Katarzyna Podlipska  
ORCID: 0000-0003-1811-5917  


DOI: 10.12775/sijp.2020.62-63.2  

ABSTRACT  
In the second decade of the 21st century, the tension-ridden region of Northeast Asia saw intensified exchanges regarding security between its civil societies. This article focuses on the cooperation between civil societies of three island communities – Okinawa, Jeju, and Taiwan – and Just Security concept, which emerged and evolved during “Peace for the Sea” International Peace Camps held in 2014-2016. Its main objective is to clarify how the Peace Camps participants have redefined security, what influenced their security perception, and how their vision of security differs from Traditional Security – as defined by the Realists – that is prevalent in the region.  
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1. Introduction  
In the second decade of 21st century, security concerns in Northeast Asia were brought to the fore by the China’s activities on the seawaters, which include the systematic breach of the Japanese territorial waters by Chinese ships, the controversial deployment of an advanced missile defence system THAAD in South Korea amid strong objections of China and Russia, the increase in military expenditures¹, or nuclear and ballistic missile tests conducted by North Korea that prompted a direct exchange of threats between North Korean leader, Kim Jong Un, and the president of the United States, Donald Trump. The deep division of Northeast Asia into two blocks – with one being the maritime-based alliance of U.S., Japan, and South Korea, and the other being the land-based alliance of China, Russia, and North Korea – and the looming threat of nuclear war hinted that military security remains the top priority of the states.  

¹ According to Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI), the military expenditures in Northeast Asia jumped from USD 253 billion in 2012 to USD 315 billion in 2016 (SIPRI 2016).
The spike in regional tensions was followed by the intensified exchanges between the civil societies of Northeast Asia. Their drive to reconstruct security and give it a strong foundation based on people’s power and the enduring links between communities regardless of their nationality resulted in the emergence of new security concepts. The Just Security concept, which emerged and evolved during “Peace for the Sea” International Peace Camps organized by and held in Jeju, Okinawa, and Taiwan in 2014-2016, is one of them.

First, the article takes a look at the Traditional Security concept as defined by Realists. In particular, it considers the environment, ends and means of the Traditional Security and the way they are manifested in Northeast Asia. Further, it seeks to identify the origins of the Just Security concept and its evolution during 2014-2016 to clarify how the communities of the three islands have redefined security and what influenced their security perception. Finally, it compares the Traditional and Just Security concepts to determine how the vision of security of local island communities differs from the vision of security of the states.

2. Traditional Security in Northeast Asia

Traditional Security – often referred to as “state security” or “national security” in the Realist thought – was comprehensively conceptualized in the 20th century. Walter Lippmann, a journalist and an informal advisor to several U.S. presidents, such as Woodrow Wilson, provided one of its first definitions. In 1943, Lippmann (1950: 51) wrote “A nation has security when it does not have to sacrifice its core values, if it wishes to avoid war and is able, if challenged, to maintain them by victory in such a war”, pointing out the existence of external threats to the core interests of the nation and determination of the state to use force to protect them. A few years later, Harold Lasswell, American political scientist, introduced his understanding of this concept stating “The distinctive meaning of national security means freedom from foreign dictation. National security policy implies a state of readiness to use force if necessary to maintain national independence”. Similarly to Lippmann, Lasswell (1950: 50) called attention to outside threats and implied that the state is justified to use force to protect itself from them. He also specified what values are important to the state and could legitimize the use of force: these are freedom and independence from foreign rule and territorial integrity. As the Cold War progressed, new complementary concepts, such as “deterrence” and “containment,” and elements of “security” gradually emerged, leading to the more explicit interpretation of “security” in military terms (Buzan
After the dissolution of the Soviet Union, which ended the Cold War, new types of security gained attention, i.e., food, water, or energy security, but military security remained the priority.

To put it simply, Realists define Traditional Security in military terms – the state and its ability to defend itself against external threats are at the core of this concept. It consists of several other important elements (Table 1), which, as Buzan (1983: 215) postulates, can be grouped into three categories: environment (characteristics and assumptions about the world, in which states operate), ends (objectives of the national security policy), and means (techniques, resources, instruments, and actions used to implement or preserve security).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Ends</th>
<th>Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State-centrism</td>
<td>State/national survival</td>
<td>Use of force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military-centrism</td>
<td>Repelling</td>
<td>Power politics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material character of threats</td>
<td>Repelling external/foreign threats</td>
<td>(arms races, alliances, the balance of power)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability and peacefulness of the domestic political order</td>
<td>Protection of territorial integrity</td>
<td>Deterrence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>States compete for security in the anarchic world (no world government and other institutions of law and rules enforcement)</td>
<td>Protection of political independence</td>
<td>Containment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-help</td>
<td>Protection of national interests / core values</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security dilemma</td>
<td>Realization of internal and international objectives of the state</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existence of violent peace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Elements of the Traditional Security Concept
Source: compiled by the author (Podlipska 2019: 31)

How these elements translate into the security developments that could be observed in recent years in Northeast Asia? The Japanese government that was formed after the 2012 election – with Shinzō Abe as the Prime Minister – lifted the ban on arms exports, approved the right to exercise collective self-defense and started to put more emphasis on building up Japan’s military capabilities, which raised regional tensions, especially in
China. Park Guen-hye, the South Korean president elected in 2013, decided to take a harder stance against North Korea. In the long-term, her decision led to the announcement of the final agreement regarding the deployment of an advanced missile defence system THAAD reached by the U.S. and South Korean defence forces in July 2016. It prompted Pyongyang to issue threats of retaliation, while China and Russia, fearing that THAAD will penetrate their territory and gather sensitive information for Washington, strongly objected to the deployment. North Korea continued conducting tests of nuclear and ballistic missile technology in spite of the United Nations’ ban, inviting new sanctions and the charged exchange of threats – involving promises of total annihilation – between the North Korean leader, Kim Jong-un, and the U.S. president, Donald Trump. China’s aggressive activities on the East China Sea and the South China Sea, Chinese territorial disputes with neighbouring countries and Beijing’s focus on increasing military capabilities coupled with the U.S. joint military exercises with Japan and South Korea further propelled distrust between the Northeast Asian states. Increasing defence budgets, nuclear proliferation, prevailing uncertainty, and a rise in tensions prove that traditional military power does not contribute to resolving the present and emerging problems.

3. The Emergence of the Just Security Concept
The rise in tensions and intensified militarization of Northeast Asia prompted local civil societies to take action and consider the current security architecture. In particular, the residents of the three islands of Okinawa, Jeju, and Taiwan feel deeply insecure due to the strategic location of the islands and the presence of military bases and installations on their land. Concerns about the current security environment led them to join their efforts to create an alternative to security based on military power. The islanders came up with an idea to organize “Peace for the Sea” International Peace Camp to bring together activists, students, and regular people from different islands of the region with an aim to build solidarity among islands’ residents, learn and share experiences of each island’s struggle against state, corporate and military violence, rethink democracy and find ways towards sustainable peace for people and their environment. The first camp took place in 2014, in Jeju, followed by events organised in Okinawa in 2015, and in Taiwan in 2017. The initiative managed to produce a sense of unity, understanding, and trust between its participants, who shared their ideas on how to improve the situation in the region without resorting to violence and promote peaceful existence.
Through discussions, workshops, and interaction that took place during 2014-2016 Peace Camps, the activists from all participating islands agreed that the source of their insecurity is the nation-state and the military-industrial complex. They pointed out that states are the source of state violence committed against islands’ residents and other marginalized people, whose interests are often sacrificed for corporate profits. Military-industry complex, on the other hand, contributes to this violence by lobbying projects that degrade the natural environment and deprive indigenous people of their land. The participants further argued that the government and the military fuel nationalistic sentiments and distrust between citizens of neighbouring countries under the pretext of national security, creating a narrative of “the enemy,” against whom the islands should be fortified to be secure (s. “Peace for the Sea” statements 2014, 2015, 2016).

The islanders concluded that their perception of security differs from the one propagated by the nation-state. They proposed an alternative vision of security under the name of Just Security, and defined it as security that does not prioritize nation-states and military-industrial complex, but puts the citizens first without discriminating any nationality and ethnicity, affirms people’s rights to live in unpolluted environment together with their responsibility to protect the water, land, and air upon which the people depend to survive, and protects the interests of island residents – particularly women, who are vulnerable to sexual violence due to the presence of U.S. military bases, and other marginalized people (ibid. 2014, 2015, 2016).


The concept of Just Security evolved, as new elements were added over the years. They were compiled in Table 2, which illustrates how security is socially constructed by the grassroots. What are the main reasons for the concept’s evolution and its subtle changes? Four reasons can be identified: (1) changing security environment in the region, especially around the islands; (2) place, where Peace Camp was held in a given year; (3) profile of the participants; and (4) extent of accumulated experience and knowledge.

First, the changing security environment around the islands is explained, and the adjustments that occurred in “scope” and “source of insecurity” of all three peace camp editions are analysed. The first camp was held in Jeju,

---

2 Military, economic, ethnic, gender-based, and environmental violence were mentioned as part of state violence.
in 2014, where “militarization of the islands and the sea,” “military and state violence,” and “anti-democratic militarism” were identified as sources of people’s insecurity. At the beginning of the same year, China started actively building artificial islands on the reefs in the South China Sea, i.e., Cuarteron Reef, Gaven Reef, and Subi Reef, and turning them into military and logistical bases, which raised security concerns in the U.S., and, in consequence, in the region (Friar 2016). Beijing also continued its ventures into Japanese territorial waters – the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MOFA) counted up to forty-four Chinese vessels from January until the end of July 2014 (MOFA 2018) – further fuelling militarization of the sea. At the same time, governments of Japan and South Korea continued pushing for the construction of new military bases in Henoko (Okinawa) and Gangjeong (Jeju) against the will of islands’ residents. The disregard of people’s opinions by the governments strengthened their conviction that militarism is harmful to democracy and democratic processes. Crimes and acts of misbehaviour committed by the U.S. service-members proved that no islands’ resident could feel free from military violence: in June 2014, South Korean officials had to “strongly” request that the U.S. military better control its personnel, after one of its members attempted to steal a taxi, and two others were accused of “inappropriately touching female employees of a popular water park” (Rowland and Chang 2014); in the same year there were twenty-seven cases of arrest involving personnel stationed in Okinawa under the Status of Forces Agreement (SOFA) ³ (Burke and Sumida 2016).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Referent Object</th>
<th>First Peace Camp (Jeju), 2014</th>
<th>Second Peace Camp (Okinawa), 2015</th>
<th>Third Peace Camp (Taiwan), 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People (residents of the three islands – Jeju, Okinawa, Taiwan)</td>
<td>Security that: – promotes</td>
<td>Security that: – promotes solidarity</td>
<td>Security that: – promotes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People (residents of Jeju, the islands of Taiwan, and Okinawa and the other Ryūkyū Islands, including Miyakojima, Ishigaki, Yonaguni, and Amami-Oshima)</td>
<td>Security that: – promotes solidarity</td>
<td>Security that: – promotes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

³ SOFA is an agreement that sets the legal framework under which the personnel of the U.S. operates in the host nation.
solidarity between the islands;
– protects islands’ environment (land, water, air)
– protects people’s right to peaceful oceans, which are considered the common human inheritance;

(ADDED):
– ensures the right of self-determination of islands’ residents (e.g., living according to their will);
– promotes the creation of alternative political communities based on the sustainable economy, the ethics of coexistence, and people’s (islanders’) shared responsibility to preserve peace.

– creates sustainable peace in demilitarized Asia-Pacific;
– protects the people, especially vulnerable ones: indigenous people, people who live on the periphery, women;
– protects natural resources and identity (especially
| **Source of Insecurity** | - the militarization of the islands (through the construction of new military bases in Henoko and Gangjeong), and the sea - military and state violence - anti-democratic militarism | - the militarization of region (especially the islands and the sea) - state-military-industry complex - anti-democratic militarism  
(ADDED) - nationalism (negative and aggressive aspect of the concept) | - the militarization of region (especially the islands and the sea) - state-military-industry complex - anti-democratic militarism - nationalism (negative and aggressive aspect of the concept)  
(ADDED) - U.S. military and military of their own states |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Means</strong></td>
<td>Security achieved through: - demilitarization of the islands (Jeju, Okinawa, Taiwan); - restoration of all three islands</td>
<td>Security achieved through: - solidifying the triangular line of peace among the three islands (Taiwan, Jeju, Okinawa) - learning from each other's struggles and experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 The Battle of Okinawa was the last major battle of the Pacific War fought on the island of Okinawa. White Terror in Taiwan was the suppression of political dissidents that lasted from 1947 to 1987. Jeju uprising and April 3rd incident occurred on South Korean Jeju Island from April 1948 to May 1949.
| to their former existence as peaceful communities; | – promoting inter-island solidarity among their communities in Jeju Island of South Korea, the islands of Taiwan, and Okinawa and the other Ryūkyū Islands, including Miyakojima, Ishigaki, Yonaguni, and Amami-Oshima; |
| – establishment of the Demilitarized Peace Area without military bases in Okinawa, Taiwan, and Jeju. | – preserving the memory of tragedy and hardship (e.g., the Battle of Okinawa, White Terror in Taiwan, Jeju uprising and April 3rd incident)⁴; |
| | – building a strong transnational community; |
| | – putting a stop to military exercises, which escalate tensions and waste natural resources; |
| | – putting a stop to construction of new military bases and helipads (namely, the naval base at Gangjeong, the helipad at Takae, the radar base at Yonaguni, the bases at Ishigaki, Miyakojima, and Amami-Oshima, the base at Henoko). |
| Plus: the means mentioned during the First and the Second Peace Camp. | – education of the next generations (e.g., about the meaning of true peace). |
| | – participation of indigenous people in policy-making and inclusion of their ideas and expertise in attaining sustainable peace and secure humanity in national and global agendas. |
| Plus: the means mentioned during the First and the Second Peace Camp. |
In the face of the abovementioned sources of insecurity, the participants of the first Peace Camp concluded that Just Security should protect islands’ environment – land, water, air – and people’s right to peaceful oceans, as well as promote solidarity between the islands. This definition was expanded during the second Peace Camp, held in Okinawa in 2015, and included “an assurance of the right of self-determination of islands’ residents (i.e., living according to their will)” and “promoting the creation of alternative political communities based on sustainable economy, the ethics of coexistence, and people’s (islanders’) shared responsibility to preserve peace.” Similarly, “the source of insecurity” saw two additions: nationalism and industry.

The expansion of these definitions was caused by the following developments. In order to make Japan stronger, the second Abe administration led up to the adoption of war bills by the Japanese Parliament, despite massive protests throughout Japan. Shortly thereafter, in the face of continued pressure from the central government to build a new military base in Henoko, Onaga Takeshi (the Governor of Okinawa) gave a speech in front of the United Nations Human Rights Council, in which he stressed that pushing for the construction of the new base in Henoko is a violation of human rights and the right to self-determination of the Okinawan people (Wanklyn 2015). Around the same time, an Aegis destroyer entered the harbour of the nearly completed naval base in Gangjeong, Jeju, thus indicating that Jeju’s identity as the Island of Peace will soon cease to exist (Save Jeju Now 2015).

In 2016, during the third Peace Camp held in Taiwan, participants broadened their understanding of “security” by adding the following elements to the existing definition: (1) creation of sustainable peace in demilitarized Asia-Pacific; (2) protection of the people (especially vulnerable ones, such as indigenous people, people who live on the periphery, and women); (3) protection of natural resources and identity (especially of indigenous people); (4) participation of indigenous people in policy-making; and (5) guarantee of just and peaceful community life. Again, a few events spurred them to include these items. In April 2016, Gangjeong’s community kitchen faced demolition. That decision was motivated by a project of building there a four-lane entry road to the cruise terminal, which was planned to be constructed in 2017. The community
kitchen held a special meaning for Gangjeong residents and activists: it was a place, where they gathered and shared meals through their continuing struggle against base construction; some called it a “spiritual pillar of struggle”. Consequently, the loss was a serious blow to the community. The Korean navy delivered another powerful blow when they demanded U.S. $2.98 million from 116 individuals and five organizations for the delay in the construction of the base (Huh 2017). The situation in Okinawa also took a turn for the worse. In May 2016, the body of raped and murdered Shimabukuro Rina was found. Since the perpetrator was an American contractor at a military base on Okinawa and a former marine, this tragic event has reconfirmed that women are especially vulnerable to military violence. Furthermore, Okinawa’s right to self-determination was violated in July, when five hundred riot police officers from outside the prefecture came to the island to ensure that the construction of helipads in Takae is carried out without any delays. This resulted in regular confrontations between riot police and protesters. Taiwan, on the other hand, entered the path of militarization: the new government announced a policy to make Taiwanese warships domestically in order to develop the country’s military industry (PfS 2016). Lack of citizens’ inclusion in policy-making, lack of effective protection from military violence, and lack of protection of local communities led peace camp participants to adopt a broader definition of security.

As has been previously mentioned, another reason for the evolution of the Just Security concept is the place where the Peace Camp was held in a given year. Since the first Peace Camp took place in Jeju, Jeju residents (mainly from Gangjeong) were responsible for the organisation of the event, e.g., for coming up with the schedule and activities for participants, so they focused on problems they knew best. These problems included: the construction of military bases and people’s struggle to prevent it, the environmental damage caused by the bases, and other aspects of the U.S. militarism. The second Peace Camp, held in Okinawa, focused not only on the U.S. military bases, but also SDF bases on Yonaguni, Ishigaki, or Miyakojima. Participants could see with their own eyes, how the will and pleas of Okinawans to abandon the plan to construct a new base in Henoko are ignored by the Japanese central government, and how much environmental damage military bases cause. Visit to the Okinawa Prefectural Peace Memorial Museum, dedicated to the Battle of Okinawa, drew their attention to the necessity to preserve the memory of war, tragedy and hardship, and to prevent historical revisionism. Since the problems and security questions discussed during the second Peace Camp
were not limited to the main island of Okinawa, but included also smaller islands in the Ryūkyū Archipelago, such as Miyakojima, Ishigaki, Yonaguni, and Amami-Oshima, they were included in the “referent object” of the Just Security concept; the same goes for Taiwan’s smaller islands, such as Lanyu Island (Orchid Island) or Ludao Island (Green Island). The third Peace Camp, held in Taiwan, focused on indigenous people and their struggle with the central government and industry sector, which carry out projects that deprive indigenous people of their land and pollute the environment, in which they live. This led to the broader inclusion of “indigenous people” in the Just Security concept.

The next factor that influenced the process of the concept’s construction is the profile of the participants: while the first and the second Peace Camp’s participants were from Taiwan, Jeju, and Okinawa, representatives from Luzon (Philippines) and Hainan (China) joined the third Peace Camp. They contributed their ideas and stories regarding indigenous people, and created a forum that fosters understanding and solidarity between its partakers, and promotes the processes of healing from the wartime past. The “referent object” of the Just Security concept has expanded once again and included also residents of Luzon and Hainan.

The last factor to influence the construction of the Just Security concept over the years is the extent of accumulated experience and knowledge. The first Peace Camp marked the beginning of cooperation between residents of the three islands: it has laid the foundation and created a framework for further closer partnership. The next peace camps built on their predecessors, increasing participants’ knowledge and awareness regarding threats to their security and possible ways to prevent or eliminate them.

In order to actualise the Just Security concept, over the years, the representatives of three islands introduced a couple of solutions, which can be divided into two groups: (1) solutions based on undertaking certain actions, and (2) solutions based on discontinuing or restraining certain actions. The first group includes: (1) affirming the coexistence of all living creatures; (2) building a strong transnational community of friendship and solidarity; (3) preserving the memory of war; (4) expanding the peace movement and supporting neighbouring anti-war movements; (5) providing peace education to younger generations; (6) organizing Peace Island Sea Olympics to promote solidarity between islanders, and peace and security in the region (sailing race rather than arms race); (7) renaming the East China Sea into the Sea of Peace and Coexistence; and (8)
integration of indigenous people’s participation and expertise in attaining sustainable peace and secure humanity into national and global agenda. The second group includes: (1) the abandonment of forcible development; (2) putting a stop to military exercises, which escalate tensions and waste natural resources; (3) putting a stop to the construction of new military bases and helipads.

However, the most interesting idea is the creation of the Demilitarized Peace Area without military bases in Okinawa, Taiwan, and Jeju (Picture 1). Its purpose would be “the reduction of tensions in Northeast Asia and restoration of all three islands to their former long-standing existence as peaceful communities at the maritime crossroads of the region” (PfS 2015). The demilitarized peace triangle would ban armed conflict, the construction of military bases and facilities, military exercises, port visits by warships and military aircraft, the passage of ships for military purpose, and meetings for military purpose within its boundaries⁶.

The geographical scope of the Just Security encompasses the islands of Okinawa, Jeju, and Taiwan, and the sea of the Demilitarized Peace Area⁷.

---

⁶ Idea discussed during “Peace for the Sea” International Peace Camp 2016 held in Taiwan.
⁷ Jeju, Taiwan, and Okinawa constitute the core of the Just Security. While the author can be sure that these islands will continue to cooperate, she lacks the same certainty towards Hainan and Luzon, who participated in the Peace Camp for the first time in 2016.
5. Comparison of the Traditional and the Just Security Concepts
The Just Security concept introduced by the residents of the three islands presents an interesting alternative to the existing Traditional Security concept that relies on building up national power and military defence. In order to find out the main differences between these two concepts, I will compare them in five categories: 1) referent object; 2) scope; 3) actor(s); 4) means; and 5) source of insecurity (Table 3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Just Security</th>
<th>Traditional Security Concept (Realism)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Referent Object</td>
<td>People (particularly islanders, and indigenous people)</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope</td>
<td>The security that protects</td>
<td>The security that seeks to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the interests of island residents and other marginalized people, giving them priority over military-industry complex and nation-states, and ensures their rights to live in an unpolluted environment and right to self-determination.

defend states from external aggression, and one that is dependant on the state’s ability to deter or defeat such attack.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actor(s)</th>
<th>People, local governments, and central governments</th>
<th>State, with decision-making power centralized in the government</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Means</td>
<td>Security relies on the solidarity between the islands and is achieved through continuous exchange between regional communities, creation of the Demilitarized Peace Area, integration of indigenous people’s participation and expertise in attaining sustainable peace and secure humanity into national and global agenda.</td>
<td>Security relies on building up national power and military defence. The common forms it takes are alliances, arms races, the balance of power (achieved through containment or deterrence strategy).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Insecurity</td>
<td>Nation-state, military-industry complex, the militarization of the sea</td>
<td>Other states, military threats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographical Scope</td>
<td>Islands: Okinawa, Jeju, Taiwan (and Hainan, Luzon)</td>
<td>Whole world</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of Proposal</td>
<td>2014-2016 (evolving during the consecutive Peace Camps)</td>
<td>From the 16th century; conceptualized in the 20th century</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
First, the referent object – an object that is being threatened and needs to be protected – should be considered. In the case of the Traditional Security, the referent object is the state. The Traditional Security concept assumes that if the state is secure then so are its citizens, thus giving priority to the state’s interests over people. The state is eligible to go as far as to restrict its citizens’ freedoms if it deems it necessary for the preservation of national security. The Just Security, on the other hand, is people-centred; it focuses on the citizens’ well-being and the protection of their rights and freedoms, and on promoting dialogue between people and communities.

The scope of security in both concepts also significantly differs. In the case of the Traditional Security, the security seeks to defend the states from external aggression but is dependants on the state’s ability to deter or defeat such attack. The Just Security, on the other hand, focuses primarily on addressing concerns and insecurities of island communities. Thus, it seeks to protect interests of island residents and other marginalized people, prioritising them over military-industry complex and nation-states, and strives to ensure their right to live in the unpolluted environment and their right to self-determination.

In Traditional Security, the state – with decision-making power centralised in the government – was identified as the main actor that can provide security. In Just Security, however, the people were recognised as the ones who are responsible for ensuring sustainable security.

Next, the means used to implement and guarantee security should be considered. Traditional Security relies heavily on the military capabilities of the state. In order to build up military power and defence, the state invests immense amounts of money in armaments, and/or seeks alliances with other states to maintain the balance of power. Just Security is on the other end of the spectrum; it is embedded in a notion of solidarity among people and cannot be brought through force. Means to achieve this type of security include building a strong transnational community of friendship and solidarity; preserving the memory of war; expanding the peace movement and supporting neighbouring anti-war movements; providing peace education to younger generations; participation and integration of indigenous people’s expertise in attaining sustainable peace and secure humanity into national and global agenda, putting a stop to military exercises, which escalate tensions and waste natural resources; putting a stop to the construction of new military bases and helipads (PiS 2014,
2015, 2016). The islanders also proposed the establishment of the Demilitarized Peace Area – a space without military bases, which would encompass Okinawa, Taiwan, Jeju, and the sea between them. Its purpose would be “reduction of tensions in Northeast Asia and restoration of all three islands to their former long-standing existence as peaceful communities at the maritime crossroads of the region” (PFS 2015, Statement). Armed conflict, military base/facility construction, military exercises, port visits by warships and military aircraft, the passage of ships for military purpose, and meetings for the military purpose would be banned within its boundaries. Since Okinawa, Taiwan, and Jeju lie in the heart of the Northeast Asia region, creating such demilitarized space would have a positive impact on the islands and regional security.

Finally, in Traditional Security, other states, and military threats they pose, are identified as the source of the state’s insecurity. This means that every state, in the long run, should be considered an enemy or potential enemy; even if a certain state is an ally today, tomorrow it can turn into an adversary – mutual suspicion is dominant, as opposed to mutual trust present in the Just Security concept, which recognizes nation-state and military-industry complex as the source of people’s insecurity.

6. Conclusions
Someone might ask why the security concept constructed by small island communities should matter? Compared to the mainland, islands are small pieces of land, so could they influence the whole region? The answer is: yes. It is without a doubt that security of the islands and the region, where they are located, are closely intertwined. Growing militarization of the islands to prepare for the perceived threats that are posed by the other states in the region only increases the tensions. The construction of new military facilities or deployment of new types of weapons and military vehicles invites distrust and stronger feelings of insecurity, which one day could turn into an armed conflict. In such a case, the mainland would certainly try to contain the conflict in its outskirts – the islands. This is why constructing islands’ security through the means that do not encourage suspicion and distrust of other states is important (Gabe 2017: 14-18).

The residents of the three discussed islands – Okinawa, Jeju, and Taiwan – set out to jointly find the solution to security issues that plague their communities. Their long-term aim is to create an environment where everyone, regardless of their nationality, can enjoy sustainable peace without sacrificing anyone in the process. At this point, their aspirations

---

8 Idea discussed during “Peace for the Sea” International Peace Camp 2016 held in Taiwan.
Katarzyna Podlipska

seem somewhat utopian: the activists do not possess the access to the top policy-makers, thus exerting significant influence on the decision-making processes of states still remains beyond their reach. They are aware of this and, at this stage, focus on building strong transnational community and creating more aware and politically engaged citizens who would join their cause and support policymakers who share their vision. If they fail to do so, their ideas will remain just ideas.

It needs to be stressed that the residents of the islands are able to discuss such matters and actively voice their discontent and critique towards the state only because of the democratic system. The use of democratic freedoms, such as freedom of speech or freedom of assembly (including freedom to hold meetings, marches, and demonstrations) helped establish the transnational connection between the islands and enabled the construction of Just Security – concept that wants to free security from borders and territoriality, and invites people to actively participate in its construction.
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