

The Limit and the Potential of Multilateral Security in East Asia

-From the View of Feasibility in Counter-Terrorism Measures-

**MARIA FUJIMORI HIROHISA KIMURA DONGYOON LEE
SHUN'ICHIRO SHIMAMURA TSUCHIYA TAKAHIRO
YUKO TANIGUCHI TSUYOSHI YOKOKAWA
<Adviser> ATSUHITO WADA MARK HAYASHI**

November 6, 2003

Introduction

The September 11th terrorist attacks in the United States not only shocked the world and had serious impact on world affairs - but also had a tremendous effect on the theory of security, particularly towards the idea concerning threat. This incident made people aware of the fact that non-state actors came to replace states such as the Soviet Union and China as new threats to nations as well as the international society. From this day forth, terrorism was acknowledged as a matter that endangers the internal peace and stability of the entire world, and “the effort to combat terrorism became a global issue led by the U.S”. On reflection, it is safe to say that this awareness is quickly spreading in Japan, as being an ally to the United States.

After 9.11, the international society has formed solidarity for the prevention and eradication of terrorism. It has continuously and comprehensively taken part in various efforts to fight terrorism, such as through “enforcing international counter-terrorism measures through multilateral, regional, and bilateral cooperation”. However, in spite of these efforts, the situation has yet to reach its fundamental solution, as asymmetric threats such as international terrorist organizations have bases scattered all over the world. “It is becoming even more difficult to predict who, when, where, and why they give threats and attack, and the fact that these unpredictable, complicated, various types of threats is becoming a multi-layered, continuous issue, is the chief characteristic in today’s security”. Therefore, a change could be seen in the response to those types of threats. The United States is abandoning the ‘threat-based’ strategy, which is based on the idea that threats could be identified, and is shifting the idea to ‘capability-based’, which focuses on how much of a threat the enemy could cause and what could be done to deal with it.

Then, how should countries in East Asia handle and deter transnational asymmetric threats, such as the Al Qaeda? First off, in the view of the nature that the actor is transnational, it is understandable that it is not something a nation could deal with on its own. That is, since the defense capability of just one nation is not enough to protect its own security, it is inevitable for them to work together and coordinate with other nations to tackle the issue. Meanwhile, multilateral frameworks such as ARF and the United Nations still remain at the point of coming up with measures that could be commonly applied to numerous actors, not being able to adjust to the actual diverse actors of these threats. Therefore, we could consider that “the need for a new framework of multinational security is the future issue”. Then, our question is, what is the ideal form of multilateral framework in East Asia effective for the treatment and deterrence of asymmetric threats? Or otherwise, could it not exist from the first place?

So far, the groups trying to deal with these threats in East Asia are multinational frameworks such as ARF, ASEAN+3 (Japan/ China/ Korea), and the Six-party Talks. Among these, ARF is significant for “it is the only forum to discuss politics and security issues of the entire East Asian region, and that it also includes members from defense departments in the intergovernmental meetings”. However, frameworks such as ARF and the Six-party Talks are the so-called cooperative security structure. They try to deal by internalizing these threats into the group, and by using unmilitary means such as

confidence-building measures and preventive diplomacy. Asymmetric threats are, like its name, threats by actors asymmetric to states. Since they do not have inherent territories of their own, measures such as punitive deterrence could not come into effect. Also, confidence-building measures are unrealistic, since it would be difficult to internalize these threats into groups. Furthermore, alliance frameworks represented by the Japan-U.S. Alliance are intended for *external* threats. It does not need to internalize the threat like the other one, but it is hard to say it is succeeding, again proving impossible for them to deal just by themselves.

With these issues in mind, we first would like to review how transnational threats are influencing the security environment of East Asia (Chapter 1), and then look at various frameworks including unilateral ones, which are taking or trying to take some kind of measures to fight terrorist groups (Chapter 2). In doing so, we would indicate the current problem by analyzing mainly on their establishing process and background, and also on the details of each measures adopted. Based on that, we will explain the limits of multilateral cooperative framework in terms of counter-terrorism measures (Chapter 3). Afterwards, we would like to examine the potential of multilateral frameworks (Chapter 4), and our final goal is to pursue the most effective structure to counter terrorism and to seek the role Japan could take in order to contribute to those frameworks.

It is vital for nations with common awareness on asymmetric threats to unite and address these issues, for the stability and prosperity of the international society. Also, Japan actively engaging in these frameworks is not only helpful for protecting Japan from terrorist groups, but also significant in terms of "contributing to ensure the peace and prosperity for the entire Asian-Pacific region, which is important for Japan's own peace and prosperity." We hope this thesis would contribute in considering the establishment of effective frameworks against threats, which is necessary in order to accomplish the ultimate security worldwide.

Chapter 1. Analysis on Possible Threats after 9.11

Section 1. Grouping and Classifying Possible Threats

In East Asia, although the security environment is getting better, such as reduction of tension in the Korean Peninsula, there still exist various kinds of threats, such as regional conflicts caused by different ethnics and religions, and proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction, WMDs. If we analyze these possible threats existing in East Asia, we can categorize them into four groups while considering following two main factors, how clear the threats are, and purposes of the threats.

The first category of threats is the use of force by nations and political actors that have enough influence to the world affairs. The second category is racial clashes and civil conflicts, which is rapidly increasing after the end of Cold War. The third category is natural disasters, which have neither clear actor nor purpose. Lastly, the fourth category is pirates around the East Asian coasting area, and terrorist organizations, which can be considered as threats of non-state actor.

The international society has come up with solutions for the first category of threats, such as MAD (Mutually Assured Destruction) and the Japan-US alliance, in order to have effective deterrence on each other. The second category of threats is a very important regional issue, however, Japan fortunately do not own serious civil conflicts. Therefore, the second category is not directly meant to be against Japan and people in Japan. In next, it is very hard to find effective solution for the third category of threats, because we do not recognize any clear actor that brings out natural disasters. Nowadays, we see more talks and discussions for counter-terrorism. It is very important for us to come up with solution for the fourth category of threats, especially, threats of non-state actor, because it has become very clear that Japan is exposed to this kind of threat by the data of pirates' increasing and Usama Bin Ladin's statement saying that they are going to attack Japan.

Section 2. Turning Point in the State Security Fields

The biggest threat in the state security fields have always been invasion and attack from other states since modern states had been established. Invasion and attack from other states can be categorized into the first category. Examples of these threats in East Asia are, confrontation between the US and the Soviet Union, the Korean Peninsula, and the Taiwan Strait. After the end of the Cold War, threats in the second category, civil conflicts drastically increased, and they became very noticed. Later on, some of them, such as anti-government organizations and terrorist organizations started to own WMDs, and became the biggest threat in the state security fields. As the biggest threat changes, many multinational frameworks started to make cooperation and to make new kind of responses against terrorism.

The 9.11 acknowledged not only the US, but also all the nations that terrorism has become the real threat in the world affairs in the 21st century. Therefore, it can be said that 9.11 was very significant that it showed non-state actors possibly can violate state security.

Section 3. Regional Cooperation against "Asymmetric Threats"

After the 9.11, the US started the counter-terrorism war with the wars in Afghanistan and areas around. The US recognized South East Asia as one of the most crucial areas, where terrorism must be eradicated. The US started supporting ASEAN countries in counter-terrorism activities. One of the US counter-terrorism activities in East Asia was the Joint Military Exercise in 2002, among the US forces and the Philippines forces, in order to sweep out the Muslim extremist, Abu Sayyaf. Through the US counter-terrorism activities, it became obvious that, in East Asia, there is terrorism network connected to the Al Qaeda. Bali bombing on October 12th, 2002 was a very significant incident, because it acknowledged countries in the Asia-Pacific region that they needed to cooperate for counter-terrorism. Therefore, it became clear that any states are facing terrorists' attacks and they need to cooperate together against the terrorism and international terrorist organizations.

In the East Asia region, it has been very difficult to establish a multilateral collective security mechanism, because of the following reasons. There are the huge differences in structure of economy and politics, and there are also ethnic and culture diversities among the states. They did not have clarified and integrated threat in the region. Therefore, in the South East Asia region, bilateral security treaties, such as Japan-US alliance, have kept the regional prosperity. In order to prevent terrorism, states have to have approaches in various fields, in information, finance, and legally. There are few multinational activities against terrorism, which are, information exchange among national police, freeze of funds owned by terrorist organizations, and prevention of the spread of WMDs.

From Chapter 2, we are going to overview counter-terrorism activities, and categorize them into trans-regional, regional, multi-national, bilateral, and unilateral.

Chapter 2. Counter-Terrorism Measures in Various States

There have been various counter-terrorism measures at trans-regional, regional, multinational, bilateral and unilateral levels. By examining the counter-terrorism measures at different states, it becomes easy to find out each measure's characteristics and problems.

Section 1. Counter-Terrorism Measures at Trans-Regional Level

There have been many measures in order to prevent terrorism in trans-regional level. Currently, there are 12 international treaties related to the terrorism prevention. Not only the international treaties, but also, there have been talks and measures to prevent terrorism by trans-regional frameworks such as the United Nations, APEC, ARF, and ASEM.

Just after the 9.11, the UN adopted the Resolution 1368, 1373, which condemned the terrorism attacks, and declared the necessity to fight against all the forms of terrorism attacks under the Charter of the United Nations.

In the Asia Pacific Region, APEC announced the counter-terrorism measures at the APEC summit, held in October 2001. The APEC members have agreed to cooperate with each other, in order to maintain the aviation security, and to network the customs for reinforcement of the investigation process. Not only APEC, but also, other trans-regional frameworks such as ARF and ASEM have worked to prevent terrorism. ARF has tried to prohibit terrorism by stopping the financial support to terrorist organizations.

Many counter-terrorism measures have been announced in various trans-regional frameworks and international treaties. However, these frameworks have not been too effective and always have had several problems. One of the main problems in the international treaties is that, it is difficult to define what the terrorism is, and to distinguish between terrorism and crime. International treaties cannot be effective when they are applied to domestic laws. For trans-regional frameworks, it is doubtful that if these frameworks like APEC, ARF and ASEM are effective enough to prevent terrorism. ARF is the multinational framework where the security issues are discussed. However, it is questionable if ARF could work effectively to prevent terrorism, because military and security personnel are not actively involved in this forum. In ASEM, there are too many member nations, and it is hard to earn the consensus of counter-terrorism measures.

Section 2. Counter-Terrorism Measures in Regional Framework

ASEAN has been working together to fight against terrorism. Especially, after the Bali Bombing in October 2002, ASEAN and also ASEAN+3 including Japan, China and ROK have helped each other to prevent terrorism through the exchange of information. ASEAN nations have reached to agreement of establishing the South East Asia Regional Center for Counter-Terrorism, and it was established in Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Malaysia. At the ASEAN summit held in October 2003, ASEAN has adopted Bali Concord II that agreed to create a new framework called ASEAN Security Community. The goal of the ASC is to make each country to work together to cope against transnational

issues.

The Shanghai Five is also the regional summit where they can discuss counter-terrorism, drug trafficking, and regional stability. The Shanghai Five consists of China, Russia, Tajikistan, Kyrgyz Stan, and Kazakhstan

Besides ASEAN, three party talks between Japan, China, and South Korea is the major framework related to security issues in East Asia. The three countries have cooperated with each other in transnational issues such as environment, economic fields, money and banking system and security issues related to terrorism.

Through reviewing these frameworks, there have been various counter-terrorism measures within the East Asia region, especially, ASEAN. However, there are several challenges to counter-terrorism measures. Since ASEAN has the noninterference of domestic affairs policy, each country cannot interfere in other countries' domestic affairs. Moreover, it is difficult to earn consensus within ASEAN. ASEAN cannot work effectively when they do not have consensus from all the member nations. In the three party talks among Japan, China and ROK, all the countries share the common security concern, which is symmetric threats, such as North Korea. Even though there are several counter-terrorism frameworks in East Asia, all of them still have problems and are hardly effectively working.

Section 3. Counter-Terrorism Measures in Bilateral Framework

The US has recognized Southeast Asia as an important area in "the War against Terrorism." Because Southeast Asia is said to be the terrorists' haven, it is important for the US to handle and deter terrorist organizations in the region. The US has been working with countries in Southeast Asia to fight terrorism.

In January 2002, the US had practiced joint military exercise with Philippines in order to eradicate one of the biggest terrorist organizations, Abu Sayaaf. The US has also granted financial aid to Philippines to fight terrorism. The US cooperates not only with Philippines, but also with Singapore and Thailand as well in fighting terrorism. The US, Thailand, and Singapore had joint military exercise called Cobra Gold. There is cooperated combat for counter-terrorism only within the Southeast Asian region as well. On May 7th 2002, Indonesia, Malaysia and Philippine signed the three country agreement, in which suggested information exchange for fighting terrorism and pirates. Later on, Thailand and Cambodia joined in, as well.

Not only with Southeast Asia, but also, the US have cooperation with China as well. The US and China agreed to work together in the counter-terrorism measures. China has agreed to have FBI officers in Beijing, and to have them inspect domestic banks in order to prevent funds from flowing to terrorist organizations.

Section4. Domestic Counter-terrorism Measures in East Asia

All the countries in East Asia have been working, in order to prevent terrorism through

domestic laws and policies. Malaysia and Singapore have arrested the Jema'ah Islamiyah members due to the Internal Security Act (ISA). In April 2002, at ASEAN Ministerial Meeting for Counter-Terrorism, Malaysia's ISA was recognized as a very effective law for counter-terrorism. After the 9.11, all the countries realized that terrorism is a serious threat enough to work and to cooperate to fight terrorism. Japan has passed the Anti-Terrorism Special Measures Law, and has played an important role in "the War against Terrorism" by supporting the Coalition Forces working in the Indian Ocean. China reinforced the domestic laws in order to punish those who is a member of any terrorist organizations. ROK announced the establishment of Terrorism Prevention Act on September 21st, 2001. Thailand has reinforced the immigrant procedure and border guard for prevention of terrorism.

Chapter Summary

Through the examination of these facts, we can see that bilateral frameworks are more effective than regional and trans-regional frameworks in fighting terrorism. It is always difficult to earn the consensus from member nations in the multilateral frameworks. Moreover, the counter-terrorism measures become less effective because of the noninterference of domestic affairs policy. However, recently, there have been some changes in the multilateral frameworks. At the APEC meeting, member nations agreed to prevent the proliferation of WMDs. They are also looking at the three-country agreement among Indonesia, Malaysia, and Philippines. It is possible that multinational frameworks among small number of nations could be effective to fight terrorism in the East Asia region.

Chapter 3. The Limits on Corresponding Multilateral Cooperation

Up to the previous chapter, we reviewed different levels of frameworks in counter-terrorism in East Asia. In their chapter, we would like to argue how difficult it is to handle and deter terrorism by multilateral cooperation. In order to do so, we would like to discuss the limit on multilateral cooperation, in general. Firstly, we will discuss a cooperative security in Section 1, and, moreover, we would like to demonstrate the limit on a multilateral cooperation, in responding to outer threats, such as, terrorism in Section 2. In that case, we are going to use concrete examples, in order to perform demonstration more persuasively.

Section 1. The Limits on Multilateral Security Cooperation

Firstly, it is necessary to clarify what kind of mechanism multilateral security cooperation is. According to Yoshinobu Yamamoto (1995), security mechanism can be theoretically categorized into eight groups. When they are categorized based on the point whether the threat is to be external or internal, one is security alliance, and the other is collective security and cooperative security, which is represented by multilateral security. Furthermore, Yamamoto explains the difference between alliance and multilateral security by quoting John G. Ruggie. Multilateral security means, "no matter where invasion takes place and no matter who causes the invasion, the states would response with constant measures." On the other hand, security alliance is "based on the principle of helping the attacked state only when the state is attacked." This is the reason why security alliance is different from multilateral security.

1) The Limits on Collective Security

The concept of collective security is constructed at the League of Nations for the first time, after the World War I. In order for collective security to work right, there are three elements that need to be fulfilled.

1. An organization has to have enough military strength to over come any peace-breakers.
2. Member nations in an organization has to have will to cooperate with policies of an organization.
3. Member nations have to share the common definition of peace-breaking.

There has never been any framework that has fulfilled these three elements, and, even in the near future, it is very hard to see if there will be any idealistic framework.

"However, there is no actual example of collective security system, which fulfilled all of these conditions above, and there is no chance of appearing in the foreseeable future."

2) The Limits on Cooperative Security

Although cooperative security shares the greater part of the special feature with collective security, it is unique in non-military measures, such as, Confidence Building Measures. However, cooperative security does not stand by itself, but it needs bilateral alliance, because it lacks mechanism of handling and deterring.

Also, there are three conditions in order for cooperative security to work.

1. All the major states in the region have to join framework.
2. There should be right process of the decision making process through discussion of member states.
3. All the member states follow the decision made by framework.

If a cooperative security framework fulfills these three conditions, it limits its own mechanism. Because of the 1st condition, a framework has to include states with various differences in East Asia. Therefore, it becomes very difficult to achieve the 2nd condition, the right decision making process through discussion of member states. The 3rd condition becomes nothing further than the “Soft Regime.” For example, in the process of regimes for ARF, there creates a conflict between the US, which wish for the “Hard Regime and Asian nations, that wish for the “Soft Regime.” This kind of conflict reduces possibility of important measures to come true, due to different national interest.

Section 2. The Limits on the Anti Terrorism in Multilateral Cooperation

After 9.11, threats of non-state actors were brought to the international attention. It showed that even the US is not possible to deal with the transnational threat, terrorist organizations, by itself. It also showed that the US needed to be a part of multilateral frameworks in order to fight terrorism. In order to set against the highly networked terrorist organization, such as Al Qaeda, it is necessary to create the extensive global anti-terrorism cooperation. Therefore, nations and multilateral frameworks, such as ARF and ASEAN, need to create anti-terrorism measures.

As we argued before, in establishing cooperate security, there is a crucial problem, which is the difference in national interests, and, because of the differences in national interests, cooperate security cannot go any further than the “Soft Regime.” In order for multilateral framework to work, it has to be small enough to standardize national interests of all the member nations. The EU’s success as the multilateral security framework has been bought out, because its members are likely to have common nations interests. Moreover, the Japan-US alliance has been successful as one of security frameworks, because there are only two actors in the alliance, and both of them have very common national interests in the region. Malaysia and Singapore’s Internal Security Act (ISA) have been recognized as successful anti-terrorism in counter-terrorism ASEAN Ministerial Meeting, and those acts are made unilaterally.

1) The Limits on the Anti-Terrorism in Trans-Regional Framework

In the Chapter 2, we made separate analysis in trans-regional framework, regional framework, bilateral framework, and unilateral framework. In Multilateral Framework, such as the UN and G8, there have been counter-terrorism agreements, however, all of them are “non-binding model,” which lack penalties. For example, G8’s global standards do not have any legal penalties. In the United Nations Security Council Convention 1373 (UNSC 1373) says, “all States should prevent and suppress the financing of terrorism, as well as criminalize the willful provision or collection of funds for such acts,” and does have legal penalties, however, because it does not define what the terrorism is, it is hardly effective. There have been 12 international treaties related to terrorism prevention today, however,

none of them clarifies what the terrorism is. Since trans-regional framework is included within the cooperative framework, it cannot do anything but formulation of "Soft Regime."

Other multilateral frameworks have tendency in limiting themselves within "Soft Regime." For example, APEC declared "Bangkok Declaration" at 2003 ASEAN Summit Meeting. However, both of them are only declarations, and hardly have specific penalties.

The main reason for the tendency is that APEC and ARF consist of actors, which have huge political and economic differences, such as Japan, ASEAN, the US, China, and so on. Therefore, it is difficult to create Trans-Regional Framework for counter-terrorism, in the East Asia region. Especially, ARF cannot go any further than "Soft Regime," because it uses the consensus system, which is pointed out to be the core part of the "The Limit Nature of Cooperative Security." The main ability of the cooperative security, which is internalization of threats, is very doubtful toward terrorism.

2) The Limits on the Anti-Terrorism in Regional Framework

Compared to the Trans-Regional Framework, such as ARF, Regional Framework, which is ASEAN-centered, has fewer actors, and is supposed to have less difference and misunderstanding between member nations. However, East Asia is said to exist, based on political, social, cultural, economic differences. Therefore, it is very hard for East Asia to reduce those differences, such as EU has successfully done.

In spite of these differences, ASEAN earned desire of progressing anti-terrorism activities after 9.11, however, it is still very hard to achieve, due to the internal political problems and the limit nature of polices and armies. This issue is relative to that ASEAN uses the consensus system and the non-intervention in internal affairs policy. Although ASEAN is head at cooperation for counter-terrorism, its declaration at Bali ASEAN Summit still referred to and did not have any reviews on its non-intervention in internal affairs policy.

It is very difficult for ASEAN to solidarize themselves due to Indonesia's losing its governance capacity. Moreover, Indonesia has half of total population in ASEAN and has lots of Muslims. Indonesia has become the resisting factor in ASEAN's anti-terrorism policies.

Chapter Summary

The joint military exercise "Balikatan" by the US Marines and Philippine Air Force has reduced the members of the terrorist organization called Abu Sayaaaf from 800 members to 240 members. Considering this achievement, we can conclude that bilateral measures between the US and the countries in East Asia have been fairly successful to combat against terrorist organizations. However, the measures against trans-regional terrorist organizations should not be limited to bilateral frameworks. The counter-terrorism measures should be applied to multilateral frameworks, as well. In order to pursue the efficiency in each measure against terrorism, the framework among a few countries, like an alliance, is desirable to combat against terrorism. In order to perform deterrence against the entire terrorist organizations, it is necessary to adopt counter-terrorism measures in multilateral

frameworks. It is ironic that in order to combat against terrorism, it is necessary to form multilateral frameworks, however, there is a limit of the frameworks to smaller frameworks.

Chapter 4. Possibility of Counter-Terrorism Measures by Multilateral Frameworks

In this chapter, based on the limits in multilateral frameworks mentioned in the previous chapters, we would like to examine that what kind of frameworks would be effective enough to manage and to deter the asymmetric threats, such as the terrorism in East Asia.

As we have mentioned before, even measures in a multilateral framework like ASEAN has a glimpse of limit to fight terrorism. Because of the fact that ASEAN includes country like Indonesia, it is hard and difficult to work together as a whole. However, in order to combat against terrorism, which is a transnational and trans-regional threat, it is hard and difficult to cope against terrorism by a single nation. Therefore, it is necessary to deter terrorism through multilateral frameworks. That is to find a new framework, which could reinforce and replace the current frameworks within the region. Counter-Terrorism measures would not be possible without cooperation among each country within the region.

Section 1. The Possibility of ASEAN+3 Framework

1) Solving the Problems in ASEAN

As a matter of fact, ASEAN started to review its policy concerning the consensus system and the noninterference of domestic affairs policy. By reviewing the policy, it could lead to further cooperation within the region. The cooperation within the East Asia region could abolish terrorism.

Yet, not only Indonesia, but also, there are other Southeast Asia nation, which lack democracy and governance. These factors have allowed terrorist organizations to survive in the region. As Afghanistan had been the terrorists' haven, Southeast Asia is also a region where many terrorist organizations exist. In order to abolish terrorism, we have to take care of nations with poor governance and anarchy.

While looking at these facts, it is important and necessary to reduce political and economic gap within the region. Specifically, there is a need to support economic infrastructure of some nations as well as the need to combat against terrorism itself. The three countries, Japan, South Korea and China must play the important roles in this process.

2) Importance of China in the Counter-Terrorism Measures

China's Minister of Foreign Affairs, Tang Jiaxuan was showing discomfort towards Balikatan led by the US and Philippines. Because China is cautious about the increase of the US influence in the counter-terrorism measures, it has been rejecting the US commitments on counter-terrorism measures in several frameworks, such as, ASEAN and China, ASEAN+3 and Shanghai Cooperation Organization. Thus, China is using these frameworks in order to warn the US against its deep engagement in the East Asia region.

It is true that China has been cooperative with the US after the 9.11. Zen Jiang had mentioned that it is needed for China to strengthen the relationship between the US, and work together in order to abolish terrorism. However, Zen Jiang also added that, in order to exercise military force against

terrorist organizations, it is necessary to show certain kind of evidence and have to consider the regional influence.

Even though China has been condemning against the US interference, China had participated in Cobra Gold 2002, which was a joint military exercise among the US, Singapore, and Thailand, and as an observer, with Vietnam and Russia as well. According to Chinese Government, China chose to support joint military exercise, which is not designed against potential enemy state. It is clear that China started to show interest in multilateral security cooperation in military affairs.

Thus on October 28th 2003, the US Secretary of Defense, Ramsfeld, and Chinese General Gangchuan have discussed about global and regional security issues in Washington DC. The US and China, Both countries have agreed to adjust the schedule, when military personnel of each country can visit each other.

Also, China has been very active in ASEAN+3 framework for counter-terrorism measures. At the ASEAN+3 Foreign Ministers' Meeting, the three countries, Japan, China and South Korea have agreed to cooperate in the transnational issues such as reinforcement of economic cooperation, piracy, and counter-terrorism. There, Tang Jixuan proposed the idea of holding a conference on transnational issues.

Section 2. Counter-Terrorism Measures by Non-Military Actors

It is expected to prevent terrorists' attacks by grasping their bases and facilities. It is also necessary for several countries to share the information related to terrorist activities. Through this process, we would be able to monitor terrorist organizations, and would be able to work effectively and prevent terrorists' attacks. Therefore, it is desirable that all the countries within the region share the same information.

After the Bali Bombing in October 2002, the Indonesian Army and Police have been working together with foreign police, such as FBI, for further investigation. On October 18th 2002, the Indonesian Police announced the establishment of the joint team, which consists of seven countries including Japan, the US, Great Britain, and Australia. In order to fight terrorism, not only regional cooperation is needed, but also, the cooperation with countries in the external region is also necessary.

Section 3. Coalition Force against Terrorism

In order to form the Coalition Force, all the countries need to share the common awareness of counter-terrorism. Unlike an alliance, the Coalition Force can be dismissed when a certain task is cleared. Because the Coalition Force is only a group of states willing to join and work together, in order to achieve a certain goal, it does not have any enforcement. In an alliance, it is hard to work with states that are not allies. Since the goal for the war against Terror is deterrence of the terrorism and eradication of terrorist organizations as well as those who support them. The task of the Coalition Force would be extended until it will eradicate the threat of terrorism.

Chapter Summary

Will the new frameworks shown in this chapter replace the existing security system in East Asia? For each country, all the frameworks are important and it is hard to prioritize which framework is more important. Actually, different security systems such as an alliance and cooperative security system like ARF coexist. The task and goal that each security system has is different. The alliance system, cooperative security system like ARF, and the joint military exercise, Cobra Gold and Balikatan are all different and have different roles in the security environment of East Asia. In other word, there is a possibility of establishing the multi-layered security system in the region.

In considering the possibility of establishment of the multi-layered security system, we, of course, have to keep it mind that collective security and cooperative security are limited in the "Soft Regime." As far as a framework is limited in the "Soft Regime," it has a problem of not being able to enforce measures. In order to do effective counter-terrorism measures, a framework has to use the "emergency response system," and has to carry out measures in either military ways or non-military ways.

Conclusion

Policy Implication

“Terrorism is thought to occur from elements such as the poor governing ability of the local government, ethnic/religious conflicts, or poverty due to economical instability. So, it is required to solve these root factors for the fundamental solution of terrorism.” However, we must accept the deterrence of the existing terrorism as an urgent matter on today’s security and therefore it is extremely important to use both bilateral and multilateral cooperation.

After the 9.11 in the U.S., the question over dealing with terrorism became an immediate issue. Japan took this issue seriously, and adopted new policy in order to actively contribute to terrorist fighting troops and assistance activities. Also, Japan has plans to complete all the treaties related to terrorism to promote the same to the rest of the world. This indicates that Japan has put weight on both bilateral and multilateral frameworks, and made full use of it. The only question left would be: how should we effectively coordinate with other nations for the trans-regional terrorist groups?

What is raised here is the necessity for strategic convergence of existing bilateral and multilateral security frameworks as a regional, multi-layered network. Since Japan seems to prefer multinational security regardless of the strong ally with the U.S., it might be the most appropriate actor of this plan.

However, to accomplish this strategic convergence, there is a need to clear out the confusion that lies between alliance and multinational security. We must go back and focus on the definition of terrorism, which was the most difficult issue in multinational frameworks. Terrorism is an act where the actor, the purpose, and the method are all asymmetric. It is apparent that clearing out this misunderstanding is the key for successful, effective counter-terrorism framework.

Therefore, the multinational security structure of “coalition of the willing”, which we have referred to in chapter 4, is believed to be the necessary and also the realistic answer. It is almost impossible to put an end to the argument over definition of terrorism in the existing frameworks. In this context, coalition of the willing has the advantage of being able to flexibly adjust to the interests of the participating countries. This is because the purpose and the method of the security cooperation are clarified, since this structure is consisted of actors with common intentions. Concentrating on the “terrorism” defined here constructs an extremely ad hoc type of framework. Only, it must be on the condition where it would not exclude countries willing to take part in it.

Given this factor, actors who were originally reluctant to participate would be able to later on, and also could take away the reason for these actors to clash with the coalition. Therefore, we believe Japan should, and would be able to take an initiative role in this ideal image of framework.