**"Globalisation and Security in the Asia-Pacific:
An Initial Investigation"**

Christopher W. Hughes

CSGR Working Paper No. 61/00

November 2000

Globalisation and Security in the Asia-Pacific: An Initial Investigation
Christopher W. Hughes
CSGR, University of Warwick.

Abstract:

Globalisation and security vie individually for the status of the most important, yet least well conceptualised, of issues for academics and policy-makers. Moreover, despite the growing sense of its significance, the interconnection of globalisation and security, or globalisation-security nexus, is also understudied and poorly conceptualised. Finally, the differential impact of the globalisation-security nexus upon the various regions of the world is also understudied. This working paper is an initial attempt to fill these gaps in our knowledge by investigating the globalisation-security nexus in both generic conceptual terms and in relation to the specific impact of globalisation in the Asia-Pacific region. The first part of the paper demonstrates how globalisation as a qualitatively new phenomenon is capable of transcending territorial and sovereign space, exploits potential divisibility between the security interests of sovereign states and their citizens, and has thus challenged us to extend our conceptions of security and to interlink domestic and international security issues. The second section of the paper then argues that globalisation requires a vertical extension of security in terms of the looking below the level of the state and at alternative security actors, including societal groups, individuals and TNCs, which are also capable of consuming, denying and supplying security to others. The horizontal expansion of security is needed in terms of broadening the security agenda away from the traditional military dimension and towards economic, environmental and societal security issues which have come to the fore under conditions of globalisation. The third section of the paper then moves on to demonstrate how globalisation has had a differential impact across regions in accordance with the ability of sovereign states, the existing unit for ordering social space, to resist the impact of trans-sovereign problems. In the case of the Asia-Pacific, this paper argues that the twin processes of decolonisation and bipolarisation have placed relative limits upon this ability for states, left them systemically vulnerable to globalisation as a process which emphasises the divisibility of state and societal security interests, and hence enabled globalisation to exacerbate existing military, economic and environmental security problems in the region.

Address for correspondence:

Dr. Christopher W. Hughes
CSGR
University of Warwick
Coventry CV4 7AL, UK
Email: c.w.hughes@warwick.ac.uk

Introduction: interconnection of globalisation and security[*]

Globalisation and security vie individually for the status of the least well-conceptualised, but yet most controversial, of academic and policy-making issues. Security has been described as an underdeveloped concept (Buzan 1991: 3), and globalisation, 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 conceptualised, therefore, only gives further grounds for concern when attempting to examine the two in conjunction. For if academics and policy-makers alike can agree that globalisation and security are the two most pressing of contemporary international issues, but still experience difficulty even in analysing them in separation, then the prospects for understanding their intersection and the globalisation-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 globalisation and security--the first of the reasons why this CSCAP working group is so important and timely. Indeed, it could be argued that a number of pioneering attempts have already been made to investigate the relationship between globalisation and security (Cha 2000: 392), in terms of its creation of new security actors, problems and responses. However, although very valuable in providing a starting point and emergent framework for consideration of the globalisation-security nexus, these attempts have tended to lack a strong empirical basis and geographical focus. Such a focus is important because globalisation is likely to differ in its security impact between regional contexts--the second of the reasons why this working group and its investigation of the globalisation and security relationship specific to the Asia-Pacific is so significant.

---

[*] A draft version of this working paper was first delivered at the 8th Meeting of the CSCAP Working Group on Comprehensive and Cooperative Security, 19-21 October 2000, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.

All of this argues that there is a need to combine the study of globalisation and security, but that this also should be carried out through the balanced application of analytical frameworks to particular regional cases. The consequent objective of this short paper is to seek to make a initial contribution to the working group's examination of globalisation and security by following this very approach. Hence, the paper attempts, in a number of stages, to both build upon the existing globalisation-security nexus literature and to extend it to the case of the Asia-Pacific region in the post-Cold War (or post-globalisation) period. The first of these stages is to define more fully the essence of the term globalisation, and the inherent problems that it presents more generically for the poses for the existing international order. The second stage is then to examine the general impact of globalisation upon security, in regard to its generation of new and re-emergent security actors, threats, and policy responses. The third stage is then to apply this model to the Asia-Pacific in order to assist our understanding of the differential impact of globalisation in the region, and the particular problems it poses for states and their citizens.

Conceptions of globalisation

Definitions

As noted above, globalisation is a notoriously slippery concept and has produced a bewildering number of definitions (Scholte 2000: 44-6). Globalisation has been defined variously as universalisation (the expansion of cultures across the globe); internationalisation (increased interaction and interdependence between people in different states); Westernisation or Americanisation (the homogenisation of the world along Western or US standards); and liberalisation (the spread of deregulated forces of technology, production, trade, and finance across borders). Many of these definitions are indeed facets of

globalisation--both in terms of its causation and eventual outcomes (Clark 1998: 484). But these definitions still fail to capture the qualitatively different nature of globalisation from other processes and phenomena associated with the interaction of social forces on a global scale. Globalisation represents a qualitatively different process due to its essential de-territorialisation, or put conversely, supra-territorialisation of social interaction (Scholte 1997: 431). That is to say, globalisation is a process which increasingly reconfigures social space away from and beyond notions of delineated territory, 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-globalisation' thesis which views the world as moving towards a condition of being totally 'borderless'. For it is apparent that there is considerable territorial 'drag' upon the free-flow of globalisation forces, wide disparities in the degree of globalisation across different regions of the world, and both resistance to and reversibility in the process itself. Nevertheless, globalisation as a process of supra-territorialisation is increasingly affecting large sections of the world, and must be acknowledged as a markedly different (although certainly not unrelated) process to those other definitions of social interaction noted above. Hence, even though universalism, internationalisaion, westernisation and liberalisation may eventually result in globalisation, the fact that they may not necessarily be entirely detached from territorialisation means that they remain on a qualitatively different level to the inherently supra-territorial phenonmena of globalisation. After all, if we could equate exactly globalisation with any of these other phenomena, then there would be little need to consider it is as anything new or to search for new vocabulary to describe it, and policy prescriptions would already be in our hands.

Globalisation and challenges to the state

The phenomena of globalisation as supra-territorialisation and the reconfiguration of social space carries significant implications for existing forms of social organisation, and, most importantly in the case of security issues, the dominant position of the nation state (or far more accurately for many states, sovereign state) within the existing globality. Needless to say, the state with its monopoly of 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 region, not all states throughout history have been able to exercise the same degree of sovereign control over all forms of social interaction. But nevertheless, sovereign states rooted in territorial notions of social space have been the prime unit for facilitating, impeding and mediating interaction between the social groups, organisations, and citizens and other categories of collective and individual social 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 globalisation as a process which transcends and overrides territoriality as the dominant principle for the organisation of social space now poses a fundamental challenge to the sovereign state as the basic social unit which exemplifies and undergirds this very territorial principle. Sovereign states must now 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 or irrelevance of

state borders, relative decline in the *de facto* sovereign authority of states over forms of social interaction, and corresponding increased exposure of 'internal' social groupings to 'external forces' (or even indeed the removal of the traditional domestic-international divide to create an intermestic arena for social interchange) has a number of outcomes for security which will be 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 inter-state order. But it is clear that the security order is now pitted against the phenomenon of globalisation which generates security issues diametrically opposed to and often beyond the limits of sovereign state authority.

Globalisation: causation and policy response

Before moving on, though, to examine the general consequences of globalisation for security and then seeking to apply these conceptions to the context of the Asia-Pacific, it is first necessary to take note briefly of the causes that lie behind the phenomena. This is because, only if we are equipped with a clearer understanding of the causes of globalisation and its relation to insecurity, can we then also attempt to tackle conceptually the possibilities of framing an effective security policy response.

This need to consider the causes of globalisation is made all the more important by the fact that all too often it is viewed in a deterministic fashion--especially in neo-liberal economics analysis--as a phenomena which somehow occurs naturally through spontaneous and unconscious social interaction amongst rational economic actors, and which is largely inevitable and irreversible in its trajectory. To be sure, and as will be argued below in the case of the Asia-Pacific, globalisation is caused to a large degree by the release of liberal economic forces (hence the point that globalisation may bring about but is not necessarily

coeval with liberalisation), is in part the outcome of unconnected actors seeking to exploit economic complementarities that subvert the economic spaces centred on sovereign states, and is on powerful forward trajectory in its diffusion across the core economic regions of the globe. Nonetheless, at the same time, it is important to understand that the role of liberal economic forces in propelling globalisation forward is in turn the outcome of conscious decisions (or more usually non-decisions, and the acquiescence in policies of inaction so as to avoid perceived costly policy choices) on the part of political actors. Hence, whether these actors are states, social groups, individuals, or organisations such as transnational corporations (TNC), they have to be seen as the prime movers in constructing the sociopolitical structures which underpin the dominance of liberal economics, and the consequent spread of globalisation (Higgott 1999: 27). If we then view globalisation as a *process* which is driven by human choice and the deliberate pursuit of liberal economic gains, rather than as some form of leviathan which is no longer subjugated to the dictate of humans but has acquired a life of its own, then it is possible to understand the causation and the reversibility, or at least manageability, of the process. Based on this understanding, the fate of security still lies in human hands, and it should also be possible to conceptualise policy responses to the security impact of globalisation.

Globalisation's impact on security: levels, dimensions, responses

If we are to view globalisation as a process which is driven forward by political choice in favour of liberal economics, and results in forms of social interaction which transcend territorial borders and state sovereignty, then it is possible to conceive of its impact on security in a number of areas. These involve both the *vertical* extension of security in terms of levels of actors, and the *horizontal* extension in terms of dimensions of security issues.

1. Levels of actors

The first of these areas concerns the identification and expanding number of security actors under conditions of globalisation. Arguably, three broad categorisations of security actors can be identified: those actors subject to security threats (often termed the referent object of security); those actors which impose security threats upon others; and those which supply security to others. Clearly none of these identities is mutually exclusive, and a certain actor may assume different identities according to the context and perception of onlookers (ie. the rather tired adage that one man's terrorist is another man's freedom fighter). Indeed, the appeal for public legitimacy of certain states and groups as victims rather than imposers of insecurity, and consequent blurring of security actor identities is one byproduct of the diffusion of the mass media and globalisation. Moreover, security actors themselves can move between and assume different identities, as in the case of narcotics cartels, which, although often categorised as forms of social organisations, can also virtually usurp the functions and identities of states. But just significant as the ability of the globalisation process to obscure the identities of security actors has been its ability to expand the range and level of actors which can assume the three identities.

One noticeable impact of globalisation has been to accentuate the concept, which has preexisted in certain contexts, that the state's position as the prime referent object of security is now rivalled by other social 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

8

'gatekeeper' to shield their citizenry and populations from external threats, is indivisible from the survival of peoples and nations. The result has been to produce a view of security which concentrates not just upon states as the key referent objects of security (Waever 1995:49), but also mainly upon the external aspects of state security. For the traditional paradigm, then, 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 as the major actors 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 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 the traditional security paradigm to 'black box' internal state dynamics means that inevitably it neglects 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 face small or large numbers of ethnic groups which reject the definition of nation and state emanating from the government and view themselves as subject to oppression. 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 inter-linked with and capable of reinforcing ethnic separatism, is that of a crisis of the state's political legitimacy and leadership amongst 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, revolt, 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 will be mentioned below, many states in the Asia-Pacific, as developing sovereign states, but often only partially 'nation' states, are subject to these twin problems of ethnic separatism and political legitimacy. Hence, these states have focussed much of their security policy-making 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 social groupings contained within the state's sovereign territory, is not new. Globalisation'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 social elements. As

explained above, globalisation 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 that impact directly and differentially upon internal social groups. For instance, globalisation 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 it engenders, undercuts the ability of the sovereign state to act as the principal arbiter of the economic welfare of its internal society. The result, as is well-known from the East Asian financial crisis, is that social groups (ethnic and economic) and individual citizens may endure economic costs which the state is unable to mitigate and redistribute. In these circumstances, even though the apparatus of the state may remain intact, social groups and individual citizens may view the state as a redundant framework for the preservation of their economic security interests and can detach themselves from it--resulting in the type of crisis of political legitimacy for the state described above. Globalisation's capacity to strip the protection of the state away from social 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' (Commission on Global Governance 1995: 81-2; Tow, Thakur, Hyun 2000).

Likewise, if the state's position as the principal referent object of security is challenged by globalisation, so also must we begin to review its position as always the principal actor responsible for the imposition and defence of threats. States clearly continue to dispose of the greatest economic and military power capabilities, and to deny or provide internal and external security to others on the largest scale. However, again whilst it is not an entirely new trend, globalisation has accentuated the perception that other social actors are capable of not

just consuming security, but also denying and supplying security to others. For example, ethnic and minority groups can infringe the security of states and other sets of groups and individuals if they are perceived to threaten stability by embarking on a political or military struggle--especially if they become involved in criminal or terrorist activities. But the opposite is also true, that these groups can be regarded as freedom fighters and the providers of security to minorities subject to repression by states. Moreover, in much the same way as individuals can be regarded as the irreducible referent object of security, so they must also be regarded as the irreducible deniers and providers of security functions. Individuals even within the legal framework of a state do still retain the capacity to inflict violence and damage upon each other and other security actors. Acts of individual murder and assault remain commonplace, and individuals can even pose threats to a society as a whole if they adopt terrorist techniques and gain access to the means of violence--as shown by the emergence of one-man bombing campaigns in the US (Unibomber) and UK (racist bombings) in the 1990s. Individuals in many societies may also feel the responsibility to provide for their own security, especially where the internal policing functions of the state have broken down (for example, certain states in Africa) or where they are perceived to be too severe (US militias suspicious of government attempts to limit the right to possess firearms).

Furthermore, TNCs now have to be considered within the scope of deniers and providers of economic, environmental, and even military security. Corporations clearly impose conditions of economic insecurity on states, societal groups and individuals, through their business activities and competition which can lead to differential patterns of poor working conditions, unemployment and underemployment, poverty, and general economic dislocation. The activities of corporations also lead to environmental degradation, and can have detrimental

effects on military security, not only by the creation of a prosperous or poor economic climate which can be conducive to increased tensions amongst security actors and the build-up or reduction of military capacities, but also in terms of the business of the global arms trade which facilitates these processes. Nevertheless, TNCs and private business corporations can also be a source of security. TNCs can foster ties of interdependence which may promote external security amongst states or alternatively provide the economic strength to promote independent security. They can also provide wealth and employment to segments of a state's population which delivers general stability and internal security. In addition, TNCs and private firms can provide an income and various welfare benefits and thus economic security to individual workers and their families. TNCs can also provide 'privatised' military security in a direct fashion through the employment of private armies and mercenaries to protect their business interests and even assist the stabilisation of sovereign states (Shearer 1998).

Finally, globalisation and the trans-sovereign problems that it creates have thrust to the fore another potential category of societal organisation which can provide security--non-governmental organisations (NGO). The legitimacy of NGO's as security actors in some case can certainly be questioned on grounds of accountability. Nevertheless, the ability of NGOs to exploit open economies and new developments in technology in order to organise across borders means that they can contribute both directly (aid activities; anti-land mine movement) and indirectly (campaigns for debt relief; environmental protection) to the military, economic and environmental security of individuals.

The argument of this paper is certainly not that globalisation has directly created these groups anew as security actors. As will be noted below with reference to the Asia-Pacific, the problems that motivate these actors originate in the constituent nature of states and the

process of state-building. Nonetheless, globalisation has impacted in such as way as to sap the economic and military ability of states to threaten or provide for the security of others, and thereby create greater freedom for these alternative level security actors to operate. If states are viewed as incapable of providing security due to their own military or economic weakness, often generated by the destabilising effects of globalisation, then other actors have to step into the breach.

2. Dimensions of threat: economic, environmental, societal, military

The second impact of globalisation on security has not necessarily been to create new dimensions of threats, but to revive and exacerbate both latent and existing security problems--so leading to the horizontal extension of security concepts mentioned above.

Globalisation's most obvious impact has been its integrative and disintegrative economic characteristics, and the consequent knock-on effects upon the economic and then military security of states and their social 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 'democratic peace' argument). Nevertheless, the disintegrative effects of globalisation can simultaneously contribute to insecurity in a number of ways:

a. Economic exclusion.

Globalisation can produce economic exclusion for states and individuals marked by disparities of welfare which may feed through into military tension amongst states in an attempt to wrest economic benefits from others, or result in internal unrest within states.

b. Economic disparity.

Globalisation 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 regionalisation can lead to the disintergration of state structures, with unforseen consequences for internal and external security.

c. Economic competition.

Globalisation can generate economic competition amongst states, TNCs, social organisations and individuals for scare natural resources; again often threatening to spill over into military conflict. Moreover, the wealth it produces can fuel arms races.

d. Economic dislocation.

As already mentioned, globalisation often leads to economic poverty, crises, and insecurity for states, social groups and individuals, all leading to social instability within and amongst state and possible armed conflict.

Moreover, sitting in between these integrative and disintegrative economic effects of globalisation are those security problems connected with transnational or trans-sovereign crime. Globalisation promotes trans-sovereign crime because economic integration and disintegration in tandem create both supply and demand, or push and pull factors, for those actors engaged in criminal activities. By this it is meant that economic dislocation and disparities within a certain state or social grouping creates incentives to engage in wealth-generating activities by engaging in the supply of illicit products such as narcotics or arms. In turn, globalisation'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 is clearly not a new phenomena. Indeed, in the past the chief suppliers of narcotics have been sovereign states themselves, the opium trade being one notable example. But economic globalisation, facilitated by transport and telecommunications technology, has enabled crime organisations to mimic the behaviour of TNCs (Flynn 2000: 52), to move with still greater ease across deregulated economic space, and thus to impinge even more directly upon the welfare of other social groups and individuals.

The other most notable security effects of economic globalisation are environmental. Although in the past socialist systems have been responsible for some of the worst examples of environment degradation, the spread of liberal economic globalisation 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 threatens directly the health of groups of individuals in various regions (water and river pollution in Europe; air pollution and forest fires in Southeast Asia; nuclear accidents in Japan), but also threatens indirectly the existence of humankind through the total destruction (global warming; sea level changes) of the biosphere.

Globalisation can also be said to encompass and exacerbate other dimensions of security such as the societal and military dimensions. Globalisation impacts upon the societal dimension of security, defined as the perceived erosion of the collective identity of certain social groups (Buzan, Waever, de Wilde 1998; 119-21), due to its promotion of trans and intra-national migration which can bring different ethnic or religious groups into contact and occasionally conflict. Globalisation's prinicpal impact in the dimension of military security is indirect. The

onset of globalisation and its related intergrative and disintegrative economic effects can both lay the grounds for and exacerbate military conflicts. Finally, as well as globalisation's influence upon the inter-linking of the different dimensions of security, it also clearly inter-meshes or supersedes the domestic and international security agendas--the conflict generating effects of globalisation on the domestic level often threatening to spill over into international tensions and conflicts.

3. Responses

A number of other papers at the working group will deal with the question of how security actors can respond to the problems engendered by globalisation. Hence, the objective of this paper is simply to stress that the inherent nature of globalisation and its supra-territoriality means that its associated security problems cannot be responded to within the traditional confines of the territorial sovereign state or by utilising the traditional tools of security policy. Globalisation's ability to circumvent territorial boundaries gives all of its related security dimensions a transnational and trans-sovereign character. Issues such as economic dislocation, crime and environmental pollution function across sovereign frontiers. States are then faced with security problems which demand policy responses that are also trans-sovereign. This makes clear the need for multinational cooperation and, most controversially, the (hopefully voluntary) abrogation at times of the principle of exclusive sovereignty in order to construct policies which can also pursue global security problems across state frontiers. However, whilst the sovereign state, due to its continued overwhelming disposition of power, certainly remains the principal supplier of security in an era of globalisation, the analysis above has also indicated that it needs to share this role with other actors, including international organisations, social groups, TNCs and NGOs. Moreover, the nature of globalisation as often a economic phenomenon also means that military power alone is not

sufficient to meets its security demands. Thus, there is a need for comprehensive approaches to security which employ military power in balanced combination with economic power.

Globalisation and security in the Asia-Pacific

Differential impact of globalisation in the Asia-Pacific

This paper has already described a number of security problems which have occurred in the Asia-Pacific region and which can be seen to be associated with globlisation. The East Asian financial crisis has been the most prominent of these and impacted on all levels of security from that of the state to the individual, and across all dimensions from the economic to the environmental, and even to the military, at least in terms of scaling back of arms procurements. But the East Asian financial crisis was only one indication of the ongoing impact of globalisation upon the security of the Asia-Pacific region. The continuing integration of the region into the global political economy is likely to only accentuate problems of economic security. For instance, economic exclusion can be said to have underlain many of North Korea's internal and external security problems in the post-Cold War period; economic disparity and uneven growth presents problems for the territorial and political unity of China and the Russian Far East, and the internal political stability of a number of Southeast Asian states; economic competition has given rise to concerns about conflict over energy resources in the region; and economic dislocation is a continuing problem for states in both Northeast and Southeast Asia. Meanwhile, trans-sovereign crime is growing in the region (Dupont 1999), with renewed problems of narcotics cartels and piracy in Southeast Asia; and environmental degradation is also continuing largely unchecked in the region, as demonstrated by the reoccurrence of the 'haze' in Indonesia and Malaysia since

1997. All these problems also draw attention to the fact that security situation in the region is affected by TNCs, NGOs, social groupings and individuals as well as by sovereign states.

It is possible, then, to identify a host of problems in the Asia-Pacific which illustrate the crucial interconnection between globalisation and security. Moreover, from the evidence of the East Asian financial crisis, it might be possible to argue that the security impact of globalisation has been differentially heavy in the Asia-Pacific compared to many other regions. The limited space of this paper does not allow for a more detailed attempt to catalogue all of the problems of the globalisation-security nexus in the region. Instead, the remaining part of this paper is devoted to an investigation of the possible reasons as to why the region may be particularly prone to the effects of post-globalisation security problems.

As stated in the introduction to this paper, it is important to understand the relationship between globalisation and security through reference to both generic analytical frameworks and specific regional contexts. The first section of this paper argued that the essence of globalisation as a security problem is to be found in its transcendence of barriers to interaction across social space, and hence its challenge to the sovereign state as the existing basis for the global security order. The forces of globalisation quickly search out any inconsistencies and flaws in the structure of the sovereign state, and can prise open its external security barriers. Consequently, this suggests that in order to comprehend the reasons for the differential impact of globalisation across regions then 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 globalisation processes. Much of what follows is painted in very broad brush strokes and its generalisations cannot capture the entire complexity of the

region. But it is hoped that at the very least it will provide a framework for making intelligible the nature of states and the political economy in the Asia-Pacific.

Vulnerable sovereign states: decolonisation, bipolarisation, and globalisation

If attention is then turned to examining the condition of sovereign states in the Asia-Pacific region, it can be seen that they are particularly vulnerable to the inherent qualities of globalisation due to the dual influence of decolonisation and bipolarisation upon the state-building process in the post-war period. The effect of decolonisation upon the Asia-Pacific region was to create states modelled in theory along the lines of the sovereign and 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: shown by the fact that the territorial and sovereign space of states in the region was often delineated along former colonial borders which had been drawn in arbitrary fashion and in contradistinction to trans-border ties of ethnicity and religion. 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 ground for the potential divisibility between the security interests of the state and its social 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 preoccupation of many states in the Asia-Pacific region since the post-colonial has been to preserve their internal integrity by advancing the process of state-building, and particularly in the economic sphere, as a means to reconcile these structural contradictions (Ayoob 1995: 21-45).

20

The problematic position of newly-established sovereign states in the region was further compounded either during or immediately after the decolonisation phase by the impact of the onset of the Cold War. The translation to the Asia-Pacific of the contest between the ideologies and political economies of the US and USSR led to the division of certain states and the biopolarisation of the region to varying degrees. As is well known, the bifurcation of the region in the early Cold War period was to create a legacy of military confrontation which has endured in many cases to this day. Nevertheless, perhaps more important when considering the post-Cold War and post-globalisation security agendas is the affect of the Cold War upon the state building-agenda and related political economies of many of the new states in the region. The Cold War in effect divided the Asia-Pacific region into three zones of political economy (Spero 1997: 12-17): a zone of independence centred for the early part of the Cold War upon a socialist bloc under the auspices of the USSR; a zone of interdependence centred upon the US, and increasingly Japan as well, throughout most of the Cold War; and a zone of dependence, consisting mainly of the newer sovereign states in Southeast Asia, which although seeking economic independence was increasingly drawn into the zone of interdependence, with Japan playing a major role in this process. The zone of independence created an alternative economic system to that of liberal capitalism and ensured the security of many of its members, although it showed increasing signs of breaking down throughout the latter period of the Cold War and as the USSR and China split the zone internally. However, this zone of independence was also eventually to be rendered asunder by the economic pressure from the zone of interdependence at the end of the Cold War, so leaving the already internally weak states of the zone exposed to the forces of liberal capitalism.

Meanwhile, the zone of interdependence can be conceived of in the Cold War period as a form of proto-globalisation and liberal economic system under the leadership of the US. This system was also to affect the state-building efforts of those states within its ambit. On the one hand, the system provided markets and aid which accelerated the economic growth of certain states on the semi-periphery and later the centre, such as Japan, as well as pulling along the growth of other states on the periphery and located in the zone of dependence in Southeast Asia. In this way, states were able to develop distinctive variations of developmental capitalism and to use economic growth to mitigate problems of internal stability. On the other hand, though, the system, revolving as it did around a form of proto-globalisation which was designed to support the security interests of the US and thus which insulated these states to some degree from full competition, also had particular effects on the evolution of these states' political economies. Hence, in extreme case states in the region were propped up by external aid, but more usually evolved political economies which were developmental in orientation but systemically vulnerable to the fully unleashed global capitalism. Thus, these states may have been able to overcome to some extent the economic shocks of the early 1970s and to move towards a new path of development in the new international division of labour. But at the same time, these states were still given special dispensations within the zone of interdependency, consisting of access to technology and the developed markets of the US and West, whilst simultaneously being able to restrict access to their own markets (Strange 1996: 6-7).

Therefore, the twin processes of decolonisation and bipolarisation have had a distinct impact upon the development of the sovereign states of the Asia-Pacific. Firstly, these processes have created states marked by internal contradictions between the delineation of territorial space and societal composition, and a consequent preoccupation with attempts to reconcile

22

the two by the defence of the principle of sovereignty. Nevertheless, despite all these efforts, there still remains a near ineradicable and potential divisibility between the proclaimed security interests of these state and large sections of their citizenry--the very conditions which globalisation is capable of highlighting to the detriment of security. Secondly, they have created states either fundamentally unprepared to cope with global economic forces as in the case of certain former members of the zone of independence such as North Korea, or states driven by the need to exploit the benefits of liberal capitalism to preserve their own internal stability, but which have been insulated in the past from the full effects of capitalism's tendency towards periodic crises. In sum, the Asia-Pacific has been characterised by states vulnerable to those forces which attack territorial sovereignty and generate external economic shocks, so frustrating state-building agendas.

Based on this understanding of the nature of sovereign states in the Asia-Pacific, the reasons for the differentially heavy impact of globalisation in the region become clearer. Quite simply, globalisation, especially when it generates seismic economic shocks on the scale of the East Asian financial crisis, represents the very antithesis of state-building agendas in the region. Globalisation is mercilessly capable of laying bare the internal weaknesses of states. This is not to say that states cannot adapt to and successfully ride the globalisation wave, and then utilise the benefits of economic growth to push forward their state-building efforts. But globalisation is also a double-edged sword, due to its ability to undermine sovereignty and produce economic dislocation. Moreover, with the end of the Cold War and merging of the zones of independence, dependence and interdependence, there is no longer a great incentive for the US to provide special economic dispensations to the states of the Asia-Pacific, so increasing the pressure for them to adopt neo-liberal modes of capitalism. The final outcome

is then to deepen and widen the process of globalisation in the Asia-Pacific and to expose its political economies to greater security risks in the process of adjustment to liberal capitalism.

Conclusion: the future security agenda of the Asia-Pacific

This paper has attempted to sketch the connection between globalisation and security through the use of generic frameworks for analysis and the regional context in the Asia-Pacific. It has demonstrated how globalisation as a qualitatively new phenomenon is capable of transcending territorial and sovereign space, and has challenged us to extend our conceptions of security both vertically and horizontally. Globalisation requires us to consider security from the level of the state down to that of the individual, and across the dimensions of economic, environmental, societal and military security. Moreover, this paper has also shown how globalisation has a differential impact across regions in accordance with the ability of sovereign states, the existing unit for ordering social space, to resist the impact of trans-sovereign problems. In the case of the Asia-Pacific, the twin processes of decolonisation and bipolarisation have placed relative limits upon this ability for states, and enabled globalisation to exacerbate existing security problems in the region. In turn, the continuing spread of globalisation in the region indicates that it is increasingly necessary to place alongside the traditional post-Cold War military security agenda of policy-makers an alternative (and certainly not an entirely new in the case of many states in the region long preoccupied with problems of internal and comprehensive security) one which focusses upon problems in the economic, environmental and societal dimensions. The optimum policy response of states to these problems--for at least for the time being these are the only social units with sufficient resources and legitimacy to spearhead the defence of other social groupings from globalisation's worst excesses--is something to be discussed in other sessions of this working group. However, it is perhaps clear that the sovereign state, mismatched as it

is in its capabilities against a phenomenon which challenges its very raison d'être of sovereignty, can only hope to respond effectively to the challenges of globalisation by also assuming more flexible and adaptive forms. All too often in the Asia-Pacific there is an underlying assumption (eminently understandable, though it may be) that globalisation is simply another historical phase, like that of the Cold War, which disadvantages the states of the region but which can be adapted to if the 'rules of the game' are simply relearned. There is a sense that the states of the region can come away relatively unscathed from the hazardous game of globalisation if they exercise sufficient guile and use a 'pick and mix' approach to the phenomena--taking the positive benefits but screening themselves off from the perceived negative aspects of globalisation.

Larger states in the region such as China may well be better positioned to follow this approach. China is blessed with a geographical size that to some degree provides it with scope to dampen over the short term, although certainly not halt over the longer term, the onset of centrifugal globalisation pressures; whilst the perceived size of its market and position as a production base equips with a certain degree of structural power in the international political economy to influence the pace and terms of globalisaiton. Other states such as Japan have had the good fortune of the 'window of opportunity' of the Cold War and alignment with the US. These have enabled Japan to climb to a level of economic development in the international political economy, and continue with state-building attempts, to the point whereby it is sufficiently strong as a state to weather the impact of globalisation.

But the fact that even states such as China and Japan, with their mixed advantages of size, wealth and strategic position are shaken by globalisation, is suggestive of the fact that it is

likely to have a far graver impact upon the smaller and weaker states of the region. For these states there is less opportunity to pick and choose from the globalisation menu and they have to increasingly take the phenomena wholesale. In this situation, they are unable to just learn or influence the rules of an existing game, but have to learn a new game entirely--a game which increasingly negates or reinvents the function of sovereignty and which further redistributes power to the large states and to non-state actors. It is only by taking on board this painful lesson that states can adapt to globalisation and tackle its related security issues. However, that this realisation may not yet have dawned on many of the political elites in the region only gives cause for concern.

References

Ayoob, Mohammed (1995) *The Third World Security Predicament: State Making, Regional Conflict, and the International System*, Boulder, Colorado: Lynne Rienner.

Buzan, Barry (1991) *People, States and Fear: An Agenda for Security Studies in the Post-Cold War Era*, London, Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Buzan, Barry, Waever, Ole, and de Wilde, Jaap (1998) *Security: A New Framework for Analysis*, Boulder, Colorado, Lynne Rienner.

Cha, Victor D. (2000) 'Globalization and the study of international security', *Journal of Peace Research*, 37 (3): 391-403.

Clark, Ian (1998) 'Beyond the great divide: globalization and the theory of international relations', *Review of International Studies*, 24: 479-98.

Commission on Global Governance (1995) *Our Global Neighbourhood*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Dupont, Alan (1999) 'Transnational crime, drugs and security in East Asia', *Asian Survey*, 39 (3): 433-55.

Flynn, Stephen E. (2000) 'The global drug trade versus the nation state', in Maryann K. Cusimano (ed.) *Beyond Sovereignty: Issues for a Global Agenda*, Boston and New York, Bedford/St. Martin's: 44-66.

Higgott, Richard (1999) 'Economics, politics, and (international) political economy: the need for a balanced diet in an era of globalisation', *New Political Economy*, 4 (1): 23-36.

Scholte, Jan Aart (1997) 'Global capitalism and the state', *International Affairs*, 73 (3): 427-52.

Scholte, Jan Aart (2000) *Globalisation: A Critical Introduction*, London, Macmillan.

Shearer, David (1998) *Private Armies and Military Intervention*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Spero, Joan Edelman (1997) *The Politics of International Economic Relations*, Routledge, London.

Strange, Susan (1996) *The Retreat of the State: The Diffusion of Power in the World Economy*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

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

Waever, Ole (1995) 'Securitization and desecuritization', in Ronnie D. Lipschutz (ed.) *On Security*, New York, Columbia University Press.