



Demokratyczny Diament Bezpieczeństwa - budowa nowego ładu pacyficznego

Przejdź do produktu na ksiegarnia.beck.pl

Information about authors

Sebastian Bobowski is an Associate Professor in Department of International Business at the Wrocław University of Economics and Business (Poland). He's an Associate of the Cambridge Learning Gateway, member of Asia-Pacific Research Centre, PAIS, EuroSEAS and EBES, author and co-author of 11 books and 98 research papers. His research interests include international economics, regional economic integration, innovativeness of regions and enterprises.

Bogusława Drelich-Skulska is a Professor of Economics in Department of International Business at the Wrocław University of Economics and Business (Poland). She's a member of Asia-Pacific Research Centre, PTE, PAIS, EuroSEAS and EBES, author and editor of 8 books and over 100 research papers devoted to economic and political processes in Asia. Her research interests include international business, institutional economics, regional economic integration, innovativeness of regions and enterprises.

Krzysztof Falkowski is an Associate Professor in the World Economy Research Institute at SGH Warsaw School of Economics. His research interests focus on international competitiveness and innovation of economies, development economics as well as sustainable development. Studies on post-Soviet economies occupy an important place in his scientific output. His published scientific output includes over 90 studies in Polish, English and Russian. He is a member of World Economics Association (WEA), World Interdisciplinary Network for Institutional Research (WINIR), European Association for Evolutionary Political Economy (EAEPE).

Andżelika Kuźnar is an associate professor at the Institute of International Economics in SGH-Warsaw School of Economics. Her research interests focus on international economics. She has written on the international trade, trade policy, economic integration, and multinational corporations. These interests are reflected in her teaching, both in SGH and abroad. In 2018 the Polish Economic Society (PTE) awarded her with the Prof. Edward Lipiński Award for the book "Międzynarodowy handel produktami wiedzy" in recognition of bringing new value to the achievements of economics.

Jerzy Menkes is Professor of Law in the Department of Integration and European Law in SGH-Warsaw School of Economics. He is an author of textbooks, monographs, studies and articles on international public law, international institutional law, human rights, European institutional law, and international economic law. He is a President of the Polish Branch of International Law Association (ILA).

Democratic Security Diamond – construction of the new order in the Pacific region

Introduction

The world's balance point is shifting to the Pacific region. The world's balance point is located in the Pacific region. Our world has no balance point. Each of these declarative sentences can be quantified as true or false, but most of all, in the general formula, it is a truism.

In the nineteenth century, the discovery and recognition of Asian civilizations by intellectuals, people of culture, and creators raised philosophy, culture, and art in Europe to a new, higher level. The dialogue between civilizations conducted since then has been building a civilization with rich diversity. Without this discovery and the undertaken dialogue, there would be no, *inter alia*, creativity and inspiration in the art of Stanisław Przybyszewski, no pedagogy of Rudolf Steiner, no theology of Hans Küng, music of the Beatles, etc. This proves the function and importance of dialogue between cultures and between civilizations. But it doesn't prove that there is a balance point somewhere. At the same time, science, culture, and art emerged from Paris, London, New York, Berlin (during the Weimar Republic), Vitebsk (from Mark Chagall's "Academy of Fine Arts"), and from Moscow (from Mosfilm, where "Battleship Potemkin"). Reasonably, it is impossible to answer who gave more.

Just as there has been rapprochement and exchange in the field of culture, there is a need for socio-political rapprochement and exchange. The Atlantic community of states needs creation, institutionalization, and close cooperation with the community of the Pacific states. This community must be able to resist threats from counter-system states and ready to support them in building societies based on freedom, the rule of law and democracy. Otherwise, the world

will be unstable and dangerous. There will be black holes in it, places where man does not create because he is enslaved. There will be hot spots in it, radiating out to neighbors, the region, and the world. Spain, Abyssinia, Westerplatte were such hot spots, as well as Manchuria and Pearl Harbor – places where the first victims in the second part of the “great war” (1914-1945) were killed. After the end of the “great war”, global peace was established in the world divided between the east and the west. The “firewall” stretched both from Szczecin to Trieste as the “iron curtain”, and along the 38th parallel (on the Korean peninsula) and the 17th parallel (in Vietnam). There were casualties at each of these sites. What differed them was only the number of victims, but it would be neither decent nor honest to admit that the pain and suffering of some were greater or more important than others.

When the US President Barack Obama announced his “pivot to Asia”, there were concerns in Europe and other continents that he heralded a withdrawal – a reduction in US presence in these regions as a consequence of assigning the highest priority to the Pacific region and cooperation with the countries of the region at the cost of others. Today we are aware that this did not happen. “Pivot to Asia” in the European Union policies, in some EU member states (those that formulate and implement foreign policy strategies) and in the US means striving to empower Asian countries in the Pacific region in international relations. The socio-economic importance of these countries is evident at first glance. Similar evident is a lack of adequate political weight in relation to the socio-economic significance of these countries. This state of affairs affects the threats in the Pacific related to the lack of assertive reaction of the region’s states to the challenges posed by China and (to a lesser extent, but also determined by the limited potential) of Russia and other counter-system states.

The implementation of *America first* through US unilateralism in all spheres (rejection of the Paris Agreement, TPP and TTIP, questioning the rules and institutions of the WTO, etc.) during the presidency of Donald J. Trump forced to strengthen cooperation between states representing a common system of systemic values. Likewise, only transregional cooperation can be a response to the policy of Russia and China. Russia is pursuing an aggressive policy in relations with its neighbors and in various regions of the world. At the same time, China, which has turned out to be a beneficiary of “free and fair trade”, seeks to obtain unilateral benefits by abusing the rules.

In response to security challenges and striving to pursue strategic interests, states systematically build institutionalized normative “orders” in the regional environment and in the world. The declared goal of these “orders” is to achieve lasting peace, but they neither lead to this goal nor they can do it on their own.

An “order” brings stability and enables conflict management, limiting the uncontrolled use of military force. An “order” is not and does not have to be fair, but injustice is a challenge to its permanence and a source of temptation to replace it with a “new order”.

The “new order” is built by democracies in the Pacific region. Its structure reflects the level and type of security challenges associated with, *inter alia*, a change in the region’s characteristics, which ceases to be a periphery, and threats are not substitutive. The armed conflicts in the region after 1945 were *proxy wars*, now the communication routes, which are real socio-economic sanctuaries, are threatened by expansionism. As a result of internal changes, the democratic Pacific states of the region are willing and able to cooperate in an institution “like NATO” (and, perhaps, “like the EU”).

We chose this construction of “new order” in the Pacific region as the subject of our study. In the monograph, we present the results of a multidisciplinary study of cooperation between Asian countries in the region: Australia, India, and Japan, and their cooperation with the USA, the EU, and Great Britain. The study covered countries that showed readiness and ability to institutionalized regional and transregional cooperation. We focused on cooperation in the formula of the Democratic Security Diamond (DSD) institution, recognizing that the institutionalization of cooperation between these participants determines its qualitative change.

The Democratic Security Diamond is a political initiative launched by Japanese Prime Minister Shinzō Abe in 2012. It includes the democratic Indo-Pacific states of the United States, Japan, India, and Australia, forming the tops of the “diamond”. The strategic alliance of these “like-minded” nations is based on fear and the will to oppose China’s growing naval power jointly. They have not established any formal structures or concluded an international agreement on cooperation within the DSD, but they actually implement it by taking joint actions. Although the primary goal of the DSD was to ensure the protection of the common sea area stretching from the Indian Ocean to the Western Pacific, the cooperation also covers the economic dimension (alongside the political, social, and military).

However, Australia, India and Japan should not limit their role in international relations to the beneficiaries of security systems. They should develop an awareness of the subject of regional and global policy. The road to this leads through cooperation with “like-minded” states in the region and from outside the region in building a (new) architecture of social, economic, political, and military security, taking into account changes in the weights and methods of operation of states and other actors in international relations. The monograph aims

to answer the question of how the process of building such a new, multi-faceted architecture of DSD cooperation is proceeding.

In the study, we are looking for answers to the following questions: –What is the legal framework for cooperation between the parties and its prospects? –What are the potential synergy effects perceived through the prism of the opportunities derived from institutionalized cooperation? –What are the main threats to security, and what could be the joint Allies’ response to threats/challenges? –What is the socio-economic potential of Australia, India, and Japan compared to the world and their strategic allies (the EU and its member states and the USA) and strategic rivals (China and Russia)? –What is the level of economic ties between Australia, India, Japan, and strategic allies compared to ties with other partners? –What is the level of competitiveness of Australia, India, and Japan in international trade and what conclusions result from this fact for trade cooperation between these countries and the European Union?

The answers to these questions are contained in four chapters of the monograph. The first chapter, *Democratic Security Diamond – the international legal context*, is a legal study of security cooperation between DSD states and their European allies in multilateral and bilateral agreements, as well as its institutionalization in the Democratic Security Diamond (DSD). We also examined other institutions of cooperation in the region; assigning particular importance to the alter ego of the DSD – the Quadrilateral Security Dialogue (Quad). The participants of the DSD and the Quad share a community of values, goals, and functions of cooperation. At the same time, these states have not placed their cooperation institutions on a treaty basis or subjected them to the regulations of international law. We examined the legal-institutional ties between the participants of the cooperation and their evolution from the “US-state of the region” model, through group cooperation in the region, to the cooperation of democratic states in the “Pacific Bridge” formula. The starting point of the study was the finding of a progressive – systemic and systematic – institutionalization of cooperation. The thesis that the participants in the DSD have not created a bond “like NATO”, but have the will and the ability to create it, was confirmed.

In chapter two, *The Economic Foundations for Cooperation of the Democratic Security Diamond countries*, we analyzed the economic ties between cooperation partners, as well as with their strategic allies and rivals, in the context of theoretical considerations regarding the relationship between politics and the economy. We presented selected indicators of economic cooperation, i.e.: bilateral trade in total goods and services and in cultural goods and services, as well as flows of foreign direct investment. The data on economic cooperation do not indicate the closeness of such ties among the Asian DSD countries. Nor are unambiguous

and significant changes in this regard over time evident. We are inclined to conclude that the following hypothesis holds true for DSD countries: international trade (economic cooperation) reduces political conflict, or this interdependence increases international cooperation. Despite the not-so-close economic relations between DSD partners in Asia, this is a factor for stability in the region.

Chapter three, *The EU's trade relations with Australia, India, and Japan*, presents the results of a study on trade relations between DSD countries and the EU, using aggregated trade statistics for 2010-2019 as a reference. Further disaggregation of data to the level of two- and four-digit codes of the Harmonized System (HS) nomenclature was used to identify the most important assortment groups in bilateral trade flows in the analyzed period. The statistical approach to the EU's trade relations with DSD partners was complemented by an analysis of the institutional and legal frameworks embedded in the concept of trade regionalism. We also presented a case study of the automotive industry in relation to EU-Japan trade relations. The performed statistical analysis indicated the potential of trade cooperation within the range of high-technology assortments, products of the machine industry, including automotive industry, such as vehicles, their parts and accessories. On the other hand, Australia and India turned out to be primarily a source of raw materials and metals for the EU during the period considered, with a limited role of industrial products. Both countries declare their will to cooperate with the EU on a wide range of issues, including, inter alia, technology and sustainable development, therefore the potential of trade, production, investment and research cooperation in high technology industries may ultimately increase.

In the fourth chapter, *Competitiveness of Australia, India and Japan in international trade. Lessons for trade cooperation with the European Union*, we analyzed the evolution in years 2010-2019 of the revealed comparative advantage of DSD countries in international trade in goods with various levels of technological advancement. For this purpose, the logarithmized original formula of revealed comparative advantages of B. Balassa was applied.

Firstly, we defined the concept of competitiveness in international trade and discussed the research method. Then, the competitiveness of Australia, India and Japan in international trade was examined for the presence of revealed comparative advantages. Additionally, India's case has been discussed in more detail as the country was identified as the leader in international trade competitiveness. Finally, the potential areas of cooperation between Australia, India and Japan with the European Union were pointed out. The analysis shows that the most competitive country in international trade during the study period was India. In contrast, the least competitive was Australia. India's growing international com-

petitive power, as well as Japan's continued high, albeit selective, competitive position, will be a major challenge for individual member states and the European Union as a whole in the near future.

Our research allowed us to assess the power of the Asian states of the Pacific region in relation to challenges (in the sphere of security, social, political, and economic issues), indicate the possibilities and limitations of cooperation with strategic allies, and define the ability to meet the challenges of strategic rivals.

The monograph is the result of cooperation between researchers from two Polish academic centers: the Wrocław University of Economics and Business (prof. dr hab. Bogusława Drelich-Skulska and dr hab. Sebastian Bobowski, prof. WUEB) and the Warsaw School of Economics (dr hab. Krzysztof Falkowski, prof. SGH, dr hab. Andżelika Kuźnar, prof. SGH, prof. dr hab. Jerzy Menkes) implemented in the years 2020-2021 as part of the *Grant for scientific research carried out by inter-university research teams* entitled *The EU cooperation with Asian participants of the "Democratic Diamond of Security" in response to the challenges for trade and security*.

[Przejdź do księgarni →](#)



ksiegarnia.beck.pl