

В этом номере вниманию читателей журнала впервые предлагается статья на английском языке. Идея публикации оригинальных статей на английском языке витала в редакционной коллегии журнала уже давно и наконец начинает воплощаться в жизнь. Проблемы экономики Восточной Азии, в том числе в контексте интеграционных связей Дальнего Востока России, занимают особое место в редакционной политике журнала. Однако очевидно, что обсуждать проблемы международной интеграции без привлечения к дискуссии зарубежных исследователей можно только до определенного предела. Материалы на английском языке, представленные в журнале, – попытка преодоления этого предела, которая даст возможность отечественным и зарубежным исследователям вести дискуссию на площадке журнала «Пространственная экономика» на одном языке.

Открывает эту рубрику статья ученых из Сеульского национального университета Ён-Чул Ха и Бом Сик Шина. В своем сообщении авторы критически рассматривают сложившиеся научные подходы к интерпретации процесса интеграции в Северо-Восточной Азии и возникающие на базе этих подходов практические институты интеграции, а также представляют собственную концепцию такого подхода и возможный способ ее реализации на практике. Авторы обращают внимание на ряд устоявшихся и, по их мнению, ошибочных подходов и стереотипов, сложившихся в научном сообществе по поводу оценок реалий и перспектив интеграции в СВА, а также анализируют главные препятствия на пути интеграции и существующие научные интерпретации этих препятствий. В завершение авторы представляют организованный ими Консорциум строительства сообщества Северо-Восточной Азии. Следует отметить, что особое место в своей концепции институционального обеспечения интеграции в регионе авторы и участники Консорциума отводят Сибири и Дальнему Востоку России. Эти регионы они считают тем, недостающим пока, краеугольным камнем общей интеграционной стратегии, который способен в действительности, а не на словах, объединить страны СВА.

UDC 339.9

# THE DEVELOPMENT OF RUSSIAN FAR EAST AND EASTERN SIBERIA AND THE FUTURE OF NORTHEAST ASIA

**Yong-Chool Ha, Beom-Shik Shin<sup>1</sup>**

*Yong-Chool Ha* – 238 Thomson Hall Box 353650, University of Washington Seattle WA 98195-3650 USA. The Korea Foundation Professor at Jackson School of International Studies, Adjunct Professor of Political Science and Affiliated Professor of Seoul National University. E-mail: yongha5@u.washington.edu

*Beom-Shik Shin* – Professor, Dept. of International Relations, Seoul National University Kwanak-ro 1, Kwanak-gu, Seoul 151-742, Korea. E-mail: sbsrus.snu@gmail.com.

The purpose of this short paper is to introduce a new concept and way of thinking about the future of Northeast Asia in conjunction with the development of Russian Far East and Eastern Siberia. The basic arguments of this paper are: first, the specialists should shed the conventional definition of geographical boundaries, especially in defining Northeast Asia; second, Russia's Far Eastern development can make a significant contribution to the regional community building depending on how creatively and imaginatively the development proceeds; lastly, it is high time to start preparation for the future of Northeast Asia before it gets too late. In this regard, at the end of this paper the authors introduce their initial effort to establish a consortium, the purpose of which is to lay groundwork for the establishment of an institute for Northeast Asian community building.

*Northeast Asia, Russian Far East, Eastern Siberia, Nationalism, Six Party Talks, Political and Economic Integration, International Consortium.*

In what follows, we will briefly introduce the background of our thinking, discuss the challenges, the sources of pessimism on the future of Northeast Asia, and suggest new ways of thinking about overcoming the pessimism in preparation for the future of the region.

The background of what we are going to say goes back to our first trans-Siberian railroad research trip that was launched in 2000. The trip left us with strong impression in transforming views of the region and the Eurasian continent. First of all, we were shocked by the geographical proximity between Seoul and Siberia and the Far East. We realized how the division of the peninsular and the cold war caused unreal and undesirable psychological distance between Eurasian continent and Korean people. But more importantly we were greatly impressed with the people who lived along the trans-Siberian railroad; they were not only friendly but also devoid of any ethnic

biases. Also, we realized the TSR (Trans-Siberian Railway) was much more than simple transportation means; it was not only an iron ribbon that integrates the vast Russian territory but also an important cultural conduit, which brings fresh air into the region from the outside [3].

Of course, we cannot deny how richly endowed the region is with energy and other natural resources. We still recall one of local officials bragging that “we have everything” when we asked him about natural resources. But what distressed us was the obvious poverty of thought behind this apparent natural abundance, which showed the lack of consideration for the people living there. The alienation of the people from the resources forced us to think about the future of the region from the people’s perspective.

Our visit to the Shanghai market, a makeshift bazaar in a corner of the city of Irkutsk, was another eye opening event which led us to think about the future of the region. Literally it was a chaotic scene where hundreds of small makeshift shops displayed various fake goods for sale, and the premise was full of people of various ethnic origins who were scrambling for survival. We saw both hope and despair. Despair because it was so unruly and under the table deals were rampant. Hope because we saw the liveliness and passion for survival among different ethnic groups. We were truly struck by the spontaneity of transactions without much official cooperation or involvement. We thought, would it be an exaggeration if we say that there, we saw a seed for Eurasian common market?

Our training background in political science with the heavy dose of realism has been an intrinsic barrier to grasp the dynamics in Eurasian continent. Reading research on Eurasia has not been too much helpful either as most of the time the focus is on Sino-Russian mutual suspicion. Our idea of Northeast Asian community building came into being with this backdrop. But we found that in and out of the region there exists too much pessimism about the idea at the present time. In fact, the sources of pessimism are so diverse and pervasive that we decided to clearly state them and to have a critical look at them before designing any positive blueprint or vision for the future of the region.

## **MISPLACED COMPARISON AND ACADEMIC PESSIMISM**

Most frequently cited among the sources of pessimism in Northeast Asian community building is what is lacking in Northeast Asia in comparison with Western Europe and EU. In fact, it would not be an exaggeration to say that the comparison of Northeast Asia with Western Europe sums up all the sources of pessimism in building a Northeast Asian community. Most frequently mentioned differences between Europe and Asia are the extent to which historical problems are resolved, the degree of common cultural heritage and the intensity of nationalism. Before

addressing each of these differences, we would like to make a general observation about the comparison.

First of all, it is understandable to make a comparison between the two regions as a way of highlighting similarities and differences. Europe has achieved EU, a regional entity which the rest of the world cannot even dream of achieving, and thus becoming the target of envy. Nonetheless, what is problematic is why, what and how to compare Europe and Northeast Asia. Most of comparative observations end up with citing the differences, which implies that East Asia or Northeast Asia may not become like EU. Repeated observations without any further conceptual and theoretical breakthrough in how to approach Asian way of integration have given rise to pessimistic tendencies in Asia.

More often than not, however, the base for comparison is also problematic. By comparing the present EU with the present situation in East Asia, or by sometimes superficial comparison, either relevant lessons are not derived or unnecessary contrasts and differences are highlighted. One of the examples is the misunderstanding of EU as a consequence of economic integration. Although it is true that economic consideration has played an important role in the integration of Europe, it is equally true that the importance of security concerns and institutions cannot be easily ignored. Neglecting this aspect leads to the consequent point that the effect of economic integration spills over into the security areas, a typical functional argument. This economy-based understanding of EU integration is blind to the origins of EU where acute awareness of the remilitarization of Germany was an important motive behind ECSC.

Furthermore, the mechanical juxtaposition between Europe and Asia in terms of differences usually leads to the institutionalization of security talks in Europe, such as NATO and CSCE without considering intricate interaction between security and economics in the process of integration. Such superficial comparison does not provide an accurate understanding of European experiences. More importantly, it does not render helpful lessons for Asia which is faced with complex problems of interaction between security and economics.

Understanding the backgrounds of the beginning of the EU in terms of security dimension is urgently needed. It is necessary because the original intention for European integration was more than just economic in nature. Or the consideration of security dimension was an essential part of the whole scheme, not just hoping that economic factor would lead to European integration. In addition, the role of security institutions in the process of integration needs to be further examined in details, so that implications for East Asia can be more clearly learned.

Another serious consequence of misplaced comparison of the present Europe and the present Asia is related to understanding of the nature of regional order in East Asia. East Asian or Northeast Asian regional order is characterized as being

hierarchical, lacking the real sense of sovereignty, and as composed of unequal alliance systems. To understand the trajectory of East Asia order, it is more productive and useful to compare the evolution of the European order right after the Westphalia treaty in terms of the process of socialization of the notion of sovereignty at both elite and mass levels. The transition from the hierarchical Holy Roman Empire to the differentiation of nation states could be more relevant to East Asia in terms of the diffusion of the idea of sovereignty and equality among nations.

Our position is that, misplaced comparison between Europe and Asia has not helped in producing new hypotheses, puzzles, and questions to better understand the future of East Asian region.

The current status of research on East Asian regional order has reached the point where differences from Europe and uniqueness of East Asia have been frequently laid out without much conceptual breakthrough. It is largely due to misplaced and superficial comparison with Europe, but more importantly, it is related to the current level of educational training and professional inertia.

It is well known that the major feature of East Asia is the divergence between increasing spontaneous economic interaction among the member countries of the region and the stalemate situation in security and political areas. No tangible clues and suggestions have been reaped from the comparison between EU and East Asia largely because we did not raise the right question or knew the reasons for such comparison. It looks as though we compared the two regions to end up being all the more pessimistic about the future of East Asian regional integration.

What reinforces this situation is our training bias. We seldom read studies on East Asian regional integration without references to realism, liberalism and constructivism, the three main streams in the present international relation theory field. Different views have different emphasis on the utility of these theories in approaching East Asia, but what they have in common is the confusion between theories built and theory building. Realism is limited in understanding increasing economic interactions; liberalism is faced with the challenge of ever increasing military build-up along with multiplying economic relations, and constructivism is tantalizingly confusing in linking ideas with reality. What the current theories cannot provide is a guide to understanding the complex interplays between security and economics. It is well-known that in Western social sciences international theories have long been separated from international political economy. That is why in most studies economic interactions are dealt with separately from security matter, and even when they are mentioned together, the link is not clear. In short, we are not professionally equipped to deal with the complex interplays between economics and security. This professional blindness is perhaps related to the superficial comparison as mentioned above.

Mechanical application of three theories does not help us in formulating new

questions related to and understanding East Asian region, as they are theories already built with limited utility. This is why most security studies look more like foreign policy studies.

A similar point can be made with regard to cultural homogeneity and nationalism issues. Sharing common cultural and religious roots by the way of Judeo-Christianity and Roman legal tradition are frequently cited as facilitators for European integration. But it is never clear how, when, and to what extent same cultural roots worked. Here we do not think that cultural factors were not instrumental. Rather our point is that the explanation is flat and leaves us nowhere. As with general approach to culture, cultural factors should be approached and understood in specific institutional contexts to see how cultural factors operate in conjunction with given tasks.

The message is not to say that comparison is not useful but how to use the comparison. Clear and detailed demonstrating of the role and influence of cultural commonality in the process of European integration is necessary to help us understand the East Asian situation better, either in the direction of finding different paths or of cultivating common cultural capital. Superficial and perfunctory comparison between Europe and East Asia should not be the basis for a source of pessimistic assessment of the future of East Asian integration.

## **CHALLENGES OF THE RISING NATIONALISM**

A rampant nationalistic fervor in East Asian countries is viewed as a serious barrier to building Asian integration. Various types of nationalism have been mentioned.

Some of the examples are defensive nationalism, historical nationalism, and sentimental nationalism. Study of nationalism has become labeling game without much substance. Aggressive nationalism, state nationalism, open nationalism and the list goes on. Frequently survey results are used to justify certain labels. Despite labeling different types of nationalism emerging in East Asia and many studies which address the issue of nationalism, no real progress in understanding the nature of nationalism in the region has been made in terms of sources of different types of nationalism, the levels and dynamics of nationalism.

Frequently cited sources of East Asian nationalism are not that much different. Historical memory, stage of economic development, and international events and situations are mentioned along with usual sources like culture, language and race. What is lacking is the general understanding of distinctive economic and social changing patterns in many of the countries in the region due to their late coming in industrialization and development. More specifically, the process of how different sources affect the character of nationalism is not clearly analyzed in most studies. For example, it is generally assumed that successful economic development boosts the morale of the people, which is likely to manifest in the form of aggressive nationalism

or, a strong desire for recognition. This observation may not be terribly wrong, but what is problematic is the lack of understanding of the process of industrialization and economic development in terms of its impact on nationalism. In the case of South Korea, modes of economic development brought about distinct ethos and world outlook. Korean people had to compete on international market through export for their survival. It was based on fierce competition. But internal modes of operation to compete on international market were based on various forms of favoritism, which they want to hide from the outside. This aspect cannot be simply labeled as defensive; it is more of a sense of shame, and it has nothing to do with what outsiders might do. The point is not that our observation is exhaustive or final; rather it is that we have not been careful in analyzing and understanding delicate and complex psychological dynamics in the course of late industrialization, which most Asian countries have been undergoing [1; 5; 6].

Related to this is the level of nationalism. Once again in the context of state-led development, whether socialist or capitalist in form, elite perceptions of the outside world and manipulation of masses are crucially important in understanding the nature of nationalism and its dynamics. Whether there is congruence or divergence in defining national identity and perception of the outside world is essential in projecting the future path of nationalism in any country. Further, identifying patterns of distribution of nationalistic feelings among different group or individuals is essential in predicting the future of political and social changes. But the current research is not clear on how different types of nationalism are distributed to what kinds of groups, or whether any single group or individual can embody different types of nationalism altogether simultaneously. In short, we should know how different sources of nationalism coexist together. Also, we are not clear about the different developmental stages of nationalism. If it is safe to assume that everything goes through cycles, nationalism is no exception to the assumption. European experiences of nationalism can be analyzed to better understand East Asian dynamics. Finally, developmental patterns of nationalism need to be closely compared among Asian countries in an effort to formulate strategies for regional community building. Different nationalistic orientations of sub-national groups in different countries will be extremely useful in thinking about possible cooperation and coalition. Most importantly, however, we are lacking a macro view of how the cultural background, historical issues, nationalism and others interact with each other.

## **OVER-EXPECTATION OF THE SIX PARTY TALKS**

It is well-known that security institutions are scarcely developed in East Asia. A rough count of the number of programs, initiatives, and institutions in economic and security areas in East Asia clearly shows how security is falling behind economic

areas. Roughly there are 32 in economic area in contrast to only 12 in security areas. Among the 12, AESEM, ARF, the Korean Peninsula Energy Development Organization (KEDO), APT, NEACD, and the Six-Party Talks exemplify frequently mentioned security-focused institutions in the region. The ARF is an offshoot of ASEAN and KEDO has long been dead.

The inter-changeable use of the term “East Asia” and “Northeast Asia” itself is a sign of the lack of clearly identifying what is feasible and possible, but more importantly, it reflects long time outsourcing of issues facing Northeast Asia to ASEAN. We do not have any intention to degrade the achievements of ASEAN at all; simply we want to highlight how the lack of initiatives and active discussion in Northeast Asia has led to outsourcing the field of discussion to ASEAN from Northeast Asia.

The Six-Party Talks is the only functioning security mechanism in Northeast Asia which has been struggling with North Korean nuclear issues. It is only natural why hope is high for the Six-Party Talks to develop into a permanent security institution in Northeast Asia. In 2007, five working groups were organized to discuss energy, future security mechanism in Northeast Asia and other bilateral relations. On the surface, this is a new development and significant in several respects. First of all, all the major powers in the region are participating in the Six-Party Talks, which in itself is quite unusual. Secondly, it has been dealing with non-proliferation and denuclearization issues, a serious security matter, which is truly a global concern. More specifically, the Six-Party Talks focuses on economics-security linkage in that North Korea would get energy supply in return for giving up its nuclear programs. All these have significant implications for the future of institutionalization of Northeast Asian security [2].

However, its significance has been seriously diluted, if not almost lost, due to the conference fatigue, serious internal differences and most importantly, the recent development of North Korea’s nuclear and its missile tests. This leaves Northeast Asia without any functioning institution which addresses the future of the region. With ever flaring up nationalism arising from territorial disputes and historical legacies, Northeast Asia must stop outsourcing its own issues outside and seek for new ways to discuss its own future.

## **INVENTING A NEW NORTHEAST ASIAN CO-LIVING SPHERE**

Northeast Asia conventionally has been understood as an area, which covers China, the Korean peninsula, Japan, and Mongolia, though this conventional definition does not have anything to do with specific goals for community building. We propose a new definition of Northeast Asia: Rather than uncritically following a conventional geographical or geopolitical definition, we can have flexible definitions



of conventional understanding of areas or regions. A new definition will include Russian Siberia and the Far East, Northern China, the peninsula, and Japan.

This new definition is not a political one although we may work out a series of political agreements to make it a reality. The definition comes from the recognition that Russian Siberia and the Far East can be integrated into the conventional Northeast Asian region in economic, social, and cultural arenas.

Rather than simply exploiting Russian resources we should be able to envision the future where Russian Eastern Siberia and the Far East will develop concurrently with cooperation with the rest of Northeast Asia. It is our contention that Russia's Far Eastern development process can make a historic contribution in creating a new co-living sphere in Northeast Asia if it is creatively and imaginatively implemented. In this regard, recent efforts of Russian government to develop the Zabaikal area, especially the Far East, are very stimulating for promoting regional cooperation. First, such developments will endorse Russia's smooth entry into Northeast Asia as well as promote Russian assets to play a constructive role within the region. Second, this development project offers an opportunity to gain economic benefits not only to Russian Federation and its Far East, but also to the individual regional states including North Korea. Third, due to its regional resources and geo-economic position, this development plan can also provide a great chance and venue for promoting Northeast Asian regional cooperation in various fields [4].

However, the specifics of the Russian Eastern Siberia and Far East development can be worked out by considering many factors at a common institutional space which will be discussed below. Suffice here to mention the general principles that the development should follow.

Firstly, the plan needs to be comprehensive: In most cases, development plans of sectors have been discussed in isolation from each other. For instance, energy development has been treated on its own without reference to the overall socio-economic and cultural development of Eastern Siberia and the Far East. The overall goals of economic, social and cultural development of the region need to be clearly set first, and each sector plans should follow from them, including energy. This way, energy development and infrastructure plans (e.g., transportation) can be a part of overall social and economic development, not as a mere target of exploitation by major multinational energy companies.

Secondly, the plan should be balanced in several respects. First, the interests of the Center (Moscow) and the local (Siberia and the Far East) need to be balanced. Second, there should be a balance between domestic and international balance. Third, a balanced participation needs to be established among international participants.

Thirdly, the political and security concerns of Russia should be heeded. Security implications of economic actions need to be considered.

Fourthly, the strong role of the state at the domestic level in developing Siberia and the Far East coexists with liberal trade with the outside world.

Finally, demonstrate serious intentions by providing detailed plans on goals and implementation. There is room for Russia to learn from developmental experiences of China, Korea, and Japan.

## **CONSORTIUM FOR NORTHEAST ASIAN COMMUNITY BUILDING**

Based upon such considerations as discussed above, we took an initiative in organizing an international consortium to provide an intellectual space for those who share common concerns for the future of Northeast Asia as a region. Launched in March 2011, the consortium for Northeast Asian Community Building still is a very young institution but has made more than modest progress. The members of the consortium represent five nations in the region except for North Korea, and the membership is open in the future. All the members shared the current situation in Northeast Asia where there does not exist any institutional space for the discussion of the future of the region. They also shared the view that the development of Eastern Siberia and the Far East should not be approached as a stepping stone for the development of Northeast Asian community building rather than as a target for resource competition. They expressed the desire that the development of Eastern Siberia and the Far East can provide opportunities to learn, to coexist among the countries concerned.

Since the first meeting, two more conferences have been organized in Beijing and Moscow in July and November 2011. In the Beijing conference, discussions focused on future institution building for Northeast Asia and strategies on how to use APEC as a venue to promote the consortium's ideas. Further details about the same agenda were discussed in the Moscow conference in collaboration with Asia-Pacific Section of Russian International Affairs Council. A report was prepared to Russian government on how to prepare APEC summit in 2012 and the basic strategies for the development of Eastern Siberia and Russian Far East.

Again, the Consortium is still a young institution, and its achievements are modest with a lot to be done in the future. However, most significant is the fact that it was able to make a fresh start in establishing an episteme community among those who share common interests in thinking about and preparing for the future of Northeast Asia by setting a new direction and strategy.

The Consortium is designed to be a time-bound institution. Its life will reach the limit when it succeeds in accomplishing two important tasks among others. One is to promote to the region and the world, the importance of and strategies for how to link the development of Eastern Siberia and the Far East with a view of establishing a co-living sphere and eventually Northeast Asian community, and the other is to

prepare a permanent institutional design which will be responsible for tasks related to Northeast Asian community building. The goal of the Consortium is to put these agenda for inter-governmental discussion to reach an agreement on the vision for the future of the regional community building.

As a step to realize the above goals, the Consortium is planning to convene its fourth meeting in the second part of this year. Specifically the meeting will be devoted to reviewing the current status of the developmental plans for Eastern Siberia and the Far East from the perspective of regional economic cooperation and security implications and to further consolidating the Consortium by expanding its membership.

Recent developments in North Korean nuclear issues and territorial disputes in the region certainly are not positive signs and they may further fan cynicism and pessimism regarding the future of the regional cooperation. However, it is our firm belief that now is the time for us to start serious dialogues to prepare for our better future. Rather than being wrapped up into academic pessimism, it is time to start a genuine and practical new thinking. Here it is worthwhile to ponder on the father of the European Community, Jean Monnet's remarks: Nothing is possible without leadership, nothing is lasting without institutions... [Institutions] make men [and nations] work together, show them that beyond their differences and geographical boundaries there lies a common interest.

## REFERENCES

1. Ha Yong-Chool, Lee Wang Hwi. The Politics of Economic Reform in South Korea: Crony Capitalism after Ten Years. *Asian Survey*, 2007, no. 47(6), pp. 894–914.
2. Ha Yong-Chool. North Korea's Brinkmanship and the Task to Solve the "Nuclear Dilemma". *Asian Perspective*, 2010, no. 34(1), pp. 87–109.
3. Ha Yong-Chool. *Russia's Choice at the Crossroads*. Seoul National University Press, 2006.
4. Shin Beom-Shik, HaYong-Chool. *Russian Nonproliferation Policy and the Korean Peninsula*. Seoul National University Press, 2007. 46 p.
5. Tracey Richard S. Using the PATRIOT Act to Turn North Korea's Dirty Money into a Bargaining Chip. *Strategic Studies Quarterly*, Summer 2009, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 124–140.
6. Walton, Jonathan. *Chinese Nationalism and its Future Prospects* (An Interview with Yingjie Guo). 2012. Available at: <http://www.nbr.org/research/activity.aspx?id=258> (accessed 21 March 2013).

## РАЗВИТИЕ РОССИЙСКОГО ДАЛЬНЕГО ВОСТОКА И ВОСТОЧНОЙ СИБИРИ И БУДУЩЕЕ СЕВЕРО-ВОСТОЧНОЙ АЗИИ

**Ён-Чул Ха, Бом Сик Шин**

*Ён-Чул Ха* – адъюнкт-профессор политологии и аффилированный профессор Сеульского национального университета, профессор в Школе международных исследований Джексона (Корейский Фонд). Университет Вашингтона, а/я 353650, Томсон холл, 238, г. Сиэтл, США, WA 98195-3650. E-mail: yongha5@u.washington.edu.

*Бом Сик Шин* – профессор, кафедра международных отношений. Сеульский национальный университет, Кванак-ро 1, Кванак-гу, Сеул 151-742, Республика Корея. E-mail: sbsrus.snu@gmail.com.

Целью данной статьи является представление новой концепции будущего Северо-Восточной Азии в увязке с развитием российского Дальнего Востока и Восточной Сибири. Основные положения данной работы следующие: во-первых, специалистам следует избавиться от традиционного определения географических границ, особенно при определении Северо-Восточной Азии; во-вторых, необходимо учитывать, что развитие российского Дальнего Востока может внести существенный вклад в создание регионального сообщества, в зависимости от того, насколько творчески и изобретательно подойти к процессу развития; наконец, следует осознать, что пришло время «подготовить почву» для будущего Северо-Восточной Азии, пока не стало слишком поздно. В связи с этим в конце статьи авторы представляют результаты предварительной работы по созданию консорциума, цель которого – формирование основ для учреждения института по построению североазиатского сообщества.

*Ключевые слова:* национализм, шестисторонние переговоры, политическая и экономическая интеграция, международный консорциум, Северо-Восточная Азия, российский Дальний Восток, Восточная Сибирь.

### СПИСОК ЛИТЕРАТУРЫ

1. *Ha Yong-Chool, Lee Wang Hwi.* The Politics of Economic Reform in South Korea: Crony Capitalism after Ten Years // *Asian Survey.* 2007. № 47 (6). Pp. 894–914.
2. *Ha Yong-Chool.* North Korea's Brinkmanship and the Task to Solve the «Nuclear Dilemma» // *Asian Perspective.* 2010. № 34 (1). Pp. 87–109.
3. *Ha Yong-Chool.* Russia's Choice at the Crossroads. Seoul National University Press, 2006.
4. *Shin Beom-Shik, HaYong-Chool.* Russian Nonproliferation Policy and the Korean Peninsula. Seoul National University Press, 2007. 46 p.
5. *Tracey Richard S.* Using the PATRIOT Act to Turn North Korea's Dirty Money into a Bargaining Chip // *Strategic Studies Quarterly.* Summer 2009. Vol. 3. № 2. Pp. 124–140.
6. *Walton Jonathan.* Chinese Nationalism and Its Future Prospects (An Interview with Yingjie Guo). 2012. URL: <http://www.nbr.org/research/activity.aspx?id=258> (дата обращения: 21.03.2013).