

# 琉球大学学術リポジトリ

## 21世紀の北東アジア地域における市民社会及び非伝統的な安全保障概念

メタデータ	言語: ja 出版者: 琉球大学国際沖縄研究所 公開日: 2017-12-01 キーワード (Ja): キーワード (En): 作成者: Katarzyna, Podlipska メールアドレス: 所属:
URL	<a href="https://doi.org/10.24564/37391">https://doi.org/10.24564/37391</a>

【研究論文】

21世紀の北東アジア地域における市民社会及び非伝統的な安全保障概念

Katarzyna Podlipska

**Civil Society and Alternative Security Concepts in Northeast Asia  
in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century**

Katarzyna Podlipska

**Abstract**

From 2012, the Northeast Asia region has seen a surge in tensions over territorial disputes, North Korean missile and nuclear tests, deployment of THAAD system to South Korea, and continuous presence of the United States. Traditional security concept with its deterrence, power projection, and alliances failed to create a stable security environment in this part of the world. The article examines the potential of civil society to provide an alternative answer to the existing security system, and introduces three alternative security concepts that emerged from transnational cooperation between civil society groups based in different countries of the Northeast Asia region.

**Introduction**

The Northeast Asia is sometimes believed to be one of the most dangerous regions in the world (Kim, 2011:64; Kwak and Joo, 2014:1). What is the reason? It is a place, where economic, political, and security interests of the three nuclear powers – namely the US, Russia, and China – and three economic powers – namely the US, China, and Japan – clash with each other. The divided Korean Peninsula remains a vestige of the Cold War, where North Korea is constantly working to increase its nuclear potential to join the atomic powers club, and to maintain good relations with China and Russia, creating with them (a kind of) trilateral alliance, while South Korea, the US and Japan present a counterbalance. The region lacks regional security structures such as OSCE, which is focused on conflict prevention in Europe, relying only on the system of alliances, which maintained the peace in Northeast Asia. This peace, however, lacks stability; tensions between the states are gradually rising, making some wonder when conflict erupts.

If states failed to create stable peace and security, what can accomplish it? It may be the

people, or, more specifically, civil society. Being a space where new ideas and forms of power are created, developed, and exercised, civil society transforms democracy, encourages processes of democratization, and connects with civil societies in other countries across the borders (Spini, 2011:15-19). It surely has its own vision regarding stable peace and security, and, since democracy is based on civil society, democratic countries should adopt foreign policy and national security that take civil society's proposals into account (Caparini and Cole, 2008:22).

Thus, this paper attempts to prove that civil society in Northeast Asia region connects across the borders to come up with an alternative to traditional security concept that could create stable peace and security in this part of the world, analyse main elements of traditional and alternative security concepts and examine how they differ, prove that civil society and its ideas should be included in decision-making process regarding national security and foreign policy.

First, this thesis explains in more detail what exactly is civil society and how it contributes to democracy, describes civil society in Northeast Asia focusing on anti-military civil society groups in Japan and South Korea, and their cooperation. Next, it clarifies the definition and elements of traditional security concept, and considers how traditional security concept failed to create a stable security environment in Northeast Asia. Then, it introduces three alternative security concepts proposed by civil society, and analyses how they differ and what they have in common, to finally compare them with traditional security concept.

## **1. Civil Society**

### **1-1 Civil Society in Theory**

Term "civil society" was defined by many scholars over the years, such as Marx or Gramsci (Fleming, 2000:2), but its modern concept includes a sphere, where public discourse is being held (Spini, 2011:18-19); citizens, who conduct public discourse (Scholte, 1999:4-7); and norms that are born during public discourse (Scholte 2002:283).

For the purpose of this paper the following definition was adopted: Civil society is the "third sector" of society, along with government and business, and can be understood as a grouping of citizens who came together due to common needs, interests and values, such as trust, cooperation, tolerance, reciprocity, and equality. Through public deliberation and exchange of experiences, views, and ideas, these citizens create, develop and exercise new forms of power, as well as develop norms around universal human rights, international cooperation on regional and global problems, and the peaceful resolution of national differences in the global arena [Jordan, 2011:94; Sholte, 2002:283; Alagappa, 2004].

"Grouping of citizens" can take on various associational forms, such as nongovernmental organizations, academic institutions, human rights promoters, youth associations, women's networks, think tanks, labour unions, local community groups, citizen-based networks, ethnic lobbies, philanthropic foundations, social movements or religious-based organizations, which

can differ in degree of possessed autonomy, wielded power and formality. Those associations can either provide services, benefits or political influence to specific groups within society [Scholte, 2002:283]. This paper, however, will focus on the associational forms that are interested in influencing politics.

The trend towards democracy that was brought about by the end of the Cold War highlighted the potential that lies within civil society, bringing it to attention of the scholars whose main interest are improvement of democracy, and possible contribution of civil society to this process. For instance, Warren (1999) and Armstrong, Bello, Gilson, and Spini (2011) noted that civil society can positively influence “good governance,” which refers to adoption of new values of governance in order to establish greater efficiency, legitimacy and credibility of the democratic system. Eight key characteristics of “good governance” concept, collected by Graham, Amos and Plumptre (2003), are: participation (anyone interested or affected by a decision has an opportunity to participate in decision-making process), orientation towards consensus, accountability to the public (government should report, explain and be answerable for decisions it has made on behalf of the people), transparency (people need to be able to clearly and easily see how and why a decision was made; what legislative requirements were followed, and what information or advice was considered), responsiveness (government should serve the entire community, all the while balancing conflicting interests in timely manner), effectiveness and efficiency (producing results that meet the needs of the people while making the best use of resources), equitability and inclusion (all members of the community, especially the most vulnerable, should have an opportunity to participate in decision-making and improve their livelihoods), and finally the rule of law (fair legal frameworks enforced impartially). Through “good governance” the opinions of minorities and the most vulnerable groups in society are taken into account in decision-making.

How can civil society contribute to “good governance” and advance democracy? It does so by fulfilling various roles and functions. First, it acts as watchdog by publicly exposing areas, which lack transparency, by directly appealing to leaders to explain reasons and motives behind their actions, by publishing and disseminating information regarding areas where compliance was not met, by monitoring the state performance, and the action and behaviour of public officials, and by checking if the policies were implemented as promised (Ghaus-Pasha, 2004:3; Armstrong et al., 2011:5). By fulfilling this role, civil society groups positively influence accountability and legitimization of government and governance. Second, it serves as a propagator and setter of new norms that lead to democratization and broader participation of citizens in policymaking process (Ghaus-Pasha, 2004:3). For instance, anti-military base groups, which are active in Japan and South Korea, try to convince the leaders to embrace new norms, such as “no foreign military bases” and “broader inclusion of civil society in policy and decision-making regarding national security and foreign policy”. At the same time they endeavour to devalue some of

the existing norms, like “regarding foreign military bases as inherent to alliance and preserving national security”. Furthermore, civil society can fuel debate about governance, introducing variety of perspectives, methodologies and proposals into the policy arena. Third, it fulfils the role of an advocate by empowering the powerless, providing them with access to political elites, and representing their interests, as well as by identifying problems and bringing them to public attention, protecting basic human rights, and voicing wide range of political, community, social and environmental concerns (Ghaus-Pasha, 2004:3; Armstrong et al., 2011:5). Fourth, it takes on the role of an educator – teaching citizens how to identify and articulate their values, beliefs, civic norms and democratic practices (Ghaus-Pasha, 2004:3). Fifth, civil society mobilizes citizens, particularly those vulnerable and marginalized, to participate in politics and public affairs in more active manner, i.e. through protests or petitions (Ghaus-Pasha, 2004:3; Armstrong et al., 2011:5; Godsäter and Söderbaum, 2011:151).

Realizing the abovementioned roles can add to effectiveness of governance and improve, or even transform, democratic processes. Civil society has the ability to propose more creative and flexible solutions to existing problems and dilemmas than traditional state bureaucracy, and to enable efficient implementation of public policies at local levels. Furthermore, activists through their pursuit of justice in various areas, like the calls of Okinawan anti-military base activists to be treated in the same way as the mainland Japan, enhance the fairness, which is one of the requirements for legitimate governance (Armstrong et al., 2011:5).

In order to achieve its goals, civil society can employ various tactics. Ghaus-Pasha (2004:19-20) names after Convey (1995) five most common strategies used by civil society to influence policy-making. These include education, litigation, persuasion, confrontation and collaboration. The education tactic consists of providing the government, citizens and media with comprehensive information regarding issues, which policy will tackle, and with policy alternatives. It can be carried out through conferences, symposia or workshops. The litigation strategy includes the use of courts, because civil society group can sue the government’s decision if it believes that such decision breaks the law. In the persuasion tactic civil society aims to convince the government that the policy supported by it needs to be implemented. This technique encompasses conferences, presentations, lobbying, peaceful demonstrations, and the use of media. In the confrontation tactic various forms of protests are used, including violent riots and destruction of private and public property, which can create discord between both sides (civil society and government). Finally, the collaboration strategy is based on building relationships between civil society and local government, as well as among civil society groups of different countries.

## **1-2 Civil Society in the Northeast Asia**

How about civil society in the Northeast Asia, especially in Japan and South Korea?

It is important to note, that civil society in its modern meaning in this region was brought to

scholars' and public attention in the mid 1990s. In case of Japan, two events caused this interest. First is the Great Hanshin earthquake that stroke Kobe area in January 1995, leaving Japanese government at a loss and victims without proper care. The lack of government's efficient action was filled by volunteers and non-profit organizations, which came to Kobe providing relief to the needy (Shaw ed., 2014). The second is the rape incident in Okinawa in September 1995, which caused large protests; the biggest rally took place on the 22<sup>nd</sup> October 1995 with 85,000 people filling a park in the city of Ginowan. In the face of continued demonstrations against the presence of the U.S. bases on Okinawa, American and Japanese governments agreed on a few concessions, i.e. reducing the amount of land on Okinawa covered by U.S. bases by 21% (Pajon, 2010:17-19; Badow, 1998:9). Both incidents proved that resilient civil society, ready to influence decision-making and policy-making in various policy areas (including national security), existed in Japan.

From that point on civil society, in the shape of citizen-based networks, thrived in Japan<sup>2</sup>. When the Okinawan residents realized that the Futenma base would be closed on condition that it gets relocated to an offshore location in the Oura Bay of Henoko, they started a sit-in protest at the place, where the projected base is to be constructed, and it continues as of December 2016. During those twenty years a few incidents happened, and they reinforced the determination of Okinawan civil society groups and their supporters in the mainland Japan to change the current shape of national security concept and alliance, on which it heavily relies. In 2004, the U.S. Marine Corps helicopter crashed at Okinawa International University campus; in 2007, the central government instructed high school history textbook publishers to downplay the military's role in ordering mass civilian suicides during the Battle of Okinawa; in 2012, the U.S. deployed MV-22 Osprey aircraft to Okinawa; in 2016, 20-years-old woman was raped and murdered by a former American soldier; all of these incidents gathered great number of protesters.

In 2015, Japanese civil society vividly demonstrated against implementation of Prime Minister's Abe security bills, calling them "war legislation" (Sieg, 2015). The new law ended a ban on defending a friendly nation under attack and expanded the scope for logistic support for the militaries of the U.S. and other countries. Security bills and plans to revise Japanese Constitution gathered many protesters and begot new citizen-centred networks, such as SEALDs – a platform of emergency actions by students to protect a free and democratic Japan, which mobilized young people across Japan to take interest in politics and taught them to question government's choices (SEALDs website).

From the 1990s until now the politically engaged NGOs in Japan are rather scarce, in contrast to citizens-based networks, which actively challenge the official policy decisions and demand that their opinion is taken into account by the state.

In the 1990s South Korea was, on the other hand, setting into democracy after transition from authoritarian rule by military dictators, which took place in 1987 among mass civilian protests (Moon, 2009:32-33). Korean civil society started to question the validity and necessity of U.S.

military presence on the Korean Peninsula, especially after a brutal murder of bar employee, Yoon Geum Yi, committed by private Markle, a member of the USFK 2nd Division in 1992 (“U.S. soldier free,” 2006). In August 2000, residents of Maehyang-ri, located near Koon-ni Range used by the U.S. army for bombing and strafing practice, started protesting, claiming that the noise of jets and bombing had caused them physical damage, like hearing loss, stress, sleeping problems and hypertension. In August 2001, they sued South Korean government for damages, and won (Fisher and Hwang, 2005). Another incident, which ignited the Korean civil society, was Yangju highway incident, which occurred on June 13, 2002. A U.S. tank fatally injured two schoolgirls, but the U.S. military court acquitted the drivers – this sparked anti-American protests (Whyte, 2015). Between 2005-2007 protests regarding the expansion of the U.S. Camp Humphreys in Pyeongtaek, and dislocation of residents of nearby Deachu-ri village brought together many civil society groups, concerned about human rights, peace, and environment. In 2007-2016, South Korean activists demonstrated against government’s decision to build a Naval Base in Gangjeong village, Jeju. The officials argued that the strategic forward location of the base could provide rapid response to any type of activity in the neighbouring seas shared with China, and protect the vital Korean shipping lanes (Lee, 2007), making the project indispensable to national security. Announcement of THAAD’s deployment sparked many protests in the latter part of 2016, with government claiming that it is necessary to defend South Korea from North Korean missiles, and civil society groups pointing out that the system will only encourage the North to attack and devastate natural environment<sup>3</sup> (Park, 2016).

Active participation of citizens in anti-U.S. military bases demonstrations in both Japan and South Korea proves that civil society has different understanding of the meaning of security than those countries’ governments: the U.S. military bases are not present in civil society’s security concept, while the governments deem their presence as an indispensable part of alliance and, in consequence, their national security policy.

Both Japanese and South Korean civil society groups noticed that they share common objectives and visions. Solidarity between them started from women groups, who organized around the issues of sexual slavery, violence, militarism and human rights, and recognized negative social aspects of U.S. military presence (Moon, 2012:146). In June 1998, Okinawans established Okinawa-South Korea People’s Solidarity group with the purpose of strengthening solidarity between citizens of Okinawa and South Korea in anti-U.S. military bases movement, and, through concerted efforts, removing U.S. forces from East Asia and building a stable peace and security environment<sup>4</sup>. Members conduct studies and examination, as well as exchange information regarding damages suffered by the residents from the presence of U.S. military bases in both countries. They participated in demonstrations against Koon-ni range, expansion of the U.S. military base in Pyeongtaek and construction of the naval base in Gangjeong. South Korean activists, mainly from Pyeongtaek and Gangjeong, on the other hand, regularly visit sites of sit-

in protests in Henoko and Takae, and participate in Peace March held in May.

The cooperation and solidarity between Japanese and South Korean civil societies over peace and security issues steadily expands. Their growing concerns about environment facilitated collaboration with civil societies from Taiwan, Hong Kong, and even mainland China. Activists from those countries participated in the 33<sup>rd</sup> Japan Environmental Council (JEC) Congress, held on 21-23 October 2016, proving their readiness to act together, in order to change the traditional security concept, which serves as the basis for present unstable security environment in the Northeast Asia region.

## **2. Traditional Security Concept**

This section examines conceptualization of traditional security, clarifying its definition, elements, and complementary concepts. Furthermore, through analysis of the present situation in the region, it considers how traditional security concept failed to create a stable security environment in Northeast Asia.

### **2-1 Traditional Security Concept in Theory**

What exactly does traditional security concept stand for? What are its elements and origins? The beginnings of the modern concept of national security can be traced back to the Peace of Westphalia and the rise of the nation-state, which became the referent object of security, and at the same time its provider (Haftendorn, 1991:5). However, it is the 20<sup>th</sup> century that brought comprehensive conceptualization of state security.

Walter Lippmann provided one of the first definitions of “national security”. In 1943, he wrote “A nation has security when it does not have to sacrifice its core values, if it wishes to avoid war and is able, if challenged, to maintain them by victory in such a war” (Lippmann, 1943:51), pointing out the existence of external threats to the core interests of the nation and determination of the state to use force to protect them. With the beginning of Cold War and proliferation of nuclear weapons, the stakes became extremely high, and the strategists concluded that the national security could be achieved only either through balance of power or by overwhelming display of power. New concepts such as “containment”<sup>5</sup> and “deterrence”<sup>6</sup> emerged, leading to even more explicit interpretation of “security” in military terms. Non-nuclear states sought protection by forming alliances with nuclear powers, rising tensions around the world (Buzan, 2009:259; Haftendorn, 1991:8). Constant pursuit of power by the states and nuclear arms race led to a situation, where increase of security in one state results in decrease in security in the other state, a phenomenon called a “security dilemma”, which is another concept complementing traditional security concept.

After the end of Cold War, governments started to pay more attention to non-military threats, such as threats for human health caused by environmental pollution, economic, and social



threats, but they still consider the military security to be the top priority.

To conclude, the state and its ability to defend itself against external threats are at the core of traditional security concept. Apart from them, there are several other important elements (Table 1), which can be grouped into three categories: environment (characteristics and assumptions about the world, in which states operate), ends (objectives of the national security policy) and means (techniques, resources, instruments and actions used to implement security).

Table 1. Elements of the Traditional Security Concept

<b>Environment</b>	<b>Ends</b>	<b>Means</b>
State-centrism	State/national survival	Use of force
Military-centrism	Repelling external/foreign threats	Power politics (arms races, alliances, balance of power)
Material character of threats	Protection of territorial integrity	Deterrence
Stability and peacefulness of the domestic political order	Protection of political independence	Containment
States compete for security in anarchic world (no world government and other institutions of law and rules enforcement)	Protection of national interests / core values	
Self-help	Realization of internal and international objectives of the state	
Security dilemma		
Existence of violent peace		

Source: compiled by the author.

All of the aforementioned elements are present in the Northeast Asia region.

## 2-2 Traditional Security Concept in Northeast Asia

Military security concerns in Northeast Asia are growing stronger by each day. Security environment worsened considerably in the second decade of the 21<sup>st</sup> century: the Japanese government that was created after 2012 elections with Shinzō Abe as the Prime Minister lifted the ban on arms exports, approved the right to exercise collective self-defence and started to put more emphasis on building up Japan's military capabilities, which raised regional tensions, especially in China. South Korea's new president, Park Geun-hye, decided to take a harder stance against North Korea and in July, 2016, U.S. and South Korean defence forces announced their final decision regarding deployment of an advanced missile defence system THAAD (Terminal High Altitude Area Defence) and stated that it will be "focused solely on North Korea"

(Kim, 2016), prompting retaliation threats from North Korea and strong objections from China and Russia. North Korea continued nuclear and ballistic missile technology tests despite United Nations ban, China's activities on the sea waters, territorial disputes with neighbouring countries and its focus on increasing military capabilities, the return of the U.S. to its former military bases in the Philippines and joint military exercises with Japan and South Korea propelled distrust between countries of the region.

Some scholars describe the current situation as the “new Cold War”, seeing its beginnings in the U.S. rebalance to Asia-Pacific, which had prompted China to counter it by moving closer to Russia, and North Korea (Dawney, 2016; Mishra, 2010). Here appears “security dilemma”: closer ties between China and Russia causes strengthening of cooperation between the U.S., South Korea and Japan, which in turn becomes a source of insecurity for the former triangle. In 2012, the U.S. deployed Osprey to Okinawa, which was not effective as a deterrent factor, since the number of Chinese ships that entered Japanese waters near disputed Senkaku islands dramatically increased in the same year (“Records of Intrusion,” 2016).

The rise in tensions proves that security environment in the Northeast Asia is unstable and that traditional military power does not contribute to solving existing problems. However, thriving civil society in this part of the world might have an alternative visions and solutions for present instability.

### **3. Alternative Security Concepts (People's, True, and Just Security)**

Security is not only the concern of the state, but of the civil society as well. This section introduces three alternative security concepts that had been born during discussions and exchanges between civil societies of East Asian countries. These are, consecutively, People's Security Concept, True Security Concept, and Just Security Concept. Each one of them was created to answer the concerns of people and communities, who feel insecure in the present regional security environment.

#### **3-1 People's Security Concept**

The International Forum for People's Security, held in Okinawa from June 29 till July 2, 2000, gathered representatives of peace, women's, labour, religious and other organizations from countries of East Asia, i.e. South Korea and Japan. The main objective of the conference was to develop an alternative paradigm of security and to promote the role of people's movements, civil society organizations, and non-governmental organizations in the construction of regional peace, alongside states, and to promote active solidarity between peace, anti-base, environmental, and human rights movements in the Asia Pacific region, as was stated in the final Declaration on People's Security (2000).

After four days of discussions and presentations, participants came to conclusion that state

security, which is based on military that destabilizes societies, contradicts people’s security. In their understanding, people’s security is a comprehensive security based on human rights, gender justice, ecological justice, and social solidarity, and its referent object are people as individuals and collectivities (i.e. communities, nations), who have a right to live in justice, without fear and anxiety. Militarized security and state-military complex were identified as main sources of people’s insecurity: the past has taught the residents of Asia-Pacific region that the military establishments do not protect the people, but themselves. Such example can be found i.e. in Japan, where during the Battle of Okinawa Japanese Imperial Soldiers forced civilians to commit honourable suicides. Moreover, they (the participants) argue that military structure is based on, perpetuates and multiplies male dominance, gender oppression, and exploitation, since the victims of their violence are usually girl-children and women, as it was in 1992, when a Korean woman, Yoon Geum Yi, was brutally raped and murdered by the U.S. soldier, or in 1995, when Okinawan schoolgirl was kidnapped and raped (“U.S. soldier free,” 2006; Pajon, 2010:17-19). Additionally, the state-military complex is the one that usually securitizes threats, identifying them and mobilizing public fear to push through their policies, and manifesting military preparedness against enemies, who, as was stressed in People’s Security Declaration, are created, constructed, or imagined, but they do not exist.

Since the state-military complex cannot be trusted, who can provide and ensure the people’s security? According to participants, it will be the people themselves (individuals, communities, nations). They can achieve it through their struggle, movements, initiatives, and people-to-people efforts, which promote democracy. Important part of the new security concept are alliances between people living across the borders that are supposed to act as guarantor of people’s security. However, such alliances do not happen overnight – people first need to rectify the historical legacies of injustice related to war and colonialism (i.e. Japan, who should address its responsibility for imperial past), in order to lay basis for their future relations, and work towards resolving inequalities through nonviolent means. Once it is done, creating strong alliances across the borders will become possible, and people’s security will come within reach.

People’s Security Declaration proposed long-term and immediate actions towards achieving alternative security, with long-term actions being more of a process than specific deeds (Table 2).

Table 2. Long-term and immediate actions.

Long-term actions	Immediate actions
1. Coming to terms with one’s own history and being sensitive to likelihood that complicity of one’s society in toleration and perpetuation of violence or violent structures, relations and values, permeates mutual relationships, in order to	1. Unconditional retraction of the project of constructing new military base in Henoko. 2. Unconditional termination of all U.S. military presence from Okinawa, mainland Japan, Korea, and throughout the region.

<p>raise mutual trust between societies across the borders.</p> <p>2. Overcoming (through dialogue and interaction) conflicts, hatreds, and suspicions of the past that exist between people, and that were and still are instigated by military structures, allowing the U.S. military to play the role of “guardian of peace” and preventing societies from creating strong regional structures that could address and solve problems between them.</p> <p>3. Addressing conflictual situations and working towards mutual trust and respect amongst communities, nations, and people – one community’s security should never be another community’s insecurity.</p> <p>4. Working towards peaceful, demilitarized and nuclear-free Asia-Pacific region, which promotes alternative ways of people-to-people and state-to-state cooperation and which is based on multilateral systems enhancing people’s security.</p> <p>5. Taking action so that people’s security is pursued and created in military, diplomatic, and political areas, as well as in the areas of everyday life: family, gender relations, social movement, and culture.</p>	<p>3. Unconditional stop to all nuclear testing and dumping of nuclear and toxic wastes in the Pacific, as well as the immediate clean-up following the withdrawal of military bases and sites.</p> <p>4. Implementation of drastic and significant cuts in military budgets and military spending, and re-channelling the resources towards meeting the basic needs of people and for conflict prevention.</p> <p>5. Immediate investigation into acts of military repression and violence against civilian population; perpetrators should be punished and victims – justly compensated.</p> <p>6. Complete cleaning of the vacated base sites by the governments concerned, based on thorough investigations into their ecological conditions, participated in by the people’s groups concerned.</p> <p>7. End to foreign military training and arms export/sales in the region.</p> <p>8. End to exploitation of people and destruction of environments safeguarded by globalized military hegemony.</p>
--	--

Source: The Declaration on People’s Security (2000)

The long-term actions put emphasis on creating and strengthening ties between communities within the state and across the borders, while immediate actions stressed the necessity of decreasing the U.S. military presence in the region through military budget cuts, cessation of projects regarding construction of new bases and training areas, as well as arm sales and joint military training, and called for their governments to take responsibility for clean-up and provide more resources for conflict prevention and fulfilling the needs of citizens.

The geographical scope of Just Security encompasses the Asia-Pacific region.

### 3-2 True Security Concept

True Security is another concept, which was born within civil society. It emerged during The 33<sup>rd</sup> Japan Environmental Council (JEC) Congress, held on 21-23 October 2016, at Okinawa

International University. Representatives of academia (professors, students) and activists from Okinawa, South Korea, Taiwan, and China gathered to discuss different issues under the main theme of “Environment, Peace, Local Autonomy and Human Rights – Exploring Future from Okinawa.”

Speakers talked about breach of human rights in their countries, especially environmental damage<sup>7</sup>, obstruction of freedom of speech and right to participate in decision process, and violation of local autonomy and right of self-determination<sup>8</sup>. They pointed out that “military bases cause tensions among local communities and their self-reliant economies that have been coexisting with natural environment” (JEC Declaration, 2016) and stressed three important things: 1) the need to collect wisdoms in order to construct regional security system non-dependent on military forces setting Okinawa as its centre; 2) the need to recover local communities, where each person is respected and able to conduct a safe life without sacrificing anybody; 3) responsibility to pass the natural environment (without damage and pollution) to the next generations (JEC Declaration, 2016).

Taking into consideration various problems that communities in different countries of the region are forced to deal with, the participants proposed the concept of True Security and defined it as security system that guarantees human rights, natural environment and right of self-determination of people living in different countries of the region, and at the same time opposes division of society, environmental damage, and violation of human rights caused by militarization (JEC Declaration, 2016).

The source of regional insecurity was identified as military-industry-government-university-media complex. Military component of the aforementioned complex is responsible for rising tensions in the region and infringement of human rights. Military institutions, particularly military bases, cause environmental pollution, and damage local communities and their self-reliant economies. Industry, similarly to military, is responsible for environmental pollution, destruction of local economies and displacement of local people for its own profits. The third component—government—ignores the will and right of self-determination of local and indigenous people, sacrifices minorities for the “common good”, approves projects that lead to irrevocable destruction of environment, and uses structural violence. Universities, responsible for forming the character and identities of future leaders and regular citizens, under government’s pressure teach distorted history and ideology that promote confrontational postures towards neighbouring countries. And lastly media, that communicate biased news and distorted truths approved by the government, often ignoring reports regarding breach of human rights or destruction of environment. Moreover, they misinform their viewers and promote confrontational postures towards neighbouring countries.

The participants of the Congress came up with a few solutions and measures that should be undertaken in order to fight the threats coming from military-industry-government-university-

media complex and to achieve True Security. These include solutions to alleviate the threats to environment, such as using renewable energy and abandoning nuclear power, restructuring the present system of managing forest and sea resources, promoting environmental education, and increasing productivity of food and energy in environmental-friendly way. The participants also call for promotion of economical self-reliance of communities, which should guarantee that no external forces could manipulate them, and strong communities that can use their right of self-determination. Furthermore, they see the need to abandon military race between neighbouring countries, and, instead, to focus on strengthening the historical, environmental and cultural exchange between China, Hong Kong, Taiwan, Korean Peninsula, and Okinawa/Japan, and exploring and learning from each other, all the while respecting individual history, culture and language of regional communities. Governments should guarantee such exchange, and it should use public funds for providing education and social security to its people, instead of wasting these funds for military expansion and arms race. Finally, they propose to cooperate with citizens of neighbouring countries in order to create strong Asian community (JEC Declaration, 2016).

The geographical scope of True Security encompasses the East Asia.

### **3-3 Just Security Concept**

The last of the three presented alternative security concepts was a product of Inter-Island Solidarity for Peace – an initiative, which main objective is building solidarity among islands of Okinawa, Jeju, and Taiwan, and their people, who struggle to achieve sustainable peace and security. “Peace for the Sea” International Peace Camp, held once a year since 2014, is the primary forum used for this purpose.

Through discussions, workshops, and interaction, the activists from all three islands agreed that source of their insecurity is nation-state and military-industrial complex. They pointed out that states are source of state violence<sup>9</sup> committed against islands’ residents and other marginalized people, whose interests are often sacrificed for corporate profits. Military-industry complex, on the other hand, contributes to this violence lobbying projects that degrade natural environment and deprive indigenous people of their land. The participants further argued, that under the pretext of national security government and military fuel nationalistic sentiments and distrust between citizens of neighbouring countries, creating narrative of “enemy”, against whom the islands should be fortified in order to be secure (Peace for the Sea Statement, 2015).

The islanders came to conclusion that their perception of security differs from the one propagated by nation-state. They proposed alternative vision under the name of Just Security, and defined it as security that does not prioritize nation-states and military-industrial complex, but puts first the citizens without discriminating any nationality and ethnicity, affirms people’s rights to live in unpolluted environment together with their responsibility to protect the water, land, and air upon which the people depend to survive, and protects the interests of island residents

(particularly women, who are vulnerable to sexual violence due to the presence of US military bases) and other marginalized people (Peace for the Sea Statement, 2015).

In order to make this concept into reality, the representatives of three islands introduced a couple of solutions, such as affirming the coexistence of all living creatures; building a strong transnational community of friendship and solidarity; preserving the memory of war; expanding the peace movement and supporting neighbouring anti-war movements; providing peace education to younger generations; organizing Peace Island Sea Olympics to promote solidarity between islanders, and peace and security in the region (sailing race rather than arms race); renaming the East China Sea into the Sea of Peace and Coexistence; and integration of indigenous people's participation and expertise in attaining sustainable peace and secure humanity into national and global agenda. However, the most interesting idea was the creation of Demilitarized Peace Area without military bases in Okinawa, Taiwan and Jeju (Picture 1). Its purpose would be "reduction of tensions in Northeast Asia and restoration of all three islands to their former long-standing existence as peaceful communities at the maritime crossroads of the region" (Peace for the Sea Statement, 2015). The demilitarized peace triangle would ban armed conflict, military base and facility construction, military exercises, port visits by warships and military aircraft, passage of ships for military purpose, and meetings for military purpose within its boundaries<sup>10</sup>.

The geographical scope of Just Security encompasses the islands of Okinawa, Jeju and Taiwan, and the sea of Demilitarized Peace Area.

Picture 1. Demilitarized Peace Area – Okinawa, Taiwan, Jeju.



Source: the author.

4. Comparison of Traditional and Alternative Security Concepts

The three alternative security concepts introduced by civil society groups operating in countries of the Northeast Asia region present an interesting alternative to existing traditional security concept that relies on building up national power and military defence.

All three concepts point to connection of people across the borders as necessary basis for stable security; however the degree, to which people connect with each other, differs (Table 3). People’s Security is ensured through alliances<sup>11</sup> between civil societies of different countries, where civil societies remain separate entities (communities) that hold regular meetings in order to discuss solutions to pressing security problems in the region. Just Security, on the other hand, relies on solidarity and exchange between members of islands’ community, where clear division between particular islands’ communities is blurred or, rather, there is one “islands’ community”, whose members are residents of Okinawa, Jeju, and Taiwan. This means more personal and closer relations between people than in the case of an alliance. True Security takes similar approach: it relies on solidarity and exchange, though it takes the meaning of “connection” further, as it denotes the Asian community created by strong local communities.

Table 3. Comparison of Traditional and Alternative Security Concepts

	Civil Society’s Alternative Security Concepts			Traditional Security Concept
	People’s Security	True Security	Just Security	
Referent object	People (individuals, communities, nations)	People	People (particularly islanders, and indigenous people)	State
Scope	Comprehensive security based on human rights, gender justice, ecological justice, and social solidarity.	Security that guarantees human rights, preservation of natural environment and right of self-determination of people living in different countries of the regions of Asia.	Security that protects interests of island residents and other marginalized people, giving them priority over military-industry complex and nation-states, and that ensures their rights to live in unpolluted environment	Security that seeks to defend states from external aggression, and one that is dependant on state’s ability to deter or defeat such attack.



			and right to self-determination.	
<b>Actor(s)</b>	People (particularly those socially oppressed and suffering from lack of security)	People (especially young generation)	People, local governments and central governments	State, with decision-making power centralized in the government
<b>Means</b>	Security is achieved through demilitarization, non-violent actions, struggles, movements, and initiatives, as well as alliances between people living across the borders that provide solutions to existing problems.	Security relies on strong educated communities that connect across the borders and create Asian community. Strengthening of historical, cultural and environmental exchange between regional societies, economic self-reliance, use of renewable energy, and construction of legal system to realize environmental democracy etc. are crucial to its realization.	Security relies on the solidarity between the islands, and is achieved through continuous exchange between regional communities, creation of Demilitarized Peace Area, integration of indigenous people's participation and expertise in attaining sustainable peace and secure humanity into national and global agenda.	Security relies on building up national power and military defence. The common forms it takes are alliances, arms races, balance of power (achieved through containment or deterrence strategy).
<b>Source of Insecurity</b>	militarized security, state-military structure	military-industry-government-university-media complex	nation-state, military-industry complex, militarization of the sea	other states, military threats
<b>Geographical Scope</b>	Asia-Pacific	East Asia	Islands: Okinawa, Jeju, Taiwan	Whole world

<b>Year of proposal</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2016</b>	<b>2014-2016 (evolving during consecutive Peace Camps)</b>	<b>From 16<sup>th</sup> century; conceptualized in the 20<sup>th</sup> century</b>
-------------------------	-------------	-------------	--	--

Source: the author.

Another common denominator is their concern about natural environment, human rights, and worsening geopolitical situation, though their main methods to alleviate those concerns differ: People’s Security plans to achieve it through movements and non-violent actions such as petitions, True Security, through education and exchange, and Just Security, through exchange and indigenous people’s participation in policy-making process. All three concepts also recognize state-military structure and militarized security as the source of people’s insecurity. However, Just Security adds “industry,” while True Security adds “industry”, “university” and “media”, identifying the source of insecurity in the broadest way.

People are identified as main actor that realizes security in all three concepts. People’s Security stresses the importance of those who are socially oppressed and suffer from lack of security, while True Security points at young generation as especially important in that process. Young people need to be motivated and politically involved, think critically and be ready for action, because they are the ones to bear responsibility in the future. For that reason, they should participate in shaping security starting from now. Just Security, interestingly, recognizes the role of government in its realization. State is, as a matter of fact, a source of people’s insecurity, but if it took civil society’s expertise in attaining sustainable peace into consideration and included its proposals into national agenda, the region would be one step closer to achieving stable security.

It is worth noting, that the geographical scope of the introduced concepts slightly differs. Just Security covers the smallest area, which is the islands of Okinawa, Jeju, and Taiwan, and the Demilitarized Peace Area between them. True Security includes not only the islands, but also all East Asian states. People’s Security presents the broadest vision among the three, and covers Asia-Pacific region. Some scholars might argue that those concepts are too narrow and region-specific, and for that reason cannot be applied globally. Author, however, disagrees with such stance. All three concepts possess some universal elements that can be successfully applied in other regions, and globally, and contribute to more stable security environment. For instance, in North America, where in April, 2016, the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe’s organized resistance to the pipeline project that endangers their sacred cultural sites and water supply, indigenous people are threatened not by foreign military, but by state-industry complex – if indigenous people’s sovereignty was recognized, and they were allowed to participate in decision-making (as all three alternative concepts suggest), the source of their insecurity could disappear.

People’s Security, True Security, Just Security – all three concepts are complacent, and each

one of them adds value to general concept of stable alternative security. Their core – which is the fact that they are embedded in a notion of solidarity among people, and cannot be brought through force – is the same, even though they put emphasis on slightly different things (like the means through which they want to create stable security). What is the reason for these differences? One is changing security environment. People's Security was worded in 2000, two weeks after the historical summit between leaders of two Koreas, Kim Dae-jung (South Korea) and Kim Jong-il (North Korea), which inspired and empowered people to work towards the removal of the U.S. military presence – the remaining source of their insecurity. True Security was introduced 16 years later, during conference held amid talks regarding global warming crisis, rising regional tensions and uncertainty, deteriorating freedom of press<sup>12</sup> and local autonomy. The proposed concept was adjusted to these new security challenges that civil society in Northeast Asia has to face. Participants of Peace for the Sea Peace Camps, similarly, modify Just Security according to changing circumstances on the islands. The second reason for the differences between these three concepts might be profile of people who participated in their creation. Activists and action-oriented intellectuals from Japan, Korea, China, Taiwan, Hong Kong, the Philippines, Indonesia, Thailand, Pacific islands, and the United States took part in wording the People's Security; some of them lived close to the military bases, while the others did not. JEC Congress welcomed participants from Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, mainland China, and Hong Kong – nationalities were less diversified, but their background was more varied: apart from scholars and activists, students were the group that actively partook in wording of True Security. Just Security, finally, was proposed by (mainly) residents of the islands, who directly suffer from the presence of the military bases.

As was mentioned earlier, the three alternative concepts emphasise different things, but their core remains the same: they are nested in a notion of solidarity among people, and cannot be enforced through force.

Traditional security lies on the other end of the spectrum; it relies heavily on military capabilities of the state. Since no one can guarantee state's security apart from the state itself, it invests immense amounts of money in armaments, and seeks alliances with other states in order to maintain the existing balance of power. State is the referent object of security, not the people.

Other states, and military threats they pose, are identified as source of state's insecurity. This means that every state in the long run should be considered an enemy or potential enemy; even if a state is an ally today, tomorrow it can turn into adversary – mutual suspicion is dominant, as opposed to mutual trust in alternative security concepts.

Another distinctive difference between traditional and alternative concepts is the referent object: in the former case it is a state, and in the latter, the people. Traditional security assumes that if state is secure then so are its people, thus giving priority to state's interests over people. State – or government, where decision-making power is centralized – can even restrict citizens'

freedoms, if it deems it necessary to preserving national security. Alternative concepts are people-centred; they focus on the well-being of citizens and protection of their rights and freedoms, promoting dialogue between people, and communities. And this might be the key to stable security: constructing it bottom-up, locale by locale, instead of doing it top-down, state by state.

Taking the above into account, it can be claimed that the three alternative security concepts are important and needed initiatives undertaken by civil society in Northeast Asia. Firstly, they reframe the meaning of “security” from one revolving around the state and based on its military capabilities into one revolving around people and based on cooperation and solidarity between them. Secondly, they prove the creativity and flexibility of civil society, which can adhere its proposals to changing security environment, and constantly searches for ways to create stable peace and security in the region, at the same time pointing out which citizens’ insecurities traditional security concept failed to address. Finally, they contributed to emergence of “budding/nascent Northeast Asian community”. Civil societies from various, sometimes even antagonistic, countries of the region (like China and Japan) realized that they are intertwined, so in order to build a stable security they need to join forces. In short, they connected over the common goal of proposing an alternative answer to traditional security concept; and that connection strengthened over time, which was illustrated by the shift from “people’s alliances” to “people’s community”. The existence of alternative concepts proves that even if states do not see eye to eye, compromise can be achieved at the people-to-people level.

## **Conclusion**

Failure of traditional security concept to provide stable security in the region, rise in tensions, and unaddressed sources of people’s insecurity spurred civil societies of Northeast Asian countries to action, and connected them over a common goal: construction of alternative security concept that could bring stable peace and security in this part of the world. Alternative concepts worded over the years during joint conferences, congresses, and peace camps reframed the meaning of “security”, putting in its centre interests of people, not states; proved creativity and flexibility of civil society that adhered their contents in response to changing security environment; and contributed to emergence of “budding Northeast Asian community”.

Analysis and comparison of the main elements of traditional and alternative security concepts revealed that while both share common goal of ensuring security, their understanding of “security”, as well as their approach and methods to achieve it, vastly differ. In the centre of traditional concept lies the state, which relies on its military capabilities and alliances, and constructs security in the “top-down” process. In the centre of alternative concepts, on the other hand, lie the people; the concepts rely on mutual respect and cooperation between citizens, and construct security in the “bottom-up” process.

The existence of alternative security concepts proved that civil society in the Northeast Asia, especially Japanese-South Korean civil society groups' networks, is very vibrant and full of ideas that are ready to be implemented by the central governments at any moment. The problem is that political leaders are still sceptic about allowing civil society's participation in policy and decision-making when it comes to foreign policy, particularly national security. They prefer traditional methods of keeping the status quo, i.e. deterring the potential adversary through the built-up of military capabilities, military alliances, and power projection. Some might argue, that peace and security are attainable through those means and, while that might be true, it is peace and security in a negative sense. Northeast Asian states merely avoid conflict instead of actively resolving it; even though they refrain from fighting openly, they harbour suspicions and fear towards each other, living in constant alertness. Peace and security achieved in this way can also impede democracy, since states tend to restrict citizens' rights and freedoms in the name of state of necessity or protection of state's core values. In addition, citizens are kept away from active participation in policy and decision-making, and states refuse to share information with them under the pretext of threat to security. The domain of national security policy remains undemocratic. The 21<sup>st</sup> century Northeast Asia needs to change this, and develop national and foreign policy that advocates construction of regional community. Civil societies of the region made the first step: their collective efforts to change the existing state-centred order and its traditional security concept that is based on hard power, into people-centred order maintained by new alternative security concept that is based on networked people's power led to emergence of "budding/nascent Northeast Asian community" whose members share common values and identity. If these shared values, identity, and understanding become the foundation for relations between localities, and after that – for interstate relations, then it will be possible to achieve peace and security in a positive sense. States would no longer avoid conflict, but rather seek to resolve the disputes that exist between them; they would operate in a stable regional environment where they could anticipate peaceful changes. Northeast Asian states should also guarantee citizens' rights and freedoms, and allow participation of civil society in policy and decision-making of foreign and national security policy, by including civil society's ideas. This, in turn, would strengthen and positively transform democracy.

## Endnotes

<sup>1</sup> Governance understood as the process of decision-making and the process by which decisions are implemented.

<sup>2</sup> The existence and operations of more organized constituencies, such as NGOs, are constrained by the NPO Law.

<sup>3</sup> Environmental issues, such as water, air, or soil pollution caused by oil leaks from military vehicles or dumping toxic waste, destruction of unique ecosystems were present in anti-military

base discourse in South Korea and Japan since the 1990s.

<sup>4</sup> Full name of this citizen-based network is Group Aiming for Solidarity between People of Okinawa and South Korea through Anti-U.S. Military Base Movement. Information obtained thanks to courtesy of Mr Masahiro Tomiyama the president of the group and Mr Toshio Takahashi, the head of group's secretariat.

<sup>5</sup> Its main objective is to contain the expansion of communism through creation of the system of alliances.

<sup>6</sup> Military strategy intended to dissuade an adversary from taking an action not yet started or from doing something that another states desires.

<sup>7</sup> During Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro in 1992 the international community has determined that the enjoyment of good environment and passing it to the next generations are very important human rights.

<sup>8</sup> The Declaration of the Congress pointed out that in Okinawa's case that would be violation of Article 92 of Japanese Constitution (local autonomy), and violation of the Local Autonomy Act that defines central and local governments as equal cooperative partners (local autonomy, self-determination), as well as UN Chapter Article 1 and International Human Right Agreement Article 1 (self-determination).

<sup>9</sup> Military, economic, ethnic, gender-based, and environmental violence were mentioned as part of state violence.

<sup>10</sup> Idea discussed during "Peace for the Sea" International Peace Camp 2016 held in Taiwan.

<sup>11</sup> Understood as alliance between all of the „security communities“, which should develop a common people's security regime.

<sup>12</sup> Compared to 2015, in 2016 Japan sank from 61<sup>st</sup> to 72<sup>nd</sup> position of 180 countries on the press freedom list (compiled by Reporters Without Borders), South Korea – from 60<sup>th</sup> to 70<sup>th</sup>, Russia took 148<sup>th</sup> position, North Korea – 179<sup>th</sup>, China – 176<sup>th</sup>.

## References

- Alagappa, Muthiah. (Ed.). (2004). *Civil Society and Political Change in Asia - Expanding and Contracting Democratic Space*. Stanford University Press. Stanford. California.
- Armstrong, D., and J. Gilson. (2011). Introduction. *Civil Society and International Governance*. In Armstrong, D., V. Bello, J. Gilson, and D. Spini (Eds.), *Civil Society and International Governance* (pp. 1-12). Routledge.
- Bandow, Doug. (1998, September 1). Okinawa: Liberating Washington's East Asian Military Colony. *Policy Analysis no. 314*. Cato Institute. Retrieved from <https://www.cato.org/publications/policy-analysis/okinawa-liberating-washingtons-east-asian-military-colony>
- Buzan, Barry, and Hansen, Lene. (2009). *The Evolution of International Security Studies*, Cambridge University Press.

- Caparini, Marina and Eden Cole. (2008). The Case for Public Oversight of the Security Sector. In Cole, Eden, Kerstin Eppert and Katrin Kinzelbach (Ed). *Public Oversight of the Security Sector: A Handbook for Civil Society Organizations* (pp. 11-30). United Nations Development Programme
- Dawney, Kit. (2016, October 17). A New Cold War in Asia?. *Thesigers*. 17 October 2016. Retrieved from <http://thesigers.com/analysis/2016/10/22/cold-war-in-asia>
- Fisher, F., and Hwang, Hae-Rym. (2005, January 16). South Korea ordered to pay villagers \$7.8M in Koon-ni Range noise dispute. *Stars and Stripes*. Retrieved from <http://www.stripes.com/news/south-korea-ordered-to-pay-villagers-7-8m-in-koon-ni-range-noise-dispute-1.28127>
- Fleming, Ted. (2000). Habermas on Civil Society, Lifeworld and System: Unearthing the Social in Transformation Theory. *Teachers College Record* (pp. 1-17). Retrieved from <http://eprints.maynoothuniversity.ie/1058/>
- Freedom of the press worldwide in 2016. *Reporters Without Borders*. Retrieved from <https://rsf.org/en/ranking>
- Ghaus-Pasha, Aisha. (2004). *Role of Civil Society Organizations in Governance*. Paper presented during the 6<sup>th</sup> Global Forum on Reinventing Government Towards Participatory and Transparent Governance 24-27 May 2005, Seoul, Republic of Korea. Retrieved from <http://unpan1.un.org/intradoc/groups/public/documents/un/unpan019594.pdf>
- Godsäter, A., and F. Söderbaum. (2011). Civil Society in Eastern and Southern Africa. In Armstrong, D., V. Bello, J. Gilson, and D. Spini (Eds.), *Civil Society and International Governance* (pp. 148-65). Routledge.
- Graham, J., Amos, B., and Plumptre, T. (2003). Principles for Good Governance in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century. *Policy Brief No. 15*. Institute On Governance. Retrieved from <http://unpan1.un.org/intradoc/groups/public/documents/UNPAN/UNPAN011842.pdf>
- Haftendorn, Helga. (1991). The Security Puzzle: Theory-Building and Discipline-Building in International Security. *International Studies Quarterly*, 35, No. 1, 3-17.
- Jordan, Lisa. (2011). Global Civil Society. In Edwards Michael (Ed). *The Oxford Handbook of Civil Society* (pp. 93-109). Oxford University Press
- Kim, Jack. (2016, July 8). South Korea, U.S. to deploy THAAD missile defense, drawing China rebuke. *Reuters*. Retrieved from <http://www.reuters.com/article/us-southkorea-usa-thaad-idUSKCN0ZO084>
- Kim, Suk Hi. (2011). The Strategic Role of North Korea in Northeast Asia. In Kim, Suk Hi, Terence Roehrig and Bernhard Seliger (Ed). *The Survival of North Korea: Essays on Strategy, Economic and International Relations* (pp.64-86). McFarland
- Kwak, Tae-Hwan and Seung-Ho Joo. (2014). Introduction. In Kwak, Tae-Hwan and Seung-Ho Joo (Ed). *North Korea and Security Cooperation in Northeast Asia* (pp. 1-9). Routledge
- Lee, Sang-hyun. (2007, May 29). Why Jeju needs the naval base? [Jeju haegungiji, wae pil-

- yohanga?]. *Konas.net*. Retrieved from <http://www.konas.net/article/article.asp?idx=11471>
- Lippmann, W. (1950). *U.S. Foreign Policy: Shield of Republic*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.
- Mishra, Pankaj. (2010, November 16). A New Cold War in Asia?. *NYR Daily*. Retrieved from <http://www.nybooks.com/daily/2010/11/16/new-cold-war-asia/>
- Moon, Katharine. (2012). *Protesting America: Democracy and the U.S.-Korea Alliance*. University of California Press
- Pajon, Celine. (2010). Understanding the Issue of U.S. Military Bases in Okinawa. *Asie Visions*, 29. Retrieved from [https://www.ifri.org/sites/default/files/atoms/files/understanding\\_the\\_issue\\_of\\_u.s.\\_military\\_bases\\_in\\_okinawa.pdf](https://www.ifri.org/sites/default/files/atoms/files/understanding_the_issue_of_u.s._military_bases_in_okinawa.pdf)
- Park, Minwoo. (2016, August 15). Angry and THAAD: South Koreans shave heads to protest U.S. missile defense system. *Reuters*. Retrieved from <http://www.reuters.com/article/us-southkorea-thaad-protest-idUSKCN10Q0U0>
- Peace for the Sea in 2015, Statement by Participants of the International Peace Camp held in Okinawa. Retrieved from <http://savejejunow.org/peace-for-the-sea-in-2015-statement-by-participants-of-the-international-peace-camp-held-in-okinawa/>
- Records of Intrusions of Chinese Government and Other Vessels into Japan's Territorial Sea. (2016, November 2). *MOFA*. Retrieved from [http://www.mofa.go.jp/region/page23e\\_000021.html](http://www.mofa.go.jp/region/page23e_000021.html)
- SEALDs (English version). Retrieved from <http://sealdseng.strikingly.com>
- Sieg, Linda. (2015, September 16). Protesters rally as contentious security bills near passage. *The Japan Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.japantimes.co.jp/news/2015/09/16/national/politics-diplomacy/protesters-rally-contentious-security-bills-near-passage/#.WE2OEhcQ46g>
- Shaw, Rajib. (2014). Kobe Earthquake: Turning Point of Community-Based Risk Reduction in Japan. In Shaw, Rajib (Ed.), *Community Practices for Disaster Risk Reduction in Japan* (pp. 21-31). Springer
- Sholte, Jan Aart. (2002). Civil Society and Democracy in Global Governance. *Global Governance vol. 8 no.3*, 281-304. Lynne Rienner Publishers
- Scholte, Jan Aart. (1999). Global Civil Society: Changing the World?. *CSGR Working Paper No. 31/99*. Retrieved from [https://www.unicef.org/socialpolicy/files/Global\\_Civil\\_Society\\_Changing\\_the\\_World.pdf](https://www.unicef.org/socialpolicy/files/Global_Civil_Society_Changing_the_World.pdf)
- Spini, D. (2011). Civil Society and the democratisation of global public space. In Armstrong, D., V. Bello, J. Gilson, and D. Spini (Eds.), *Civil Society and International Governance* (pp. 15-30). Routledge.
- The 33<sup>rd</sup> Japan Environmental Council (JEC) Congress Declaration 2016
- The Declaration of Okinawa International Forum on Peoples Security Towards People's Security in the Asia Pacific Region. July 2, 2000, Urasoe, Okinawa. Retrieved from <http://>



[www.jca.apc.org/ppsg/Doc/urasoede.htm](http://www.jca.apc.org/ppsg/Doc/urasoede.htm)

U.S. soldier free after brutal 1992 murder. (2006, October 28). Retrieved from [http://english.hani.co.kr/arti/english\\_edition/e\\_national/167869.html](http://english.hani.co.kr/arti/english_edition/e_national/167869.html)

Warren, Mark. (1999). *Civil Society and Good Governance*. Georgetown University. Retrieved from <http://faculty.georgetown.edu/wilcoxc/CivilSociety.pdf>

Whyte, Leon. (2015, July 20). Evolution of the US-ROK Alliance: Anti-Americanism. *The Diplomat*. Retrieved from <http://thediplomat.com/2015/07/evolution-of-the-us-rok-alliance-anti-americanism/>