

ANNEX I

JAPAN'S VIEWS
CONCERNING THE ASEAN REGIONAL FORUM (ARF)

This paper outlines **Japan's** preliminary thinking on the **ARF**. We would appreciate this paper is being taken into **consideration**.

1. **Japan's** views on the holding of the ARF

1) It is important that we make this **year's** ARF meeting a "**Good Start**" towards the **establishment** and promotion of regional political and security dialogue. It is, therefore, desirable that the participants in this year's meeting have a shared perception regarding the need for regional political and security dialogue.

We agree with ASEAN's suggestion that views be exchanged within the framework of the topics, "**Asia Pacific Security Situation**" and "**Possible Development of Confidence Building Measures in the Context of Preventive Diplomacy**."

Regarding the admission of new members in the future, we think it necessary to reach consensus among all of the ARF **participants**.

2) Because the ARF SOM is a senior officials level meeting, permitting a longer session, more concrete issues can be discussed in the ARF SOM than in the **ARF**. Therefore, in addition to its function as a preparatory meeting for the ARF, the ARF SOM should also function as an independent forum for political and security dialogue, having a role different from those of the PMC and the ARF, both of which are **ministerial-level**.

3) Both the ARF and the ARF SOM are held annually. We should not expect to discuss all aspects of mutual reassurance measures exhaustively **in** this year's meetings of those fora. We think it

worthwhile to consider the establishment of working groups to discuss the following topics in detail. We also think that it would be desirable to set up one working group to deal with several topics, rather than creating a separate working group for each topic. This will avoid an excessive workload, an important consideration, given the fact that the ARF has no secretariat.

2. Content of discussion in the ARF

1) Information Sharing (Transparency)

a) Publication of annual national defense white papers

We think **information-sharing** on defense in the region will be enhanced by the publication of annual defense white papers. However, if the immediate publication of defense white papers is difficult, it seems to us to be a good idea for each member to prepare papers concerning its defense policy specifically for the ARF or the ARF SOM, with discussion based on those papers, with a view to making possible better exchange of views on measures for **information-sharing (transparency)** on defense policy.

For example, each ARF member would submit to the chair-country (this year : Thailand) a paper (in English) outlining its defense policy, at least 10 days before the ARF (which will take place in July this **year**). The paper would be 10-15 pages in length, and would cover how that country sees the security situation in the region, doctrine, present military capability, **etc.** The chair-country would distribute the paper to the other ARF **members**.

b) Promotion of the UN Register of Conventional Arms

We are aware that some members of ASEAN feel

that there should be discussion of the establishment of an arms register for South-East Asia. We welcome such initiatives. However, in view of the fact that there are currently ARF members who have not yet reported their data to the UN Register of Conventional Arms, we should give priority to encouraging those members to do so.

c) Cooperation on **Non-proliferation**

The ARF participating countries should cooperate in order to prevent the **proliferation** of weapons of mass destruction and missiles. Firstly, it is useful to deepen dialogues on strengthening the **non-proliferation** norms such as the question of NPT extension, ratification of Chemical Weapon Convention (CWC), **etc.** Export control on materials which may be used to develop or produce such weapons is an international challenge. In increasing the **effectiveness** of international export control regime such as the Nuclear Suppliers Group , the Australia Group and the Missile Technology Control Regime, it is particularly important that the Asian countries establish effective export control systems. For the purpose of promoting cooperative relations in this field, it would be beneficial for the ARF countries to undertake exchanges of views. For our part, Japan is ready to offer assistance such as training and hosting seminars.

2) Personnel exchange

It is important for enhancing mutual reassurance to promote personnel exchange, including exchange of defense personnel. We are studying the following measures which may be expected to contribute to that end.

a) Promotion of Defense Personnel Exchange

For defense personnel exchange with other countries, Japan already has several programs in

place, such as student exchange, with defense personnel from other countries attending the educational institutions of the **Self-Defense** Agency, and a Defense Research Fellow exchange program. Such programs can be effective measures for building confidence among defense personnel in the region. We believe it is important to encourage the promotion of exchange of defense personnel through similar programs in each country.

b) Holding of a specialist meeting on emergency relief

There is no doubt that early and appropriate action to combat a disaster should be taken primarily by the country affected. However, in the case of a large-scale disaster, it is likely that international measures will be needed, quite possibly presenting other countries of the region with a formidable task. Emergency relief is in many cases carried out with the participation of a **country's** armed forces. In order to carry out emergency relief more smoothly in the Asia-Pacific region, a meeting of specialists on this matter, one including military personnel, would contribute to promoting effective aid activities. It would also contribute to personnel exchange among the **region's** armed forces and be useful for broader **confidence-building** among the countries of the **region**.

3) Cooperation in **PKOs**

It would be useful to seek cooperation in PKOs, including that of military personnel, as a way of promoting **confidence-building** among the countries of the Asia-Pacific region in the Post-Cold War world. Although **it** is true that PKOs are not **unique** to the region and **that**, indeed, the need for PKOs is relatively small at the moment in this region, PKOs can be a good objective for regional cooperation in

a longer **term**, bearing in mind the possibility of future challenges to the region. From this **standpoint**, it might be useful to hold a seminar concerning, for example, exchange of information **on PKOs**, and how PKOs should be created. Such cooperation would be in line with the current discussion in the UN concerning the improvement and uniformity of the quality of the members of PKO to be dispatched by each country, and cooperation among the UN and regional **organizations**.

3. Other matters

The "**CBM**" was created, against the background of East-West **confrontation** in Europe during the Cold War, to ease tension between the two camps and to minimize the risk of military **confrontation**. However, in the Asian region, there is no such bipolar structure of nations divided into two hostile **camps**. The most significant feature of Asia is its diversity, not only in **nations'** security concerns, but in other **areas**, such as political and economic system, culture and religion. In such **circumstances**, for the stability of this region, it is necessary that, in addition to minimizing the risk of military **confrontation**, efforts be made to increase mutual assurance and openness of defense policy (**transparency**) through a wide variety of measures, including political, economic and cultural measures. We feel the "**CBM**" is too narrow a concept to cover all the measures **needed**. It would **be more** appropriate to have some such concept as "**measures to increase** mutual reassurance (Mutual Reassurance Measures : **MRM**).