A Study on the Establishing Alternative Security System in Transition Order

Moon Ye Chan[*]

KDI School for Public Policy and Management,
Sejong, South Korea

Abstract: This paper proposes an alternative security system in the international community. The U.S.-China trade war and the scrapping of the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) treaty have intensified the global hegemonic war. The international community faced a transition order, promoting the emergence of a new multi-polar system. As a result, security concerns in each country were increased, especially a new arms race for nuclear power began, and the nuclear deterrence regime is collapsing. A new security dilemma is about to emerge. Since the treaty on nuclear weapons has been scrapped, armed war is worth considering. In the transition period, a new order should be prepared to replace the INF treaty and realigning a perspective of international politics. The research adopted a qualitative approach such that the data is retrieved through journal articles, monographs, and reports. This research analyzed the limitation of the existing security system through papers and empirical evidence. This paper suggests the peace-building process through the ASEAN Regional Security Forum (ARF). The forum covers Asia, Europe, and America, and it is the only multilateral security consultative group in which North Korea participates. By expanding ARF, unilateral diplomacy based on each countrys interests can be prevented; moreover, ARF can establish an alternative security system that neutralizing hegemonic war. Ultimately, ARF should connect the Nuclear Weapon Free Zone on each continent by establishing Free Zone in Northeast Asia. Focusing on the value and role of ARF, the current study provided a new aspect of accessing international peace security and rendered valuable suggestions for policy-makers.

Keywords: US-China trade war, security dilemma, security system, ARF, INF

I.   INTRODUCTION

The international community has been effort to build a nuclear deterrence. The U.S. and the Soviet Union signed the INF Treaty, contributing to restrict the possibility of nuclear proliferation and armed conflict. But in February 2019, the United States announced its intention to withdraw from the INF treaty. There was a rift on the formation of international consensus for nuclear deterrence. In addition, August 2019, Russia also announced to agree to drop out the treaty, which led to complete abrogation. INF treaty was signed in 1987 and curbed the nuclear arms race on the international society, especially between the United States and the Soviet Union. Treaty established the gradual peace process and further contributed to the end of the Cold War (Detente). It could assess as a peace treaty in the aspect of protecting mankind from nuclear weapons and lowering the possibility of accidental nuclear war.

However, denounced treaty greatly affects to stable international community, shaking the peaceful condition. China's move to form a new multi-polar system against the U.S. leading arms race. In particular, as the treaty expires, it deepens security instability on neighboring countries located around the United States, China and Russia. Also, the existing alliance can be deteriorated or destroyed, implying the possibility of change on rela-

---

[*]Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Moon Ye Chan, KDI School for Public Policy and Management, Sejong, South Korea. E-mail: ans3981@naver.com

tionship among countries. In other words, the increasing armaments could deepen the dependency between countries including subordinated relationship. Representative example is the situation on northeast Asia, especially the Korean Peninsula. The deployment of a U.S. nuclear strategy is being considered and fracturing an U.S.-South Korea alliance [1, 2].

U.S.-China hegemonic war also a significant indicator that threaten the peace on Korean Peninsula as well as the international security system that the international community has established for long time.

Now we need a new perspective to access on international politics. International politics led by United States is turning into an American first. The interests of the United States are considered as the first priority rather than peace and stability of the entire international community. And various side effects are occurring accordingly. Therefore, this paper seeks to propose method to protect the international community from U.S. priority and suggest a new regional security system for the denuclearization and peace of the world. In particular, this paper proposes a new international security system to replace the INF treaty by coming up with a new international consultative body that can deter the U.S.-China hegemonic war and contribute to peaceful international community. This paper aims to propose a peace road map of the international community by presenting solutions to security instability that the international community may face in the future. Furthermore, trying to expand a consultative group of ASEAN to replace the U.S.-led multilateral cooperation system.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

The study of the security system has been actively studied in terms of international politics and regional security. However, it has often been limited to political factors such as ideology. In particular, period-specific factors such as the post-Cold War period strongly influenced the research, and less research was conducted to connect up with the present generation. In the case of ASEAN, where this paper concentrated on, most of the studies have focused solely on the effects of the ASEAN region and have failed to lead to expansion to other regions. Even if extended to areas outside ASEAN, it was only Southeast Asia and East Asia [3, 4]. Some studies showed a transnational approach but were limited to economic agendas and not done in terms of security and peace [5]. Thus, this study will contribute to complement existing limitation that previous research showed and will expand ASEAN topic as a transnational and beyond-ideology in order to construct international peace.

III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The research will be carried out through qualitative research such as papers, monographs and reports. This research will analyze the limitation of existing security system through papers and empirical evidence. Focusing on the value and role of ARF, this paper will provide the new aspect of accessing international peace security. In particular, suggests the transition of ASEAN Peace Community with the simulation of the denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula. Also, this paper contains research methodology as proposing hypothesis to investigate the relations between internal peace and expansion of ARF.

IV. CURRENT STATUS OF INTERNATIONAL SECURITY SYSTEM

A. North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)

The NATO is a security system launched in April 1949 with the North Atlantic Treaty. It is a security community of Western European and North American countries started with 12 member countries, including the United States, Canada, Belgium, and France. Since its foundation, NATO has succeeded in encompassing the counties of former Soviet Union with the entry of Czech, Hungary and Romania, and has formed a large collective security system. NATO has had a series of changes in the characteristics of its detailed strategy and organization purpose due to historical factors such as the Cold War period and ideological conflicts. However, it has served as an effective security regime by continuing to discuss security policies among member states and maintaining joint military exercises [6].

NATO had complex goals and corresponding characteristics according to its initial task of responding to communism. It can be assessed that the NATO aimed to win the ideological confrontation by assuming security targets such as U.S., Germany, and the Soviet Union. The purpose of NATO's establishment was "to keep the Russians out, the Americans in, and the Germans down." Meanwhile, NATO sought to seek a new reason for existence as the identity of the organization became unclear after the end of the Cold War. Although it was launched for collective defense, NATO existence value has weakened as the Detente started. In particular, the new international environment of post-Cold War has created a variety of new security issues, threatening the security activities of NATO [7]. In the end, NATO embraced the security environment of its member states in the transition order and the security environment, transforming it into a organization for an extended range of security as well as undergoing various characteristics changes to maintain

the appropriate form of security regime.

B. *Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE)/Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE)*

The Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE), which encompasses both communism and liberalism, began in 1975 with the Helsinki Final Act. In January 1995, the CSCE was institutionalized and renamed it as the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE), leading to a huge security regime involving North America, Europe and Asia [8]. It is striving to come up with sustainable dialogue and joint norms, dealing with various fields, including economy and environment, as well as politics and military. The Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe aims for comprehensive security and seeks cooperation at various levels, away from ideological confrontation. There was OSCE experts talks on various agendas, including environment, cultural heritage and human rights, and focus on conflict prevention and crisis management [9]. OSCE can be assessed to be approaching fundamental security beyond the political factors by applying the concept of common security. In particular, it puts forward a comprehensive agenda, accessing with universal and humanitarian aspects, as it adapts to changes in the international political environment due to historical factors [10].

C. *Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO)*

The Shanghai Cooperation Organization was launched in June 2001 and is a security system with six countries including China, Russia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan and Uzbekistan. Following the declaration of the Shanghai Cooperation Organization decision, the Shanghai Convention was concluded to eradicate terrorism, separatism and Islamic fundamentalism [11]. Since its foundation, it has focused on cooperation in the security sector, covering not only traditional security areas such as border stability but also non-traditional security areas such as terrorism, separatism and fundamentalism. On the other hand, the Shanghai Cooperation Organization also regularly conducted joint military exercises with member states. However, observation of exercises only allows for member states and observer states not for other Western countries. Through military training, the SCO can be assessed to include the content of military assistance and to be pursuing a higher level of security cooperation in the future [12]. In addition, the SCO seeks to expand into economic cooperation and can be seen from the launch of the SCO Business Council, the SCO

Inter-Bank Association [13].

V. REALIGN THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIETY THROUGH ARF

So far, the security system has shown limitations in terms of the range of member states, key agenda and sustainability. First of all, the western security system often consists of European countries and restricts other countries' participation. Meanwhile, system centered around China and Russia, has also continued independent security cooperation, disallowing observation of western countries. This practice can be said to be linked to ideology, and the confrontation between liberalism and communism in the past applies to the current type of security system.

Next, the agenda of the security system is often regional, or narrow-minded in ideology and security. Border and military agendas are the main issues, as the scope of member states is limited to neighboring countries, and transnational agendas are rarely dealt with. Of course, it also covers universal agendas such as the environment and human rights, but this is often a conditional agenda that takes place after security cooperation precedes, and even if implemented, it is often temporary [14, 15].

Biased agenda are linked to the sustainability of the security system. In the case of NATO, after the end of the Cold War, it took time to find a new identity, which eventually resulted in an expansion of security, leading to no agenda shift. Thus, in order to elicit cooperation and support from the international community, it must be able to encompass a variety of member states, and the agenda must be universal and linked to the interests of various countries. In this case, sustainability could be secured to form a community beyond the security system. In this respect, ASAN Regional Forum offers great implications.

ASEAN Regional Forum could create an "ASEAN Peace Community, APC" by harmonizing cooperative security and collective security. In short, the ASEAN Peace Community has formed the U.N. Security Council in line with ASEAN's circumstances. It suggests ways to overcome the limitations that the U.N. Security Council has and ways to co-exist with the international society and ASEAN. Below, this paper proposes a way to develop a community that gaining fully supported by the international community.

First, we should overcome the limitation of U.N. Security Council in order to establish sustainable community. The U.N. Security Council consists of permanent members and non-permanent members, and all international exercised by the U.N. are carried out with the consent of the Security Council. The permanent members

are the United States, Britain, France, Russia and China, with the non-permanent members having a two-year term as a total of 10 countries. The permanent member has the Veto right, or veto power, and if any of the permanent members veto it, the agenda will be rejected even if all countries agree. This privilege has intensified the competition for hegemony in the international community and has caused side effects of power being concentrated in certain countries. In particular, agenda items directly related to the interests of permanent members are often put forward, and the relatively overlooked 'Asia-Pacific agenda' and 'ASEAN agenda' are often excluded.

To realign the international society through ARF, we should solve a problem of the Veto right. If the veto held by the permanent members of the U.N. Security Council is applied to the ASEAN Peace Community as it is, it cannot induce even participation from all countries. In addition, the names expressed as permanent and non-permanent members are being abused by countries as a means of 'creating power' and cause discrimination between countries. First of all, we need a device to deter decision about specific country's interests. Therefore, the ASEAN Peace Community wants to change the name to "negotiating countries" and "cooperating countries," respectively, and form different negotiation and cooperation countries each time depending on the subject. The countries and partners are a relative concept and can become partners of the negotiators is a separate subject of specific topics. The partners in cooperation with the negotiations, referring to the countries is not a subordinate concept of the negotiations.

Negotiating countries are total of five countries, Three Countries accounted for three different continents and two countries from ASEAN. This helps to prevent collusion among ASEAN countries with similar interests. In addition, Veto right cannot be used alone by a single country in the peace community. It can be using their veto power be the consent of the majority of the negotiating countries. Meanwhile, more than two of the five negotiating countries must be the directly related to the issue or case, with the other being elected through a vote in the ASEAN Regional Forum. The Cooperating countries has a total of 10 countries to the international community as a whole. Each two countries from ASEAN, Europe and Asia (including Oceania), and four countries from America continent (North America, Central America, South America).

VI. SIMULATION OF THE DENUCLEARIZATION OF THE KOREAN PENINSULA THROUGH THE ASEAN PEACE COMMUNITY

Based on the afore-mentioned negotiating and cooperating countries, the ASEAN Peace Community addresses the agenda for the denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula. First of all, the negotiating countries are Malaysia and Vietnam among ASEAN countries (pretend those two countries are selected by process). Other two countries should be the directly related to the agenda, such as South Korea and the North Korea. Th last negotiating country will be selected through the election, and this simulation assumes Japan.

Negotiating countries were selected as Malaysia, Vietnam, South Korea, North Korea and Japan, and their cooperating countries will be elected through an election in ASEAN Regional Forum. This simulation randomly selected Laos, Singapore (ASEAN), China, New Zealand (Asia), Germany, United Kingdom (Europe), the United States, Guatemala, Brazil and Jamaica. When the ASEAN Peace Community is formed, the agenda for the Korean Peninsula is addressed by 15 countries. Unlike the U.N. Security Council, it can contain the voices of countries alienated from the international community, including Jamaica, Guatemala and Laos. In particular this community contribute to make a security consultative group between powerful and developing countries.

TABLE 1
SIMULATION OF THE DENUCLEARIZATION OF THE KOREAN PENINSULA THROUGH THE ASEAN PEACE COMMUNITY

	Country	Continent, Major role	Expectation
Negotiating country	South Korea	Directly related to the agenda, seeking consensus while emphasizing one's interest	Prospecting Korean Peninsula Relations in the International Community; Eliciting comprehensive agreement and international support
	Vietnam	ASEAN, Explaining agenda	Retaining the experience of unification, providing implications for the unification of the Korean Peninsula
	North Korea	Directly related to the agenda, seeking consensus while emphasizing one's interest	Prospecting Korean Peninsula Relations in the International Community; Eliciting comprehensive agreement and international support
	Malaysia	ASEAN, Explaining agenda	Select the main agenda for denuclearization on the Korean Peninsula
	Japan	elected country, Selecting agenda	Providing a reasonable agreement
Cooperating country	United States	America, Provide a way to cooperate	Eliciting specific agreements on denuclearization agenda
	Guatemala	America, Provide a way to cooperate	Presenting a Direction on the denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula
	Brazil	America, Provide a way to cooperate	Provide a way about the Inter-Korean Exchange and Cooperation
	Jamaica	America, Provide a way to cooperate	Propose the Inter-Korean Cooperation Plan
	China	Asia, Provide a way to cooperate	Increase China's chances of changing its stance on the Korean Peninsula that maintaining a tough stance
	New Zealand	Asia (Oceania), Provide a way to cooperate	Propose the Inter-Korean Cooperation Plan
	Germany	Europe, Provide a way to cooperate	A country that experienced unification, conveys lessons and implications for the reunification of Korea
	United Kingdom	Europe, Provide a way to cooperate	Propose the direction on the Improvement of Relations between US and North Korea
	Laos	ASEAN, Provide a way to cooperate	Suggesting Improvement of Inter-Korean Dialogue
	Singapore	ASEAN, Provide a way to cooperate	Suggesting the direction of the US-North Korea negotiations

VII.   CONCLUSION

The abolition of the INF treaty has intensified the global hegemonic war. The U.S. has called for China's participation, emphasizing a new arms control treaty, and a new multi-polar system is about to emerge. In particular, a new arms race for nuclear power began with the development of ultra-high-speed missiles, and the nuclear deterrence Regime which has been building since World War II, is collapsing. In addition, for the expansion of the interests of the superpowers, the deployment of tactical nuclear and missile weapons to neighboring countries is being considered. Before the rest of the world, participate on the arms race and accelerate the destruction of international community, a new security system is needed

to rearrange the international order.

This paper proposes the ASEAN Peace Community and presents effective solutions to the resolution of international security issues, including the denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula. The ASEAN Regional Forum is efficient in improving the North Korean nuclear issue and inter-Korean relations. Also, it can create a new order in the international community centered on diplomacy with ASEAN or middle power. As shown above, the ASEAN Peace Community is strengthening its legitimacy as a regional security system by comprehensively embracing the international community. In particular, it can gain multilateral support for denuclearization and peace on the international society.

The ASEAN Peace Community can grow into an international security consultative group that deals with issues in the Asia-Pacific region, and further the world as a response to global hegemony returning to the U.N.-centered, western states. If we work with ASEAN to promote middle-power diplomacy and build up the ASEAN Peace Community based on it, we can reshape the new international order, not accelerate the nuclear arms race. It is time to break away from the U.S.-led international order and practically complete denuclearization and peace on the world.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

There are no financial or non-financial conflicts of interest in this work.

REFERENCES

[1] A. Lanoszka, "The inf treaty," *Strategic Studies Quarterly*, vol. 13, no. 2, pp. 48–67, 2019.

[2] S. H. Lee, "A new security threats and transformation of NATO in the 21st century: The analysis of 2010 NATO strategic concept," *Journal of National Defence Studies*, vol. 54, no. 2, pp. 91–116, 2019.

[3] C. K. Byun, "ASEAN way and the regional security in Southeast Asia: Accomplishment and problems," *Korean Journal of Political Science*, vol. 17, no. 2, pp. 165–187, 2009.

[4] D. W. Ohn, "ASEAN and the security and coopera-

tion in East Asia," *Southeast Asia Journal*, vol. 21, no. 3, pp. 253–281, 2012.

[5] S.-H. Kim, *The Success or the Failure of North Korean Denuclearization and Its Impact on Northeast Asian International Relations*. Seoul, South Korea: Korea Research Institute For Strategy, 2019.

[6] J. Duffield, "The north atlantic treaty organization: Alliance theory," in *Explaining International Relations Since 1945*, N. Woods, Ed. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 1996.

[7] J. J. Mearsheimer, "Back to the future: Instability in europe after the cold war," *International security*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 5–56, 1990. doi: https://doi.org/10.2307/2538981

[8] S.-H. Lee, "Recomposition of UN security council and qualifications of its permanent member," *The Journal of Political Science & Communication*, vol. 17, no. 2, pp. 113–130, 2014.

[9] G. C. Gwon, "Overcoming of the cold war system and the lost decade of the collective security: A critical reconstruction from the perspective of peace research," *The Korean Journal of International Relationship*, vol. 42, no. 3, pp. 29–51, 2003.

[10] K. O-Yoon and S. Ding-Chang, "Preconditions for a cooperative security regime in Northeast Asia," *Peace Studies*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 59–95, 2007.

[11] A. J. Bailes, P. Dunay, P. Guang, and M. Troitskiy, *The Shanghai cooperation organization*. Solna, Sweden: SIPRI, 2007.

[12] M. d. Haas, "The peace mission 2007 exercises: The Shanghai Cooperation Organization advances," Defence Academy of the United Kingdom, Tech. Rep., 2007.

[13] B. Lo, *Axis of Convenience: Moscow, Beijing, and the New Geopolitics*. Washington, DC, WA: Brookings Institute Press, 2008.

[14] J. V. Anderson and A. J. Nelson, "The inf treaty," *Strategic Studies Quarterly*, vol. 13, no. 2, pp. 90–122, 2019.

[15] U. Kühn and A. Péczeli, "Russia, NATO, and the INF treaty," *Strategic Studies Quarterly*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 66–99, 2017.