Conceptualizing the Globalization-Security Nexus in the Asia-Pacific

CHRISTOPHER W. HUGHES*
Centre for the Study of Globalisation and Regionalisation, University of Warwick, UK

The Globalization-Security Nexus

GLOBALIZATION AND SECURITY vie individually for the status of the least well-conceptualized, but yet most controversial, of academic and policymaking issues. Security has been described as an underdeveloped concept, and globalization, for a variety of reasons and as briefly described below, has been subject to any number of definitions. That both issues are so often poorly conceptualized, therefore, only gives further grounds for concern when attempting to examine the two in conjunction. For if academics and policymakers alike can agree that globalization and security are the two most pressing of contemporary international issues, but still experience difficulty even in analysing them separately, the prospects for understanding their intersection and the 'globalization–security nexus' appear to be poor. In these uncertain circumstances, we all should fear for our security.

There is thus an urgent need to define and interconnect the twin issues of globalization and security. Indeed, it could be argued that a number of pioneering attempts have already been made to investigate the relationship between globalization and security in terms of its creation of new security actors, problems and responses.[1] However, although valuable in providing a starting point and emergent framework for consideration of the globalization–security nexus, these attempts have tended to lack a strong empirical basis and geographical and historically contingent focus. Such a focus is important because globalization is likely to differ in its security impact between different regional contexts. Conversely, those studies which have concentrated on non-traditional security issues, such as economic dislocation, migration or crime, within the actual context of the Asia-Pacific have usually lacked a strong

Security Dialogue © 2001 PRIO. SAGE Publications, Vol. 32(4): 407–421. ISSN: 0967-0106 [021768]

conceptual basis for explaining the reasons why globalization has had such a deep impact upon the sovereign states of this particular region.

All of this argues that there is a need to combine the study of globalization and security, but that this also should be carried out through the balanced application of analytical frameworks to particular regional cases. Hence, this article attempts, in three stages, both to build upon the existing globalization–security nexus literature and to extend it to the case of the Asia-Pacific region in the post-Cold War (or post-globalization) period. The first of these stages is to define more fully the essence of the term globalization and the inherent problems that it presents broadly for the existing international order. The second stage is to examine the impact of globalization upon security in both generic terms and specific regional terms in the Asia-Pacific by focusing on its generation of new referent objects of security, threats and policy responses. The third stage is then to seek to explain the differentially heavy impact of globalization in the Asia-Pacific as the outcome of the internal and external structural weaknesses of the sovereign states, in turn a product of the historical intertwining of the processes of globalization, bipolarization and decolonization. This analysis should then demonstrate how these state vulnerabilities will continue to hamper the efforts of policymakers in the region to respond to the challenges of globalization.

Conceptions of Globalization

Definitions

Globalization is a notoriously slippery concept and has produced a bewildering number of definitions. Globalization has been defined variously as universalization (the expansion of cultures across the globe), internationalization (increased interaction and interdependence between peoples in different states), Westernization or Americanization (the homogenization of the world along Western or US standards), and liberalization (the spread of deregulated forces of technology, production, trade and finance across borders). Many of these definitions are indeed facets of globalization – in terms of both its causation and its eventual outcomes – but these definitions still fail to capture the qualitatively different nature of globalization from other processes and phenomena associated with the interaction of social forces on a global scale.

Globalization represents a qualitatively different process because of its essential de-territorialization – or, stated in reverse, supra-territorialization – of social interaction.[2] That is to say, globalization is a process which increasingly reconfigures social space away from and beyond notions of delineated terri-

tory, and *transcends* existing physical and human borders imposed upon social interaction. For instance, global financial transactions, facilitated by information technology, can now often operate without reference to physical territorial distance or human-imposed territorial barriers.

It is important to avoid the type of 'hyper-globalization' thesis which views the world as moving towards a condition of being totally 'borderless'. It is apparent that there is considerable territorial 'drag' upon the free flow of globalization forces; that not all forms of economic interaction, such as trade and labour migration, are as fully globalized as finance; that there are wide disparities in the degree of globalization across different regions of the world; and that there is both resistance to and reversibility in the process itself. Nevertheless, globalization as a process of supra-territorialization is increasingly affecting large sections of the world and must be acknowledged as a process that is markedly different (although certainly not unrelated) from those other definitions of social interaction noted above. Hence, even though universalization, internationalization, Westernization and liberalization may eventually result in globalization, the fact that they may not necessarily be entirely detached from territorialization means that they remain on a qualitatively different level to the inherently supra-territorial phenomena of globalization.

Challenges to the Inter-Sovereign-State Security Order

The phenomena of globalization as supra-territorialization and the reconfiguration of social space carry significant implications for existing forms of social organization and, most importantly in the case of security issues, the dominant position of the nation-state (or, far more accurately for many states, the sovereign state) within the existing globality. Needless to say, the state with its exclusive jurisdiction – or, in other words, *sovereignty* – over a particular social and territorial space, delineated by a combination of physical geography and most especially human construction, has been the basic unit for the division of global space in the modern era. States in the past have attempted in theory and practice to exercise sovereign control over all forms of social interaction in the political, economic and security dimensions, both within and between their territorial borders. Quite clearly, and as elucidated below with reference to the Asia-Pacific, not all states throughout history have been able to exercise the same degree of sovereign control over all forms of social interaction. Nevertheless, sovereign states rooted in territorial notions of social space have been the prime unit for facilitating, impeding and mediating interaction between the societal groups, organizations, citizens and other categories of collective and individual societal units contained within their borders. Hence, to date, global social space has been primarily international, or inter-sovereign-state, social space.

However, the inherent nature of globalization as a process which transcends and overrides territoriality as the dominant principle for the organization of social space now poses a fundamental challenge to the sovereign state as the basic social unit that exemplifies and undergirds this very territorial principle. Sovereign states must contend with the freer flow of social forces on a global scale, which move with declining reference to the previous limitations and channels imposed by state borders. This increasing porosity of state borders, relative decline in the de facto sovereign authority of states over social interaction and corresponding increased exposure of 'internal' societal groupings to 'external forces' (or even, indeed, the removal of the traditional domestic–international divide to create an inter-mestic arena for social interchange) has a number of outcomes for security, as discussed below. For if global social space has been primarily international or inter-sovereign-state space for much of the modern era, then the security order as one aspect of social interaction has been primarily built around the interstate order. But it is clear that the security order is now pitted against the phenomenon of globalization, which generates security issues diametrically opposed to and often beyond the limits of sovereign-state authority.

Globalization's Impact on Security in the Asia-Pacific

If we view globalization as a process which is driven by political choice in favour of liberal economics and results in forms of social interaction which transcend territorial borders and state sovereignty, it is then possible to conceive of its impact on security in both the *vertical* extension of security in terms of its referent objects and the *horizontal* extension in terms of security-threat dimensions.[3]

Levels of Referent Objects

One noticeable impact of globalization has been to accentuate the concept, which has pre-existed in certain contexts, that the state's position as the prime referent object of security is now rivalled by other societal groupings. The study of security has traditionally rested upon the assumption that the security of the institution of the sovereign state can be necessarily conflated with the security of the 'nation' or general population and citizenry contained within that state's borders. Hence, in the past and still in the contemporary period, the tendency of security studies has been to argue that the survival of states, as institutions which are created as the embodiment of collective national will and which serve as the point of interface or 'gatekeeper' to shield their citizenry and populations from external threats, is indivisible from the

survival of peoples or nations. The result has been to produce a view of security which concentrates not just upon states as the key referent objects of security, but also mainly upon the external aspects of state security. For the traditional 'realist' paradigm, security is concerned with external threats to states, and especially those threats imposed upon states by inter-sovereign-state conflict – the natural outcome of friction in an international system dominated by states all seeking to ensure the security of their own populations from external challenges.

The identity and role of sovereign states as the referent object of security undoubtedly remains central to our understanding of security in the contemporary era, and this may be especially so for those states which can assert with conviction the character of being nation-states, marked by a cohesive association between the security interests of the state as an institution and its 'national' population as a whole. In other instances, though, the assumption that the security of states as referent objects approximates with that of the population or nation at large, and consequently that all states focus upon external threat perceptions, is inaccurate. The tendency of traditional security paradigms to 'black box' internal state dynamics means that inevitably they neglect also those internal threats which arise from a fundamental divergence between the perceived security interests of states themselves and segments of their population. Newly established and late-starter sovereign states with borders cutting across and encompassing a variety of national and ethnic groups are particularly sensitive to internal security threats. It is often the case that such states confront substantial minority ethnic groups that reject the definition of nation and state emanating from the government. As a result, these groups seek instead to secure autonomy or to secede, and may often launch insurgency movements, so challenging the integrity and internal stability of the state.

Another internal security problem, often independent of – but also at times interlinked with and capable of reinforcing – ethnic separatism, is that of a crisis of the state's political legitimacy and leadership among the general population. In certain states, the majority of the population may support the cause of national and state integrity, but come to reject the political legitimacy of the government system or governing regime and elite. The antagonism of the general population towards the political regime may be aroused by a variety of factors centring on perceptions of misgovernment, including the management of the economy, issues of crime and corruption, and the commitment to stable or democratic government. The outcome can be political turmoil, violent demonstrations and even revolution. If prolonged, political unrest can bring the prospect of factionalism and civil war. Most explosive of all is a combination of political crisis and ethnic separatism, which can threaten the internal disintegration of a state. As outlined below, many states in the Asia-Pacific region, as developing sovereign states that are often only partially

'nation'-states, are subject to these twin problems of ethnic separatism and political legitimacy. Hence, these states have focused much of their security-policymaking energy on dealing with internal rather than external security threats.

Therefore, the argument that the state cannot be considered as the exclusive, or even main, referent object of security, and that there is a need to give our attention to problems of the internal security of societal groupings contained within the state's sovereign territory, is not new. Globalization's impact, though, has been to heighten this consciousness of the potential divisibility of the security of the sovereign state from that of its internal societal elements. Globalization as a process which transcends territorial and sovereign boundaries, and thus which penetrates with relative ease the internal social space of the state, inevitably also brings with it security effects that diminish the role of the state as the barrier to external threats and impact directly and differentially upon internal societal groups. For example, globalization has such an impact in the dimension of economic security, whereby the free flow of market forces across borders and the accompanying wealth creation but also economic dislocation that this engenders undercut the ability of the sovereign state to act as the principal arbiter of the economic welfare of its internal society. Globalization's capacity to strip the supposed protection of the state away from societal groups and citizens then helps to explain why there has been a significant shift in security perspectives away from those fixated on the state and towards the irreducible, yet ultimate, level of individual and 'human security'.[4]

The East Asian financial crisis illustrates well many of these security effects of globalization. The crisis from 1997 onwards produced a set of economic costs for societal groups (ethnic and economic) and individual citizens that many of the states of the region found themselves unable at first to mitigate and redistribute. In these circumstances, even though the governmental apparatus of the states of the region remained intact, societal groups and individuals began again to view certain states as redundant frameworks for the preservation of their economic and political security interests, and so looked to detach themselves from political dependence upon them. The result for many of the states has been to produce short- and longer-term crises of legitimacy.

In Malaysia, differences over economic policy responses to the financial crisis triggered an elite power struggle between Prime Minister Mahathir Mohamed and Deputy Prime Minister Anwar Ibraham from 1997 to 1999, which then spilled over into civil violence between the police authorities and rival political support groups. The effect of the crisis has also been to re-expose differences in economic status between the Malay majority and Indian and Chinese minority groups which the government had attempted to suppress since the race riots of 13 May 1969 through ethnic distributive and high-

growth policies – leading to renewed religious and ethnic tensions and occasional intercommunal violence, an example being the unrest near Kuala Lumpur in March 2001, which resulted in the deaths of a number of Malays and Indians.

Meanwhile, in Indonesia, the general enfeeblement of the central government and military apparatus caused by the shock of the financial crisis has opened an ugly Pandora's box of internal security problems at the societal, group and individual levels. The financial crisis undermined export-oriented high-speed growth policies that had supported the state-building efforts of President Suharto's New Order and were designed to integrate Indonesia's multifarious ethnic and religious groupings. In turn, the conversion of the financial crisis into a full-blown economic crisis and the further impoverishment of large sections of Indonesian society, which had come to expect economic liberalization to bring improvements in living standards, generated not only a tragedy of economic and human security but also set in train a political regime crisis. This political crisis, accompanied by mass violence on the streets of Jakarta between the police and pro-democracy groups, led to fall of the government of Suharto in May 1998 and formed the backdrop for the political turmoil of President Abdurrahman Wahid's presidency until July 2001. Simultaneously, the economic crisis and the perceived economic inequalities that it highlighted between the Javanese majority and Chinese minority sparked
'pogroms' of elements of the former and actions by the Indonesian military against the latter in May 1998.

The financial crisis has also provided the occasion for the security situation in other regions of Indonesia to spiral out of control. Long-term economic tensions between Dayaks and transmigrant Madurese, heightened by the impact of the crisis, have produced violent clashes and thousands of refugees in Sambas, West Kalimantan Province. The economic crisis and related social instability have also promoted conditions for the re-emergence of religious violence. From 1999 onwards, Muslims and Christians have been involved in intercommunal violence in Ambon, Maluku Province, resulting in thousands of deaths and widespread destruction of property. Meanwhile, political confusion in Jakarta was one factor which encouraged the Fretilin pro-independence movement in East Timor and enabled the former Portuguese colony's eventual breakaway from Indonesia. However, this was only achieved after considerable bloodshed in clashes between pro-independence supporters and anti-independence militias backed by the Indonesian military, the displacement of up to three-quarters of East Timor's population, the destruction of 90% of the province's physical infrastructure and the eventual intervention of a UN-sanctioned and Australian-led International Force in East Timor from September 1999 onwards.

Indonesia has also seen revitalized autonomy or independence movements in West Irian Jaya and Aceh, which were emboldened by the decline of the formerly highly centralized state created under Suharto and are now seeking greater political freedom from a state which they no longer view as serving their political, economic or security interests. The Free Aceh Movement, intent on recovering control of the province's rich oil and gas reserves, has proved particularly virulent, escalating the guerrilla war which it has been engaged in since 1973. The knock-on effects upon inter-sovereign-state security of Indonesia's potential disintegration have been shown by the East Timor crisis, but the problem of Aceh has also indicated the wider security risks involved, with the guerrilla movement successfully disrupting a large proportion of the exports to Japan of liquefied natural gas from the province.

Dimensions of Threat: Economic, Environmental and Military

Globalization's most obvious influence has been its integrative and disintegrative economic characteristics and the consequent impetus it gives to problems of the economic and then military security of states and their societal constituents. The spread of liberal market forces is capable of bringing economic inclusion and interdependence, which may contribute to social stability and peaceful relations internally and externally (a form of the 'democratic peace' argument). Nevertheless, the disintegrative effects of globalization can simultaneously contribute to insecurity in a number of ways.

First, globalization can produce economic exclusion for states and individuals. This may be marked by disparities in welfare, which can then feed through into military tension among states resulting from attempts to wrest economic benefits from each other, or result in internal unrest within states. In the case of the Asia-Pacific region, this type of problem can be seen in North Korea's loss of access to the socialist economic sphere following the end of the Cold War and in its exclusion, both self- and externally imposed, from the rapidly globalizing political economy of the region. In addition, North Korea has been presented with a new security dilemma by the globalization–security nexus. For, on the one hand, North Korea's reluctance to reform and integrate itself into the region will only exacerbate the deep-seated structural economic crisis that it has experienced since the latter stages of the Cold War, which could lead to the implosion of its political regime; on the other hand, though, the North Korean leadership is also aware that economic liberalization even on a modest scale would expose its closed political economy to the shocks of globalization, transcend previously imposed sovereign barriers to the political control of its society and threaten the collapse of the regime. Hence, faced with the twin risks of this dilemma, the North Korean regime has attempted to steer a middle path, with a limited policy of opening to the outside world but on terms that it has sought to dictate. In practice, this has meant that North

Korea has utilized its remaining military assets in a strategy of brinkmanship to extract economic concessions in the form of food aid, as well as preferential access to energy, financial aid, investment and entry to international economic institutions from the surrounding powers.[5] In many instances, North Korea's strategy has succeeded brilliantly, manoeuvring around larger powers to gain short-term economic concessions (even if, over the longer term, North Korea is effectively mortgaging its remaining military assets and setting itself on a trajectory towards integration into the region), and has been a demonstration of how the fear of globalization and the related problems of economic exclusion can also generate increased regional military tensions.

Second, globalization is capable of re-mapping economic and social space, with the frequent result that economic interdependency can pull actors and regions away from the defined territorial space of the sovereign state and towards regions incorporated within other states. In these instances, the rise of regionalism can lead to the disintegration of state structures, with unforeseen consequences for internal and external security. These problems in the Asia-Pacific are encapsulated in speculation about the breakaway from Russia of its Far Eastern provinces, resulting from their desire for greater control over their own natural resources, and the possible 'deconstruction' of China as economic liberalization undermines the capability of the centre to govern the provinces. Moreover, China's economic liberalization has created problems of security not only between the centre and the provinces but also within the provinces themselves, as China's gradual abandonment of socialist principles erodes the basis for the 'iron rice bowl' that ensured political stability and was one of China's greatest achievements in terms of providing human security for the bulk of its population.

Third, globalization can generate economic rivalry among states, transnational corporations (TNCs), societal organizations and individuals over scarce natural resources, which again often threatens to spill over into military conflict. The most prominent example of globalization spurring on high-speed economic growth and competition for natural resources is China's territorial aspirations in the South China Sea and its desire to acquire the energy resources necessary for continued economic expansion. The potential that this creates for military conflict between China and a number of member-states of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) and the risks that it poses for other regional states, such as Japan, using the sea lines of communication in the South China Sea are well documented. In addition, rapid economic growth, which often brings with it population growth and expanded domestic food consumption, has given greater force to disputes among ASEAN states such as Thailand, Vietnam and Malaysia over fishing grounds in Exclusive Economic Zones; to territorial disputes involving fish stocks, such as that involving Japan and South Korea over the Takeshima (Tok-do) Islands;

and to competition for precious fresh water resources in areas such as the Mekong Delta.[6]

Fourth, globalization can often result in economic dislocation, poverty and financial crises. All this can lead to insecurity for states, societal groups and individuals, which can again feed into social instability within and among states as well as possible armed conflict. The discussion above of the problems of many ASEAN states in the wake of the financial crisis of 1997 provides examples of these types of security problems.

Moreover, sitting in between these integrative and disintegrative economic effects of globalization are those security problems connected with transnational or trans-sovereign crime. Globalization promotes trans-sovereign crime because economic integration and disintegration in tandem create both supply and demand factors for those actors engaged in criminal activities. In other words, economic dislocation and disparities within a certain state or societal grouping create incentives to engage in wealth-generating activities through the supply of illicit products such as narcotics or arms. In turn, globalization's creation of economic wealth in certain areas of the world creates a market and demand for the supply of these economic commodities.

Crime as an economic activity and the trade in 'illicit' commodities are clearly not new phenomena, but in the past the chief suppliers of narcotics have been sovereign states themselves, the opium trade in East Asia being one notable example. Economic globalization, facilitated by transport and information technology, has enabled criminal organizations to mimic the behaviour of TNCs, to move with still greater ease across deregulated economic space and thus to impinge even more directly upon the welfare of other societal groups and individuals.[7] In the Asia-Pacific region, rapid economic growth and the establishment of improved communications have led to an expansion in narcotics trafficking in terms of both volume and sophistication since the end of the Cold War. The breakdown of previous Cold War barriers to economic interaction among many states of the region and the new wealth of many citizens have increased the market for narcotics. Conversely, the financial crisis and the economic downturn since 1997 have also acted to make drug trafficking an economic lifeline for the citizens of many ASEAN states. The traditional concentration of the narcotics trade in the Golden Triangle of Burma, Thailand and Laos has transcended sovereign-state borders to include a wider economic area that also includes much of southern China. Thai, Chinese and Burmese Shan ethnic organized crime groups have remained engaged in the trade, but have grown in sophistication through the exploitation of information technology and improved transport infrastructure.[8]

The security risks of the regionalization and globalization of the narcotics trade in the Asia-Pacific are demonstrated by the health and welfare effects of drug addiction on millions of users in the region, as well as by the economic distortion and systemic corruption the trade engenders in many of the re-

gional states. The drugs trade has not been the only area of organized crime to have expanded in the region as a result of globalization processes. Studies have demonstrated that piracy has increased in recent years in Southeast Asia, driven by the increased opportunities created by the expansion of shipping traffic resulting from the region's rapid economic growth, but also by the increased motivation to engage in crime on the part of those groups which have been marginalized in the process of economic globalization.[9]

The other most notable security effects of economic globalization are environmental. Although, in the past, socialist systems have been responsible for some of the worst examples of environmental degradation, the spread of liberal economic globalization has arguably taken these problems to new heights. Liberal capitalism's vast and largely unimpeded appetite for natural resources, and the pollution that usually results, not only directly threatens the health of groups of individuals in various regions (through soil, water and air pollution), but also indirectly threatens the existence of humankind through the total destruction (global warming, sea-level changes) of the biosphere. The impact of globalization and economic liberalization on environmental security in the Asia-Pacific region can be seen in concerns about how China's economic growth may impose massive pollution costs on its own citizens and those of neighbouring states, as well as in the impact of forest fires across the Indonesian archipelago in 1997 and 1998. The fires in Kalimantan and Sumatra were the product of high-speed development policies that allowed unregulated logging and forest clearance, and they generated a 'haze' that affected the health of literally millions of Indonesian, Malaysian and Singaporean citizens. In many ways, the fires represented the apogee of the globalization–security nexus in that they threatened human security in complete transcendence of sovereign-state borders and revealed the inability to compartmentalize international and domestic security in an era of globalization.

Globalization and the Future Security Agenda in the Asia-Pacific Region

This article has identified a host of problems in the Asia-Pacific region that illustrate the crucial interconnection between globalization and security. These problems are exemplified by the East Asian financial crisis, which has threatened to impact upon all levels of security, from that of the state to that of the individual, and across all dimensions, from the economic to the environmental to the military. Moreover, the fact that the financial crisis has had such severe and prolonged security effects in the Asia-Pacific since 1997, in contrast with other financial crises which occurred near simultaneously in Russia and Latin

America, argues that the globalization–security nexus may be having a differentially heavy impact in this region compared to others. In turn, these observations raise two crucial and interrelated issues that form the focus of the remaining part of this article. The first is the reasons why the Asia-Pacific region has been and will continue to be particularly prone to the security effects of globalization, and the second is a consideration of whether the states and policymakers are equipped to deal effectively with the challenges of the unfolding post-globalization security agenda.

Vulnerable Sovereign States: Decolonization, Bipolarization and Globalization

As stated in the introduction to this article, it is important to understand the relationship between globalization and security through reference to both generic analytical frameworks and specific regional contexts. The first section of this article argued that the essence of globalization as a security problem is to be found in its transcendence of barriers to interaction across social space, and hence in its challenge to the sovereign state as the existing basis for the global security order. The forces of globalization quickly search out any inconsistencies and flaws in the structure of sovereign states and can prise open their external security barriers. Consequently, this suggests that, in order to comprehend the reasons for the differential impact of globalization across regions, it is necessary to examine the differential nature of sovereign states in each region and their ability to absorb and withstand the security shocks associated with globalization.

In the case of the Asia-Pacific, it can be seen that states are inherently vulnerable to the impact of globalization owing to the dual influence of the processes of decolonization and bipolarization upon the state-building process in the post-World War II period. The effect of decolonization upon the Asia-Pacific region was to create states modelled in theory along the lines of the sovereign nation-states of their former colonial masters, but which in practice have not always conformed to these ideals. In many instances, the idea of the sovereign state came before or diverged from that of the nation-state: the territorial and sovereign space of states in the region was often delineated along former colonial borders, which had been drawn arbitrarily and in contradistinction to transborder ties of ethnicity and religion and which continued to incorporate minority groups brought in under colonial migratory policies – problems particularly salient in many ASEAN states. These contradictions between sovereign space and societal composition clearly weakened from the start the internal political cohesion of states in the region and laid the groundwork for the potential divisibility between the security interests of the state and its societal constituents. Moreover, the common legacy of distorted development from the colonial period also placed these states in a disadvantageous economic position to maintain their internal stability. Therefore, the preoccupa-

tion of many states in the Asia-Pacific region has been to preserve their internal integrity by advancing the process of state-building, particularly in the economic sphere, as a means to reconcile these structural contradictions.[10]

The problematic position of newly established sovereign states in the region was further compounded either during or immediately after the decolonization phase by the impact of the onset of the Cold War. The bifurcation of the region between the competing ideologies and political economies of the socialist and capitalist blocs was to create a legacy of military confrontation that has endured in many parts of the region, such as the Korean Peninsula, to this day. Nevertheless, perhaps more important when considering the post-Cold War security challenges is the effect of this bipolarity upon the state-building agendas and the development of the political economies of many states in the region. The socialist camp, consisting of the USSR, China, North Korea, Vietnam and Laos, initially under the auspices of the USSR and later rent asunder internally by the Sino-Soviet split, created an alternative developmental economic system to that of liberal capitalism, which ensured the security of its members but was fundamentally vulnerable when exposed to the forces of liberal capitalism at the end of the Cold War. Meanwhile, the capitalist camp, consisting of many of the original ASEAN states and South Korea, and centred on the USA and increasingly Japan, enabled its members to evolve distinctive models of developmental capitalism and to use economic growth to mitigate problems of internal instability. On the other hand, though, revolving as it did around a form of proto-globalization, this system – which was designed to support the security interests of the USA and thus insulated these states to some degree from full competition – also had a distinct effect on the future resilience of these states in the face of economic liberalization.[11] The developmental states of the region were provided with preferential access to technology and the markets of the USA and the West, while at the same time they were able to restrict access to their own markets.

Therefore, the overlapping processes of decolonization and bipolarization have had a significant impact upon the development of the sovereign states of the Asia-Pacific and their ability to respond to the process of globalization. First, these processes have created states marked by internal contradictions between the delineation of territorial space and societal composition, as well as a near ineradicable divisibility between the proclaimed security interests of these states and large sections of their citizenry. Second, they have created either states that are fundamentally unprepared to cope with global economic forces, as in the case of North Korea, or states, such as those of ASEAN, that are driven by the need to exploit the benefits of liberal capitalism to paper over the political and security cracks in their own societies, but which have been insulated in the past from the full effects of capitalism's tendency towards periodic crises. The end of the Cold War and the declining incentives

on the part of the USA to provide special economic dispensations are also increasingly exposing the states of the region to fully fledged modes of liberal capitalism and their attendant security costs. In sum, then, the Asia-Pacific has been and continues to be characterized by states especially vulnerable to those forces which attack territorial sovereignty, generate external economic shocks and frustrate state-building agendas – the very conditions which globalization is capable of creating and exploiting to the detriment of security.

Responses and Policy Implications

The above discussion of the inherent structural weaknesses of many of the states of the Asia-Pacific region and their resultant inherent vulnerability to the globalization–security nexus leads to the crucial issue of whether they will be capable of responding to globalization's future challenges. Detailed examination of these issues will form the basis of future studies, but the aim here is simply to stress two key points about the evolving globalization–security agenda in the Asia-Pacific. The first is that the nature of globalization as an often economic phenomenon means that military power alone is not sufficient to meet its security demands. There is a continued need for comprehensive approaches to security which employ military and economic power in balanced combination. The second point is that globalization's essentially supra-territorial nature means that it cannot be responded to within the traditional confines of the territorial state. Globalization's ability to circumvent territorial boundaries means that all its associated security problems, including economic dislocation, crime and environmental pollution, are trans-sovereign in character. States are then faced with trans-sovereign problems that require multinational and, most controversially, trans-sovereign responses.

The evidence from the responses of Asia-Pacific states to recent security problems is that they continue to understand fully the importance of the need for a comprehensive approach – demonstrated by Japan's 'Human Security' initiatives in response to the East Asian financial crisis since 1998. But it is not clear if the policymakers of the region are yet ready to fully contemplate trans-sovereign responses to many extant security issues. The inability of the ASEAN states to respond to the trans-sovereign problem of the Indonesian 'haze' and the divisions evident in the organization over the question of external intervention in the East Timor crisis indicate that they still hold the norms of exclusive territorial sovereignty and non-intervention to be largely sacrosanct, even at considerable cost to the human security of their own and other states' populations. Again, this reluctance to breach the principle of sovereignty is explained by their hard-fought efforts for decolonization and state-building in the Cold War period, and the states of the region may be able to compensate with improved multilateral coordination and adaptive forms of governance, such as the ASEAN+3, and new functional norms such as 'flexi-

ble' engagement. However, policymakers will also need to consider that the maintenance of exclusive sovereignty may prove untenable in an era of globalization and that they will have to support more actively policies of humanitarian intervention and the explicit criticism of each other's 'internal' security affairs if they are to effectively address the globalization–security nexus.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

* Dr Christopher Hughes is Senior Research Fellow at the Centre for the Study of Globalisation and Regionalisation, University of Warwick, UK.

1 Victor D. Cha, 'Globalization and the Study of International Security', *Journal of Peace Research*, vol. 37, no. 3, May 2000, pp. 391–403.

2 Jan Aart Scholte, 'Global Capitalism and the State', *International Affairs*, vol. 73, no. 3, July 1997, pp. 427–452, on p. 431.

3 Paul B. Stares, 'Introduction', in Paul B. Stares, ed., *The New Security Agenda: A Global Survey* (Tokyo & New York: Japan Center for International Exchange, 1998), pp. 11–22, on p. 15.

4 William T. Tow, Ramesh Thakur & In-Taek Hyun, *Asia's Emerging Regional Order: Reconciling Traditional and Human Security* (Tokyo, New York & Paris: United Nations University Press, 2000).

5 Christopher W. Hughes, *Japan's Economic Power and Security: Japan and North Korea* (London: Routledge, 1999), pp. 51–116.

6 Alan Dupont, *The Environment and Security in Pacific Asia.* Adelphi Paper 319 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), pp. 41–73.

7 Stephen E. Flynn, 'The Global Drug Trade Versus the Nation-State', in Maryann K. Cusimano, ed., *Beyond Sovereignty: Issues for a Global Agenda* (Boston, MA & New York: Bedford / St. Martin's, 2000), pp. 44–66, on p. 52.

8 Alan Dupont, 'Transnational Crime, Drugs and Security in East Asia', *Asian Survey*, vol. 39, no. 3, May / June 1999, pp. 433–455.

9 Neil Renwick & Jason Abbott, 'Piratical Violence and Maritime Security in Southeast Asia', *Security Dialogue*, vol. 30, no. 2, June 1999, pp. 183–196.

10 Mohammed Ayoob, *The Third World Security Predicament: State Making, Regional Conflict, and the International System* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 1995), pp. 21–45.

11 Christopher W. Hughes, *Japan's Security Agenda: The Search for Regional Stability* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, forthcoming, 2002).