean-American Alliance: A Japanese Perspective*. August 1998.

Michael Swaine. *Chinese Military Modernization and Asian Security*. August 1998.

Hideo Sato. *Japan's China Perceptions and Its Policies in the Alliance with the United States*. September 1998.

Oknim Chung. *The Origins and Evolution of the Japanese-American Alliance: A Korean Perspective*. September 1998.

Andrew Scobell. *Show of Force: The PLA and the 1995–1996 Taiwan Strait Crisis*. January 1999.

Urban Dynamics of East Asia Project Discussion Papers

Mike Douglass. *East Asian Urbanization: Patterns, Problems, and Prospects*. July 1998.