

**ISA International Conference
Hong Kong
15 ~17 June 2017**

THE PACIFIC CENTURY?

SD16: New Solutions For Enduring Problems in Northeast Asia

**Features of Northeast Asia from comparative regional
perspectives**

**Na'oki ONO
Tokyo-Toshi University**

Comments are welcome but please do not quote without permission

Features of Northeast Asia from comparative regional perspectives

I. Increasing importance of regional international relations after the Cold War

After the cold war, systemic transformation of international system has been in progress. In addition, global issues have emerged as major concern of the world politics and roles of non-state actors have become critical and the globalization has significantly accelerated. As a result, the international system has been transformed into the world system. The collapse of the USSR brought the end of socialist economic system and market economy has become world standard and the economic globalization has led to significant acceleration of worldwide economic interdependence. On the other hand, while the US remains as only super power, its global influence has been weaker than that during the cold war, due to US's declining interests in global affairs and rise of emerging states as BRICS. Since emerging states are located outside of the West, regional situation outside of Europe and North America has become more important than that during the cold war years. Under the absence of the US-Soviet rivalry at global level, regional international relations have become major concern of states in respective region. Also since role of civil society is critical in dealing with global issues and the situation of civil society is different by region, regional international relation is essential to cope with global issues. Considering that emerging states, BRICS, are located outside of Europe and North America, it is plausible to say that one of outcomes of the post cold war global systemic transformation is increasing importance of regional international relations.

II. Identifying regional features of Northeast Asia in comparison with other regions

But features of international situation in respective regions are quite different. And there are various features unique to Northeast Asia. Understanding features

peculiar to Northeast Asia, it is necessary to identify features of respective regions.

Europe (EU)

As a result of end of the US-Soviet rivalry, the cold war regional international institutions in Europe were no longer necessary for both Eastern and Western blocks. While COMECOM disappeared, however, EC was maintained and the European Union (EU) was established at the conclusion of the Maasticht Treaty in 1992. Under the EU, the Amsterdam Treaty in 1997 and the Lisbon Treaty were concluded and its member country and mandate have been extended. Instead of protecting Western block's interests under the cold war, primary concern of the EU is to promote cooperation among states in Europe.

Although uncertainty on its future still remains as shown in the BREXIT, possibility of Franco-German rivalry which brought two world wars in the 20th Century and the cold war division of Europe between East and West has been more and more difficult to reemerge under the EU. In addition, EU's decision making is not based on simple majority but Qualified Majority¹ so that it is not possible to take majority by neither coalition of major powers, such as Germany and France, nor that of other states. What this means is that international relations in Europe is not based on power and mutual cooperation is essential principle of their relations. This situation could be understood as "security community" discussed by Karl Deutsch and regional international system in Europe is not under anarchy.

On the other hand, international relationship between Europe and other non-Western regions is still based on security-military oriented conventional posture of international relations. Europe's participation of invasion of international forces to Afghanistan based on the UN security council resolution after 9.11 NATO and the ISAF occupation activities have been led by newly mandated and expanded NATO. So in dealing with international relations with states outside of former Western allies including Japan, EU has maintained security-military based conventional features. Typical example of EU's security-military based features under anarchy is its relations with Russia.

Russia

Unlike EU member states, Russia did not experience religious, social, and political transformation through the Protestant Reformation, the Enlightenment and adaptation of republican system from absolute monarchy from the 16th through 19th Century in Europe. Russia was under the rule of the House of Romanov based on serfhood from 1613 through 1917. After the collapse of the empire at the Russian Revolution in October 1917, the Soviet Union was established and ruled under the one party despotic system of the communists from 1921 through 1991. Just after the collapse of the Soviet Union, Russia adopted a democratic system but under the Putin administration, anti-democratic measures against, such as intervention to press freedom, centralization of regional governance, have been taken since around 2000². In addition, Russia invaded Georgia and separated South Ossetia and approved their independence in 2008³. Also Putin intervened the Ukraine crisis and occupied and annexed the Crimean Peninsula in 2014.

Since the annexation was unilateral and force was used, the Russian conduct was considered as violation of international law and the European Union and states taking this position applied sanctions to Russia. Russia was out of member states of the G8 Summit after the annexation. Facing this development and despite economic downturn, the Putin administration increased military spending and resumed its nuclear program and development of new weapons⁴. Increased tension between Russia and European states under the circumstance is inevitable.

In addition, Putin administration intervened the civil war in Syria since 2016 and has been supporting the Assad regime⁵ to which NATO states are critical. This conduct is also unilateral and another cause of increasing tension with NATO states.

What is understood from the situation is that Russia is historically, politically and socially quite different from EU and states in North America⁶. International relations with these states are not based on “security community”, but based on conventional power politics.

Western Hemisphere

Regarding international relations of the American continent, it is necessary to focus on two levels, the Americas and Latin America respectively.

【the US-Latin American relationship】

As for international relationship of the Americas, the United States adopted the “Monroe Doctrine” in 1823 and excluded interventions of European powers. The US annexed Arizona, Nevada, Utah, Wyoming, New Mexico, Colorado and California and claimed right to govern Texas at the Mexican-American War in 1848, and sponsored the first Pan-American Conference in 1889. So during the 19th Century when most colonies in Latin America became independent, the US dominated political and economic relations with Latin American states based on their overwhelming difference of power. After around the end of the 19th Century, significant political structural transformation underwent and strong sense of nationalism emerged in Latin America. Due to the strong anti-US sentiment, Latin American states did not accept to participate WWI with the US. The strong anti-American sentiment was one of the reasons why the Roosevelt administration adopted “a good-neighbor” policy in the early 1930s. And the US declared to end interference in Latin America’s internal affairs by using forces. This was fundamental policy shift and departure from the imperialistic position toward Latin America since the 19th Century. As a result Latin American states became original member of the establishment of the United Nations. During early years of the cold war until the end of the 1970s, however, the US influenced domestic and regional international issues in Latin America through overt and covert operations based on anti-communist principle and used military capability if considered necessary so that the US-Latin American relationship was not smooth. But after the accumulated debt crisis, Latin American states began to accept foreign direct investment including that of the US to promote export led growth and were democratized from military regime in the 1980s, their position to the US became more favorable and the anti-US sentiment was weakened. Also since the end of the cold war and following the collapse of the Soviet Union led to disillusionment of socialism and leftists’ acceptance of market economy so spectrum of Latin American politics shifted toward center. On the other hand, however, measures to promote market oriented economy,

called the “Washington Consensus”, to transform Latin American economies increased unemployment, accelerated inflation and expanded income inequality. The anti-“Washington Consensus” sentiment brought regime change in many Latin American states in the 1990s and the US-Latin America relations became tensed during the Bush administration. Under the Obama administration, efforts to find a way out of the difficulties and return to more cooperative relationship were made.

Understood from the above, while the United States maintained its influence on Latin America based on its overwhelming difference of power from the 19th Century through the cold war period, the US began to avoid taking imperialistic position after the “good neighbor” policy under the Roosevelt administration. Although the US intervened states of its interests during the cold war period if considered necessary, the US basic position toward Latin America is to promote cooperation rather than intervention⁷.

【intra-Latin American international relationship】

Since most Latin American states were colonies of Spain, except for Brazil and very limited number of states, it is quite understandable that people in Latin American states lacked sense of nation at the time of their independence. On the other hand, after their independence, Simón Bolívar, one of the leaders of their struggle of independent from Spain, organized the Congress of Panama in 1826, and the meeting proposed creating a league of American republics, with a common military, a mutual defense pact, and a supranational parliamentary assembly. So the Latin American states has been maintaining regional integration idea since their independence in the 19th Century. The first attempt to realize their regional integration, however, began in the 1960s. It was aimed at achieving regional economic integration, but since the effort was led by government initiative, the attempt did not bring expected integration. It was in the 1980s that Latin America’s regional integration began to produce results. Regarding economic integration, it was in 1995 when 6 South American states established a customs union, known as MERCOSUR (Mercado Comun del Sur) and 6 other South American states joined as semi-member. Merged with the Andean Community established in 1996 and expanding areas for cooperation, the Common Market of the South was established in 2004 and it became

UNASUR (Union de Naciones Suramericanas) in 2007. As for security/political sphere, four Central American states (Mexico, Colombia, Panama and Venezuela) established the Contadora Group to cope with their regional conflicts in 1983 and to support their efforts, four South American states (Brazil, Argentina, Peru, Uruguay) organized the Contadora Supporting Group in 1985. After concluding the peace accord, the two groups merged and other states in Latin America joined the regional cooperation efforts in the 1990s, which is known as the Rio Group. With participation of Caribbean states in 2000s, Community of Latin American and Caribbean States (Comunidad de Estados Latinoamericanos y Caribeños: CELAC) was established in 2011⁸.

Understood from the above, although there had been some conflicts among them just after their independence in the 19th Century, serious military conflicts among the Latin American states for territorial expansion has not been the primary feature of intra-Latin American international relations. In other words, “power politics” which was the basic feature of international relations in Europe and the US before WWII has not been the driving force of intra-Latin American international relations. It is also important to notice that nationalism sentiment in Latin America became visible after around WWI, in other words, after their independence⁹.

In addition, basic principle of post cold war foreign policy of Brazil, which is the most powerful state in Latin America and emerged as one of BRICS states under the post cold war economic globalization, is not to rely on military capabilities in pursuing its influence in the region. And Brazil officially has stated that it aims to create situation that other Latin American states are voluntarily support Brazil and the primary measure of the policy is to use soft power, instead of engagement and influencing based on hard power is¹⁰.

Thus, it is not considered that intra Latin American post cold war relations would be driven by power struggle among major states.

Africa

Except for Liberia of which status of independent state was given by the US in 1847, South Africa which was established in 1910, and Ethiopia, all states in

Africa at present got their independence after WWII. Most of their national border was artificially decided based of power balance of the European powers at the Berlin Conference in 1874. However there was no significant territorial dispute or attempt to expand territory in Africa after their independence. In other words, power maximization conduct has not been typical foreign-security feature of African states. As for governance in Africa, poor administrative capability under the colonial rule remained after independence. Since this problem was not focused on during the cold war period, poor governance has remained major feature of states in Africa after the cold war and establishing “good governance” is primary objective of development assistance to Africa at present. On the other hand, although there had been communities of tribes and ethnic groups in Africa before the colonial rule, they were divided by the artificially decided national borders. And since people within territories of African states is mixture of different tribes and ethnical groups, civil society is immature in Africa and sense of “nation” still is not fully developed^{1 1}.

Because of their poor governance, it is difficult for African states to adapt the post cold war economic globalization and most African states left behind the economic globalization. Combined with their poor governance, Africa has become the major source of international immigration, pirates and other criminal activities and terrorism. And due to the immature civil society and poor governance, it is difficult for African states to deal with the global issues effectively.

On the other hand, regional international relations in Africa has been based not on power maximization but on mutual cooperation since the cold war years. In fact, it was in 1963 when the Organization of African Unity (OAU) was established. After the end of the cold war, African states have been enhancing mutual cooperation through further political and economic integration, expanding areas of cooperation and diversification and intensification of cooperation activities. The establishment of the African Union (AU) in 2002, reorganization of the OAU, is aimed at realizing these objectives. Number of member states of the AU is 55 as of 2017, which is the largest regional organization to promote regional cooperation^{1 2}.

South Africa is one of BRICS states and the largest economy in Africa except for

2014, 2015 and 2016 when Nigeria was the largest economy in the region. What is critical is that major powers in Africa are not to maximize their power by using military capability. In other words, security is not primary concern of regional international relations in Africa and power politics is not dominant feature of the regional relations

Southwest Asia

Most of states in Southwest Asia has history as British colony and other states as Afghanistan and Bhutan have experience as the British protectorate so that they have retained British influences after getting their independence. Since the partition of British India in 1947, India maintains overwhelming position in Southwest Asia's international system. Historically, on the other hand, there were only three times when India functioned as a unified state, that is, the rule of Asoka (263~226 BC), the Mughal Empire (1556~1858) and the British India (1858~1947) ^{1 3}. Except for the rule under King Asoka, however, India was not unified indigenously but conquered and ruled by powers outside of Indian sub-continent, that is, Mongols and British. And it is well-known that "divide and rule" was the British way of ruling the colony of India. Thus, after the rule of Asoka, India had no experience of governing itself until 1947. Besides it is very difficult to expect that people in India has sense of "nation" after their independence.

Under the circumstance, foreign policy conduct was the new challenge for the unified India after 1947. And after taking neutral position to the US-Soviet rivalry and supporting peaceful liberalization of colonies just after the independence, India shifted to realist's position to increase military expenses on the territorial conflict with China in 1962. While Pakistan chose the US, India approached Soviet Union under the cold war. India has territorial problem of Kashmir with Pakistan, and intervened the Tamil separation problem by sending its peace keeping forces to Sri Lanka in 1987. In the 1990s when policy shift toward economic liberalization to regain economic growth momentum was initiated, India stressed promoting cooperative relationship with Southeast Asia and other neighbors ^{1 4}, although she responded to China's military expansionism by increasing defense expenditure in the 21th Century.

What is confirmed is that in Southwest Asia, India, the overwhelming power, had never taken measures for territorial expansion since the cold war period, and is rather pursuing more cooperative relationship in the region. However, India responded to security pressure from outside, such as the border conflict with China in 1962. After the cold war, India has not taken aggressive position in Southwest Asia, while she is responding to security pressure from the outside of the region, especially China by increasing her military expenditure and promoting security cooperation with the US, Japan and other states considering China as threat.

Thus it is plausible to consider that in Southwest Asia where India, one of BRICS states, is located, there was no power maximization conduct taken by major regional powers, in particular India. Furthermore, like Brazil, under its rising, India has not conducted to change regional international systemic structure to meet its interests with forces.

Southeast Asia

Except for Thailand, states in Southeast Asia had been colonies of European powers or the US before WWII and Southeast Asia's regional international relations began after WWII. Under the cold war, however, the states in the region were divided by their position on the US-Soviet rivalry and the regional international relations were strongly constrained by the cold war. In addition, international relationship within each side was not smooth. In fact, under the Vietnam War, it had been difficult for Southeast Asian states aligned with the US to establish institution for promoting their cooperation and coping with threat of Vietnam until they agreed to start Association for South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN) in 1967. After the end of the Vietnam War in 1975, Southeast Asia's international situation was not stable due to the civil war in Cambodia and other problems in the region under the cold war.

The end of the cold war brought opportunity for Southeast Asian states to reconsider their future direction. Their answer was to shift ASEAN's mandate from the institution to protect interests of pro-US states in the region under the cold war to an institution to cover all states of the region to promote intraregional cooperation and the region's interests in the world system^{1 5}. So Vietnam and

other enemies during the cold war as well as isolated military regime of Burma joined the post cold war ASEAN. The new ASEAN is offering opportunities to discuss East Asia's security and other interests by hosting such meeting as ASEAN+5 and ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF) to such states as China, DPRK, Japan, the US, although its influence is limited and maintaining their unity is not easy. In 2015, ASEAN established ASEAN Economic Community (AEC) aiming at accelerating growth momentum of the region through trade liberalization and economic integration of the region.

What is confirmed from the post cold war Southeast Asia's situation is that power maximization is not driving force of states in the region and they stress cooperation rather than confrontation.

Northeast Asia

It was the first half of the 19th Century when Northeast Asia was exposed to the Euro-centric multipolar system of the time. While Japan adapted to the prevailing situation and became only non-Western permanent member of the Security Council of the League of Nations, China's Qing Dynasty failed to respond and collapsed in 1911 and China was in turmoil until the end of WWII. Korea's Yi Dynasty also failed to transform Korea to adapt to the new international situation, collapsed and became Japan's colony in 1910. Thus Northeast Asia's international relations before WWII were negligible and restarted after WWII. After the outbreak of the Korean War in 1950, the cold war came to Northeast Asia, and states were divided into either the US or Soviet allies, according to the side they chose. But there was no serious international conflicts or crises in Northeast Asia after the Korean Armistice in 1953. As a result it was after the end of the cold war when Northeast Asian states have to deal with the region's international relationship without strong pressure from outside of the region.

After the cold war, significant international systemic transformation has been in progress in Northeast Asia and states of the region are facing unstable situation. This is brought by post cold war rise of China, stagnant Japan and unpredictable conduct of North Korea (the Democratic People's Republic of Korea; DPRK). And the tension of the region after the cold war is much higher than ever. China is one of BRICS benefitting from the post cold war economic globalization and

became the second largest economy surpassing Japan in 2010. Under the unprecedented economic growth, China has continued to increase its annual defense expenditure to enhance its military capability by more than 10% since 1990, except for 2010. After recovering from the Financial crisis of 2007-2008 faster than any other major economies, and as shown in its territorial claims in South and East Asia seas, China began to take more assertive position in its international conducts than before. To cope with the Chinese aggressive conducts, states of the region including Japan enhance their security capabilities through such measures as introducing new security legislation and increasing defense spending. And military and security cooperation among states of concern, such as Japan, the US, Australia, Vietnam and India, is intensified. On the other hand, the DPRK has maintained its socialist economy under the authoritarian regime. Since it had lost economic assistance as a result of the collapse of the Soviet Union, the DPRK have to find out ways to sustain the economy and to survive the authoritarian regime. Major sources of foreign exchange after the Soviet collapse are armament exports, illegal drug smuggling, remittance from abroad. Intensifying nuclear and missile developments is to get surrounding states to extend assistance from neighbors and to survive. Although various efforts to stop the development programs, such as the 6 party talks, were made, the DPRK still continues the program, while it has been isolated in the region.

Northeast Asia's distinct traits identified by comparison with other regions

Comparing Northeast Asia's situation with other regions' situations confirmed above, following differences are identified. First, while regional cooperation is primary features of other regions, regional cooperation is not sought in Northeast Asia. Second, instead of regional cooperation, security concern is the most important among states in Northeast Asia and antagonistic not friendly atmosphere is prevailing in the region's international relationship. Third, understood from their reluctance to follow human rights requirements and slow response to global warming, Northeast Asia's responses to global issues are slower than other regions and in some case even negative, like China's negative response on human rights. This situation means that in dealing with collective goods problem, North Asian states prefer interests of their own country to collective (group's) or the region's interests. Finally, among BRICS states, only

Russia and China continue to rely on power in their relationship with neighboring states.

III. Northeast Asia's uniqueness as a region

While those identified above are based on the given world system developed after the cold war, the features and response of respective region are quite different from each other. And it is obvious that it is not possible to explain the regional differences by using realist paradigm based on power, except for Northeast Asia and Russia. Besides, liberalist paradigm of cooperation cannot explain power based international conducts in Russian-EU and Northeast Asia. On the other hand, constructivism paradigm is analytical framework to focus on and analyze state-level conducts, not regional situation. In addition, English school found that possibility of regional international society is quite limited in the case of Northeast Asia¹⁶. In other words, there is no common analytical framework to explain the differences of regional features identified above. And understanding Northeast Asia's features, it is necessary to identify factors specific to Northeast Asia, rather than applying conventional IR analytical frameworks. As shown below, there are five traits peculiar to Northeast Asia. And it will be confirmed later that the distinct features or differences with other regions identified above are reflections of the uniqueness of Northeast Asia as a region.

(1) Strong sense of "nation" and conscious of state

Comparing Northeast Asia with other regions, the first distinct trait is that duration as independent state of the states in Northeast Asia is overwhelmingly longer than that of other regions: China, Japan and Korea was unified as country and sense as a country emerged in about the 6 or 7th century. In the case of China, it was in 581 when the territory was unified by Sui and the civil service examination system was introduced to function China's centralized government and the Grand Canal of China began to be built and northern and southern economies were linked to work as one economy and it became possible for the centralized government to collect nationwide tax for the first time in history¹⁷.

On the Korean Peninsula, after repeated meeting and parting, Silla eventually conquered the other two kingdoms and established Unified Silla in 676. Since then, the Korean Peninsula was ruled under the Unified Silla, the Koryo and the Yi dynasties. As for Japan, it was the *Asuka* period in 592 when centralized ruling system began. Thus, although they were not “nation states” based on national border and developed under the history of Europe, except for divided Korea after WWII, three states have continued as independent entity for more than 1300 years since the 7th Century until present.

In the case of Europe, it was the conclusion of the Treaty of Westphalia in 1648 when the concept of “nation state” emerged. Relationship between medieval Europa had not been based on sovereign states. Benedict Anderson pointed out that there had not been conscious as national until the Middle Ages in Europe, and in the case of states in Latin America and Africa, conscious as “nation” emerged in the 19 Century¹⁸. In contrast, sense of nation has been maintained for more than 1300 years in Northeast Asia. Although there is discussion that it was in the 19th Century when nationalism emerged in Northeast Asia, conscious as nation emerged in Northeast Asia 1300 years ago and has been maintained since then, overwhelmingly longer than any other regions. And intercourse among the three states based on the national conscious has been continues until present. In contrast, understood from the fact that Germany and Italy were established in the 1870s, most European states at present did not exist when Northeast Asian states had been established. In addition, people living in respective European states are not ethnically homogeneous but mixed reflecting European history of invasion of outside barbarians and intra-European wars, that is the reason why sense of nationalism is necessary to build nation state in Europe.

Comparing with European states people of which are ethnically mixed , people living in the three states in Northeast Asia have common language, relatively homogeneous ethnical identity. Also, although national border for them was not as critical as for European states after the Westphalia, states in Northeast Asia have very long history of intercourse among them. What this trait means is that self-interest of states in Northeast Asia is clear and strong and the states tend to prefer self-interest to collective and /or region's interest so that regional cooperation is inherently not easy in Northeast Asia.

(2) Absence of region-wide international relationship until the 19th Century

Regarding Northeast Asia's inter-state relations, the Tributary System of Chinese empires is often cited. While international relations among nation states is horizontal among sovereign states with legal equality, the Tributary System was a formal order based on vertical relationship between Chinese Emperor and tributaries or hierarchical relationship between empire China and tributary states (or tributaries). The situation that the formal relationship between Chinese emperor and tributaries was vertical was, in many cases, a reflection that the Tributary System was based on asymmetrical power balance between China and tributary states. This means that power maximization was not the primary objective of states under the Tributary System¹⁹. Although the strategy of weaker states' international behavior was to bandwagon with China, the Tributary System was not based on using military capability to maintain stability. So it was not the regional international order but a device developed by the Chinese empire to maintain stability in its relationship with neighboring states²⁰.

What is important here is that since power maximization through territorial expansion was not the primary objective of the system, it was a matter of choice for states other than China in Northeast Asia to join the system. In fact, except for brief period in the *Ashikaga* period, Japan did not join the system and maintained only trade relations with China. As a result, while very long intra-state vertical relationship under the Tributary System had been maintained between China and Korea, there was no formal state level relationship between China and Japan and between Japan and Korea until the 19th Century.

Thus, since not all the states in the area joined the Tributary System, there was no formal (state to state) diplomatic relationship. In other words, in Northeast Asia, there was no international order covering all the states before the 19th Century.

(3) Inexperience of intra-regional diplomacy until the 1990s

【Lack of opportunities of intra-regional diplomacy since the 19th Century until 1945】

Northeast Asia was exposed to the Euro-centric international system at the beginning of the 19th Century. While Japan successfully adapted to the new international order through opening the country to the West and introducing nation state system after the Meiji Restoration, the Qing dynasty in China and the Yi dynasty in Korea failed to adapt, as discussed above.

The Qing dynasty tried to maintain the Tributary System, and attempted partial adaptation of nation state system, but the progress was very slow and faced with strong resistances of vested interests groups. So it was not possible to stop their declining process, and the dynasty collapsed in 1911. And nationwide civil war between warlords dominated China's domestic situation since then so that it was not possible for China to function as nation state after 1911, although the Kuomintang superficially represented as the Chinese government until the end of WWII.

On the Korean Peninsula, the Yi dynasty maintained the "closed door" policy under the Tributary System until 1876 when she was forced to open the country by the Japanese "gun-boat" diplomacy. And after the opening of Korea, the power struggle among factions in the court between supporters of introduction of the Western system and technologies (reformers) and anti-modernization conservatives continued so their adaptation to the new regional international environment was very slow. That is the reason why the Korean Peninsula was colonized by Japan in 1910.

Because of the absence of effective government in China capable to provide services required and the colonization of Korea, there was no opportunity for the states in Northeast Asia to practice effective diplomatic conduct until the end of WWII.

【Low priority of foreign affairs during the cold war

During the cold war, except for the period of the Korean War, Northeast Asia's security environment was very stable. After the Korean armistice in 1953, focus of the US-Soviet rivalry was out of Northeast Asia. And the military priority of the USSR was in Europe and its military capability in the Far East was limited and

weaker than that of the US. In Northeast Asia, the Republic of Korea (ROK) and the Republic of China (Taiwan)'s international behavior were managed under their alliance with the US. And the DPRK's international behavior was constrained under its alliance with the Soviet Union.

Under the circumstance, the People's Republic of China's (PRC) priority under Mao Zedong was nation building through transforming the economy into a socialist economy and promoting economic development. But due to Mao's failed policies of the Great Leap Forward in the 1950s and the Great Cultural Revolution in mid-1960s, the PRC was under continuous domestic turmoil until the death of Mao in 1976 and the Chinese Communist Party (CCP)'s credibility of ruling the country was significantly lowered. That was the reason why Deng Xiaoping launched the Reform and Opening-Up Policy since 1978. Maintaining stable relations with her neighbors was, thus, vital for the PRC during the cold war period.

As for Korea, after the Korean Armistice, policy priority under the Park Chung-hee administration was to promote economic development. Under the Miracle of the Han River, the ROK's economic and military capabilities surpassed those of the DPRK by the end of the 1970s. So combined with the restraint of the Soviet Union, it was more and more difficult for the DPRK to destabilize the Korean Peninsula.

With the absence of major security threats, Japan became one of industrialized economy by mid-1960s and her major trade markets were the US and Western Europe. In other words, Northeast Asia was not major interest for Japan during the cold war.

【Absence and lack of experience of inter-state relationship】

Understood from the above, in addition to the absence of inter-state relationship until the 19th Century, diplomatic links were not essential and strong among states in Northeast Asia during the cold war. In other words, in addition to the lack of diplomatic relations before WWII, opportunity of intensive diplomacy among states in Northeast Asia was very limited and not vital until the end of the 1980s. Thus intra-regional relationship is new challenge for states in post cold

war Northeast Asia.

(4) Reinforced strong nationalism in the PRC and the ROK

Next feature is derived from the historical background of Northeast Asia that except for Japan, all states in the region were established after WWII. And because of their founding after WWII, priority was nation building and due to their humiliated experience after the opening of Northeast Asia in the 19th Century, nationalism sentiment was very strong among people in the newly established states in Northeast Asia, i. e. the ROK and the PRC. And the source of their reinforced nationalism is their relations with Japan after mid-19th Century.

(5) weak or absence of civil society

The last feature of the region is, unlike states in Latin America, Africa and other Asian regions, that states in Northeast Asia have no experience as colony of the Western powers. Although Korea was colonized not by the West but Japan, no states in Northeast Asia were governed under administrative, judicial and legislative control of the West. In addition, all the states in Northeast Asia have no experience of ideological, social and political modernization, like the period of the Enlightenment and transformation into republican system from the absolute monarchy in Europe, both of which Europe experienced before the industrial revolution. This difference means that practicing Western way of governance is not implemented as in the West and governance of the states in Northeast Asia is based on their traditional practices of the past.

In fact, although her postwar political and social institutions were introduced by control of the Supreme Commander of Allied Powers during the postwar occupation and they are institutionally democratic, even Japan is not fully practiced democracy. In politics, there is essentially no regime change since 1955 when the Liberal Democratic Party was established. Executive office is strongly influenced by career bureaucrats who are not democratically chosen but successors of competitive national examination, policy making capacity of legislative office is very weak, and press and other media do not monitor independently the government activities to evaluate government performances and to disseminate necessary information for the public to evaluate executive

office and political parties' performance.

In the case of the ROK, after the military coup d'état in 1961, it was under the military regime until 1987 when democratic process was introduced and the president has been chosen by national election since then. Institutionally democratic, however, traditional practices of governance, such as regional and blood ties, strong influence of Confucianism, power struggles within the government, plays significant role in their actual practices^{2 1}. As for China, since 1949 when the Chinese Communist Party established the People's Republic of China (PRC), the PRC has been governed under one party autocratic system. Thus democratic process of separation of the administrative, legislative, and judiciary branches of government as well as national election based on universal suffrage is not working and human rights are not observed.

In the three states of Northeast Asia, influence of bureaucracy is strong in governance and because of very insufficient or lack of democratic process, civil society in Northeast Asia is very weak or immature^{2 2}. As a result, civil society in Northeast Asian states is not capable to compete with government, which is essential requirement of democratic governance, as observed in the West. And due to the weak civil society, Northeast Asia is not able to play major role in dealing with global issues

IV. Northeast Asia's features as reflection of the uniqueness of the region

Under the post cold war world system, it is Northeast Asia where the most dynamic and rapid regional international systemic transformation is in progress and power balance among states of the region has been significantly changing. So regional international security is the focus of the region. While approach of dealing with regional issues in other regions is based on cooperation, Northeast Asian states still stick with power, conventional way of dealing with international politics and the relation is confrontational and tensed. In addition, Northeast Asian states' response to global issues is slow and ineffective. These features of Northeast Asia identified in II can be considered as reflection of the uniqueness of Northeast Asia as region discussed in III.

Firmly built-in sense of “nation” and conscious of state for more than 1300 year mean that self-interest is paramount priority of states in Northeast Asia and group (regional) interest is not concern for the nations. Reinforced strong nationalism in the PRC and the ROK contributed to the position that state interests are vital and regional interests are not critical for them. Under the backdrop, facing the post cold war rapid and significant regional international systemic transformation, security interest has become the region’s primary concern. On the other hand, however, with the absence of region-wide international relationship before the 19th Century, in particular, lack of diplomacy between China and Japan and between Korea and Japan, limited experience of regional diplomacy until the end of WWII and low priority of regional international relationship during the cold war, Northeast Asian states have to deal with the post cold war regional international problems as their first region-wide encounter among themselves. And on bilateral relations, although Sino-Korean relations have the long history, Sino-Japanese and Japanese-Korean case were virtually first formal exchange in history, except for brief exchange from opening of Northeast Asia in mid-19th Century through the 1910s.

Thus because of their self-interest oriented foreign policy position combined with reinforced nationalism and high security concern under the significant post cold war regional international systemic transformation, it is inevitable for the Northeast Asian states to face highly tensed regional international relations. And with lack of enough experience of region-wide diplomacy in the past, trial and error is unavoidable process that Northeastern states have to pass.

In addition, due to immature or lack of civil society, it is difficult for Northeast Asian states to take alternative position to change their self-interest oriented traditional approach of international conducts. Besides, the immature civil society means that NGO’s activities, in particular, of policy evaluation and making areas requiring professional capabilities, are very weak or none existing in Northeast Asian states. This situation is significant obstacle to deal with global issues and major source of producing Northeast Asia’s weak and slow responses.

-
- ¹ For qualified majority, see “How does European Council Work?”, European Council, http://europa.eu/european-union/about-eu/institutions-bodies/european-council_en#how_does_the_european_council_work, and “Qualified majority”, http://eur-lex.europa.eu/summary/glossary/qualified_majority.html?locale=en.
- ² <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-17839672>, confirmed on August 31, 2015.
- ³ http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/country_profiles/1102477.stm, confirmed on August 31, 2015.
- ⁴ <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-31146595>, confirmed on August 31, 2015. confirmed on August 31, 2015.
- ⁵ <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-middle-east-34290965>, confirmed on August 31, 2015. confirmed on August 31, 2015.
- ⁶ On recent situation of Russia and continuity from the past, see Stephen Kotkin, “Russia’s Perpetual Geopolitics”, Dimitri Trenin, The Revival of the Russian Military, *Foreign Affairs*, May/June, 2016, Vol. 95, No. 3, pp. 2~9 and pp. 23~29.
- ⁷ For historical part of this section, see Masuda Yoshiro, *Monogatari Raten-Amerika-no Rekishi* (a history of Latin America (as a tale)), Chuo-Koron Shinsha, 1998, Chapter 10, and Kunimoto Iyo and Nakagawa Fumio ed. *Raten Amerika Kenkyuu-eno Shotai* (an invitation to Latin American studies), revised edition, Shin-Hyoron, 2005, Chapters 3 & 4.
- ⁸ Kunimoto and Nakagawa, op. cit. p. 87. On UNASUR, see MOFA’s site, <http://www.mofa.go.jp/mofaj/area/latinamerica/kan/unasur/gaiyo.html>, September 1, 2015.
- ⁹ Kunimoto & Nakagawa, op. cit., Chapter 3. Benedict Anderson discussed that nationalist sentiment emerged at the turn of the 19th Century. Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, Cornell University Press, 1983, Chapter 4.
- ¹⁰ Mikael Wigell, “Brazil in Global Affairs: A Geoeconomic Perspective”, SA59 Brazil Going Global?, The International Studies Association, 56th Annual Convention, New Orleans, Louisiana, February 21, 2015.
- ¹¹ For details on Africa, see Martin Meredith, *The Fate of Africa*, Public Affairs, 2005 参照。
- ¹² For transition from OAU to AU, see MOFA’s site, http://www.mofa.go.jp/mofaj/gaiko/bluebook/2003/gaikou/html/zuhyo/fig02_07_01.html. On AU, see MOFA, <http://www.mofa.go.jp/mofaj/area/oau/oau.html>, confirmed on September 3, 2015.
- ¹³ For history of India, P. N. Chopra, (translated by Miura Yoshiaki), *History of India, Hozo-kan*, 1994.
- ¹⁴ Kondo Norio ed., *Gendai Indo-no Kokusaikankei* (international relations of contemporary India), Institute of Development Economies, 2012, Chapter 1. Besides, collapse of the Soviet Union, with which India had maintained partnership relations, was the other reason of the reform under the Manmohan Singh administration.

-
- ¹⁵ **The ASEAN Charter**, ASEAN Secretariat, January 2008,
<http://www.asean.org/archive/publications/ASEAN-Charter.pdf>, 2015 年 9 月 3 日確認。
- ¹⁶ Barry Buzan and Yongjin Zhang ed., **Contesting International Society in East Asia**, Cambridge University Press, 2014
- ¹⁷ Hori Toshikazu, **Chuu-goku-to Kodai Higashi-Ajia** (China and ancient East Asia), *Iwanami-Shoten*, 1990, particularly Chapter 8, Hoshi Ayao, **Dai-Unga Hatten0shi** (History of the Grand Canal), *Heibon-sha*, 1982、 pp. 381~408。
- ¹⁸ Benedict Anderson (translated by Shiraisi Takashi and Saya), *Shoseki-kobo Souzan*, 2001.
- ¹⁹ Although territorial expansion was not critical objective of nations under the Tributary System, until the establishment of the Sui Empire in 581, China expanded its territory towards south where there were arable lands but did not invade North, the land of nomads who invaded China whenever their power rose. After integration of the territory under the Sui Empire, there was no attempt to expand the Chinese territory, except for none-Hang Chinese dynasties of the Yuan (Mongol) and the Qing (Manchus).
- ²⁰ For the discussion on the Tributary System of this part relies mainly from Hori Toshikazu, **Chuugoku to Kodai Ajia Sekai** (China and Ancient East Asian world), Iwanami Shoten, 1993.
- ²¹ See, for example, Donald Stone Macdonald, **The Koreans – Contemporary Politics and Society** 2nd ed., Westview Press, 1990, Chapter 4.
- ²² As for Japan, there is virtually no NGOs which are active in international level and in the case of China, NGOs are controlled by the communist party. For Japan's NGO, see Naoki Ono, **Nihon-no Taigai Kodo** (Japan's international conducts), *Mineruva Shobo*, 2011, pp. 210~215. On NGOs in China, see Elizabeth Economy, **The River Runs Black** (Chugoku kankyo report), *Tsukiji Shoten*, 2005, Chapter 5.