Globalization has not produced a safer world. Rather, there have been occasions when the tools of globalization have been misappropriated for the opposite purpose. The most gruesome example of which was the terrorist act of 11 September. Its impact was shocking and the tremors are still being felt. In this article, Lt. Gen. H.C. Stackpole, U.S.M.C. (retired), president of the Asia-Pacific Center for Security Studies in Honolulu, examines the impact of globalization on the Asia-Pacific region and its security landscape. He focuses on the implications for security in Northeast Asia and in particular, on the challenges facing the US–Japan alliance as well as the perceptions that South Korea, China and Japan have of the US. He concludes that multilateral efforts are essential to deal with the shift in security paradigm.

The tragic events of 11 September 2001 in New York and Washington reverberated well beyond the United States. With at least 80 countries experiencing loss of civilian lives in the World Trade Center disaster the act of terrorism became international. It also provided a grimly graphic example of what the term “asymmetric warfare” means. The use of fuel laden commercial aircraft bearing innocent civilians to attack an international business nerve center and the seat of US military power in a terrorist act was the macabre solution to bypass high tech military capabilities. It was a vicious act and a terrible miscalculation by the planners and supporters of the attack if they thought they would escape unscathed, especially in view of its aftermath. US technical capabilities and military power joined with the local knowledge of the opposition Northern Alliance to oust Osama bin Laden and his al-Qaeda forces as well as the totalitarian Taliban government out of Afghanistan. The attack of 11 September was an example of globalization fueling asymmetric war: It also gave a face to transnational threats and the impact of non-state actors on sovereign states in the twenty-first century. It has also clearly demonstrated the need for multinational efforts, both globally and regionally, to deal with a new dimension identified as human security in a comprehensive approach that no one nation can achieve alone.
Human security and the information age

The campaign against terrorism have influenced the policy of all nations, but have had a particular impact on the Asia-Pacific region and its security landscape. From the Asian financial crisis in 1997 to the outbreak of terrorism in the name of ethnic, religious and separatist movements, globalization has wrought a fundamental change in the region. The engine behind this globalization has been the information technology (IT) revolution that has marked the post-Cold War decade of the 1990s and has reached a new zenith at the beginning of the twenty-first century. On the positive side, this explosion of IT has resulted in better international communications and reduced the likelihood of traditional warfare between nations and all but eliminated classic set piece battles of Corps and Divisions, ocean battle fleets and air armadas in the Asia-Pacific region.

On the negative side, however, the dark side of globalization has stripped away the veneer of civil behavior and reconciliation of tribal, ethnic and religious enmities. This has resulted in communal killing from the Balkans to Africa to South Asia and Oceania. There is a new “ring of fire” (having nothing to do with seismic activity and tectonic plates) across the southern tier of Asia and the Pacific. Hate, distrust and terrorism have been manifest from Sri Lanka and the Indian Ocean across the Indonesian archipelago through Mindanao and the Solomon Islands to Fiji. Small wars and civil unrest have resulted in brutal killings throughout the world. This issue was highlighted by the UN Secretary-General, Kofi Annan who, pointing out the results of the Small Arms Survey 2001, stated “small arms are implicated in well over 1000 deaths every single day, the vast majority of them women and children.” In South Asia, indiscriminate artillery exchanges across the Line of Control in Kashmir have caused the deaths of thousands of civilians and the toll is still rising. Another downside of globalization is found in the misappropriation of modern technology to further transnational crime on a scale that no one nation can hope to defeat or even blunt on its own. It is an all too familiar laundry list of the violation of human security and perpetual degradation of our neighbors both sub-regionally and worldwide. This has resulted in a new dimension in security, which I believe goes hand in hand with globalization: human security. Can multilateral approaches deal with the issues of this globalized world, respect sovereignty and provide protection for the non-combatant citizens of our nations? It must be done is the answer to the question. “How” is the other dimension we must deal with in order to make rhetoric reality.

Defining the threat

The “threat” of today carries a myriad of names, but all are a challenge to comprehensive security that goes beyond defending the territory of our respective homelands and the protection of our people, normally defined as external and internal security. Terrorism leads a list that includes arms trafficking, illegal migration,
organized crime, such as money laundering and drug trafficking. These threats contribute significantly to the need for crisis management that eludes civil law enforcement agencies. These circumstances, coupled with the damage caused by natural disasters such as volcanic eruptions, typhoons, floods and earthquakes, create a formidable challenge to human security, both globally and regionally. What is required is a subregional approach to tackle the root causes of these conflicts. Although these conflicts are non war-fighting security threats, they do not preclude low intensity conflicts. The prospects for a common agenda brought into sharp focus by the campaign against terrorism produced a common interest among the nations of Asia. The United States National Security Policy can provide a catalyst to that end. Again, that common interest is driven by the need for human security.

The US in Asia
The United States is inescapably part of the Asia-Pacific region because it is a maritime nation which has engaged in three wars in Asia in the last century to allow peace and stability to emerge from oppression and totalitarianism in the region. Despite this payment in blood as an Asia-Pacific nation, the US continues to suffer a poor image amongst many Asians. Arrogance is the most often used criticism. There is also a streak of isolationism in the American makeup that emerges briefly from time to time, which is often misinterpreted beyond US shores. America is a “reluctant” superpower faced with realities that mandate a new approach to security matters. US Forces in Japan and the Republic of Korea are facing political challenges and local hostility at a new fundamental level but their presence still remains critical to peace and stability in the region.

Globalization in Asia
At the Asia-Pacific Center for Security Studies discussion on the region has focussed on the friction in Asia between globalization and nationalism. Is globalization a true threat to national sovereignty? It is useful to identify the core characteristics of globalization as a common frame of reference:

- Unprecedented economic interdependence driven by cross border capital movements, rapid technology transfer, and “real time” communication and information flows;
- Rise of new actors that challenge state authority, in particular, nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) and civic groups, multinational corporations and global production networks, and financial markets;
- Growing pressure on states to conform to new international standards of governance, particularly in the areas of transparency and accountability;
- The emergence of an increasingly Western-dominated international culture, a trend which, in many countries, has raised concern about the erosion of national identity and traditional values; and
The rise of severe transnational problems that require multilateral cooperation to resolve.

The impact of these elements of globalization on Asian security is increasingly complex. The positive impact has been a reduction in the potential for conflict from economic integration, mainly in Southeast Asia. In contrast, however, new security concerns have arisen and aggravated existing tensions in both intra and inter-state behavior among the nations of Asia. This relentless force of globalization grows against a backdrop of new transnational threats as demonstrated by the events of 11 September 2001. Regional institutions, such as the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) and Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), appear weaker and there have been apparent shifts in the balance of power, changes in governance and most importantly, expanding military roles despite declining resources and recruitment shortfalls.

Key US relationships and Asian perceptions

US–Japan relationship

While the importance of the US-Japan alliance cannot be overstated as a foundation of Asia’s stability, the bilateral relationship has been subjected to heavy stress primarily due to the changing conditions on the Korean Peninsula. Managing that relationship is crucial and has an impact on the policy towards China for both nations. Factors that affect the relationship in the first decade of the twenty-first century are:

- **Bureaucratic pursuit of narrow interests**
  
  With the purpose of the alliance still seen by many as unclear, even with the new guidelines, government agencies are free to pursue narrow goals. In both countries, several agencies vie for control of policy. This can result in an accumulation of “mini policies,” which in some cases appear uncoordinated and at times contradictory.

- **Compartmentalization of issue**
  
  In an environment of policy parochialism, agencies with the “lead” on a given issue often closely guard control of the decision-making process. Issues that require a broad, inter-agency response, such as the 1997 Asian financial crisis, are addressed by a single department or ministry. An example is the control of the Japanese Government Cabinet Legislation Bureau (CLB) concerning United Nations Peacekeeping Operation (PKO) and the participation of the Self-Defense Forces (SDF). Despite the passage of the 1992 Peacekeeping Operations Law, this is an issue which has yet to be resolved satisfactorily. The use of weapons for the purpose of eliminating obstructions is known as “Type B” in the UN manual for PKO forces.
The CLB was the final decision-maker in a policy that meant Japanese SDF in UN PKO were not allowed to use weapons for “Type B” purposes. Based on a strict interpretation of the constitution, the CLB decision thus blocked operational reality and actually leaves Japanese PKO forces at risk.

**Perceived American benign neglect and Japanese obsession**

With the purpose of the alliance requiring clarity in the absence of a Cold War threat, Washington had appeared to neglect relations with Japan. Tokyo, concerned with the same requirement for a new rationale, feared weaker American resolve to remain committed. Security independence by Japan and US abandonment of the alliance have always been the worst fears of the other Asian nations. A need for a revision of the relationship was raised in the October 2000 so-called Armitage-Nye Report, named after the two principal authors of the report, who called for a bigger Japanese role in the alliance. Japan’s involvement in logistic support of US actions in Operation Enduring Freedom has begun to allay those fears but also raised new ones concerning the historical antecedents of a militaristic resurgence in Japan. Although most commentators, including myself, do not believe this to be the case, that specter still looms large for the other countries of Asia.

**Divergent interest and perspectives**

The Cold War was a unifier of common interest in the alliance and major international issues. That model has changed and the interplay of diplomacy, economics and regional security demands a new approach if the alliance is to remain viable. Ironically, the circumstances of 11 September have provided the opportunity for such an approach.

**US-China relations**

China continues to modernize the Peoples Liberation Army (PLA) to the extent its defense budget will allow. China has been very concerned about the threat of US missile defense (MD) and is a factor in renewed ties with Russia and India as a hedge against US MD. China’s domestic problems include challenges to stability, the continuation of its “reform and opening up” policies and the security of the region. The difficulties facing China’s leadership today include:

- State Owned Enterprises (SOE) divestiture;
- Rising unemployment in rural and urban areas;
- Massive internal migration;
- Shrinking foreign direct investments (FDI);
- Rife corruption;
- Shift of power from the center to the provinces;
- Poor regulation of banking and financial system;
Bad debt currently held by SOEs;
Growing political dissent;
Various environmental challenges;
Ethnic tensions; and
Muslim separatism.

Admission to the World Trade Organization (WTO) and hosting the 2008 Olympics may spur a faster response to the above litany of problems but they will not go away. China’s assessment of the security situation appears to be in parallel with the various US analyses, from both government and private think tanks. “Peace and Development” will remain the major themes in the twenty-first century for the People’s Republic of China (PRC). There is a trend toward multi-polarity and economic globalization. Efforts at relaxation in the international security situation in general is evident, and specifically in Asia, the major flash points of the Korean Peninsula and the Taiwan Straits. Although South Asian tensions in the wake of 11 September have taken on a new dimension fueled by both military and terrorist actions, the PRC does not expect a major war and ultimately sees the forces of peace prevailing. It does, however, recognize that there has been no significant “peace dividend” following the end of the Cold War. As always, the PRC’s definition of “peace and development” may differ from the US perspective.

Asian perceptions
In developing a new policy for Asian Security, the US must be more acutely aware of Asian perceptions of America as it exercises its role as the world’s lone superpower. US actions in the Balkans, while motivated by the best of intentions, had nonetheless left serious concerns among Asian nations about US objectives and policies. Surveys of students at the Asia-Pacific Center for Security Studies reveal that Kosovo had left the impression that: (1) the US will intervene unilaterally anywhere, anytime without benefit of international approval and (2) that the US would always employ “hi-tech” warfare in the interest of force protection. The circumstances in Kosovo were unique and not likely to be repeated. This has been proven by the US units deployed in Afghanistan. Nevertheless, the unfortunate air strike on the Chinese Embassy in Belgrade did not convince many that the most powerful, technically capable nation in the world could make such a mistake. The Chinese “man in the street” came to one conclusion: the attack was deliberate.

Korean perceptions
According to contemporary Korean thought driven by a Confucian view of the world, the US positions itself as a senior partner but does not show the benevolence, understanding, tolerance or genuine caring attitude that is the duty of the “older brother.” This makes the US not worthy of respect.
The Korean perception of the US is influenced by the memory of negative events linked with the US in the Korean psyche. They range from the alleged 1950 No Gun Ri massacre during the Korean War to the 1980 Kwangju incident, to crimes committed by military personnel and even the 1997 economic crisis.

Some characterizations of Americans are very one-sided and based on an overly simplistic image. To some, Americans are arrogant, boorish, disrespectful and decadent.

There is a strong general feeling that self-preservation from the detrimental influences of the West is necessary. Westernization equates to Americanization and both are considered a cultural compromise.

Putting aside these prejudices, most Koreans are aware of the need for, and acknowledge the advantages of, a good relationship with the US. They are nevertheless troubled by influences that are perceived as negative. This weighs heavily on a people who value patriotism, self-determination and have traditionally looked unfavorably on intrusive internationalism.

With the inclusion of North Korea in the “Axis of Evil” by President Bush in his 29 January 2002 State of the Union address, Korean watchers feared the consequences for South Korean President Kim Dae-Jung’s “Sunshine Policy” and relations with the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea.

Chinese perceptions

Many Chinese view the US as hegemonic, domineering and arrogant, intent on preventing the “rise of China.” There is a view, albeit toned down since China’s entry into the WTO, that the true purpose of the US is to impose a form of colonialism on China so that the US has access to cheap labor and mass markets.

The PLA leadership asserts respect but not fear for the US’ technologic and military prowess. Many Chinese used to believe that the US would run at the first sign of blood; a view reinforced by the force protection approach employed by the US in Kosovo, although now dispelled by US military action in Afghanistan.

Many Chinese perceive US demands on human rights as: (1) primarily a political strategy designed to suppress China and (2) an arrogant, intolerant personal interpretation of human rights in order to flagrantly interfere in Chinese affairs. The US is accused of ignoring the progress made by China in human rights and being insensitive to the possibility of ensuing chaos in an unstable society. The American people, however, are seen in a generally favorable light: the US government is seen as the problem. The general Chinese view is that most Americans see good relations with China (preferably a weak China) as in the US interest.
Japanese perceptions

- At the same time, there has been fear in Japan of an inward-looking America. Many Japanese see the US as increasingly inclined to relax on the laurels of its wealth and power, with an American general public ever less interested in foreign affairs. Some Japanese see US pursuit of MD as indicative of this lingering isolationist sentiment, and worry about the US flying from the nest of Asia.
- Most Japanese still support the US-Japan security treaty, but that support can be somewhat soft and often contradictory. For example, record numbers of Japanese want to see the alliance maintained, but solid majorities also would like to see US forces reduced and consolidated. They also would like to pay less to host US bases.
- Many Japanese are also very concerned about the future of US-China relations. As has been the case for much of the post-war period, many Japanese are afraid of being entangled in America’s wars. In the wake of the 2001 F-8/EP3 aircraft collision, anxiety that Sino-US relations might spiral into confrontation was manifestation of that fear. Tokyo would be very concerned if US-China relations were to seriously deteriorate.
- Finally, Japan wants to find more diplomatic “space” for itself in international affairs. Japan wants to be more of a leader, particularly in Asia, but continues to struggle with how to do so. The actions of the highly popular Prime Minister Junichirō Koizumi have moved Japan into a series of steps toward becoming a “normal” nation.

Multilateral regional security cooperation

In 2001, many individuals and organizations advocated a multilateral approach to security in Asia, although not on the scale of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). Rather, the emphasis has been on “enriching” bilateral relations to expand to a comprehensive security approach encompassing the areas of common interest identified at the start of this paper as non-warfighting; humanitarian assistance, disaster relief, peace making and peacekeeping as principal areas of multilateral operations. At the Asia-Pacific Chiefs of Defense Conference held in Honolulu in November 2001, nations of the region agreed to continue developing tactics, techniques and procedures (TT&P) workshops deemed essential to cooperation. Also agreed to was continued planning and training in the refinement of the Multilateral Planning Augmentation Team (MPAT) that would be the catalyst for forming a joint combined staff for response to crisis in the region for coalitions brought together by mutual agreement. The Multinational Planning Augmentation Team is a cadre of military planners from nations with Asia-Pacific interests capable of rapidly augmenting a multinational force (MNF) headquarters established to plan and execute coalition operations in response to small scale contingencies (SSC). The goals of this already established program are to:
• Improve interoperability and multilateral cooperation;
• Reduce crisis response time and increase planning effectiveness;
• Strengthen MNF command and control; communications and information systems procedures; and
• Develop common standing operating procedures (SOP) for coalition/MNF Headquarters.

MPAT is a vital tool for operational planning augmentation for a multinational force staff not necessarily led by a US officer but certainly “back boned” by the US with the team composition determined by the contingency and nations operating in a common response. It provides expertise in ground, air, sea, communications, intelligence, legal, logistics, medical, engineering and other areas as required. East Timor is an example of such coalitions but is only one model; it is not The model. Multilateral efforts are in and of themselves confidence building measures. The Commander-in-Chief, Pacific Command’s (CINCPAC) Exercise Team Challenge in 2001 was designed to bring nations together in both participation and observation. It combined major exercises with Thailand and the Republic of the Philippines in a common humanitarian response scenario with sea, air and land forces from multiple countries.

Another significant tool in assisting the practical application of MNF in military operations short of war is the development of the Asia-Pacific Area Network (APAN). Established on 3 June 1997, this was considered a revolutionary step for the Asia-Pacific defense and security community. APAN is:

• A World Wide Web Site;
• An information sharing and collaboration network;
• To foster multinational interaction and multilateral cooperation;
• Aimed at the staff officer and officials of other government agencies; and has
• Universal access.

APAN is designed to be an information-sharing and collaboration site. It is an attempt to build a network of related defense and security agencies to foster greater multinational interaction and more effective multilateral cooperation. The site is also intended for use by defense academics, and international and NGOs whose work is in the defense and security field. APAN allows the user access to the site from anywhere in the world using nothing more sophisticated than a personal computer and a connection to the Internet.

MPAT and APAN represent the beginning of practical mechanisms for collaboration in planning and operations. They are currently being used in the campaign against terrorism. Against a non-state actor this capability, coupled with the recognition that terrorism is both international and localized, has created an opportunity for the US to lead the world, united in a common purpose. That purpose
must also respect sovereignty and calls for support from those nations whose terrorism is of the local “home grown” variety. The close support in sharing the technology needed for surveillance and detection, as well as in training is an example of the dual approach essential in the Asia-Pacific region. Nations have come to the conclusion that some degree of sovereignty may have to give way in the face of transnational threats. The US leadership has stated that the war on terrorism will be long and arduous: The war against poverty, drugs, slavery and environmental destruction should be equally committed. The key is the political will of the nations of the Asia-Pacific region to work together to build trust in an atmosphere of mutual respect. There were encouraging signs from China, even before joining the United States in the coalition against terrorism. In the PRC’s 2000 White Paper on National Defense, for example, the section on “Regional Security Cooperation” specifically mentions the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF) as “the only pan-Asia-Pacific official multilateral security dialogue and cooperation forum at present,” and the need for ARF to “focus on confidence building measures, explore new security concepts and methods and discuss the question of preventive diplomacy.”

According to Wu Xinbo, a Chinese academic, “the establishment of an Asia-Pacific security community is possible because states in the region have shared interests in a peaceful and stable security environment, because they increasingly benefit from growing economic interactions. This nascent mechanism for regional security will evolve over time into a more effective means for promoting regional cooperation on security issues. In this context, the United States will play a significant role, not as a hegemon, but as a key player.”

Conclusion
In this opening decade of the twenty-first century, the multilateral approach in a time of global crisis is the key to enhanced regional comprehensive security cooperation. One certainty that has emerged is that the role of military power has changed significantly over the span of history since the nation-state first appropriated it. Cooperation and integration of capabilities among states has become a necessity in the interest of human security. Other dimensions of national power, such as economic growth and interdependence, have become increasingly important in the development of national security strategies. In spite of such developments, the threat of force inherent in the traditional roles of the military—that is, deterrence, compellence and defense—remains a foundation for interaction within the international system. As witnessed by the Gulf War, the Balkans, and now Afghanistan, military power can be most effective to manage and stabilize a crisis in this new millennium. The sharing of technology and integration of capabilities in the interest of others in the region will enhance the security for each nation’s most precious resource: its people.

Clearly, military power also has its limits. The long-term efforts by civil law enforcement agencies and the work of international NGOs are necessary to restore
the infrastructure, rebuild the institutions and sustain the basic needs of societies, as can be seen in Afghanistan today. It is only through this evolutionary process can peace and stability be brought to marginalized countries. It is vital that the positive forces of globalization, whether on an international or regional basis as the case may demand, are used for human security. There is no greater example of this than the war on terrorism, which now transcends and affects nearly all cultures. Narrowly conceived unilateral interests must give way to global necessities which proclaim that while borders may define the territory and identity of 189 nations, our common bond is our humanity.

Notes
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