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Abstract

This article presents the changing interests of security. With the trends of globalization and the transformation of state interests, there has been increasing interest in the conceptualization of security, and with it, the concept of human security, which concentrates on the individual in place of the state, has emerged. The relationship between state security and human security is complementary, mutually reinforcing and interdependent; thus, it is necessary to understand both the traditional concept of state security and the newly emerging aspects of human security.

Further, this paper aims to apply the concept of human security to the context of Asia. Conditions in Asia are unique from other regions. Although the East Asian Tigers have gained recognition in the global arena for their economic achievements, there are still many segments of the population suffering from extreme poverty, malnutrition and infectious diseases. Some of the challenges that are unique to the region and inhibit the construction of an East Asian Human Security Regime are identified in order to develop a framework that is adaptable to the characteristics of the region.

By analyzing the regional features of East Asia, it is possible to substantialize a human security framework in three regards; enforcing a multilateral approach in agenda setting, developing a network of leading states in a governance structure, and initiating a bottom up scheme in advocacy and awareness. These abovementioned factors are essential to enhance human security in the region. Finally, this paper proposes on how to collaborate these efforts to formulate a metagovernance framework which will be applicable to East Asia.
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I. Introduction

In the post-cold war era of the 20th century, the anticipation of demilitarization and disarmament was prevalent in the world. However, this expectation was seriously thwarted through intra-state armed conflicts, such as civil wars, internal disturbances, and warlord rebellions which resulted in a great number of civilian causalities. Major threats to human security presented themselves in various forms; devastating natural disasters such as the 2004 tsunami in the Indian Ocean, or behaviors of transnational non-state actors, e.g. terrorist groups and transnational corporations that have violated international human rights norms.

On one hand, states can only exercise solemn power under the privilege of its own resources, e.g. organize troops to preserve territorial sovereignty against external aggressions. On the other hand, states must function to prevent internationally recognized human rights violations by legitimatizing actions against infringement. Under such context, a state’s desire to achieve rapid economic development or development-rights trade-offs (Donnelly 2002) can be justified.

Globalization has led to a worldwide marketization and exchange of finance, information and people. Detrimental aspects point to problems that must be resolved; poverty, illiteracy and pandemic illnesses that inflict people in isolated parts of the world which are immune to the effects of globalization. Thus, the issue of human rights has gained increasing importance and recognition from scholars and efforts to conceptualize and institutionalize human security aim at prioritizing an individual human being’s rights in front of other global agendas. This idea has become prevalent amongst believers of multilateralism who attempt to identify persons accountable to protect human dignity and fundamental rights.

Increasing attention from academia and the political community has led to a conceptualization of ‘human security’ as the security of human beings in the face of many different kinds of threats. This concept has evolved through a process of universalization of human rights and has developed into a major issue of debate (Soh 2005). Boutros Boutros-Ghali, a former Secretary General of the United Nations in the Security Council voiced the need for an ‘integrated approach to human security’ by encouraging involvement from all States, regional actors, NGO’s and particularly the UN system in hopes to secure a more peaceful world. His ideas were further elaborated when the Human Development Report, the first comprehensive attempt to issue human security, identified a broad spectrum of definitions.

In response to the demand to enhance human security within a regional context, the OSCE (Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe) has consistently declared that member states must make every effort to protect human rights and that basic freedoms are essential requirements for establishing a comprehensive security regime (Soh 2005). C. Gavira, Secretary-General of the OAS (the Organization of American States) insists that the individual will become the key reference point for analysis of

---

security problems, noting that whilst an ambitious proposal, the idea is consistent with the OAS’s hemispheric agenda.²

East Asian countries have become more aware of the basic concepts of human security and this recognition has been supported by moderate economic growth, which has reduced the number suffering from extreme poverty in the region. However, East Asian countries still have a long way to go before being able to realize a common understanding and conceptualization of human rights. Currently, attempts to organize initiatives and form consensus to protect human rights are limited to individual countries, mainly Japan and Thailand. This is due to historical, political, social, and cultural reasons.

With these considerations in mind, this paper will discuss the inter-connectedness between human security and state security in multi-dimensional facets, exemplify a variety of cases from failed states that have violated human security, and conclude by illustrating a plausible constructive roadmap to advocate human security in East Asia, based on multilateral cooperation and governance networks among individual governments, international organizations, NGOs, and civil societies.

II. Conceptual Framework of Human Security

Concerns for threats to human security—war, drought, plague and enslavement—can be traced back to the human centered liberalism beliefs of Kant. With the end of the cold war and the demise of the Soviet Union in 1991, the debate on security gradually shifted from state security to human security. The term “human security” is reported to have been coined by Lincoln Chen, formerly of the Harvard Center for Population and Development Studies.³ But it was only after the CFI (Common Security Forum), established in 1992 to facilitate international dialogue among scholars and decision makers about the nature of security in a changing world, echoed the phrase that has been increasingly used in writing and thinking about global policy. Furthermore, as former Pakistani Finance Minister Mahbub ul Haq encouraged a number of governments to partake human security as a central theme for their foreign and defense policies, the concept of human security emerged as part of the holistic paradigm of human development cultivated at UNDP. In 2001, the Commission on Human Security, chaired by Nobel Laureate Amartya Sen and the former UN High Commissioner for Refugee, Sadako Ogata, was established to explore the concept of human security and to make recommendations for policies.⁴

² Refer to the Address at the Inaugural Session of the 30th Regular Session of the OAS General Assembly (Windsor, Ontario, June 4, 2000).
³ The Common Security Forum is a network of scholars and policy makers who are interested in exploring Post Cold War global security issues via collaborative international research and dialogue; the founding institutions of which include the Centre for History and Economics, King’s College, Cambridge and the Harvard Center for Population and Development Studies. (refer to Sara Edson, Human Security: An Extended and Annotated International Bibliography, 2001).
Different multidimensional perspectives have conceptualized human security in various ways. Largely, there have been two competing schools of thought in security studies, ‘traditionalists’ who continue to focus exclusively on politico-military issues and ‘wideners’ who seek to extend the agenda into integrating economic, societal, and environmental sectors.\(^5\) Caroline Thomas offers a critique of the neo-liberal policies of global governance institutions, the IMF, the World Bank and practices of TNC’s that have exacerbated human insecurity for the world. According to Thomas, there are two ways forward: ‘reformist’-a continuation of business as usual or ‘transformist’-an emphasis on new win-win norms.\(^6\) In a balanced and scholarly manner, Emma Rothschild traces current accounts of ‘extended security’ to conceptual antecedents in European political thought; she noted extended national security concepts in four directions: downwards from nations to individuals, upward from the nation to the biosphere, horizontally from military to political, economic, social, environment and political responsibility for ensuring security diffused in all directions from national states.\(^7\) Sabina Alkire attempting to infer a working definition stated the objective of human security as to safeguard the vital core of all human lives from critical pervasive threats, without impending long-term human fulfillment. The term ‘vital core’ is not meant for precision, but suggests a minimal or basic set of functions related to survival, livelihood and dignity, implying that although institutions that undertake protection of human security will not be able to protect every aspect of human well-being, they will at the very least concentrate on protecting the crucial fundamental elements.\(^8\)

With these diverse conceptualizations common perspectives exist that can be attributed towards defining human security. Human security, which focuses on individuals has been widely discussed and has replaced the conventional security concept centered on state security and territorial sovereignty. Second, human security is sophisticatedly intertwined in a wide array of socio-economic elements, which could jeopardize human well-being. Poverty, environmental degradation, governance failure, infectious diseases-HIV/AIDS, SARS and Avian Influenza, and transnational terrorism threaten human well-being and must be addressed under the context of human security. Third, multilateral cooperation and networks that encompass proponents of human security, States, intergovernmental and regional organizations, international and domestic NGOs and civil society organizations, and academia should be established so that a human security regime, both in a regional and global context may be proposed to further ameliorate the vulnerability and resilience of human being toward overcoming physical risks.

Traditionally, international peace and security has been recognized as state security and the defense of a state’s territorial integrity from external threats or attacks. As suggested by emerging norms of humanitarian intervention and increasing responsibilities to protect from violations of human rights, the concept of human security, i.e. the security of human security in the face of many different kinds of threats is beginning to

\(^5\) Sara Edson, 15.
take hold. Realists who mainly seek power based regimes still maintain at the core of their conceptualization, an emphasis on the role of state security; that the state must be taken into more deliberation than any other factor. Historically, the state system, and the focus on state security, is a characteristic of the Westphalian system that emerged in answer to the problem of order and violence in 17th century Europe.

The consolidation of the primacy of the state during the 18th-19th centuries was accompanied by the monopolization of security by the state. The state provided solutions to security dilemmas for individuals who sublimated individual quests for personal safety into the identity and security of the state. Robert Kaplan points to the way the military assumes a great role in foreign policy making, as witnessed by NATO’s increasing role in international affairs. The military, in his view, is the only group in Washington with technical know-how for humanitarian interventions and identifies that the military will inevitably shape itself accordingly, making it fit to lead actions in the national self-interest. Therefore, a core edge of disagreement between human security and state security emerges in relation to these two agenda-the population under consideration and different objectives, e.g. by the realists assertion, maximization of state power.

On the other hand, although once limited by numerous menaces, a common understanding of state security is prone to be broadened, demonstrating the rapidly changing international and domestic environment. P. Stoett, in this regard, seeks to add to the post Cold War international politics with a discussion of four principle threats to human and global security: state violence, environmental degradation, population displacement. (P. Stoett, 1999). These highlight that security issues in a modern world should be expanded beyond state-centered security concepts, ranging from individual to communities that are vulnerable to widespread threats. Thus, it is quite important to consider the relationship between human security and state security. One key reason is that the UN’s existing organizational mandates and mechanisms draw heavily from state security assumptions and another is that collaboration with state security forces is essential at the national level.

When it comes to the correlation between state security and human security, compared to state security that narrowly defines protection of the nation’s people and sovereign territories against external physical intimidations, human security is more comprehensive and encompassing; human security requires strong and stable institutions. Whereas state security is focused, human security is broad. Jorge Nef sees human security as resting on a number of interwoven dimensions; environmental, personal and physical security, economic security, social security, political security and cultural security (J. Nef, 1999). Furthermore, human security can be perceived as a timely extension

12 Sabina Alkire, 3132.
of state security frameworks, which explore and develop new issues that are on the edge of the security agenda. Secondly, human security and state security are increasingly inter-dependent and mutually reinforce each other. Without human security, state security cannot be attained and vice versa, thus, fusion of individual human security and state security has begun to be legitimized. Finally, human security can complement state security in four respects;

- Its utmost concern is with the individual and the community rather than the state;
- Menaces to people’s security include threats and conditions that have not always been identified as threats to state security;
- The range of actors is expanded beyond the state and;
- Achieving human security includes more than just assisting people to fend themselves.14

III. Conflicts and Challenges of Human Security in Asia

According to the UN OCHA (Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs), in 2006, more than US$19 million, or 17% of the total field operation budget, was allocated to Asia to provide humanitarian aid, prepare for emergencies and response.15 For example, Sri-Lanka, devastated by the tsunami in the Indian Ocean and the long-term internal strife and armed conflict between the government and LTTE (Liberation Tigers of Tamil Elam), was identified as a complex humanitarian emergency. In Nepal, although the Maoist have changed their strategies and tactics, they have persisted with their goals; Maoist commitment to pluralistic politics and society is far from definitive, and their future course will depend on both internal and external factors. In Indonesia last March, arrests by the police counter-terror unit netted seven detainees in Central and East Java (an eighth was killed), a huge cache of explosives and weaponry and documents that seemed to suggest a new military structure for Jemaah Islamiyah (JI).16 The DPRK, attempted to take a strategic position against the US through nuclear programs that threatened regional security and more seriously violated human rights of its people who were arrested and repatriated from Northern China, by imposing imprisonment, torture, forced labor and public execution.

People in poverty-stricken countries in Asia still suffer from malnutrition, making them susceptible to other physical risks. Extreme poverty tends to be less of a problem in Asia when viewed in relative terms, but, given the large populations, the absolute

13 Ibid., 32.
number suffering from extreme poverty is large. Thus, while China has done a remark-
able job in reducing extreme poverty, it is still true that more than 200 million can be
classified as the extreme poor. In absolute numbers, the poor in Asia can be counted
as more than 270 million in East Asia and 430 million in South Asia, all of whom are
vulnerable to drought, natural disasters and other shocks.

For over a decade, Asia has failed to immunize against many pandemic diseases,
leading some to label Asia as an epicenter of new contagious diseases, such as SARS or
AI. Current health trends indicate that human security is severely threatened throughout
Asia as well as elsewhere around the world. Over 7 million people in Asia are infected
with HIV/AIDS, and each year there are over 1 million new infections. China, in par-
cular, is of critical concern. While infection rates are still relatively low, current esti-
mates suggest that by 2010, up to 10 million people in China alone will be infected with
HIV/AIDS. An epidemic of this size, according to UNAIDS estimates, indicates that the
magnitude of resources needed to respond to epidemics in Asia will soon be equivalent
to that needed in Africa.

Heavy pollution and environmental degradation in Asia have seriously affected
the ecological balance and the industrialization and urbanization boom in the region has
resulted in a change in the global climate. There are numerous, large-scale and transna-
tional environmental issues in East Asia including yellow dust, acid rain, global warm-
ing and desertification.

Confronted with multilayered threats and violations of security aforemen-
tioned, most actors of human security advocacy must collectively discuss these agen-
das-political, socio-economic, health, environment and other relevant issues to reach
out a consensus and find a more fundamental, constructive and comprehensive reso-

IV. East Asian Human Security Regime

East Asia is a region that is haunted by a historical legacy of war and coloni-
ization. Until recently, it had little experience with cooperative measures of problem
solving or forming international agreements. As stated by Gilbert Rozman, North-
est Asia today is a case of “stunted regionalism” (G. Rozman, 2004). Unfortunately,
no counterparts or alternative entity to the EU, OAS, AU and the Arab League ex-
ists in the East Asian region. Even though the mere existence of a regional organiza-
tion is not enough to suggest an instrumental role in achieving a decline in arm con-

18 UNDP, UN Millenium Project. 2005. Investing in Development: Practical Plan to Achieve the Millenium
19 Helene Gayle, Nafis Sadik and Naruo Uehara, The Human Security Impact of AIDS and Other Communi-
cable Disease in Asia, presented in the Human Security Challenge of HIV/AIDS and Other Communique-
dable Disease: Exploring Effective Regional and Global Response hosted by Asia Society and JCIIE, on
provide a legal framework or institutional solution to appease political and military tensions within the region.

The European human security framework is equipped with a well institutionalized human rights regime. The EU has ‘a critical interest in developing capabilities to make a contribution to global human security’; it outlined seven principles for a new European security doctrine: the primacy of human rights, clear political authority, multilateralism, a bottom-up approach, regional focus, use of legal instruments, and appropriate use of force.20 Furthermore, the EU and Canada, another forefront leader of human security regimes, have pledged to work together on a broad spectrum of human security issues, e.g. co-operation on peace building and conflict prevention, issues regarding small arms, natural resources competition and economic agendas in civil wars, corporate social responsibility and the role of UN special representatives proactive-agenda setting.21

In America, OAS has shown a keen interest in discussions and agenda setting of human security. OAS identifies in its guiding principles how it shares a constructive framework of human security in full cooperation with Canada and how it should be institutionalized. Human security can also provide a template for policies in Africa. One attempt to apply it to the continent posits five conditions. The first is the shift from a personal-patrimonial to a rational-legal bureaucracy which exercises effective control over the territory of the state and results in providing order. Second is the emergence of an independent commercial class which will help to split patronage between politics (power) and economics (wealth). Third is the transformation of people from subjects to citizens by incorporating them within an inclusive ideology of nationalism. The fourth condition identifies the importance of democratization which will help to institutionalize the transfer of sovereignty from ruler to people. And fifth, because of persisting weakness of the states in Africa, the regionalization of security and development is necessary for application.22

A regional framework focused on human security issues should be established through multilateral cooperation, based on an agreement of the definition of human security and recognizing changes in human rights issues. Multilateral actors including government, inter-governmental organizations, and international NGOs must form a collaborative network to promote enhancement of human security in East Asia. Due to the region’s distinct historical, political and cultural background, East Asian countries need to establish their own institutional framework to promote human security.

By analyzing the regional features and history-stricken legacies in East Asia, it is possible to substantialize a human security framework in East Asia in three regards; multilateral approach in agenda setting, a network of leading states in governance structure, and a bottom up scheme in advocacy and awareness.

1. Multilateral Approach in Agenda Setting

The UN has continuously been advocating the importance of human security through efforts to conceptualize the concept of human rights, and continuing qualitative and quantitative research while maintaining an institutional approach. The Human Development Index, elaborated by the Human Development Report of UNDP, paved the way for a shift from interests focused on solemn state security to human security. Furthermore, in 2000, the UN supported by Canadian initiatives formulated ICISS (International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty), which aimed to address the highly complex problem of state sovereignty and international responsibility of humanitarian intervention. The Commission on Human Security, a two year ad-hoc commission, submitted a comprehensive report that includes a policy recommendation to strengthen human security.

Next on an intergovernmental level, a Track I approach focuses on inter-governmental cooperation in East Asia. ASEAN, ASEAN+3 and AFR may launch discussions regarding protection mechanisms to the extent in which to set out regional human security and human rights issues including economic security. But since a considerable number of East Asian states are not entirely free from human rights problems, there exist limitations to holding substantive discussions on an inter-governmental level.

Thirdly, the Track II approach is not played by traditional government representatives or diplomats but is unofficial diplomacy conducted through policy debates and research by academics and quasi-governmental officials. For instance, the CSCAP (Council for Security Cooperation in the Asia Pacific) presented the concept of comprehensive security in response to environmental problems, economic disparity, human rights issues in the Asia Pacific region. Also, the EAVG (East Asia Vision Group) submitted a vision report on regional cooperation that included not only economic, political and security areas, but also environmental, social, cultural and educational fields. These developments convey an important message to the effort to develop human rights in East Asia.

Finally, Track III is an approach that identifies the role of NGOs; NGOs are interwoven with governments and international organizations. This interrelationship has the additional advantage of being able to provide a new way of thinking to resolve problems that cannot be approached by the three aforementioned approaches. That Track III emphasizes the role of NGOs based on a bottom-up approach is meaningful since it suggests an effective and practical plan for the solution of human rights problems of human security within the region.

2. Metagovernance of Regional Networks

The Commission on Human Security, along with other key actors insists that the efforts, practices and success of all these various groups should be linked in national,
regional and global alliances. The goal of these alliances would be to create a kind of horizontal, cross-border source of legitimacy that complements that of the traditional vertical and compartmentalized structure of institutions and states.\textsuperscript{24}

However, due to destabilization and distraction, the heterarchy of a self-organizational governance structure can limit convergence into a unified and concerted outcome. According to Bob Jessop, given the complexity of the social world, structural contradictions, strategic dilemmas and multiple or at least ambivalent, goals, failure is a necessary outcome of attempts at coordination through the anarchy of the market force, the hierarchy of state control, or the heterarchy of the self-organization of inter-organizational relations. This highlights the role of the ‘metastructure’ of inter-organizational coordination more generally, metagovernance or, perhaps even better, collabration-governance of governance.\textsuperscript{25} For the purpose of a human security framework in East Asia, within the inter-governmental sector it is most plausible that Japan, Thailand and Korea play a coordinating role in establishing this holistic framework of human security.

Japan has been recognized as a forerunner of endorsement of human security. Japan maintains the broadest definition of human security and insists on strengthening efforts to cope with threats to human lives, livelihoods and dignity. Furthermore, since Prime Minister Obuchi announced that a Trust Fund for Human Security would be established in the UN in 1998, the Japanese government has donated more than US$297 billion which has been used to fund more than 66 projects throughout Asia. The aims of the Fund are to realize the concept of human security and apply approaches of “Protection” and “Empowerment” that are managed in accordance to guidelines agreed to between the Japanese government and the UN Secretariat.\textsuperscript{26} As such, Japan shows a profound leadership in the highest level of government, and supports result-based development programs in perspective of human security.

In the case of Thailand, it is a founding member of the Human Security Network, which is a group of like-minded countries from regions worldwide, at the level of Foreign Ministers, that maintain dialogues on questions pertaining to human security. Thailand is also looming up as an emerging donor country that places human development at the forefront of their national agenda. The 1997 Constitution placed particular importance on respect for human rights, and Thailand will be able to use the HSN as a platform to promote human rights at all levels.\textsuperscript{27}

Korea is a country that achieved democracy through mass-centered movements, by incorporating a bottom-up approach. Even today, Korea continues to take a serious position in view of human dignity and fundamental human rights. Within the context of human rights, compared to neighboring countries, Korea has achieved a significant institutionalization and coherence in the public sector, e.g. National Human Rights Commission, an independent governmental agency that monitors violation of human rights.

\textsuperscript{24} Commission on Human Security, 142-143.
\textsuperscript{26} MOFA, \textit{The Trust Fund for Human Security; For the “Human-centered” 21st Century} (Tokyo: MOFA, 2007), 5-15.
\textsuperscript{27} See at http://www.mfa.go.th/web/23.php.
and has also experienced numerous grass-root level civic movements, which suggests that an infrastructure of human security advocacy already exists within Korea. With regard to the ODA volume, US$681 billion was disbursed in the year of 2004 and nine of top ten recipient countries were located in Asia. The Korean government is planning to increase ODA to more than US$1,000 billion by 2009, which may be funded towards the purpose of human security advocacy in the region.\(^\text{28}\) Thus, Korea is expected to play a leading role in establishing a human security framework, especially within the East Asian regional regime.

Similar to the progress that Canada and Norway have achieved by signing the Lysøen Declaration\(^\text{29}\) and formalizing their commitment to promote human security in a cooperative manner, an effort to coordinate and advocate the human security movement in East Asia, through a formal or in-formal, tri-lateral agreement by Korea, Japan and Thailand will contribute towards establishing an Asian human security network.

On the level of NGOs, the 56th Annual DPI/NGO Conference for Human Security and Dignity: Fulfilling the Promise of the United Nations, held on September 8–10, 2003, recorded attendance by 2,000 representatives from more than 600 UN-affiliated NGOs in 86 countries, and shared a discussions on a wide array of human security issues-Psychological Aspects of Human Security and Dignity, Educating for a Secure Future, Sustainable Development in the Context of Globalization, and so forth. As Louise Fréchette, Deputy Secretary General of the UN stated in her opening address, “You can make an enormous contribution in helping to translate these global goals into concrete gains for people at the local level. You can also be instrumental in bringing local concerns and realities to the attention of decision makers, both at the national and global level.”\(^\text{30}\)

Active participation of NGOs and CSOs on various issues of humanitarianism, gender equality, environmental protection and sustainable development from local to global levels have made it possible to provoke state-centric internationalization, based on the power-based international regime. The emergence of NGOs is strongly associated with rising international pluralism, which puts the global community above territorial states and calls for fundamental changes in modern international order.

The significance of these NGOs is not simply that they monitor and publicize human rights abuses, but that they campaign on specific causes and, combined can form a global network of human rights organizations. With the advantage of operating on a transnational level, NGOs are able to bypass governments to establish vigorous global or regional networks of activists.\(^\text{31}\) In terms of correlations between (human rights)
NGOs and regional organizations, the most outstanding contribution of NGOs is their role of reinforcing the implementation capacity of inter-governmental organizations. As exemplified in the case of OSCE in 1993, human rights regimes in Europe, along with the U.S. and the UN, institutionally guarantee NGOs participation in these processes which tends to extend further still.\footnote{Rachel Brett, \textit{The Role and Limits of Human Rights NGOs at the United Nations}, Political Studies XIII (1995), 108-109.} Moreover, since NGOs are guaranteed to participate in the monitoring activity of inter-governmental organizations, they take part in reporting human right violations as in the case of the American human rights regimes, or indirectly participate in the implementation process by supporting the victims of human rights violations such as the UN and European human rights regimes.

Whereas the Northern NGOs have the advantage of a long historical legacy of identity and structural systems of operation, cooperation and networking amongst NGOs in East Asia are less developed. In order to strengthen the network of NGOs in East Asia, NGOs must first converge to address a unified identity and common goals. Second, expertise on regional issues must be attained. Third, the widening of networks from local and national to transnational levels is necessary. Fourth, financial resources must be secured to stabilize this network. Fifth, NGOs should be active and prepared to launch multi-layer cooperation with international organizations and INGOs. Finally, communication skills, in particular language barriers must be alleviated to provide an efficient stream of information.\footnote{Korea Institute for National Unification, \textit{Methodology of Construction of the Infrastructure for a Network amongst NGOs and Revitalization of Cooperation in the Northeast Asia} (Seoul: KINU, 2006), 251-256.}

As aforementioned, there has been consistent disagreement on notions of human security among countries in East Asia due to political, historical and cultural reasons. For this reason, NGOs are expected to play a central role in reaching a consensus on the concept of human security and in building-up a collaborative network to promote enhancement of human rights in East Asia by promoting changes in identity and interests of states which will allow the construction of a collective identity.

\textbf{V. Conclusion}

While efforts toward a conceptualization and legitimization of human security is ongoing, criticisms and rebuttals against the concept are backed by realist and state-centric regime theorists that have encouraged human security proponents to attempt to achieve a more sophisticated and plausible concrete human security theory. There has also been an ongoing debate between human security and state security as to which should be given more priority within the context of security. Fortunately, a great number of research and fact-finding efforts have been done by academia in the North. It is obvious that human security is becoming a significant agenda that must be tackled by actors in the global community.

Although human security has attracted less attention in the Asia, and while some States in East Asia may be unwilling to accept human security into their domestic poli-
cies, efforts to formulate a human security regime must be continued until any visible outcome is achieved. In order to form this type of regime in East Asia, it is necessary to focus on a bottom-up approach and emphasize active mobilization of NGOs by fully using the Track II approach. Failure of human security regimes because of the ‘dual’ nature of state functions can be prevented by diverse activities of NGOs. Furthermore, NGOs can positively contribute towards enhancing the implementation capacity of a regime. In addition to roles of NGOs, leading States that dedicate a full fledge of contributions and support, and most importantly adopt human security as a significant agenda in their foreign policy and diplomacy, must make a full commitment to coordinating the process of agenda setting and realization of a regional human security regime.

Finally, a human security regime in East Asia in the multilateral and multi-layered dimension must be established in the form of global governance. No matter what challenges and criticisms key actors may confront, holistic cooperation never fails to achieve an ultimate goal. This will shed a light of hope and vision on the human security regime in East Asia.
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