地域情報研究：立命館大学地域情報研究所紀要
5: 133-137 (2016)

■論　文

Constructing an "Energy Security Community" in Northeast Asia: Energy Security Dynamics in the NEA Regional Security Complex

Takehiko Yamamoto*

Abstract: The theoretical framework of resource geopolitics including energy geopolitics is presented in relation to classical paradigm of political realism in international relations theories. Then, current situation of energy demand and supply in Northeast Asia is briefly discussed in terms of increasing economic developments and energy shortage of many countries in this region. Finally, the need for building an energy security community is examined from the perspective of avoiding a kind of zero-sum game between and/or among the countries in the region.

Keywords: resource geopolitics, energy security, security community

Ⅰ. Resource Geopolitics and Energy Security

Ⅰ.1 Energy Geo-politics and Security Dilemma

Generally speaking, the national security policy of any sovereign state has been based on the need for self-preservation. As well known, this principle has been insisted by the realist school of international relations for so long time. This principle, as a matter of course, connotes the escalation of conflicts over national security interests with other rival sovereign state(s). John H. Harts named this escalation of conflict as "security dilemma" between and/ or among these sovereign states.[1)]

In other words, it means the typical case of escalation of "prisoner's dilemma" between and/or among conflicted states over national security interests. [2)] This connotation may be also applied to the pursuit of economic security policy by any sovereign state. If and when it pursues selfishly its economic interests vis-à-vis any other country, this selfish policy might lead to counter measures by other sovereign state. These actions would lead to "economic security dilemma" between and/or among them.

By the same token, If and when a country pursues its own selfish policy of energy supply vis-à-vis any other country, this policy would bring about counter energy-supply policies by other countries; that is to say, it might lead to not only "energy security dilemma" because it might raise, between and/or among related actors, but also to "dilemma of interpretation and response"[3)] to one actor's energy supply policy and actions.

This dilemma was clearly illustrated during the first energy crisis of 1973-1974 at a time when the Organization of the Arab Petroleum Exporting Countries (OAPEC) had decided to prohibit to

* Senior Researcher, The Research and Development Institute of Regional Information, Ritsumeikan University

export crude oil to any country which supported and had friendly relations with Israel. The consumer countries which imported crude oil from the member states of OAPEC, like Japan and West European countries, were forced to compete harshly and keep in check with each other in order to get energy resources as much as possible. The dynamics operated during the process was the feeling of suspicion and bogie between and/or among them.

Ⅰ.2 Geopolitics in the Sovereign State System

Geopolitics means the general policy framework of national security of one nation-state in the sovereign state system (in the international system). Resource geopolitics including energy geopolitics had been the basic ideology of policy-making for the strategy of obtaining natural resources since the early 19th to 20th century,; especially the competition and the strategy for expansion of the colonial empires by the Western powers including the United States.

The geopolitics of Germany, specifically during the inter-War period, exemplified the rudimental features of resource geo-politics. The famous notions, “Lebensraum” and “Autarkey”, developed by Karl Haushofer who was the father of the Munich School of geopolitics was the typical example of the day.[4)]

Even now, a number of countries have been pursuing the basic policy of this old type of resource geopolitics. The major powers of both Western camp and the former Soviet bloc had harshly competed each other over natural resources in the Middle East and other third world regions. After the end of the Cold War, all of the major powers have continuingly endeavored to get their own bases of such natural resources as crude oil and natural gas. One of the examples of conflict and competition among the major countries has been over around the Caspian Sea area. As well known, the European countries, China and Japan have been deeply involved in the development programs around the Sea, although Japan had been forced to withdraw from the big national project of the development of the Azadegan oil and natural gas field by the strong pressure of the U.S., on the one hand.

On the other hand, China has been deeply committed to get the new resource bases around the Caspian Sea, in the Central Asia, in Mongolia, Latin America and Africa by using the huge amount of economic aid and investments. This Chinese ambitious attitude for obtaining the important energy resources should be said as encirclement dynamics of important energy resources. Even in the early stage of the 21th century we are continuingly facing with the geopolitical interactions over natural resources among major powers.

Ⅱ. Constructing an “energy security community” in NEA

Ⅱ.1 Energy Security Dynamics in the NEA Regional Security Complex[5)]

Here we might be possible to make two basic questions. First, energy resources could be the possible “collective international public goods”? [6)] Second, energy resources might inescapably continue to “private goods” of individual nation-state in the sovereign state system?

In the military field, we have often used the terminology of “international public goods” in the alliance system like the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. However, even in the energy field, we looked at some cases such as International Energy Agency(IEA) established after the first oil shock during 1973-1974 at a time when the West European countries and Japan had experienced the hard economic lives for a half year.

In a sense, it might be said that the IEA was built based on the idea of “International economic public goods,” particularly because the developed countries which have not enough energy resources could be dependent on emergency supply by the IEA. It should be said that the idea of “international economic public goods” is almost similar to the idea of economic “collective security.”[7] By the same token, we will be possible to call an “energy collective security” architecture (or system) in a particular region like in Northeast Asia. In other words, energy resources are not only “private goods” of each nation state, but also would be “international public goods”, so far.

In fact, at a time when Japan and Western Europe were largely dependent on supply of crude oil produced by the members of the Arabian Petroleum Exporting Countries (OAPEC) were heavily shocked by total embargoes of oil by them. Through the lessons of this heavy shock, they decided to build a new mutual help system in such emergency case after the first oil shock .Owing to this emergency supply system, these advanced countries were able to overcome the second oil shock during and after the Iranian Revolution in 1979.

In East Asia, year after year, energy demand has dramatically increased mainly due to rapid economic growth of the related countries. Especially Chinese economic jump-up since the early 21th century and China will continue to be leading country for tremendous economic and societal developments in East Asia. In addition to Chinese rapid economic development, India will more develop its economy and as well as the ASEAN countries. As a matter of course, total demand of energy will dramatically increase in the foreseeable future.

According to the IEA’s forecast, in primary energy demand of 2035, China will be the main driver of increasing energy demand in the current decade, but India takes over in the 2020s as the principal source of growth.[8] So, China, then India, will drive the growing dominance of Asia in global energy demand & trade. As for India, she is set to contribute more than any other country to the rise in global energy demand over the next 25 years, underlining its ever-greater influence in East Asia and on the world stage; even so, its energy demand per capita in 2040 would still be 40% below the world average.[9]

Ⅱ.2 ASEAN’s Challenge to Construct the Economic Security Community

In addition, we need to look at current dynamics of economic and societal integration among 10 member countries of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN). As well known, ASAN has just started to build “the ASEAN Economic Security Community” from December 2015. In other words, this means that ASEAN tries to establish an economic “collective security” system in the ASEAN region. Originally, the concept of “security community” in international community

had been developed by liberal institutionalists like Karl Deutsch in the 1950's.[10)]

This concept had been applied to the integration process in Western Europe since the European integration started in 1952 when the European Coal and Steel Community was established. Since then, Western Europe has succeeded in establishment of economic security community. Therefore, when we looked back the successful story of European integration, it should be said that ASEAN's current experiment to build the economic security community is 'revolutionary' attempt in a sense that ASEAN challenges to overcome the negative constraints of geo-political interactions in the economic field.

Conclusion

Since December 2005 when the first meeting of the East Asian Economic Summit (EAS) was held, the members of the EAS increased year after year. However, non-the-less, the arguments for building an economic (including energy) collective security" system or an "economic security community" have not yet emerged in any meeting. Whoever did not take initiative for that purpose, personally, I would like to propose the Japanese government should take this initiative primarily because Japan has ever been avoid of self-supply capabilities of conventional energies.

In this context, Japan should also take an initiative for Mongolia to enter into the framework of energy and trade interdependence mechanism in the EAS as well as the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC). Mongolia has big potentiality of resource development and energy trade capability, so that she could play an important role in the regional framework of Northeast Asia as well as in the Asia Pacific. As for Japan, Mongolia would be the reliable partner in terms of energy supplier and trade partner.

[Notes]

1) John H. Hertz, "Idealist Internationalism and the Security Dilemma," *World Politics*, Vol.2, No.2, January 1950, pp.157-180.
2) As for the theory of prisoner's dilemma, see, Robert Axelrod, *The Evolution of Cooperation.* (New York: Basic Books), 1984.
3) Ken Booth, *The Theory of World Security.* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 2007.
4) Regarding the geopolitics of Munich school, see, Holger H. Herwig, "Geopolitik: Haushofer, Hitler and Lebensraum," in Colin S. Gray and Geoffrey Sloan, (eds.), Geopolitics, *Geography and Strategy.* (London: Frank Cass), 1999, pp.218-241
5) The academic idea of regional security complex has been developed by the Copenhagen school of International relations headed by Barry Buzan and Ole Waever. See, Barry Buzan and Ole Waever, *Regions and Powers; The Structure of International Security.* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 2003. Security community means a set of nation-states whose major security perceptions and concerns are so interlinked that their security problems can't reasonably analyzed and resolved apart from one another.
6) Here, the notion of "international public goods" will be used in the conceptual framework

developed by Mancur Olson. See, Mancur Olson, *The Logic of Collective Action: Public Goods and the Theory of Groups.* (Harvard University Press), 1971.

7) See, Joseph S. Nye, Jr., "Collective Economic Security," *International Affairs*, Vol.50, No4, October, 1974, pp.586 ff.

8) IEA, *World Energy Outlook*; 2013

9) IEA, *India Energy Outlook*; *World Energy Outlook Special Report*, 2015, p.11.

10) See, Karl W. Deutsch, et.al, *Political Community and the North Atlantic Area: International Organization in the Light of Historical Experience.* (Princeton: Princeton University Press), 1957.

[References]

Axelrod, Robert, *The Evolution of Cooperation*. (New York: Basic Books), 1984.

Booth, Ken, *The Theory of World Security*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 2007.

Buzan, Barry and Ole Waever, *Regions and Powers; The Structure of International Security.* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 2003.

Deutsch, Karl W., et.al, *Political Community and the North Atlantic Area: International Organization in the Light of Historical Experience.* (Princeton: Princeton University Press), 1957.

Hertz, John H.,, "Idealist Internationalism and the Security Dilemma," *World Politics*, Vol.2, No.2, January 1950, pp.157-180.

Herwig, Holger H., "Geopolitik: Haushofer, Hitler and Lebensraum," in Colin S. Gray and Geoffrey Sloan, (eds.), *Geopolitics, Geography and Strategy.* (London: Frank Cass),

Nye, Jr., Joseph S.,, "Collective Economic Security," *International Affairs*, Vol.50, No4, October 1974. 1999, pp.218-241

Olson、Mancur *The Logic of Collective Action: Public Goods and the Theory of Groups.* (Harvard University Press), 1971.

北東アジア・エネルギー安全保障共同体の構築に向けて
―北東アジア安全保障複合圏内でのエネルギー安全保障力学との関連で―

山本　武彦

【要旨】本稿では、エネルギー地政学を含む資源地政学の理論枠組みが現実主義国際政治学との関連で論じられるとともに、北東アジアにおけるエネルギー需給関係がこの地域の国々の急速な経済発展に伴い逼迫している状況が描き出される。最後に、エネルギー資源獲得をめぐる競争がゼロ・サム・ゲームに陥ることを回避するための方策として、この地域の諸国間でエネルギー資源を共有し合うエネルギー安全保障共同体を構築することの必要性が論じられる。

【キーワード】資源地政学, エネルギー安全保障, 安全保障共同体