

Trade Disagreement Between Japan and South Korea

Yiquan Wang¹

¹ Australian National University, Canberra, Australia

Correspondence: Yiquan Wang, Australian National University, Canberra, Australia. Tel: 61-42-111-2057.

Received: October 15, 2019

Accepted: November 4, 2019

Online Published: December 14, 2019

doi:10.20849/abr.v4i3.685

URL: <https://doi.org/10.20849/abr.v4i3.685>

Abstract

Trade disputes between Japan and South Korea have become increasingly serious. Some people blame the US president for this dispute, while others associate this with the need for the two countries to maintain the upper hand in Asia. Some of the problems are caused by trade restrictions and mutual embargoes between the two countries, all of which are aimed at achieving hegemony. Realism insists that the state develops on a self-sufficient basis, and the fundamental reason for its availability is to strengthen its own strength to help them get assistance in advance. The study will seek to assess whether Japan is willing to strengthen and congest power by undermining the Korean budget. Liberal internationalism assumes that the current global order may create peace, and global cooperation is an effective way to improve national interests. This view will assess whether Japan and South Korea will resolve their problems in a sincere manner and whether the United States will take a more active stance when making a resolution.

Keywords: realism, liberalism, history, area security, trade war

The connections between South Korea and Japan are currently disjointed since Japan has assumed the independent choice to bar South Korea's essential mineral exports for its electronics market. South Korea and Japan are two important entities that contribute significantly to the local and international markets. The two have a bitter background that dates back to WW2, but these past matters have never been handled as required. Most of the argument concerns the complaints of categories that abandoned the historic treaty between the nations (Schott, Jung, & Cimino-Isaacs, 2015). South Korea blames Japan of abusing Korean females in the course of World War II, whereby many South Korean females were compelled to be servants of Japanese soldiers (Hayashi, 2008). The Japanese regime decided to eliminate South Korea from the catalogue of trade simplification (Jqknews.com, 2019). To profoundly understand the nature of disagreement between the two powers, it is essential to consider the strained past relations that help to explain the bilateral agreements between the two nations.

An inquiry into the disagreement is essential because it will help to explain and offer recommendations on how Japan and South Korea can become more influential hegemony in East Asia. The primary reason for the resentment is the unsettled past problem of South Korean women who operated in Japanese in WW2 (Rastin, 2016). Research is, therefore, important as it delves into two of the highly critical nations in the area, and continued conflicts might have regional and global issues that can be addressed at an earlier stage (Seitz, Tarasov, & Zakharenko, 2015). If the two nations put aside their differences, it will be possible to operate and collaborate on matters meant to make the region more stable, triggering growth in the economic, social and political arenas.

The research will evaluate the present trade issue between South Korea as well as Japan, from Realism alongside Liberalism points of view. Realism maintains that countries operate out of their egotistical gains and that the essential reason for their availability is to elevate their strength to assist them in advance (Guzzini, 1998). The proposed study shall seek to evaluate whether Japan is willing to enhance and crowd power by damaging the South Korean budget. This notion will assist in understanding the foundation of the argument between the two nations and will reconsider the happenings of the Second World War. Liberalism internationalism postulates the present global order might produce peace, and that worldwide collaboration is the approach effective to advance the state's interests (Sohn, 2015). Such perspective will appraise whether Japan and South Korea, might crack their issues cordially and if the United States will assume a more active stance in positing a resolution.

The election of Donald Trump has triggered an indecisive state that has made international actors more concerned about the safety in the East Asian region. (Meng, et al., 2018). Through a collection of reports

encouraging South Korea and Japan to boost trade and at the same time intimidating the two powers in an attempt to allow more control by the United States, there was a confusion that even Tokyo could not understand despite being its major defense partner in the region. Trump's duty is the sole section of Japan's security approach. Certainly, Japan's trade strategy is further a cause of the fears received from the outside: North Korea's trade and economy plans, Russian operations in the Far East, as well as China's elevating fierceness in the East China Sea (Meng, et al., 2018). In the post-Cold Battle duration, it is unclear how the Japanese channelled their international business to align with global powers. Japan's actions have enormous effects on the East Asia trade. As the area's second-biggest economy as well as an economic powerhouse, Japan's danger insight reveals how politicians in Tokyo consider where Japan revels economically with its allies (Park & Sang - Chul, 2017). Japan's reaction to the intimidations shapes what its nationals do in retaliation. The past violence, ongoing trade arguments, and Japan's possibility to become an economic influence again, its allies carefully check what Japan does economically (Park & Sang - Chul, 2017). Besides, research on such queries will illustrate how major factors of Japan's national trade; involving appeasing norms as well as legal limits on the utilization of business, among others, have in the past molded trade policy.

Dissimilar to realism, liberalism is low on threats and engagement than on collaboration and affluence. Still, it largely contends that countries may identify trade threats from diverse regime forms, more so non-democracies, ones that do not involve in free business, and others that might not be part of global companies. From a liberal point of view, Japan would precisely find issues of distress in the Chinese, Russian, and North Korean governments. Rather than escalating the battle, nonetheless, liberalism anticipates states to seek to resolve issues serenely via global companies, trade, and investment, as well as the promotion of self-governing values and establishments (Park, & Sang - Chul, 2017). As per this perception, Japan should enhance equality, economic connection, and global companies in East Asia as a way of improving the chances of peace and affluence in the place. Primarily, Japan has performed all these functions in the post-war period.

Japan started confining exports of three substances, which are hydrogen fluoride gas, fluorinated polyimide, and photoresists within national security distress. Japanese bureaucrats have noted that South Korea does not adequately supervise the end use of such chemicals that might further cause trade issues outside the three items, even after noting that Seoul might have provided North Korea admittance to specific goods (Park, & Sang - Chul, 2017). South Korean agents have refused to accept those claims and have examined the import and utilisation of the chemicals, releasing reports that there are no illegal activities.

Many experts understand the technology trade war emanated from the nature of interaction in World War II. South Korean offence of Japan's application of forced work in the course of the wartime job, and what most people in South Korea consider as Japanese reluctance to recognise the nation's trade operations or instigate compensations fully (Petri & Peter, 2018). The initiative for the trade battle seems to be a South Korean issue last year, which indicated that Japan's largest maker of steel, Nippon Steel, utilised compelled labour in the battle and forced the company to repay some South Korean stayers with about \$95,000 each. A similar incident within the past year posited in contradiction of Mitsubishi Heavy Industries, as well as other instances on scores of Japanese companies being processed in lower law courts (Petri & Peter, 2018). Japan contends that it has by now instigated compensations with a financial payment in the 1965 past that regenerated diplomatic connections between the two nations. However, South Korean law courts hold a contrary position.

The connection between structural realism and liberalism provides an imperfect illustration of how Japan intends to handle intimidations. Tokyo has vigorously endorsed egalitarianism and nation-building, financial interdependence with its nationals, and global and local governments to boost its welfares; all these are critical factors shaping a liberal overseas market approach. Liberalism is never the motive behind all these happenings. All Japanese allies are part of global entities such as the United Nations (Schott, et al., 2015). Financial reliance in the area is not endangered; South Korea and Japan, for instance, business with and capitalise mainly on each other. However, Japan has further balanced coercions both inside as well as outside the way the mechanical pragmatists might relate. Within, it has acquired innovative weapons frameworks, introduced native projects, provided "airplane carriers" for purposes of near-sea defence, and capitalised in investigation as well as expansion. It has further elevated logistical suppleness by shifting ground powers from its north in which they at one time expected Soviet trade to its southwest to effectively protect the territory from South Korea (Seitz et al., 2015). Interior regulations have been maintaining restrictions. Missing are the key legitimate improvements and shifts in the trade evasion tendency of its global trade approach, defence regulations, and administration entities. Japan has not reviewed Article 10 of the peace composition; it is under the self-effected ban on utilising over 1% of a gross domestic product on national defence.

Realists contend that smaller countries in East Asia, such as Japan as well as South Korea, have constructed enormous conventional advantages by upgrading their current trade status. They are typically capable of defending themselves against pressure from a possible regional hegemon (Sohn & Yul, 2015). Japan has the technical prowess and financial ability to develop its trade structure and its own highly sophisticated conventional framework. The country can further develop trade connections shortly with the help of the United States. Indeed, Japan's reaction to the 'rise of China' is notable, bolstered by the so-called elevation of Japanese nationalism spirit.

Japan has in the past collaborated with the U.S. to check on South Korea. Realists contend that Japan is not a weak force since it is the fourth biggest economy in the globe and thus efficient in balancing South Korea's and its own trade affairs. Nonetheless, there is another version about South and Japan, which lends trustworthiness to the liberal projection. It was Japan that first supported the entry of South Korea into the World Trade Organization (WTO) (Solís, Mireya, & Jeffrey, 2017). The same happened in the discourse on Japanese extremism in the course World War II in South Korea and the Japanese humiliation thesis notwithstanding. Japan perhaps knows that engaging China in international economic agencies serves its interest, as this results in a prosperous and steady East Asia; profoundly high importance for the Japanese national interest. Liberal institutionalism systems also account for Asian political systems founded on informal lines: individual contacts that are far less organised and non-bureaucratic (Allen, John, & Benjamin, 2017). Dissimilar to the European version of over-institutionalism, as well as structural and formal regulations of communication, the East Asian approach is to proceed more.

Both Japan and South Korea are essential to the world economy, and disturbances will provide spillover effects that will go beyond the two adversaries. The immediate danger is to the universal tech supply chain, but any stoppage elevates the likelihood of a global recession. The disagreement has come at a chiefly lousy time (Arif et al., 2017). Leading economies are today witnessing weak expansion with harmful levels emanating from the United Kingdom and Germany and a typical stoppage in the United States, China as well as India. It should be noted that with the world's two biggest economies, the United States, and China are in a looming price battle that is a frightening business venture. The competition will affect trade flows in the world particularly, in Japan and South Korean trade row, leading to business doubt and confusion. There is a reduced indication as to when such disputes will be handled, or in whose courtesy (Arif et al., 2017). Connect to this the chaos on Brexit, and companies are left unsure of what will transpire next (Baldwin, Richard, & Javier, 2015). Not astonishingly, companies are already accepting a wait and see approach, postponing investment and awaiting clarity amid elevating uncertainty, as bond markets and industries send alarming signs of a looming slump.

In historical times, the United States might have come in to avert any clash between its Southeast Asian allies from getting out of hand (Berger, et al., 2017). Nonetheless, the Trump's administration has been cautious about being included, regardless of the critical duty both nations play in checking South Korea's trade determinations. In an essential symbol of fluctuating power in the area, Japan has by now decided to move in and assist in resolving the issue. The international leaders in the recent past have failed to provide a date for the yearly conference of their managers. Japan regards stability necessary and has been looking forward to bolstering local economic connection as its link with South Korea sours (Cameron, et al., 2016) It will further be concerned on the effect the Japan-South Korea business issue could have on big Chinese machinery entities such as ZTE as well as Huawei, which depend on United States suppliers in the form of Qualcomm for chips alongside semi-conductors. Nonetheless, if the United States trade authorisations cut off this basis of supply, they will be considering South Korea for the vigorous components. Another issue globally is Japan's application of nationwide security to validate its business policy. This weapon of trade was effective after Donald Trump's specification of security issues when placing tariffs on steel as well as aluminium items. Japan sees the trade battle as a way to disrupt its fundamental development approach, avert its re-emergence as a global power, and considers the trade issue through the lens of security as well as sovereignty (Dent & Christopher, 2016). World Trade Organization (WTO) regulations, which control trade between nations, are, in no small degree, founded on norms. They involve a national security release clause that relies on participants applying it in proper faith (Duong & Patrik, 2018). Once member nations commence taking advantage of the endowment, there is likely to be a dropping effect, tempting more nations to weaponize this exception in a tit-for-tat trade battle. Both hatred and mistrust commenced in Japan's 1910 to 1945 annexation of Korea when Japan compelled an approximated hundreds of thousands of Koreans to operate as voluntary labourers or to work as sex slaves in armed brothels. Since then, the two nations have differed over what Japan should do to offer long-term solutions. Japan, as well as South Korea, normalised connections in 1965 and decided Japan would offer South Korea \$800 million in

financial contributions and loans (Eckhardt & Arlo, 2016). Japan notes that the 1965 regime accord resolved the problem, despite that the South Korean public has long reinforced individual claims for reimbursement.

Japan has tightened regulations over the export to South Korea of major chemicals and other resources that South Korea's tech world needs to manufacture smartphone screens as well as semiconductors (Heilmann, 2016). As an outcome, Japanese companies must undergo a lengthy government approval process to sell these products to South Korea. Japan announced strategies to remove South Korea from its catalogue of favoured trading allies, which would affect exports of many distinct products. In retaliation, South Korea announced it would further move to evoke Japan's favoured trade status. Most South Koreans have called for embargoes of Japanese commodities. Japan's new export restrictions loom to have global ripple effects. The country regulates 90% of the global supply of special chemicals required for semiconductors as well as smartphone displays, in which South Korean entities are the globe's dominant manufacturers (Herrero, Alicia, & Jianwei, 2017). If South Korean entities run out of the resources, global tech supply chains from Apple iPhones to TV sets would be affected.

South Korea and Japan are significant colleagues of the U.S. within East Asia. The two nations are "window replicas" of democratization and monetary progression in a free globe. Sustained safety delivery of the U.S. to the two nations in the course of and after the Cold Battle era offered a podium for elevating their world rank as well as elevating the superiority of existence of the individuals of the two states. For the last 50 years, after South Korea and Japan normalized their connections in 1965, cooperative relationships between the two countries have shifted forward. In 1965, the level of people visiting the other nation was about 10,000 (Hong, 2017). In 2007, 5 million Japanese and South Koreans crossed the two borders, which implies that more than 10,000 Japanese and South Korean people have been entering the two nations in a single day. In 1970, bilateral trade between the two countries was only \$300 million (Howell & Thomas, 2019). In 2008, trade between the two states was recorded at \$80 billion (Jones & David, 2016). The "Korean wave" is so extensive that Japanese housewives and youth are captivated by Korean movie stars. Snowballing number of Japanese approaches izakaya is located in Seoul. According to Khan et al. (2017), these are typical examples of excavating ties between South Korea and Japan.

However, abrasions between the two nations have never paled away. There are instances of history-connected frictions since the mid-1990s (Kim, et al., 2015). History controversies, Yasukuni shrine visits, as well as Dokdo/Takeshima issues galvanise both the South Korean and Japanese trade. Anti-Japanese views in Korea are not essentially on the rise, but responses to the Japanese incitements are becoming intensid. As opposed to the Cold War era when both South Korea and Japan provoked North Korea, the two nations have acquired diverging insights into the North Korean danger during the past times (Khan, et al., 2017). This laid the basis for submerged but possible conflict. There is no doubt that cooperation has escalated during the past few years, but frictions persist. As for the future of the South, Korea-Japan planned connection, opinions are split, and experiential realities are mixed as well as complex. Assuming that premises can work as a directing light to circumnavigate through the unknown future, this would be addressed from a logical point of view. This will apply contemporary global relations theories, namely realism, liberalism, as well as constructivism to the scheduled times of South Korea-Japan connections and interpret mixed signs with a prism of academic perspectives (Kim & Samuel, 2016). After reviewing both hopeful and pessimistic perceptions drawn from diverse notions, this would draw out a synthesis that stands on careful optimism.

The combination of physical realism and liberalism offers a flawed illustration of what Japan does to tackle trade threats. Tokyo has actively endorsed democracy and nation-building, financial interdependence with its allies and international as well as regional agencies and other connected entities to strengthen its interests; all critical factors of a liberal foreign policy. Liberalism, per se, is not the leading cause of this rift between the trade on South Korea and Japan (King, 2018). All its nationals are participants of international entities such as the United Nations. Financial interdependence in the region is not endangered; South Korea and Japan, for instance, trade with and capitalise heavily on one another for sustenance and survival (Steven, 2016). Japan has further balanced threats both within and externally the way the physical realists would identify.

Within, it has attained advanced trade systems, offered indigenous projects, unveiled "helicopter machines" for near-sea defense, and speculated in research and development (Suzuki, 2017). It has further elevated logistical flexibility by moving ground trade forces from its north, where they initially anticipated Soviet attacks toward its southwest to effectively defend its territory from China. Interior balancing has confined (Suzuki, 2017). Missing are the essential constitutional modifications and changes in the vehemence avoidance tendency of its national trade strategy, trade laws, as well as government institutions. Japan has not reviewed Article 9 of the peace composition; it remains under the self-provided ban on utilizing more than two percent of GNP on national trade.

In conclusion, it can be noted that the trade dispute between Japan and South Korea is worsening as days elapse. Some people blame this dispute to the presidency of America, while others connect the same to the need of both countries to maintain an upper hand in the Asian region. Some of the problems are brought about by the trade restrictions and embargoes both nations are placing on each other, and this is all aimed at attaining supremacy. Additionally, both Japan and South Korea are competing in terms of innovation regarding which nation should supply what materials to the United States. It should be noted that the present tensions stem from the anger over Japan's settlement of the Korean Peninsula during the period that led to the Second World War. Korea insists that Japan should apologize for forcing many of its women to operate as slaves for Japanese soldiers.

References

- Allen, J., & Sugg, B. (2016). *The US-Japan Alliance*. Brookings Institute. Retrieved March 10, 2017, from <https://www.Brookings.edu/research/the-us-japan-alliance/>
- Arif, I., Kazmi, S. W., & Khan, L. (2017). Relationship between trade openness and energy consumption in oil-importing Asian countries. *Journal of Finance & Economics Research*, 2(1), 37-53.
- Baldwin, R., and Lopez-Gonzalez, J. (2015). Supply-chain trade: A portrait of global patterns and several testable hypotheses. *The World Economy*, 38(11), 1682-1721.
- Berger, A., Brandi, C., Bruhn, D., & Chi, M. (2017). Towards "greening" trade? Tracking environmental provisions in the preferential trade agreements of emerging markets. No. 2/2017. *Discussion Paper*, 2017.
- Cameron, C., Pachauri, S., Rao, N. D., McCollum, D., Rogelj, J., & Riahi, K. (2016). Policy trade-offs between climate mitigation and clean cook-stove access in South Asia. *Nature Energy*, 1(1), 15010.
- Dent, C. M. (2016). *East Asian Regionalism*. Routledge.
- Duong, T., & Hultberg, P. T. (2018). Trade Openness, Economic Growth, and Environmental Degradation in Asian Developing Countries. *Journal of Applied Business and Economics*, 20(5).
- Eckhardt, J., & Poletti, A. (2016). The politics of global value chains: import-dependent firms and EU-Asia trade agreements. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 23(10), 1543-1562.
- Heilmann, K. (2016). Does political conflict hurt trade? Evidence from consumer boycotts. *Journal of International Economics*, 99, 179-191.
- Herrero, A. G., & Xu, J. (2017). China's Belt and Road Initiative: Can Europe Expect Trade Gains?. *China & World Economy*, 25(6), 84-99.
- Hong, G. H., Lee, J., Liao, W., & Seneviratne, D. (2017). China and Asia in global trade slowdown. *Journal of International Commerce, Economics and Policy*, 8(1), 1750001.
- Howell, T. R. (2019). *Conflict among nations: trade policies in the 1990s*. Routledge.
- Jones, D. M. (2016). ASEAN's imitation economic community: the primacy of the domestic political economy. In *ASEAN Economic Community* (pp. 11-31). Palgrave Macmillan, New York.
- Khan, M. T. I., Yaseen, M. R., & Ali, Q. (2017). Dynamic relationship between financial development, energy consumption, trade, and greenhouse gas: comparison of upper-middle-income countries from Asia, Europe, Africa, and America. *Journal of cleaner production*, 161, 567-580.
- Kim, B-H., Kim, H., & Lee, B-S. (2015). Spillover effects of the US financial crisis on financial markets in emerging Asian countries. *International Review of Economics & Finance*, 39, 192-210.
- Kim, J. Y. (2015). Rethinking the role of identity factors: the history problem and the Japan-South Korea security relationship in the post-Cold War period. *International Relations of the Asia-Pacific*, 15(3), 477-503.
- Kim, S. S. (2016). China, Japan, and Russia in inter-Korean relations. In *Korea Briefing* (pp. 119-158). Routledge.
- King, A. Y. C. (2018). *The Chinese University of Hong Kong. The Administrative Absorption of Politics in Hong Kong, with Special Emphasis on the City District Officer Scheme*.
- Koh, B. H., Wong, W. P., Tang, C. F., & Lim, M. K. (2018). The double-edge resource-based view of logistics performance and governance in Asian countries. *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics*, 30(3), 652-668.

- Kolk, A., & Pinkse, J. (2017). The influence of climate change regulation on corporate responses: The case of emissions trading. In *Corporate Responses to Climate Change* (pp. 43-57). Routledge.
- Many, M. E. (2015). Managing Japan-South Korea Tensions. *Discussion Paper*. New York: Council on Foreign Relations., et al. 2016. "US-South Korea Relations." CRS Report, April 26. Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service.
- Meng, J., Mi, Z., Guan, D., Li, J., Tao, S., Li, Y., ... Feng, K. (2018). The rise of South-South trade and its effect on global CO₂ emissions. *Nature Communications*, 9(1), 1871.
- Park, S-C. (2017). Can trade help overcome the economic crisis? Implications for Northeast Asia creating regional FTA between Korea, China, and Japan and Mega FTAs such as RCEP and TPP. *International Organizations Research Journal*, 12(2), 104-128.
- Petri, P. A. (2018). The interdependence of trade and investment in the Pacific. *Corporate links and foreign direct investment in Asia and the Pacific* (pp. 29-55). Routledge.
- Schott, J. J., Jung, E., & Cimino-Isaacs, C. (2015). An assessment of the Korea-China free trade agreement." Peterson Institute for International Economics. *Policy Brief*, No. PB, 15-24.
- Seitz, M., Tarasov, A., & Zakharenko, R. (2015). Trade costs, conflicts, and defense spending. *Journal of International Economics*, 95(2), 305-318.
- Sohn, Y. (2017). The Abe Effect on South Korea's Trade Policy. *Asian Perspective*, 39(3), 461-481.
- Solis, M., & Wilson, J. D. (2017). From APEC to mega-regionals: the evolution of the Asia-Pacific trade architecture. *The Pacific Review*, 30(6), 923-937.
- Steven, R. (2016). *Japan's new imperialism*. Routledge.
- Suzuki, H. (2017). The new politics of trade: EU-Japan. *Journal of European Integration*, 39(7), 875-889.

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).