Non-traditional Security Cooperation for Regionalism in Northeast Asia

Tsuneo Akaha
Professor of International Policy Studies and Director, Center for East Asian Studies,
Monterey Institute of International Studies
Visiting Scholar, Peace & Governance Programme, United Nations University

Keywords: Formation of regionalism, Confidence building, Non-traditional security, Multilateral cooperation,

This brief analysis is based on the assumption that the formation of regionalism in Northeast Asia requires confidence building at multiple levels of relations in the region.   The central argument is that multilateral cooperation over non-traditional security issues will contribute to the building of mutual confidence in the region. "Northeast Asia" is geographically defined here to include China, Japan, North and South Korea, Mongolia, and Russia.

The paper first discusses the two key concepts underlying the analysis: "regionalism" and "non-traditional security."   It then identifies the main factors thus far preventing the development of multilateral cooperation in security—including both traditional and non-traditional security—fields in Northeast Asia through a comparison with other regions of the world, where regionalism has moved further than in Northeast Asia, namely among the EU countries, in the NAFTA region, and among the ASEAN countries.   The discussion then moves to a brief look at the major non-traditional security issues in Northeast Asia, which call for multilateral cooperation.   The paper concludes with the central argument stated above.

<u>"Regionalism" Defined</u>

According to Rozman,[1] "regionalism" has five dimensions:

1. an accelerated increase in economic relations supported by a common strategy for economic integration (i.e., economic integration);
2. advancement of political relations through summitries and institutions designed to establish common action (i.e., institutional integration);
3. social integration through labor migration and corporate networks or a

---

This paper is based on my talk at Waseda University, Tokyo on November 27, 2003.

common agenda concerning various existing problems (i.e., social integration);

4. shared recognition of a regional identity facilitated by a common culture amidst globalization (i.e., identity formation); and,

5. an expanding security agenda for reducing tension and ensuring stability (i.e., security integration).

The process of integration through which regional agendas and identity are formed and sustained is called "regionalization" and the end result is called "regionalism".   When regionalization proceeds successfully along all five dimensions and domestic processes and structures are intimately linked to region-level processes of integration, regionalism is said to be solid or deep.   Furthermore, for regionalization to continue on a sustained basis and produce peaceful consequences, transparent political processes, robust economic growth, and a fair distribution of the benefits of integration among the countries concerned are necessary.[2]

Among all the various postwar regionalization schemes around the world, the European Union (EU) most closely meets the above conditions, followed by the North American Free Trade Area (NAFTA).   Within Asia-Pacific, region-wide integration lags far behind the European and the North American cases, but Southeast Asia is many years, perhaps decades, ahead of Northeast Asia in term of institutionalized regionalism.

The NAFTA area is economically integrated, but its institutional and procedural structures are not nearly as complex as those of the EU.   Social integration is deep between the United States and Canada, whereas Mexico's social integration with either the United States or Canada is less so.   NAFTA is not a security institution, but the United States and Canada share membership in the NATO and share a common security agenda, indicating deep political relationship between the two countries. Mexico has no such defense relations with either the United States or Canada, but there is no expectation or preparation for war between the NAFTA countries.   In this sense, the NAFTA region constitutes a quasi security community.[3]

In contrast, the large number of countries and diversity of societies in Asia Pacific do not lend themselves easily to the formation of a common culture or shared historical experience within the region.   The countries of the region are also at various stages of economic development and their domestic political structures vary widely. Cultural diversity is also enormous.   The kind of hegemonic role the United States played in bringing about economic integration in North America is also absent in Asia-Pacific.   During the postwar decades, the hegemonic power of the United States functioned not as an integrative force but as a wedge between ideological-political rivals

in this region.   The end of the Cold War has made some degree of reconciliation possible between some of the adversaries in Asia-Pacific, but there are two states that remain divided, as well as a number of other countries that have only recently found a path toward historical reconciliation.   Consequently, a European-style regionalism is unlikely to develop in this region anytime soon.

<u>"Non-traditional Security" Defined</u>

Let us turn to the concept of "non-traditional security."   The concept has grown out of dissatisfaction with the traditional notions of "security" and "national security," the research agenda based on these concepts, related theoretical arguments, and their influence on policy.   The critique of "traditional security" touches the five fundamental elements of "security."   They are: (1) what values or whose values are to be protected? (2) what threatens those values? (3) what means are available to protect those values from the threats? (4) who is to provide those means, or instruments of security? And (5) who is to bear the cost of providing the security?

Here, the main criticisms of "traditional security" are briefly introduced.

First, the traditional concept of security has enjoyed a privileged position within the mainstream, realist paradigm of international politics.   The concept positions military threats and military responses at the center of national and international security policy and analysis.   Within this paradigm, environmental hazards, food shortage, resource depletion, and lack of or distortions in economic development are relegated to "low politics," deemed to be of secondary importance to national and international security policy, hence deserving less attention from the research community.   However, deepening economic interdependence around the world and globalization trends have rendered non-military problems, including some domestic problems, increasingly important for their impact on the security of states and peoples around the globe.   The inadequacy of the traditional conception of security has been addressed by the development of such terms as "economic security," "food security," "energy and resource security," and "environmental security."   Some countries have officially adopted these concepts as part of their national security agenda.[4]

Secondly, the traditional concept of security has been criticized for its bias toward the protection of the interests of central governments and the privileged classes in society for which state institutions speak, to the neglect of the interests of ordinary citizens, particularly the underprivileged classes in society.   In other words, it is contended that "traditional security" has served as an ideology to serve the purpose of

state control and the maintenance of economic social structures favorable to the privileged classes.   As a result, the critique concludes, the political, social, and cultural institutions that are maintained in the name of "national security" view individual citizens' freedom, health, and welfare as of secondary importance in terms of national security priorities.   Moreover, "traditional security" is criticized as an instrument of control of minorities and oppression of dissent in developing countries, where those out of power challenge the legitimacy of central authorities.   It is contended that such use or misuse of the agenda and instruments of national security can no longer be tolerated in a democratizing world.

Third, as already observed, "traditional security" more often than not neglects the security and safety of individuals.   However, security policy today and in the future must define as its ultimate goal the protection of human life and living and freedom from hunger, that is, human security.[5]   Security policy that is pursued at the expense of individual citizens' life, health, and material welfare must be viewed as failing in its fundamental function.   However, it must also be stated that the absence of national security often implies the absence of human security.   That is, national and human security may not necessarily be mutually exclusive but rather complementary.

The exploration of alternative concepts of security, which encompasses non-military sources of insecurity and non-military means of security, is a welcome development.   However, "nontraditional security" also faces several challenges. Briefly, they are as follows:

First, there is as yet a consensus definition of "non-traditional security." Economic development, social stability, provision of food, energy, and other resource, environmental protection, the protection of unique cultures, individuals' freedom and freedom from hunger—these are all parts of non-traditional security.   It may be argued that for analytical purposes it is more useful to examine each of these types of security issues separately rather than subsuming them under the general concept of "non-traditional security."   However, this fails to recognize the importance of the social and historical context in which "non-traditional security" has been proposed in opposition to or in contrast to "traditional security."

Second, "non-traditional security" may be faulted for failing to recognize the different contents (referents) of security pertaining to the specific security needs and concerns of each country or area of the world.   That is, the use of "non-traditional security" as a catch-all reference for political, economic, social, and cultural phenomena suffers from the problem of equivalence.   What may be "non-traditional security" in one country may be quite traditional in another country.   For example, "economic

security," "food security," and "energy security" were accepted as important national security issues in the 1970s and today are considered part of "traditional" security issues in Japan. "Human security" has also been adopted as part of official Japanese diplomacy and the Japanese government has been a strong supporter of the UN Commission on Human Security and the Fund for Human Security.[6] China has issued a position paper on international cooperation in non-traditional security fields, which includes terrorism, drugs, HIV/AIDS, piracy, illegal migration, environmental security, economic security, and information security.[7] However, the Chinese government avoids the use of the term "human security" in its official pronouncements.[8] In the United States, "economic security" became an important policy issue under the Clinton Administration, but has not become a part of the mainstream national security debate. Neither is "food security" a part of the mainstream security discussion in the United States. Indeed there are these and other important differences in the mainstream understandings of national and international security in different countries. However, to what degree and under what circumstances these various "non-traditional security" issues have become part of the security debate in the establishment of each country can be an interesting focus of comparative analysis. That is, the readiness of a society to accept "non-traditional security" as deserving of national attention equal in importance to traditional security can be defined as a dependent variable along which societies can be compared. This approach may reveal important differences in the relationship between state and society and between the military and the civilian sector, as well as historical, cultural, and geographical differences between the societies we study.[9]

Third, with respect to the question of who "securitizes" issues, interest in "non-traditional security" may be criticized for overlooking the fact that in the end it is the state apparatus that determines which issues are of importance to national security and therefore the introduction of "non-traditional security" cannot overcome the state-centric security paradigm. However, the criticism ignores the importance of the very process through which public policy issues become securitized. If pressure from nongovernmental concerns leads to the inclusion of non-traditional security issues in national security debate, it is of historical importance in Northeast Asia where central authorities have historically monopolized on the national security agenda. The process of securitization that includes the participation of non-state agents clearly deserves our attention. A more inclusive process of security agenda setting may very well be a consequence and evidence of the democratization of society. The democratization of national security debate should reveal the fact that ultimately sovereign citizens are responsible for their own security and if state authorities'

monopoly of national security discussion is inadequate in addressing the citizens'
security needs, they should press their issues forward.   Indeed, many non-traditional
security issues, e.g., energy security and environmental security, cannot be left to the
public sector alone.   Democratization of society requires transparency and
accountability on the part of those who formulate national response to the society's
security concerns.   This in turn requires that the citizenry be well educated and well
informed about national security issues, both traditional and non-traditional.

What is important to the academic community is how a given concept is useful
in analyzing and understanding the phenomenon with which the community is
concerned.   Let us see how the concept of "non-traditional security" aids our
understanding of the security challenges facing Northeast Asian countries in the
contemporary period.   Before we do so, however, we need to identify the reasons why
regionalism has been slow in developing in this part of the world by comparing it with
regionalization in other parts of the world.

Regionalisms Compared

Several factors account for the successful regional integration in Europe.
First, through their long history of war and peace, European countries developed a
common culture in their state-to-state relations.   State diplomacy and international law
became shared arenas of interaction between the European sovereigns.   The
Westphalian notions of national sovereignty, territorial integrity, and political
independence became fundamental elements of state-to-state diplomacy and were
legitimized as international legal principles.   Through the expansion of
Europe-centered international diplomacy and commerce, the concepts also became
legitimized in other parts of the world, including Northeast Asia.   Normative in their
origin, these concepts were accepted as descriptive (real) terms as well, rendering
analyses based on them legitimate.   Realism was born of this tradition.   Second, the
realist notions of national sovereignty, territorial integrity, and political independence
were used to manage cross-border exchanges in commerce, culture, and human
migration, providing grounds for restricting cross-national and trans-national identities.
At the end of the Second World War, European leaders shared the consensus that
postwar peace and stability in the region required economic integration, particularly
integration of German and French economies.   The leaders were able to translate this
common understanding into institutional realities thanks to their common civilization
and cultural backgrounds.   Moreover, the United States--the emerging world
power--viewed regional integration in Europe as conducive to its own national interests.

The identification of U.S. interests and European integration was aided by Washington's historical preference to avoid entanglement in European power politics and the emergence of Cold War animosities between the East and the West.   Consequently, Washington provided generous support for economic development and integration and defense alliance in Europe.

In North America, the essential factor contributing to the formation of the free trade agreement (NAFTA) was the United States' hegemonic power of production and consumption and its need of expanded markets to sustain its capitalist growth. Secondly, unable either to challenge the U.S. economic power in global competition or to sustain growth on their own, both Canada and Mexico needed the superfluous production and consumption power of the United States.   The existing quasi-security community was the third contributory factor for the development of NAFTA as it rendered unnecessary any concern about the security implications of regional economic integration.   In short, U.S. hegemony made regional integration in North America possible and aided integration in Western Europe.   The U.S.-led globalization is further accelerating integration in the Western Hemisphere and in Europe, where, thanks to civilizational and cultural commonalities, fewer signs of resistance to globalization are seen than in Asia.

The formation of regionalism in Asia-Pacific is lagging far behind that in Europe and North America.   The Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) process is not an institution for political integration or security consultation.   APEC is a reactive response by policymakers in the region to the deepening interdependence among their economies and its consequences for domestic economic management.   It is led not by hegemonic leadership or a common civilizational background or cultural identity but by pragmatic considerations to manage international frictions and domestic problems resulting from growing economic interdependence.   APEC is essentially a forum for dialogue, not a mechanism for joint action.   Although some institutionalization is seen, including the secretariat and the regular meetings of heads of state and cabinet ministers, they are designed to facilitate dialogue.

Within Asia-Pacific, institutional efforts toward economic integration are far more advanced in Southeast Asia than in Northeast Asia.   In the former region, however, centripetal forces have long worked against integration among the developing economies.   Strong ethnic loyalties and multiple cultures in each country have delayed the development of democracy and liberal market forces and prevented the emergence of a strong leadership for regional integration.   Moreover, the region's economies have developed dependence ties with extra-regional economies, i.e., the U.S., Japanese,

Chinese, and European economies.   It is only in the last decade that the ASEAN leaders have decided to strengthen regional solidarity against the dominance of external economic powers through the development of a free trade area in Southeast Asia by 2015.   On the political-security front, the Southeast Asian nations failed to find a common adversary during the Cold War.   Political rivalries within the region also hampered the development of a common approach to many of the security issues in the region.   The leaders of the region established the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF), with encouragement from Japan, but it is a forum for dialogue rather than a mechanism for common defense.   Its main purpose is to facilitate confidence-building measures.   It is true, however, that Southeast Asia, through the ASEAN process, has developed a regional identity of sorts.

In comparison, Northeast Asia is not an economic unit, nor a political or a security community, but largely a geographic referent.[10]   There are several reasons for this.[11]

First, post-war Northeast Asia was riddled with conflicts and tensions due to legacies of history.   The countries of the region were unable to reach reconciliation over the prewar and wartime history of militarism and imperialism.   The birth of socialist states in the region and the permeation of the area by the East-West divide during the Cold War prevented the settlement of prewar and wartime atrocities. Secondly, the state-centric international relations of the region severely restricted cross-national market forces and also stifled the growth of civil society in most of the countries of the region.   As a result, economic and social exchanges transcending national borders could not gain momentum.   Nationalism remained strong and internationalism weak.   Authoritarian leadership generally prevailed over nascent democratic forces and established highly centralized political structures and mobilized national resources for the purpose of nation building.   Consequently, the international relations of the region nurtured competitive and even confrontational approaches rather than cooperation.   Moreover, the interests of the great powers--the United States, the Soviet Union, China, and Japan--intersected in this region, preventing the development of region-wide relationships of equality or dominance-subordination.   Unlike in North America, the hegemonic power of the United States worked not to integrate but divide most of the regional powers.   Nor did the countries of the region share a common civilizational space or cultural affinity.   Furthermore, under these circumstances, bilateralism prevailed over multilateralism.   Only in the 1990s did the United States, Japan, and South Korea forge multilateral coordination with respect to their approaches to North Korea, but the trilateral consultations were not designed to facilitate broad

multilateral cooperation in Northeast Asia but predicated on the division of the Korean peninsula.   The six-party talks that emerged in 2003 in response to the North Korean nuclear crisis has the potential of developing into a lasting multilateral framework for regional security cooperation, but this is far from certain.   Finally, the presence of capitalist and socialist economic systems, highly developed and underdeveloped economies, and resource-rich and capital-rich countries rendered region-wide integration impossible.   Asymmetric economic needs and capabilities prevented the emergence of balanced exchanges of economic benefits through interdependence.   In the absence of mutual trust at the state level and economic-social interaction in the private sector, free trade and other integrative schemes remained a distant goal in this region, although more recently interest in bilateral and trilateral free trade arrangements has grown.

For the above reasons until recently the past defined the present, politics reigned over economics, the state controlled civil society, and nationalism prevailed over internationalism in Northeast Asia.   Naturally, therefore, traditional national security interests dominated non-traditional security concerns.

In the last decade, however, the cloud of history has begun to lift from the political landscape of the region.   The future-directed reorientation of Japanese-South Korean relations since the late 1990s is an important evidence of this, as is the improvement of overall Russo-Japanese relations in recent years, notwithstanding the territorial disputes that still exist in these bilateral relations.   As well, economic ties among most Northeast Asian countries have grown substantially during this period. As much as 30-60 percent of each Northeast Asian country's trade is now conducted within the region.   Even Japan and China, the two big powers that are still haunted by the issues of history, have found their growing economic relations mutually beneficial. Moreover, civil society is also developing in all Northeast Asian countries except North Korea, contributing to the growth of trans-national ties between nongovernmental groups and local organizations, some of them with enough political clout to affect national policies.[12]

If the post-1990s trends continue, they cannot but have an important impact on the security environment of Northeast Asia.   We already witness the emergence of non-traditional security issues in the domestic and international discussion in the region. Let us now turn to those issues.

Nontraditional Security Issues in Northeast Asia
There are seven sets of issues facing Northeast Asian countries that can be

defined as "non-traditional security" issues.[13]   Let us briefly look at each.

      Environmental problems are clearly transnational problems that require international cooperation.[14]   Acid rain and nuclear waste disposal at sea are examples of trans-border problems that cannot be solved through unilateral measures.   Global warming is another problem area in which multilateral cooperation is clearly in order, particularly between Japan, South Korea, and China, the three biggest sources of CO_2 emissions in this region.   Successful implementation of the Kyoto Protocol requires Russia's ratification of this global legal instrument, but it appears Moscow is not eager to submit to the new regime.   Most environmental problems in Northeast Asia are being addressed through unilateral measures.   There are multiple conferences and forums for discussion, as well as some technical cooperation and information exchange on a bilateral or a multilateral basis, but there are no regional frameworks with legally binding force.

      Resource scarcity and depletion and water resource problems also exist in Northeast Asia and their solutions require international cooperation.   For example, many fishery resources and forestry resources are being exploited beyond nature's ability to renew them.   The development and use of coal and oil to fuel the fast growing economies of the region add to the environmental strain.   Natural gas is touted as an "environmentally friendly" source of energy and the APEC has called for regional cooperation to accelerate the development of reserves in east Siberia and the Russian Far East.   The energy needs of Japan and China are expected to continue to grow and there are already indications of competition between these giant economies for Russia's natural gas supply.   Desertification of agricultural land and shortage of water in China and Mongolia are also serious problems that require international cooperation.

      Migration and other human flows across national borders pose human security threats in the region.[15]   International migration that has long been a global phenomenon is now an important regional trend in Northeast Asia.   The growing cross-border human flows in Northeast Asia take various forms, including legal and illegal labor migration, refugees, defectors, and human trafficking.   Together with international tourists and short-term visitors, these flows are having visible impacts on host communities.   Racial discrimination, illegal employment, and prostitution that are often associated with cross-border human flows have serious human security implications, for both foreign nationals and local citizens.   Some human flows raise real or potential diplomatic problems: Chinese migration to the Russian Far East, North Koreans defecting to China and other countries, Chinese workers and students illegally working in Japan and South Korea, Russian and other women who enter Japan, South

Korea, and China on tourist visas but are forced or enticed into prostitution and other illegal forms of employment, often with the involvement of organized crime in the sending and receiving countries.   These problems arise from the existence of marked gaps in economic opportunities and disparate demographic and population patterns in the countries of Northeast Asia.   Therefore, solutions require a regional approach that addresses both "push" and "pull" factors systematically and comprehensively, encompassing economic development, population, immigration, and nationality and citizenship policies.   Such cooperation is absent today.

Drug and arms smuggling is yet another non-traditional security problem that requires international cooperation.   Narcotics produced in Central and Southeast Asia find their way to markets in Japan, South Korea, and Russia, often through China.   The rise in illegal arms trade in Northeast Asia is largely a result of the breakup of the Soviet Union and the ineffectiveness of post-Soviet arms control structures.   North Korea is also a major source of illegal arms traded in and beyond this region.   Organized crime is also involved in illegal arms transfer to markets in Japan and South Korea. Response to these problems has been largely unilateral and bilateral, with very limited multilateral cooperation in Northeast Asia.

HIV/AIDS and SARS (severe acute respiratory syndrome) are major threats to individual and public health.   The SARS epidemic in 2002-03 exposed the lack of transparency and ineffectiveness of public health policy in China and affected not only Chinese citizens but also those of many other countries.   Concealment and under-reporting of infection cases by medical personnel and public officials seriously affected public trust inside China and outside, resulting in the firing of the mayor of Beijing and the health minister of China.   International cooperation, partly coordinated by the World Health Organization, eventually put a stop to what could have become a devastating global crisis, but not until the world had witnessed numerous preventable deaths.   The health ministers of the ASEAN + 3 countries agreed on the importance of transparency in public health policy, improving the living conditions, and accelerating economic development, particularly in the poor sections of the member countries.   The SARS crisis demonstrated that governments that are unable to protect their citizens' lives and health cannot protect human security.

The 1997-98 "Asian crisis" demonstrated how devastating the effects of *globalization* could be for countries that are ill prepared to deal with the fast-paced inflow and outflow of international capital.   Some analysts blamed the crisis on the mismanagement of corporate finance and lack of policy transparency and urged the affected countries to accelerate financial market liberalization, while others attributed

the crisis to the lack of government control over international capital, with Malaysia closing its financial market to foreign speculators in response to the crisis.[16]   In Northeast Asia, South Korea and Russia were the most severely affected by the financial-currency crisis of 1997-98, with their currencies suffering devastating depreciation.   In some Southeast Asian countries, the crisis triggered social unrest, the worse case being Indonesia, where anti-Chinese sentiments fueled ethnic violence and public unrest resulted in the fall of government.   Economic crisis directly threatened human security.   In the aftermath of the crisis, a major international disagreement was seen, particularly between Japan and the United States, over how to prevent the recurrence of a similar crisis.   U.S. objection to the "Miyazawa Plan" killed the Japanese finance minister's proposal to institute a special fund to assist governments whose currencies are targeted for attack by international speculators.   However, the ASEAN + 3 countries have begun to establish a pool of currency reserves for member governments threatened by impending currency attack to draw on.   However, the necessary structural reforms require sustained, long-term efforts, particularly in reducing rich-poor gap in the region's developing economies.

   Terrorism has both "traditional" and "non-traditional" security aspects.   The terrorist attacks in the United States on September 11, 2001 are said to have changed the world. [17]   Whether one accepts this assessment or not, one cannot deny that international terrorism requires the cooperation of the entire international community. However, post-9/11 developments have proven the difficulty of building a unified international position on how best to counter international terrorism.   The U.S. "war against terrorism" has divided the international community.   The United States and Great Britain justified their military attack on Iraq on the unproved claims that the Saddam Hussein regime was linked to the 9/11 attacks by al-Qaida and that Iraq was hiding weapons of mass destruction.   France, Germany, Russia, and China insisted that the attack on Iraq was premature at best and unjustified at worst inasmuch as the United Nations had not been given sufficient time to substantiate the U.S. and British charges against Iraq.   Japan, while calling for international cooperation through the United Nations, decided in December 2003 to send Self-Defense Forces personnel to U.S.-occupied Iraq and participate in what Tokyo called post-conflict reconstruction assistance.   In the United States and elsewhere around the world, civil liberties have been curtailed by security measures designed to prevent terrorist attacks.   Moreover, there have been numerous charges in the United States that persons of certain ethnic (e.g., Arab) background have been subjected to unfair and unjust security measures.

   Whether international terrorism should be seen in the light of   "non-traditional

security" is subject to debate.   On the one hand, international terrorism is "traditional" if it is seen as an armed attack against sates and their interests and if the response involves the military and other action of the targeted or affected states.   Moreover, terrorist organizations often claim that the political, economic, and social environment surrounding them justify their action to challenge the legitimacy and expose the incompetence of their own and other states.   Such justifications have much in common with the claims of more traditional armed insurgencies against states or regimes.   On the other hand, much of the internationalization of terrorist organizations' recruitment of members, acquisition of arms, intelligence gathering, and financial mobilization is a part of the globalization phenomenon sweeping the world.   Seen in this light, international terrorism has much in common with the trafficking in arms, drugs, and humans by private organizations, which, as seen above, is very much a part of the "non-traditional security" problem.   Furthermore, terrorist organizations are non-governmental organizations and more often than not select private citizens and groups as their immediate target even when their goal is to weaken the states against which they have political gripes.   Clearly, then, the state-centric definition of security is inadequate to deal with international terrorism.

Terrorism in Northeast Asia has been a mixed phenomenon in terms of traditional and non-traditional elements of security.   We saw state terrorism by North Korea in the 1970s.   Its proximate and ultimate targets were the South Korean government and its representatives.   We also witnessed Japanese terrorist groups challenging the legitimacy of their state in the 1960s and 70s, as well as a religiously motivated group terrorizing private citizens in the country in the 1980s.   More recently we have seen terrorist attacks by independence-seeking groups in China and Russia against their states.   With the exception of the North Korean case, all groups conducted their acts of terrorism within the territorial boundaries of their own states.   The response to most of these acts has been largely through internal measures on the basis of domestic law rather than through multilateral mechanisms.

Conclusions

In view of the historical and structural characteristics of Northeast Asia, we will be hard pressed to build in the near future a multilateral framework to solve security problems that have their causes in territorial, sovereignty, and other political conflicts between states in the region.   Fundamentally, the establishment of such a framework would require the level of trust that simply does not exist today between the region's governments and peoples of the countries.   We may be better positioned to

explore international cooperation over non-traditional security issues as a means of building confidence and forming a habit of cooperation.   In fact, the non-traditional security issues discussed in this paper present an opportunity to seek such cooperation because bilateral and multilateral efforts in these areas is not likely to threaten the regional powers' pursuit of traditional security goals, namely the protection of national sovereignty, territorial integrity, and political independence.

In Northeast Asia, the expansion of transnational market linkages is deepening the interdependence of regional economies.   If market development in China, the Russian Far East, and Mongolia proceeds, economic complementarities between these economies and the more advanced market economies of Japan and South Korea are bound to translate the existing potentials into visible benefits for the producers and consumers in the regional markets.   Social integration proceeds through the network of corporate and human linkages.   On the corporate side, industrial and commercial enterprises in East Asia have made substantial progress through horizontal and vertical integration over the last several decades, with Japanese corporations in Southeast Asia and China taking the lead.   The formation of transnational corporate linkages in Northeast Asian countries is a more recent phenomenon.   It has been driven by businesses in Japan and, more recently, in South Korea, contributing to the growth of Japanese-South Korean-Chinese corporate networks.   Human networks in Northeast Asia are slowly emerging through growing numbers of border-crossing migrants, professionals, and laborers.   Multilateral linkages in the traditional security field are of an ad hoc nature and limited to the six-party talks concerning the North Korean nuclear issue and bilateral and trilateral consultations associated with them.

There are ample opportunities--as well as needs--for multilateral cooperation in the non-traditional security field, encompassing environmental, resource, migration, arms and drug trafficking, HIV/AIDS, SARS, economic globalization, and terrorism issues.   Problems in this area directly affect people's lives and livelihoods, and successful cooperation, through governmental channels or at the non-governmental level, is bound to produce visible benefits to the citizenry.   Moreover, solution to many of the non-traditional security problems requires the direct involvement of ordinary citizens.   Successful efforts in this area, therefore, will be conducive to the formation of social networks around the issues involved and to the development of cooperative efforts in other areas.

Notes

[1] Gilbert Rozman, "Korea at the Center: The Growing Quest for Regionalism in Northeast Asia: Introduction" (Draft), 2003.

[2] For this hypothesis, see Bruce Russett and Harvey Starr, World Politics: The Menu for Choice, Third Edition, New York: W.H. Freeman, 1989, p. 432.

[3] For the concept of "security community," see Karl Deutsch, Nationalism and Social Communication, Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1953.

[4] As noted below, for example, Japan has long incorporated "economic security," "food security," and "energy security" into its official policy language.

[5] On the concept of human security in the policy context, see United Nations Development Programme, Human Development Report 1994, New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994; Commission on Human Security, Human Security Now, New York: Commission on Human Security, 2003. For analytical discussions on human security, see Ramesh Thakur, "From National to Human Security," in Stuart Harris and Andrew Mack, eds., Asia-Pacific Security: The Economics-Politics Nexus, Sydney: Allen and Unwin, 1997, pp. 52-80; Edward Newman, "Human Security and Constructivism," International Studies Perspectives, Vol. 2, No. 3 (August 2001), pp. 239-251.

[6] Tadashi Yamamoto, "Human Security: What It Means, and What It Entails," paper presented at the 14th Asia-Pacific Roundtable, June 3-7, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia; Hans Van Ginkel and Edward Newman, "In Quest of 'Human Security," Japan Review of International Affairs, Winter 2000, pp. 59-82; Ryokichi Hirono, "Human Security and Conflict Prevention," Japan Review of International Affairs, Winter 2000, pp. 261-284. See also "Opening Remarks by Prime Minister Obuchi at an Intellectual Dialogue on Building Asia's Tomorrow," December 2, 1998 (http://www.globalwarming.mofa.go.jp/policy/cultgure/intellectual/asia9812.html).

[7] "China's Position Paper on Cooperation in the Field of Non-Traditional Security Issues," online at www.fmprc.gov.cn.

[8] Shulong Chu, "China and Human Security," North Pacific Policy Papers, No. 8, Program on Canada-Asia Policy Studies, Institute of Asian Research, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada, 2002.

[9] For the role of historical, cultural, and geographical factors in shaping national security conception, see Peter Katzenstein and Nobuo Okawara, Japan's National Security: Structures, Norms, and Policy Responses in a Changing World, Ithaca: Cornell University East Asia Program, 1993; Thomas U. Berger, "Norms, Identity, and National Security in Germany and Japan," in Peter J. Katzenstein, ed., The Culture of National Security: Norms and Identity in World Politics, New York: Columbia University Press, 1996, pp. 317-356; Muthiah Alagappa, ed., Asian Security Practice: Material and Ideational Influences, Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998, particularly chapters 1, 2, and 19.

[10] See Tsuneo Akaha, "Introduction" and "Conclusion: Nationalism vs. Regionalism in Northeast Asia," in Akaha, ed., Politics and Economics in Northeast Asia: Nationalism and Regionalism in Contention, New York, St. Martin's Press, 1999, pp. xxiii-xxx and pp. 367-382, respectively. For alternative ways of defining "Northeast Asia," see Samuel S. Kim, "Northeast Asia in the Local-Regional-Global Nexus: Multiple Challenges and Contending

Explanations," in Kim, ed., <u>The International Relations of Northeast Asia</u>, Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield, 2004, pp. 3-61.

[11] See Tsuneo Akaha, "International Cooperation in Establishing a Regional Order in Northeast Asia," in Kap-Young Jeong and Jaewoo Choo, eds., <u>Towards New Dimensions of Cooperation in Northeast Asia</u>, Seoul: Institute of East and West Studies, Yonsei University, 1998, pp. 25059; Tsuneo Akaha, "Economic Cooperation in NEA: A Global Perspective," in Kap-Young Jeong and Jaewoo Choo, eds., <u>Dynamic Transition and Economic Cooperation in Northeast Asia,</u> Seoul: Yonsei University, 1997, pp. 19-39.

[12] See, for example, Tsuneo Akaha, "Despite the Russian-Japanese Territorial Dispute: Hokkaido's Courting of the Russian Far East," <u>Pacific Focus</u>, Vol. 18, No. 1 (Spring 2003), pp. 89-122.

[13] For a more detailed discussion of these issues, see Tsuneo Akaha, "Seeking Non-traditional Security in 'Traditional' Ways: Northeast Asia and Emerging Security Challenges," in Ramesh Thakur and Edward Newman, eds., <u>Broadening Asia's Security Discourse and Agenda: Political and Environmental Perspectives</u>, Tokyo: United Nations University Press, forthcoming in 2004.

[14] Advocacy for including environmental problems in security debate and analysis can be found in Ramesh Thakur, "Threats without Enemies, Security without Borders: Environmental Security in East Asia," <u>Journal of East Asian Studies</u>, Vol. 1, No. 2 (2001), pp. 161-189; Jack A. Goldstone, "Demography, Environment, and Security," in Paul F. Diehl and Nils Petter Gleditsch, eds., <u>Environmental Conflict</u>, Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 2001, pp. 84-108. For a critical view, see Marc Levy, "Is the Environment a National Security Issue?" <u>International Security,</u> Vol. 20 (1995), pp. 35-62.

[15] For a discussion on the migration-security linkage, see Mark J. Miller, "International Migration and Global Security," in Nana Poku and David T. Graham, eds., *Redefining Security: Population Movements and National Security*, Westport, Conn.: Praeger, 1998, pp. 15-28; Ronald Skeldon, "Migration Policies and National Security," in Nana Poku and David T. Graham, eds., <u>Redefining Security: Population Movements and National Security,</u> Westport, Conn.: Praeger, 1998, pp. 29-50. For a series of case studies of migration in Northeast Asia in terms of their implications for human and state security, see Tsuneo Akaha, ed., <u>Human Flows across National Borders in Northeast Asia, Seminar Proceedings, United Nations University, Tokyo, Japan, November 20-21, 2002</u>, Center for East Asian Studies, Monterey Institute of International Studies, Monterey, California, January 31, 2003. See also Mikhail A. Alekseev, "Chinese Migration in the Russian Far East: Security Threats and Incentives for Cooperation in Primorskii Krai," in Judith Thornton and Charles Ziegler, eds., <u>The Russian Far East: A Region at Risk?</u> Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2001.

[16] For a discussion of these explanations, see Morris Goldstein, <u>The Asian Financial Crisis: Causes, Cures, and Systemic Implications,</u> Policy Analyses in International Economics 55, Washington D.C.: Institute for International Economics, 1998.

[17] The difficulty of defining international terrorism in conventional terms was amply demonstrated by the series of essays posted in the Nautilus (Berkeley, California) Special Forum on the September 11 attacks in the United States. See, for example, Allen Carlson, "Interpreting the Attacks: Democracy, States, and Coalition-Building," September 28, 2001; David Cortright, "Developing an Alternative, More Effective Strategy," September 26, 2001; Michael Edwards , "Future Positive," September 28, 2001; Mary Kaldor, "Understanding the Message of Tuesday's Events," September 21, 2001. See also Ramesh Thakur and Hans van Ginkel, "An International Perspective on Global Terrorism." <u>UN Chronicle</u>, Vol. 38, No. 3

(2001) (http://www.un.org/Pubs/chronicle/).