Open Regional Studies Vol.2, No.1
2023. 2, pp. 1~22

Human Security in Northeast Asia
: Searching for Regional Cooperation

Gyu Sang Shim* · Yongmin Kim**

|| ABSTRACT ||

Given its history of regional tensions, devastating accidents and natural disasters, Northeast Asia is one of the most potentially sensitive areas in the world. As a result, the region's countries are hard-pressed to respond quickly and adequately to human security needs, including, but not limited to, environmental, food, health, political and community security concerns. In the context of modern-day globalization, a new paradigm is needed to address these threats. This article examines several regional issues from the perspective of human security with the aim of deriving a new model for regional cooperation. The authors suggest that each country in the region set aside the realist directives currently seen in their foreign policies and, as an alternative, emphasize direct discussions between the countries' officials and interdisciplinary activities between the respective states. New mechanisms for cooperation in this area are also discussed.

Keywords: Human Security, Non-traditional Security, Regional Cooperation, Northeast Asia, Great East Japan Earthquake

* Professor, The Bush School DC Texas, A&M University, gshim2@exchange.tamu.edu
** Corresponding Author: Professor, KU China Institute, Konkuk University, kym7224@konkuk.ac.kr

I . Introduction

Northeast Asia is one of the most potentially fragile areas in the world, with on-going, long-term conflicts and tension between many of its countries. The Cold War may have ended with the fall of the Berlin Wall and the Soviet Union, but Northeast Asia maintains a cold-war composition to this day. The Korean Peninsula remains in a condition of uneasy cease-fire. North Korean nuclear missile development is a worldwide security concern, directly involving the world's superpowers such as the United States and China. Various other disputes exist among China, Japan, North Korea, South Korea and Russia. Compounding this state of regional tension are periodic disasters and accidents, such as the East Japan earthquake and tsunami of March 2011.

In this context, the region's respective countries find it difficult to respond quickly and adequately to human security needs. These needs include environmental concerns (e.g. radiation leakage at the Fukushima nuclear plant), food security (with regard to both the safety of Japanese food and the food crisis in North Korea), health security (such as international diseases) and political and community security. All the countries of Northeast Asia have their own human security issues and respond to them in their own ways.

There has been a continuous movement to create a Northeast Asian regional economic and political community over the last 20 years or so. There have also been many attempts to achieve regional cooperation under the traditional security regime or via economic integration, such as by emulating the European model and its common market. However, no such developments have occurred in the region's political and institutional arenas. Especially, in the context of steadily progressing globalization, a new paradigm with which to approach regional cooperation is needed. This paradigm should include means of addressing non-traditional human security issues.

This article examines several regional issues from the perspective of non-traditional or human security concerns, aiming to identify a new model for regional cooperation that may help to solve long-running territorial disputes and traditional national security concerns. We do not claim that efforts to protect human security will be a panacea for all of Northeast Asia's problems; human security theory has its own inherent weaknesses and

limitations. Rather, this article offers a revised model based on human security theory, not as the only possible solution but as an alternative approach to achieving regional cooperation in Northeast Asia. For this purpose, we have attempted to ascertain and evaluate the human security objectives of each country in the region, define their human security issues and seek new categories and understandings related to each country.

The following section examines several different human security definitions apparent within the region and analyses the research trends in each country. We then assess common human security issues in the region, demonstrating why it is impossible for a single country to solve the region's problems, as was attempted in the 1950s and 1960s. This section also presents evidence that a new human security approach is needed at the policy-making level for effective regional cooperation. The final section summarizes the results and proposes a new conceptual framework regarding Northeast Asian human security. It also outlines new forms of cooperation that could be introduced into regional discussions and that could contribute to the establishment of a joint response mechanism.

Ⅱ. Comparison of Human Security Concepts in Northeast Asian Countries

1. What is Human Security? [1)]

To understand the meaning of 'human security' or 'non-traditional security', we must review previous studies on the topic. There are two significant models in this regard: the Japanese model of human security (Model J), with a broad focus, and the Canadian model (Model C), with a narrower range of focus (see Table 1). The differences between the two models are crucial to an understanding of the concept of human security, since most previous studies have applied one of them.

1) Other excellent works could be mentioned, such as Tadjbakhsh and Chenoy (2009) and Burgess and Tadjbakhsh (2010), but these are not highlighted here because of the article's focus on the Northeast Asian region.

Table 1. A Comparison of the Japanese and Canadian Human Security Models

Human Security Model	Concept and Contents of Human Security Model
Model J (Japanese human security perspective)	Wide, contains almost everything that threatens human security Freedom from fear, Freedom from want
Model C (Canadian human security perspective)	Narrow, only includes serious threats to humanity Freedom from fear (for example, terrorism)

Model J is very closely connected to economic and socio-cultural rights and to the development agenda; in Model J, the traditional concept of security has limited meaning. This wide-ranging human security concept has its origin in the 1994 Human Development Report of the United Nations Development Program (UNDP). Drawing on the UNDP report, Model J considers both 'freedom from fear' and 'freedom from want' as significant foundational concepts (Evans, 2003). In Model J, use of military power is excluded. This model has four basic characteristics (global, anthropocentric, interdependent and early-stage preclusive) and seven important elements (economic, food, health, environment, personal, community and political) (Chun, 2004: 33). Model J applies the concepts contained in the *Diplomatic Bluebook* of 1999, in which the Japanese government claimed that

> Human security comprehensively covers all the menaces that threaten human survival, daily life and dignity—for example, environmental degradation, violations of human rights, transnational organised crime, illicit drugs, refugees, poverty, anti-personnel landmines, and other infectious diseases such as AIDS—and strengthens efforts to address these threats. As these are all cross-border issues, coordinated action by the international community will be important, as will linkages and cooperation among governments, international organisations, non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and other parts of civil society. (www.mofa.go.jp/policy/other/bluebook/1999/II-3-a.html (14 October 2013)) [Remark 1]

By contrast, Model C is aligned with the limits of security articulated in the '2001 Report of the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty' (Yu, 2009). This model focusses on using the human security concept only in relation to particular political events and emphasizes the importance of legitimate policy organization. Model

C encompasses only serious threats to human nature such as massacres, wars and racial crimes. These tenets follow the regulations of the United Nations Security Council.

A third view on human security, held by a group that is critical of the original concept, is that human security is an overstretched concept of security that is dangerous because of its potential to condone 'disciplinary operations' and purports to construct a 'parsimonious' theory of international relations (Kang 2008: 199). Moreover, human security is an appropriate term for slogans and the expression of public sentiment but not as a research theme. This scepticism also rests on the fact that although many governments and non-governmental organizations have discussed the concept of human security for a long time, there is still no clear concept of what it means. Critics consider it as too broad and ambiguous to be regarded as an applicable theory.

Even if we acknowledge this criticism, the human security paradigm has value in today's world, especially in Northeast Asia, where the Great East Japan Earthquake, Chinese environmental problems and various humanitarian issues related to North Korean defectors are just some of the region's many problems. Thus, the next sub-section will assess how each of the countries in Northeast Asia defines human security, seeking to ascertain commonalities and differences.

2. Human Security Research Trends in Northeast Asia and Differences in Definitions

1) Japan

Japan claimed an international role in human security when the UNDP originally raised the issue in 1994. Japan also uses human security as an important factor in foreign policy to fulfil its responsibility as a regional leader—for example, to justify its economic support of Third World countries. However, it can be argued that the extent to which the Japanese government has considered human security a central element of its foreign policy has been systematically exaggerated over the years (Bacon, 2011: 2).

According to Edstrom (2011), human security ceased to be a core element of Japanese foreign policy shortly after 2000. Edstrom (2011: 41) argues that, while Obuchi was in power, human security was the main pillar of his foreign policy. One can document the

rise and fall of this concept by tracing its status in Japan's annual *Diplomatic Bluebook*. First mentioned in the 1999 edition, human security featured in Chapter 2 of the book for the next two years and was then promoted to the introductory chapter for two years. However, its status declined from 'pillar' to 'key perspective' during this period, and in 2003, the concept moved from the book's introduction to the third chapter. Although it remained prominent in Chapter 3 from 2004 to 2006, since then it has declined significantly in status, to the point where it has only merited scattered and occasional mentions (Edstrom, 2011: 43-44).

Japan's Official Development Assistance (ODA) policy also changed after 2007, with economic profit, rather than development assistance, taking priority. Consequently, the official policy can now be termed 'Realism ODA' (Yoon 2011: 80). After the Democratic Party of Japan (DPJ)-led government established this trend, it became especially strong as the party attempted to differentiate itself from the long-standing Liberal Democratic Party (LDP) regime. The DPJ government changed the focus of ODA toward boosting the domestic economy as a means of overcoming long-term economic depression (Yoon 2011: 83).

Table 2. The Life Story of Human Security in Japan

Phase	Year	Life Story of Human Security
Phase 1	1999-2000	A pillar of Japan's long-term foreign policy
Phase 2	2001-2003	A priority of Japan's foreign policy
Phase 3	2004-2006	A pillar of Japan's ODA policy
Phase 4	2007-Present	One of the five key concepts of Japan's ODA policy

Source: Edstrom (2011: 46)

Table 2 shows how Edstrom (2011) documented the life story of human security in Japan. As previously noted, Edstrom contends that human security as a component of Japanese foreign policy is declining and has ceased to be important, even though the concept was one of the most important factors in Japanese foreign policy during the 21st century. Despite this domestic criticism, however, Model J has been officially recognised as the predominant model of human security by the United Nations. Furthermore, the Japanese government has maintained its view of human security to propagate Japanese superiority in disaster management (at least, until the Great East Japan Earthquake), as

illustrated by the Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA) Annual Report of 2010:

> The year 2010 marks the 15th year since Japan's Great Hanshin-Awaji earthquake. Japan experiences major damage from a variety of disasters … [but] is an advanced country in the field of disaster prevention and has registered numerous achievements in this area. Based on the lessons learned from past disasters, Japan has established related legal systems and disaster prevention-related facilities, carries out disaster prevention training and education and sets up emergency response structures that function smoothly when a disaster strikes. … Japan is the only country capable of integrated comprehensive cooperation to provide continuous seamless support ranging from disaster emergency response to recovery and reconstruction as well as building disaster prevention structures. (JICA 2010: 15)

This confident quotation might suggest that, contrary to Edstrom's contention, Japan's reforms of 2003 did not involve a relegation of human security, but rather its redeployment, and that Japan still wants to project its influence and expertise outwards (Bacon, 2011: 6).

2) China

Research on human security in China began with the 1997 Asian economic crisis, including the Korean international monetary fund crisis, and the terrorist attacks of 11 September 2001 in the United States. However, many observers indicate that the human security research was truly initiated by China's scientists and government only in 2003, when the country suffered a major outbreak of severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS), its first major non-traditional security threat. In an editorial on 21 May 2003, the *People's Daily* newspaper proposed that Chinese society should regard non-traditional security as equally important as traditional security (Goi 2010: 247).

Subsequently, the Chinese government began paying serious attention to human security issues, holding official meetings of relevant government officials (Wang 2008: 184). The concept of human security can be expressed in Chinese with three different words: *人的安全, 人類安全* and*人本安全*. The first two are most frequently used.

The first word, *人的安保*, is a direct translation of 'human security' and is most often used in Chinese research. It focuses more on the individual than on the state, suggesting that

Chinese security concerns are not completely non-traditional but are evolving in focus (Table 3).

Table 3. Categorization of the Chinese View of Security

Traditional Security		Non-Traditional Security
Threat to Nationalism		Human Security (人的安保)
Subject of State	Non-Subject of State 1. Terrorism 2. Separatists 3. Religious extremism	Economic Problems 1. Global Economic Crisis 2. Resource Deficiency Problems Social Problems 1. Welfare 2. Illegal Immigration 3. Environmental Problems

Source: Based on Goi (2010: 249), translated by the authors.

The second word used for human security in China is *人類安全*, which is generally believed to originate from the translation of the UNDP report. However, *人類* means 'humanity', so this term is primarily used when describing global matters, such as the 2011 earthquake (Cheng, 2008). Other theorists have used this term when referring to global or supra-national issues.

Although Chinese theorists and the media use these two terms for 'human security', they are not used officially by the government because Beijing is cautious about human-rights issues.[2] It may, however, be premature to conclude that the Chinese government opposes the idea of human security, as it makes similar claims that its governing activities are 'people-oriented' and directed toward a 'harmonious society' (Goi, 2010: 254). These two terms, originally used for sustainable development, appear frequently in official documents, revealing that although the Chinese government does not use the exact words 'human security', it agrees with its fundamental principles (www.fmprc.gov.cn/chn/gxh/xsb/xw/t182304.htm, (14 October 2013)). Thus, it can be said that China agrees with the basic concept of the 1994 UNDP on human security and leans towards Model J rather than Model C, especially with regard to economic development and its social security system.

2) *'關於加强非傳統安全領域合作的中方立場文件', People's Daily* (May 29); 2002.

3) Russia

The Russian concept of human security is not sufficiently developed to be called an analytical framework. However, Russia also faces several problems that cannot be solved by a traditional security perspective, such as the protection of its territory, unity and sovereignty, as well as issues of 'freedom from fear' and 'freedom from want'. At the same time, because of its systemic characteristics,[3] Russia, much like China, is very circumspect regarding human security issues that could possibly be connected to human rights issues, which could in turn result in interference by Western countries in Russia's domestic affairs.

4) Korean Peninsula

On the Korean Peninsula, although human security research has progressed, the peninsula remains, as mentioned earlier, on a cold-war footing because of North Korea's nuclear missile development. Broader human security issues tend to receive low priority because of other more direct and traditional security concerns. Paradoxically, however, a solution to North Korea's human security issues, such as its challenges in the areas of food and health security, could be of immense help with regard to the traditional conflict between North and South Korea. For this reason, this article discusses the human security of the two Koreas together.

Table 4. Regional Preferences for Human Security Model

Country	Model Preferences
Japan	Inventor of Model J
Korea (North and South)	Accepts Model J in food security and health security issues in North Korea
China	Prefers Model J because of human rights issues
Russia	Cannot accept Model C because of use of military power in human security issues

3) Russia is often very concerned with extremist and separatist movements, such as the one in Chechnya, because of its recent experience of the Soviet collapse. However, if it adopts military programs to address these concerns, it may fear interference by Western countries based on human rights grounds.

The following section examines several common human security issues in the region, as measured by Model J's seven categories, in an attempt to construct suitable options for regional cooperation that could ease conflict between the various countries.

The two concepts of human security expressed by the UNDP, 'freedom from fear' and 'freedom from want', can easily be applied to the Korean peninsula as a whole. Although North Korea claims to have only traditional security issues, there is general awareness, despite the limited information available to the international community, that human security issues exist and are ignored. Moreover, North Korea's nuclear missile development, as a pretext for withdrawing from direct negotiations with the United States, can be reasonably expected to result in human security issues.

5) Summary

In summary, although the human security concepts of Northeast Asian countries differ from each other, in reality, they can all be summarized using Model J, as shown in Table 4. Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that the application of this model could contribute toward attaining regional cooperation in this area.

3. Common Northeast Asian Human Security Issues

1) Japan

The most significant Northeast Asian human security issue in recent years has been the recovery process associated with the Great East Japan Earthquake, including the on-going energy and food security issues related to the Fukushima nuclear crisis. The recovery process can be divided into two parts: the direct recovery of the Fukushima region and the reconstruction of the security system. The process has not unraveled as the Japanese government expected. The regional infrastructure and security system required total reorganization after a series of ill-advised reactions by the Tokyo Electronic Power Company (TEPCO) that resulted in negative criticism from around the world.

The poor management of the Fukushima nuclear plant and the ensuing responses by the Japanese government led many people to distrust the government. The earthquake caused a paradigm shift in the Japanese disaster prevention system, as the country shifted from disaster prevention to 'disaster reduction', recognizing that humans cannot completely forestall natural disasters regardless of the prevention systems put in place. This catastrophe also led to significant social disaster (Kansai University Faculty of Safety Science 2012: Prologue), with consequential or indirect secondary social damage in Japan that continues to this day (Song, 2011).

The following specific actions were required following the Great East Japan Earthquake: (1) reconstruction of the infrastructure and preservation of life in the damaged area; (2) facilitation of regional economic recovery; (3) reconstruction of houses and buildings in the damaged area; and (4) initiation of mental health programs to aid victims (Kansai University Faculty of Safety Science 2012: Chapter 1). Recovery from disasters of this magnitude is extremely complex and challenging to manage. Issues can often cross borders, causing problems for nearby or adjacent countries and necessitating timely regional cooperation on human security issues. There are no existing organizational mechanisms or procedures for coping with this type of multinational disaster. Thus, the creation of a model for regional cooperation using the human security concept would be very useful in the aftermath of future disasters.

Energy security has been a particularly pressing issue for Japan since the earthquake. The nation's large energy demands and heavy dependence on imports have made energy security a priority for all the preceding governments in Tokyo, particularly since the oil crises of 1973 and 1979, which caused the Japanese economy to record negative growth rates for the first time in its post-war history. The impact of these crises on the lives of Japanese citizens remains deeply etched in people's minds. As a result, the Japanese government has adopted highly successful policies aimed at improving energy efficiency and reducing the demand for oil, thereby making Japan the most energy-efficient country in the world (Vivoda, 2012: 135).

However, after the Great East Japan Earthquake, Japan was forced to stop production at its nuclear power plants, which generated 30% of the country's energy, and to turn to traditional thermal power generation. This measure was extremely expensive and led to Japan's first trade deficit since 1980 ('Worrisome Trade Deficit', 2012). Faced with

unfavourable public opinion and international criticism regarding the country's nuclear power plants, the Japanese government has faced difficult decisions regarding how to amend this power supply deficit, an issue directly connected with energy security. There are movements to seek alternatives, such as research into solar energy, hydropower and biofuels, but none of these offer an immediate solution, making energy security a long-term concern for Japanese society and requiring a fundamental paradigm shift in its understanding of human security.

Food security issues have arisen primarily due to the radiation leak near the Fukushima nuclear plant IV, which has resulted in serious food safety concerns. This threat has also impacted Japanese exporting; South Korea, for instance, has prohibited the import of marine products from the Fukushima region. This situation has not only damaged food prices in Japan, but also led to the collapse of the Japanese plan to build an East Asian food security structure (Ohga, 2010). This plan was initiated within the Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN) countries because Japan increasingly depends on East Asian food products. In addition, Japan and South Korea consume a different variety of rice from the rest of the world and were reluctant to ahai rice during the rice supply crisis of the 1990s, adding to the severity of food security concerns in both countries.

Finally, Japan must confront health security concerns which are connected to all the other issues (natural disasters, food and energy) discussed previously. Health security concerns (e.g. related to SARS and bird flu outbreaks) existed before the Great East Japan Earthquake, but the earthquake made them much more salient and serious (Lee, 2008).

2) China

China's leading human security issues are (1) a separatist movement and terrorism, (2) environmental security problems, (3) health security and (4) natural disasters (Yoo, 2010). At present, the Chinese government has three problems that are not the subject of state security: terrorism, separatism and extreme religious movements (Table 3). Separatist movements such as Falun Gong are found in various regions including Taiwan, Tibet and Xinjiang Uygur. Examples of terrorists include the Eastern Turkestan independent activists who use violence to achieve their goals, and particularly dangerous to the Chinese government are the separatist movements in Tibet and Xinjiang Uygur, which

are causing bloodshed. On 5 July 2009, 140 protesters died and 800 more were injured in Urumqi, Xinjiang Uygur; it was the biggest, most bloody crisis in recent separatist demonstrations in China (Cho, 2009; Yoo, 2010: 133). The ultimate goal of the Xinjiang Uygur separatists is to establish a separate, Islamic nation of East Turkestan, alongside countries such as Uzbekistan and Tajikistan. Unlike the Tibetan separatist movement, the Xinjiang Uygur movement is not internationally well known, so it tends to use extreme methods of violence. This type of movement and other religious groups like Falun Gong are the most dangerous threats to Chinese human security, especially where their treatment can be linked to Western countries' criticisms of the Chinese human-rights environment as China attempts to strengthen its position on the international stage as a G-2 country.

China also has severe environmental security problems. The Chinese government, by its own admission, has not responded adequately to the country's rapid industrialization. Pollution, resource shortages and yellow dust and acid rain have generated strong criticism from other countries in the region. As of 2012, China is the world's largest source of air pollution and the world leader in terms of chemical oxygen demand. Because of these conditions, the Chinese take environmental matters very seriously and some sections of the media regard the environment as one of the nation's top four problem areas, along with corruption, social safety network and housing. If China wants to play an important role on the international stage, it must tackle its environmental problems.

We have noted that health threats such as infectious diseases can lead to serious human security problems and even to international conflict if they cross national boundaries. After the 2003 SARS crisis, the Chinese government fully realized the importance of health security. At first, it took the traditional Chinese approach to the problem, concealing the outbreak. However, on 20 April 2003, China began reporting daily statistics to the World Health Organization for the first time (Kim, 2003: 45). The spread of SARS showed that infectious disease can be more than just a health problem, as, in this case, it spilled over into social, economic, political and security areas. As a result of this painful experience, when the H1N1 virus spread in China in 2009, the Chinese government quickly reported the number of patients to the world and invested almost one billion U.S. dollars into developing a vaccine.

As for natural disasters, China suffered an enormous tragedy three years before the Great East Japan Earthquake—namely, the Sichuan earthquake of 2008, in which 70,000 people died, 370,000 were seriously injured and 18,000 went missing and were presumed dead. This was by far the only such event; in fact, between 1990 and 2008 China lost 4 billion U.S. dollars every year to natural disasters. Recently, the Chinese government has constructed an international cooperation system for natural disasters and adopted an open, cooperative attitude towards other countries in its region.

Despite the presence of these non-traditional human security issues, Chinese policy is still primarily influenced by traditional security issues such as territorial disputes. Although other human security issues have gained importance since the SARS crisis, the Chinese handle them very delicately because they usually overlap with traditional security issues and because of the Chinese government's extreme caution regarding possible threats to its sovereignty. However, if China wants to enhance sustainable development across its vast nation and continue to expand its global influence, international cooperation is essential and demands on China in global matters must increase. All of China's human security issues are interwoven with issues of human rights.

3) Russia

Leading threats to human security in Russia include terrorism, international emigration and health issues. Terrorism in Russia has a political, rather than a military, aim and is used primarily to sow discord and confusion. Victims are usually individual civilians rather than the government, making terrorism a salient human security issue.

Russia is a primary target for terrorism because it is not free from the post-Cold War threats of religious extremism and separatism. Russia has defeated the Chechen rebel military twice, but terrorism continues near the Caucasus region. For example, in September 2004, in Beslan, North Ossetia Republic, 300 people died when a school was seized; there were 12 civilian victims in a raid in Nalchik in October 2005. Chechen rebels have also carried out acts of terror far from the Chechen region, even in Moscow. In October 2002, a rebel attack on a theatre cost 129 lives; in February 2004, rebels bombed two subway stations, leaving 41 people dead and 80 injured; in January 2011, an attack on one of Moscow's airports killed 37 and injured 173.

The second Russian human security issue concerns international migration, which has two aspects: (1) movement of people from crowded and undeveloped areas to developed areas that need labour and (2) social tensions and disputes between ethnic groups. Native residents are wary of immigrants and worry about a loss of their identity and traditional values, creating the possibility of conflict between groups. Thus, international emigration can constitute a threat to community security.

Russia is experiencing active international migration. According to the federal government, over 8.4 million immigrants came to Russia between 1992 and 2010, while 3.6 million Russians emigrated elsewhere (http://www.gks.ru/wps/wcm/connect/rosstat_main/rosstat/ru/statistics/population/demography/, (24 May 2013)). The government has further estimated that there are 4-10 million illegal immigrants (ria.ru/society/20050905/41300360.html, (24 May 2013)).

Immigrants, especially those from central Asia with non-Russian roots, have faced considerable hostile reaction from the Russians, who believe that immigrants have taken their jobs, committed crimes and spread infectious diseases. Immigration has become a leading cause of xenophobia throughout the country. According to 2011 statistics, 52% of Russian people think that there has been an increase in extreme nationalism, while 44% believe that the original cause of nationalism is provocation by a minority. Additionally, 35% of Moscow citizens support nationalist parties to a certain extent (www.fergananews.com/article.php?id=7159, (24 May 2013)). Nevertheless, Russia needs immigrant labour to develop the country's economy and stabilize its population; if there were no immigrants, the Russian population would decrease because the Russian death rate is much higher than the birth rate.

Regarding healthcare, during the Cold War era, the Soviet Union was a world leader, but according to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), as of 2009, the average Russian life expectancy at birth was 62.8 years for males and 74.7 years for females, ten years lower than the OECD average (OECD, 2011). This relatively low life expectancy is closely connected to conditions of substandard healthcare. In 2008, there were 1,185,993 deaths in Russia, 57% of which were caused by cardiovascular disease; the second leading cause of death was cancer, which claimed 289,257 lives (14%). The infant mortality rate was 8.5 deaths per 1,000, down from 9.6 in 2007. Since the collapse of the Soviet Union, there has been a dramatic rise in both cases of and deaths

from tuberculosis, with the disease being particularly widespread among prison inmates (en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Health_in_Russia, 2013). The primary reasons for substandard healthcare are poor financial aid from the central government; the high cost of private healthcare, which the poorer working class cannot afford; and a delay in reforming the existing healthcare system.

Overall, it is certainly clear that Russia also faces many non-traditional human security problems that, unlike traditional security problems, can be solved only by a human security approach.

4) Korean Peninsula

The predominant human security issues on the Korean Peninsula concern North Korean defectors, the food crisis in North Korea and human rights violations in the north. Traditional security issues must also be addressed which would decrease the tension between the two countries.

As can be seen from the recent deportation of North Korean youngsters from Laos to China (www.voanews.com/content/laos-deports-9-north-korean-defectors-to-china/1669651.html, (11 October 2013)), the issue of North Korean defectors is complicated and can involve numerous other countries. In addition, the interface of multiple legal systems—domestic law, international law and the UN Displaced Persons Act—becomes a factor. Okonogi (2009) has suggested that the defector problem be treated as a typical human security issue. Several previous studies have investigated North Korean defectors in South Korea but focused only on how North Korean defectors had adapted to the capitalist society of South Korea and not on their reasons for defection.

The problem of North Korean defectors should be examined in conjunction with the North Korean food crisis, rather than from a realist international relations approach, and should be normatively classified as a human security issue. According to a 2012 investigation by the National Human Rights Commission of Korea, 20,000-30,000 children in China were born to female North Korean defectors, and 4,000 of these need remedial education. This phenomenon started in the early 1990s and the mind-set of the defectors has changed in several ways since then. As a result, they have remained in China for a long time, leading the Chinese government to take action. For example,

according to the *White Paper on Human Rights in North Korea* (Center for North Korean Human Rights Studies, 2013), in June 2012, the Chinese police and the North Korean security agency collaborated in a joint crackdown at Yanji city over a period of 15 days, and road inspections were strengthened to block defectors if they attempted to reach Southeast Asian countries. In addition, the Chinese police won over several defectors and used them in sting operations to catch other defectors.

The North Korean defector issue has become a burden to the three main countries involved. China gives no citizen status or identification to defectors, and if they are deported to North Korea, the children born in China are forced to have relationships with Chinese families. There are neither any clear standards/laws for these children in South Korea, China or Japan, nor any kind of safety measures. We must thus approach this issue, which is also associated with the Japanese abductee issue, from a human security perspective.

The second human security issue on the Korean Peninsula concerns the food crisis in North Korea. As mentioned above, defections are precipitated partly by this food crisis, making it an urgent human security issue. A series of North Korean nuclear missile launches has led to a significant decrease in the number of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) providing humanitarian food aid to that country, as well as a reduced flow of information regarding specific situations in the country. In addition, two large floods in 2006 and 2007 and economic restrictions imposed by the international community have exacerbated the problem. North Korea faced a food shortage of 1.66 million metric tonnes in 2008, according to a World Food Program (WFP) investigation. Since then this situation has reportedly not improved because of the global recession.

In an ideal situation, North Korea would increase its own agricultural yields, in a manner similar to that of Jilin province in China, which has almost the same climatic conditions. If North Korea produced crops at the same level as Jilin does, it would be self-sufficient. However, North Korea maintains a 'military first' policy, placing a higher priority on military power than on its own people's survival. There is no short-term remedy to the food shortage in the country, which demands for a change in policy. Because the WFP and Western countries have stopped providing aid, North Korea's only support comes from China, and this aid is not sufficient to meet all its needs, leaving the country in a state of chronic disequilibrium.

Table 5. Conditions of Human Security Issues in Northeast Asian Countries

Seven Categories of Human Security	Japan	China	Russia	Korean Peninsula
Economic security				Poverty in North Korea
Food Security	**Food Security concern because of the Fukushima nuclear accident**			**Food crisis in North Korea**
Health Security		**Facing difficulties from diseases like SARS or bird flu**	Problem of substandard healthcare	
Environmental Security	**Pollution following Fukushima nuclear accident**	**Environmental issues due to industrialization**		
Personal Security		Extreme separatist movements	Extreme separatist movements	
Community Security			**International emigration problems**	
Political Security				**North Korean defectors and human rights issues**

Areas indicated in bold require cooperation or joint confrontation.

The United States and some of its allies regard food aid as a way of retarding nuclear missile development. However, it is very difficult to use NGOs for food assistance in North Korea because of the lack of clarity regarding how the food will be used. Here, again, a human security issue can easily spill over into a traditional security issue, although caution is warranted because innocent North Koreans, not the North Korean government, will suffer if food aid is not provided.

The third human security issue in North Korea, which is related to the previous two, involves basic human rights. As the *White Paper on Human Rights in North Korea* (Center for North Korean Human Rights Studies, 2013) has documented, the basic human rights of this country's citizens are endangered in numerous ways, and no solution is in reach because of the complex traditional security issues involved.

The possible human security issues in Northeast Asia are listed by country in Table 5. There are four important issues that require cooperation or joint action by the nations in the region: (1) environmental security concerns, primarily related to the Fukushima

nuclear radiation leak and pollution in China; (2) food security, related to the safety of Japanese food and the food crisis in North Korea; (3) health security, due to diseases that cross borders; and (4) political and community security. All four issues are serious and urgent and are outside the purview of the traditional security category.

Therefore, this analysis suggests the following approach. In this study, we have ascertained that all the Northeast Asian countries tend to conform to Model J with regard to human security issues, despite some differences. China and Russia cannot choose Model C because they are very sensitive to human-rights issues. This study has also identified four important issues that are impossible for any one country to solve on its own. Seeking to craft shared approaches to human security is not a panacea for distrust and disagreement, but in Northeast Asia, the traditional realist approach to security cannot solve the complex, international and multi-dimensional problems facing the region. Accordingly, this article suggests human security activity as an alternative methodology for use in fostering regional cooperation. Human security measures are already operational in the respective regional member countries; thus, this approach can be applied on a regional basis immediately. The concluding section provides further detail.

Ⅲ. Conclusion

As discussed above, the countries of Northeast Asia have several commonalities. First, they all have human security issues that require urgent action and that cannot be solved by any one country alone. These issues would benefit from a new approach based on Model J, with a focus on human security. Second, these issues themselves have some commonalities despite the distinct characteristics of each country. Third, these countries already have the opportunity, as well as the infrastructure, for regional human security cooperation. We can therefore assume that platforms for cooperation already exist; all that remains to be completed is a paradigm shift among the leaders of each country regarding their way of thinking about their respective human security issues.

This article asserts that all human security concepts in the Northeast Asian countries

conform to the Japanese human security perspective, or Model J, originally designed by the UNDP in 1994. The relevant human security problems have been considered in terms of seven categories, as shown in Table 5. We have identified four categories of threats that the different countries must face together: environmental security, food security, health security and political and community security. There is a high possibility that additional, unforeseen human security threats will arise in the current climate of global economic recession. To address these new types of threats, every country in Northeast Asia must set aside traditional international political realism in its foreign policy and encourage discussion between their national representatives, as well as interdisciplinary activities. In addition, new mechanisms and institutions for joint cooperation must be established.

Such mechanisms must differ from those envisioned in the existing regional cooperation discussions of the East Asian community. A new, alternative possibility for regional cooperation is envisioned here, with a focus on human security. It is very difficult to cooperate on traditional security issues in Northeast Asia, but it is imperative to sustain the hope of regional cooperation. The countries of Northeast Asia must cooperate on relatively simple matters, such as human security issues; such cooperation, we believe, can produce beneficial spillover effects in the region. It is possible to produce win-win results on many human security issues because, unlike traditional security issues, they are not zero-sum games. While in the Cold War era, countries faced mutually assured destruction, they now exist in a state of mutual economic dependence and cannot survive without cooperation. A new regime or institution is needed, such as the initiative for peace and cooperation in Northeast Asia suggested by South Korea's President Park in a speech to the U.S. Congress, or an existing regime must be revitalized, such as ASEAN+3 and the Comprehensive Economic Partnership in East Asia.

Passion might initiate attempts to effect the necessary changes, but without regime or institutional evolution, the region cannot continue to remain secure. Those who persist in adopting a realistic political approach will regard the necessary evolution as impossible, but this article proposes that now is the right time—and that human security issues are the right issues—for idealism. If the countries of Northeast Asia choose the right issues and focus on them appropriately, they can open a new door to regional cooperation; human security is almost certainly the right key for this new door.

References

Bacon P. 2011. Post-Disaster Reconstruction, Human Security and Good Governance: Ten Issues for Human Security. Mainstreaming Education for Sustainable Development in the Asia Pacific Region: Rethinking the Linkage with Human Security Conference Paper, Osaka, Japan.

Burgess P., Tadjbakhsh S. 2010. The Human Security Tale of Two Europes. *Global Society* 24(4),135-151.

Center for North Korean Human Rights Studies. 2013. *White Paper on Human Rights in North Korea*. Seoul Korea Institute for National Unification.

Cho S. 2009. People Died in Xinjiang Uygur. *The Chosun Il-Bo,* July 6.

Chun W. 2004. National Security and Human Security. *Korean Journal of International Relations* 46(1), 25-49.

Edström, B. 2011. *Japan and human security: the derailing of a foreign policy vision*. Stockholm: Institute for Security and Development Policy.

Evans, P. 2003. Human Security and East Asia-In the Beginning. *Journal of East Asian Studies* 11(2), 5-35.

Goi T. 2010. The Development of Non-traditional Security Discussion and Human Security in China. *International Public Policy Studies* 15(1), 243-257.

Japan Times. 2008. A Worrisome Trade Deficit. *The Japan Times*, 31 January.

JICA Annual Report. 2001. Japan International Cooperation Agency. Tokyo; Japan.

Kang S. 2010. The Impact of Human Security upon Theories of International Relations-A Paradigmatic Shift or Another Academic Mirage?. *Peace Studies* 16(1), 170-205

Kansai University Faculty of Safety Science. 2012. *Kenshō Higashi Nihon Daishinsai*, Kyoto: Mineruva Shobō.

Kim J. 2003. Politics of SARS: International Pressure and China's Policy Change. *Journal of Chinese Studies* 31(2), 4-57.

Lee S. 2008. Epidemics, Human Security and National Security. *Journal of International and Area Studies* 12(3), 229-246.

Ministry of Foreign Affairs. 1999. *Diplomatic Bluebook 1999: Japan's Diplomacy with Leadership toward the New Century.* Tokyo: Okurasho Insatsukyoku.

OECD. 2011. *Health at a Glance 2011*: OECD Indicators, OECD Publishing. http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/health_glance-2011-en.

Ohga K. 2010. Food Security Policy in East Asian Community Building. *Nogyokenkyu* 23(1), 163-192.

Okonogi M. (ed.) 2009. *Kita Chōsen to ningen no anzen hoshō.* Tokyo: Keiō Gijuku Daigaku Shuppankai.

Song W. 2011. Japan after 3.11 and East Asia. *Journal of Northeast Asian History Studies* 50, 3-44.

Tadjbakhsh S., Chenoy A. 2007. *Human Security: Concepts and Implications*. London: Taylor and Francis.

Vivoda V. 2012. Japan's Energy Security Predicament Post-Fukushima *Energy Policy*. 46(2), 135-143.

VOA News. 2013. Laos Deports 9 North Korean Defectors to China. *VOA News*, May 28.

Wikipedia. 2013. Healthcare in Russia. June 30, en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Health_in_Russia,.

Yoo D. 2010. Non-Traditional Security in China: Challenge and Policy. *Defense Policy Study* 26(1), 120-153.

Yoon S. 2011. Critical Review on Democratic Party of Japan Government's ODA Policy. *Japanese Studies*. 49(2), 67-86.

Yu H. 2009. A Study on Canada's Human Security Policy: International Contributions, Strategies and Domestic Institutions. *Journal of Social Science* 35(3), 1-21.

접수일: 2023년 1월 8일, 수정일: 2023년 2월 15일, 게재확정일: 2023년 2월 24일