

## **Session 4: The Six Party Talks as Viable Mechanism for Denuclearization**

Hayoun Jessie Ryou

The George Washington University

### **Summary**

Is the Six Party Talks (SPT) a viable mechanism for denuclearization? Panelists agree on basic function of it but view it with a strong resentment and point out several caveats in the SPT.

Sue Mi Terry from Council on Foreign Affairs expressed the most positive view among panelists, and focused her remarks on the efforts of the US administration. She gives high credit to the current US administration in handling the problem, and argues it put forth its best effort in bringing forth a fruitful conclusion. Bruce Klinger of the Heritage Foundation shows the failure of the successful denuclearization so far necessities the strong alliance of the US with Japan and Korea, more efforts by the current US administration and more comprehensive measurement. The problem does not lie with the US and its allies but rather with North Korea. Thereby he points out that it is time for North Korea to show its effort. Focusing on the role of China, Larry Wortzel of the US-China Economic and Security Review Commission, insists the Chinese priority concern of North Korea is not about security but rather about economy and stability which sharply differs from the US and its allies. Burwell Bell, former commander of United States Forces Korea, thinks the SPT mechanism is not a viable one. He found the reason of failure of the SPT so far from the internal divergence of the strategic interest of the SPT members; the US and China have different strategic priorities; China and Japan are unwilling to support Korean unification due to their own strategic interests in the region. These are the major hindrances in pursuing

effective dialogue among SPT members. As divergent as they are in their strategic interests, he suggest the adoption of a more unified approach toward North Korea, emphasizing stronger alliance relations.

As to whether we need to further consider utilizing existing regional security mechanisms, with special regard to the Shanghai Cooperation Organization, Bruce sees it is unnecessary due to overlapping membership of two mechanisms (Russia and China) and their potential ineffectiveness. As to whether we need much stronger containment policies, Terry sees it as impractical to merely look at containment policy in practical terms, pointing out the current US administration's efforts are more wide-ranging than merely focusing on containment. Other panelists believe more aggressive containment policies are necessary.

\* The views expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the views of the Asan Institute for Policy Studies.

\* The views expressed here are panel overviews of the Asan Plenum. They do not necessarily reflect the views of the author or the institutions they are affiliated with.

---