

Session II Cluster 1 Transcript

Moderator

Feng Zhu

Participants

Dipankar Banerjee
Ajin Choi
Malcolm Cook
Ralf Emmers
Kiichi Fujiwara
James Gannon
Brad Glosserman
Qingguo Jia
Roy Kamphausen
Santosh Kumar
Nikola Mirilovic
T.J. Pempel
Srinath Raghavan
John Ravenhill
John Schaus
Andrew Shearer
William Tow
Fu Xiao
Tadashi Yamamoto
Daqing Yang

This product presents
speech transcript deli-
vered at the MASI 2010
Annual Meeting.

The East Asia Institute
909 Sampoong B/D
310-68 Euljiro 4-ga
Jung-gu
Seoul 100-786
Republic of Korea

© EAI 2010

www.eai.or.kr

MacArthur Asia Security Initiative 2010 Annual Meeting

Session II. Cluster Discussion Cluster 1. Regional Security Cooperation

August 6, 2010

- **Date:** July 8, 2010, 14:00~15:20
- **Venue:** Grand Ballroom, Westin Chosun Seoul

Moderator: Feng Zhu

Please take your seat. At this session we have a couple of subjects we need to just go through. First of all, I'd like to invite all cluster members research institutions to give us brief introduction of what your research project is and how it's going on. Second, we also need to spend some time discussing the format of next year's annual meeting of MacArthur Asia Security Initiative. Because next year, it's my turn to host annual MacArthur's Asia Security Initiative conference. It's also the last year of the first three year in a research project. So we need to think about in what format, such cluster-based collaboration and cooperation are moving and going successful. Another thing is for us to need to discuss with all of you here is that next year in Beijing, we also need to consider some sort of such a cluster-based research proceedings, another sort of such a proceeding we can set up, I think that each of cluster member institution also doing a very great job by proceeding with individualistic project. Next year, we can, not just get in together here, maybe in some way, we can put our research outcome together and make it, for example, published in some way and also produce some sort of piles of compacts. That's why I need your suggestions and advice, how next year's Beijing MacArthur's annual conference could be going in a way not just efficient but also productive. The third one is, the progress of individual research institution-economic cooperation in this con-

based research work must sort of help, and assistance you expect from others that also give us chance to exchange the views, and also we can discuss, for example, into a lot of such conferences, facilities, venues, logistical organizations, some sort of visiting fellowships, any sense like that so we can exchange the view and that sort of collaboration also can be variable among us. So first of all, let's just start out from the first subject, and maybe we can have some sort of brief introduction of your project maybe we can start from General Banerjee. Please.

Dipankar Banerjee

The project that the Institute of Peace and Conflict Studies has undertaken is a part of an ongoing dialogue regionally addressing Asian security issues. And here, our project focuses on developing India, China, and the other nations, and there is a developing framework for regional cooperation in Southern Asia. As was discussed in the earlier session, China-India relationships not only in Asia but also in the world. Second importance perhaps is to China-U.S. relationship. If there are issues between China and India, which has impeded cooperation, and created conditions for instability, potentially in the future, and therefore, we address the issues of instability and develop a framework for cooperation. So, it has a three-track approach, one is developing and enhancing military confidence building across the unsettled border in India and China. Second is developing border-free relationships to introduce a degree of

Of course, India-China trade is develop-

ing in a different dynamics that does not need to be addressed in a security framework, but the border trade does. And the third part of the project is developing border infrastructure for making it possible for greater cooperation between the two regions. The project partner in this project is Fudan University of Shanghai, and for each of the three separate projects we have different partnering institutions in China, in Beijing and in Yunan. I have a full list of these participants etc., of course I'm not going to details of that, the military confidence building measures dimension of this project. We held a conference in Beijing, in March of this year. It prepared peoples from India and China, addressing all issues of potential military conflict between the border countries. Participants were at a senior level, from senior officials, major research personnel from universities, leading think tanks, institutions from Fudan University, but the researchers from China and India came from other leading universities and institutions in respective countries. The next phase of the announcement of the border trade and developing border infrastructure is ongoing, and it will be developed during this year, and we held a planning meeting in Singapore, addressing planning agenda for all the separate issues, and processing and progressing the research into these areas at the present moment. We'll bring them back for discussions and independent research on all the issues, and then further build up on the second and third year into a final output. I'll discuss the details of the other dimensions that the chair mentioned, separately once we've discussed other issues regarding the projects that others are undertaking individually. Thank you.

Moderator: Feng Zhu

Ok, great. Thank you General Banerjee. So, Ajin?

Ajin Choi

Ok, I'll introduce our project overview and objective of our project and then also what kind of achievement we have made so far. Yonsei Graduate School of International Studies submitted two-year research proposal entitled "Cooperation in Northeast Asia: Architecture and Beyond," in

collaboration with the UC San Diego, on global conflict and cooperation and University of Tokyo. We have three objectives: first, we aim to publish the English and Korean volume based on our project findings and results by the end of 2010. Second, we propose to publish two Northeast Asian security initiative policy brief, each in 2009 and 2010 for policy makers in the relevant ministries and agencies. And third, Yonsei also proposes to host the training workshop in the summer of 2010, inviting national security and foreign policy makers, analysts, academics and journalists across the region.

Next, I'll introduce what we have done in 2009. First, we actually held an international conference on cooperation in Northeast Asia architecture and beyond in June 30th and July 1st in 2009. The conference had four sessions and three to four scholars presented in each session and this was followed by discussions by the scholars from various academic institutions and government officials from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade of Republic of Korea and embassies from Japan and the U.S. And second, based on the participants' presentation and discussion during the conference, a policy brief has been prepared but not yet printed due to the final process of reviewing and editing. Although the brief does not reflect every view of the individual members, it represents our best collective views and opinions, the policy brief aims to provide the overview of the current challenges and huddles facing Northeast Asia security. Third, we made progress in publishing volumes in Korean and English. The Korean volume has been approved by the Yonsei University Press this year, and we also have been discussing the publication of the English volume through the leading publishing policy in the U.S. Fourth, we also supported, hosted actually, Young Leader's Conference in Seoul in May 29th and June 2nd in 2010, and the conference was designed to provide participants with the valuable opportunity to understand the regional environment, identify security challenges in Southeast and Northeast Asia and discuss the confidence building measure in the region. This is what we have done in 2009, and then as a future plan we have a second international conference on the same topic, but we did it in

June this year, and then actually in this conference aims to review and update how much papers submitted at the first conference in 2009 have been developed and articulated. Also, Yonsei GSIS hosts the workshop for the national security and foreign policymakers, analysts and academics, actually we held this conference, no, the workshop from June 16th and 18th this year. And third, the policy brief too will be published in winter of 2010, based on the policy brief of 2009, and this brief will provide the overview of the regional security environment challenges and issues including recent developments in the Korean peninsula. Fourth, during the second international conference, we discussed how we can publish the books in detail, and lastly, actually we have a plan to have a collaborative road show, actually collaboration with the IGCC, UC San Diego and University of Tokyo. And then we plan to conduct a collaborative road show in November 2010 in Beijing, Seoul, Tokyo and Washington, D.C., and the road show has the objectives of sharing our academic findings with the scholars, politicians and government officials and public at large and then make most conceptual and practical suggestions throughout the dissemination of the policy brief of 2010. Thank you.

Moderator: Feng Zhu

Thank you, Ajin. Malcolm?

Malcolm Cook

I might first set out a little bit about our approach to the project overall in philosophical terms, and as a starting point, really our project is what I'd call "cautiously pessimistic," we're very much focused our work on shifting power balance in Asia and the policy choices that flow from those shifting power balances. So our analytical starting point is that there are good reasons why security institutions in Asia are underdeveloped as we all know they are—we talked a lot about that this morning in our group—and we look really at why are there the limits to cooperation that are imposed by those competitive dynamics. What we are trying to do is that not to be too bleak in our assessment of Asia's future but rather to ground our

work in a realistic appreciation of what sort of cooperation might be possible and again, that goes back to functional approaches to institution building. From that charting exercise, what we hope to do is identifying different ways of building confidence, and different mechanisms for ensuring those competitive dynamics don't spill over into conflict, and we can do that by looking at a series of domains and I'll speak more of that in a bit. Our work recognizes the growing importance of non-state actors, and non-traditional security threats. But our central focus is very much on the state-to-state interactions and hard power competition in East Asia. The underlying logic, if you like, is that power leads to order, leads to institutions, rather than the ...

So far we have completed two major projects. The first of these was released last November, and it's a poll, and quite an unusual one I think, of Chinese public attitudes to security questions. Now the poll addressed threat perceptions and Chinese public attitudes to a range of countries and threw out some very interesting results. For example, we found that when asked to rank safe and security threats, the Chinese public was very focused on internal, non-traditional threats, so the biggest identified threat was in fact environmental challenges including climate change, the second greatest surfaced threat was issues around food and water security and immediately after those considerations, people started to raise some of the more traditional hard power threats from the state actors. We've found that very interesting and hope others will find it useful, too. The other dynamic that I think came through very strongly from the poll was a generational gap in perceptions in China. It was interesting that slightly older generations of Chinese people took the view that generally China's power was receiving due respect in the international community, they were more likely to focus on emerging internal threats whereas we found a very striking evidence that younger Chinese people were tended to be more nationalistic, tended to be more preoccupied with external threats and in particular more likely to see the U.S. as a threat and also less likely to think that China was getting appropriate respect in international system. Again I think a very interest-

ing finding.

A second major paper we've produced so far, released just last month in June, was a paper called "Power and Choice," this lays out alternative Asian security futures, we look at four possible future security orders. The first one is the continuation of the U.S. primacy, the second one is the emergence of more dynamic balance of power system in Asia, and the third one is a concept of great powers, and the fourth one, which we think is perhaps more distant, is the possibility of a system based on Chinese primacy. This paper focuses very much on shifting great power dynamics, but we emphasize throughout the paper the importance of choice, that's what's in the title at point here is that the short term decisions that the great powers make in particular but also other powers in Asia are going to be very important short-term decisions made often in crosses, conditions based on imperfect information but also longer term decisions, longer term shaping decisions that we all make of the next ten to fifteen years is going to be very important in determining which of these futures come to pass. Our analysis is not deterministic; we have identified a number of shocks, variables that could make one of these futures more likely than the others, I won't go through those in detail but they are covered in our paper. We launched that paper in Canberra but we also had a very useful workshop in Singapore after Shangri-La Dialogue with about forty regional experts to talk about that paper and it was very healthy debate and a place to sow a good deal of disagreement with some of the conclusions and we look forward to taking that discussion on the dialogue with colleagues. In terms of our next steps, we have launched a series of short crisp papers that recalling strategic snapshots. These are going to focus on the first instance on different regional reactions to the Power and Choice paper, and some of the other dynamics around Asia's emerging security order, and we are going to develop a series of in-depth papers looking at competition and confidence building across a range of domains, domains like the maritime one obviously an important one in Asia, energy, nuclear, cyber, and space. I think those are the main ones. That's basically the outline of our work over the next year.

Moderator: Feng Zhu

Ralf?

Ralf Emmers

Thank you. At our sides we have two programs. We have one which is led by my colleague and friend, Mely Anthony, she is in the next room, and then we have this program that focuses specifically on the emerging security architecture in Asia. But perhaps in contrast to other studies presented and discussed today, our point of departure is actually Southeast Asia. Because we focus on the role that the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) has been playing but also could be playing in the future, in drafting and formulating the security architecture. So as a result, we focus on four different themes, we start by looking at developments within Southeast Asia when it comes to regionalism and integration, with a particular interest on the Asian security community, making the argument that ASEAN is going to only have a voice in the wider region if it indeed succeeds in establishing a security community in Southeast Asia itself. The second theme, then, addresses ASEAN's role, a driving role, we'd like to think, in organizations or institutions like the ERF, the ASEAN+3, and the East Asia Summit, so what kind of influence ASEAN has been playing in those areas, how was the ASEAN way been applied in those institutions. The third theme focuses on the potential institutionalization of great power relations in East Asia and again, examining the role that ASEAN has been trying to play, for instance, through the formation of the ERF in the early 1990s, but even today with this ASEAN + 8 notion, the role of ASEAN being the organization that brings together great powers to address some of the most pressing issues of the time. And finally, the fourth theme looks at alternative forms of leadership in regionalism in East Asia, looking increasingly, at some point we were giving a lot of attention to the Kevin Rudd initiative, we may have to drop that part. So the Kevin Rudd initiative, Hatoyama Trilateral Summit, what do they mean for ASEAN, what do they mean for the role ASEAN can play

in the region. Briefly summary of activities, well, we have managed to come up with twelve researchers, who are hopefully writing papers as we speak, we had our initial conference last year in November, but we in fact have our second major conference in about ten days in Singapore, and this will then be followed by a series of roundtables, organized in Jakarta with CSIS Jakarta, one in Canberra, and our host will be the ANU, and thank you again very much for that, and the third one in Beijing in the Spring of 2011. In terms of publications, we so far have come up with a series of commentaries, working papers, conference reports, referred articles, and the long-term objective clearly is an edited volume that would bring together the twelve research papers and their claims. Thank you.

Moderator: Feng Zhu

Thank you, Ralf. Fu Xiao?

Fu Xiao

Thank you. I'll give you a brief introduction of the project funded by the MacArthur Foundation. The project followed the CFIS is a comparative studies on nuclear strategies and policies. It is a two-year project starting from the last year we hope it could be completed at the end of this year. We have hired fifteen researchers to form our research team, including both military and civilian experts and also from the policy community and the research arena, we are trying to listen to the different opinions from these experts. And contents can be divided into two parts. The first is a studies on adjustment and changes of nuclear strategy and policy, and the second is comparative studies. And we selected nine countries. The group these nine countries constitute three categories: the first is the five nuclear-weapon states like the U.S., Russia, U.K., France and China; the second is the three de-facto nuclear states, India, Pakistan, and Israel; and last, it is special, it's North Korea. We'll review the North Korea nuclear policy. And the second part is comparative studies among these different countries, like the use of the nuclear weapons, strategies of the development of the nuclear weapons, nuclear operational principles, nuclear arms control policy and etc.,

and we hope we can, the outcome of our project is a book publicly published at the end of the year, and also an internal policy report to the government. During this period, we also had some conferences, seminars concerning this project. We held the workshop with the international experts from neighboring countries, South Korea, the U.S., and India. And we also have the domestic inter-agency symposium, and we invited some government officials and some experts from the research community to sit together and discuss the project. That's very useful. Also, this year, there are a lot of changes in this field like the Nuclear Security Summit, the release of the NPR, and the treaty between the U.S. and Russia so we would like to improve more in this field, and we hope we could finish this project on time. Thank you.

Moderator: Feng Zhu

Thank you, Fu Xiao. Fujiwara sensei?

Kiichi Fujiwara

First of all, apologies. This annual meeting book does not include the report from University of Tokyo. In fact, I wasn't sure if I could attend this meeting, and although I'm attending this meeting, I'll have to leave here at the end of the day. My apologies for that. Our work is part of a three-university research unit, composed of IGCC of the University of California, Yonsei University, and University of Tokyo, policy alternative research institute. Now the Yonsei group is working on regional security architecture, I believe, and our group is working on what we call the economy-security nexus. And IGCC is working along with both units, to be more precise, Professor T. J. Pempel, who is right here, is a guiding light, and also a captain of the two projects going on at the moment. Very briefly, the research question is as follows: this is a review of what has been called the economic peace theory, that the growth of trade and investment would change the priorities in security studies. The argument, of course, goes all the way back to the days of Adam Smith, the Manchester liberals, and there's a resurgence of several arguments that dealt with the international political economy; however, not much

work has been done in the recent time. And we'd like to discuss about all this. However, the argument here is not deterministic. If you simply focus on the absence of war as an outcome, we do know that after the Second World War, there have been no major wars in the Asian region. Even after the Korean War, there were no major wars. Whether that is an evidence of economic peace, of course, is rather highly dubious, and just like the democratic peace theory, it is so easy to build several plausible causal relationship out of basic outcome. So, therefore, we would not work on a deterministic model, we are working more on non-linear model, economy might affect security but security also might affect economy, so we take this to be a two-way street. We also assume that there may not be direct causal relationship between economic policy and security policy. So our aim is far more limited than a grand restatement of economic peace. Right now, we have finished a workshop held July 3rd to 4th of 2009, and in that meeting, there were prototypes of products that would be delivered, and the next month, from 23rd to 24th, August 2010, there will be another meeting where the finished papers would be presented. And hopefully, it would be part of an edited volume at the end of this grant.

Along with such research, we are now preparing a training session, as we call it, session that includes practitioners, people who are close to policy decisions. We are having difficulties in getting the right people here, because of all the political, if you allow me, turmoil that has taken place in Japan right now, and there are things that interest people more than talking about policies. They want to say they're next. However, somehow we have collected a number of important practitioners, and we will be having a training session from 25th to 26th of August this year. As Ajin has already mentioned, not only a training session, we will have a road show where we would disseminate findings from research to those people who are really in decision-making positions. The first road show, I believe, will take place November this year in Seoul, Beijing, and Tokyo. The outcome of the research would be in forms of publication and right now we are having publication both in English and Japanese. For the Japanese publisher, we already

have an informal agreement on that source. We will come up with something.

Moderator: Feng Zhu

Thank you. Brad?

Brad Glosserman

Yep. And T.J., you can follow.

T.J. Pempel

I think both Ajin and Kiichi summarized the project very well. I mean, so far the coordination has been primarily on those three major aspects, a volume for each of the two projects, and policy workshops for practitioners, and finally our efforts take our show on the road, which will be coming up on November. So I don't think I have anything to add to that, although I must say the Ahab metaphor is something that's completely new to me, so I'm trying to think how to respond to this. But having not seen any white whales lately, I think I better just stay away from that metaphor.

Moderator: Feng Zhu

Thank you, T.J.

Brad Glosserman

My turn. Pacific Forum has a grant to explore the future of the U.S. alliance with Asian. Quite simply that meant in year one, seven trilateral conferences, workshops and seminars that we held with featured U.S. alliance partners in the region. Year two has included several of those bilateral, we are moving to trilateral, we have the U.S., Japan, Korea discussion, the U.S., Philippines, Thailand discussion, and then year three, we will again have several bilaterals as well as quadra-laterals. We'll bring Australia into each of the trilateral meetings. There are conference reports from several of those sessions already on the website, trying to put them both in English and the other relevant language if it isn't English. And, in addition to distribution, we've held, as per usual, a steady round after almost each session we end up going to regional capitals talking about the out-

comes, getting a reality check from other non-participants, to make sure that in fact our takeaways are complete. The summary of the findings from macro- and micro-takeaways are in the reports. I won't bother anyone with it.

Moderator: Feng Zhu

Thank you. Roy?

Roy Kamphausen

In India, we have two distinct projects under the aegis of the MASI, and I'll briefly discuss each of them. The first is what we'd call non-traditional security architecture for Southeast Asia, or SRS, the MASI is the proliferation of acronyms I think, and we continue that. So SRS looks in a future's way at non-traditional security challenges that would likely present themselves in some combination in South Asia, and then having done that analytical work, infuses that data into a future's approach that we have developed at NBR, and actually backcasts that future to the present, in ways that help participants understand how particular futures might be unfolding over time. There are participants in the first workshop in Taka, Bangladesh, including a cross-section of scholars, policy practitioners, retired diplomats, and some retired military folks. And the response was exceptionally positive. One notable comment of participants, that they have never been a part of this sort of approach in which tools have actually informed a kind of forward thinking policy approach. So we're quite pleased with the first round. The second round workshop will take place in Colombo, Sri Lanka, with the Regional Center for Security Studies as our regional partner, and again, we'll again seek to fulfill the MASI initiative of partnering with a regional institution and in essence, transferring some of these analytical tools that we've developed in ways that will help their own processes going forward. The second initiative is called the maritime energy resources in Asia, overlapping claims and opportunities for cooperation, or ME-RA for short, looks at the nature of possible avenues for jointly developing maritime energy resources in three critical bodies of water, with overlapping claims: South China Sea, East China Sea, and the gulf of Thailand. The first

workshop took place in Bali, Indonesia last December, and I quickly recognized that being in Taka, Bangladesh last November, and as contrast with not being in Bali, Indonesia in December was a mistake that I hope to rectify in future rounds. But the first round was a terrific workshop, and then round two will take place next month in Vietnam, Ho Chi Minh City, and with the expectation that the report findings from that round will come out by the year's end. So, that's it for our two initiatives.

Moderator: Feng Zhu

Thank you, Roy. Ambassador Kumar?

Rajiv Kumar

Thank you, Mr. Chair. We're doing a chronicle project, which is called strategic and economic capacity building program. The idea is that in this world where complexities are increasing, the economies, and all of the countries are coming together, there is more globalization, now complex issues which I will going to re-raise in the future, for which there is no expertise in South Asia, or there is inadequate expertise. At the same time, while many of these countries in South Asia may have been happy to, let's say, duck issues which are outside the immediate concerns of these countries, I think we can no longer afford to do that. We can't duck those issues. And one result of the previous phase was that institutions, which looked at external policies and international global issues, are somewhat behind what is needed. So with that sort of gap in mind, we are doing this program, which has two modules. The first one is a research module, where we encourage South Asian scholars, diplomats, other government officials, media people to undertake that research on a particular subject. And this should be with international, regional and with a future dimension. So this is such, we give them six months, so it's not a thesis, and yet it's not a sort of short piece which can appear on newspaper or something, it's meant to be in-depth research. The idea is number one that builds up their domain knowledge, it builds up their analytical skills, and at the same time hopefully at the end of it we will have pa-

pers which we can then have a some sort of discourse, have some seminars around those papers, and this we plan to do as soon as some of these papers come in, and there are someone in clusters, there is one cluster of papers which looked at water issues, I mentioned that in the morning, there's another which looks at South Asian regional integration and the role of China and the U.S. in that integration. And there's a paper which looks at the population movements where cross-border that are common among populations in South Asia, which have common cultural or linguistic links, so what is the movements and what are the implications, what are the issues that are thrown out from that? Another paper is on energy security and I think someone mentioned here, someone is going to do a research on energy security and the role of Indian Ocean sea lands in that. So this is to give you a favor of some of the types of topics that are being looked at by the research.

The other module which we have is advance briefing program. The first, the idea is to have a program which will be researching a work for a couple of weeks, to brief opinion makers and decision makers in South Asia on some of the issues of the future. This is somewhat like the program which was outlined by professor Fujiwara, so we're doing the same sort of thing for South Asia. First program will be November this year, where we hope not only some of the experts from India, but from across the globe to talk to the trainees about issues of the future which cover both strategic and economic topics. So, in brief, that is what we are undertaking at ICRIER, and I notice that there is some amount of, shall we say, overlap with some of the programs that other people are doing. So we'd like to develop the exchange of ideas, and develop our program in cooperation with them, and of course, for all these programs, we have, as I said, mentors both for the research and for the briefing program from across the globe, and I hope that some of the people from the institutions which are represented at this conference will help us in future, in sort of guiding some of the participants. The details of the program are available on the ICRIER website, so anyone who wants can access that, and then give us some ideas on how to improve it.

Moderator: Feng Zhu

Thank you, ambassador Kumar. Nikola?

Nikola Mirilovic

So we'll describe the power and identity in Asia project, which is undertaken by the Sigur Center for Asian studies of the Elliott School of International Affairs at George Washington University. There are two components to the project. It seeks to make a contribution to the IR literature, and it seeks to disseminate the information to policy makers and journalists in United States and Asia and to form the links between people interested in these issues in the United States and Asia. So the independent variable for the project we are interested in is identity, variation identity, and we're interested in how identity affects regional level outcomes in Asia, ranging from international integration to interstate war, where there will be one of the prospects for future conflict and cooperation in Asia. And in the IR literature, the weakness of the IR literature that deals with identity is that it tends not to clearly define what identity means, not to clearly conceptualize, operationalize, and compare across country's identity issues, and this project seeks to fill that gap. So for example, to evaluate several states in the same dimension of identity such as commitment. And the states that we covered in the project are China, India, South Korea, Japan, and ASEAN regional bloc. So the goal of the project is to produce papers in each of these countries, which will then be published either in peer-reviewed journals or together as a teamed issue of a journal. We recruited, each paper was co-written, by the U.S.-based experts and Asia-based experts. And some of the prominent people who were working on this project are and Charles Glazer.

On the other side of the project I mentioned is disseminating the findings and forming links between the U.S. Asia-based experts, and one way in which we do this is that we have launched a website, you can find the address in the booklet, where our findings are disseminated and the links are provided to other institutions with similar interest, so I'd actually like to extend an invitation to you if

you're interested in exchanging links in the website, we're interested in doing that. We also plan to launch a blog, which will address current events in Asia that should take place in the fall. Some of the events we held already are, in May we had a conference in China which was organized together with China Foreign Affairs University, which brought together the U.S.-based authors with China-based experts, mostly professors based in Beijing. Another event we held was a launch of this project where the keynote speaker was Peter Katzenstein, and this was followed by a dinner attended by D.C.-based academics and policy makers. We also held a policy media briefing in Washington, D.C., and this project has attracted support at university-wide from the president of the GWU, Steven Knapp, and the dean of the Elliott School, Michael Brown. We have also produced policy commentaries on China's and India's free trade deals with ASEAN, and on the Confucius institutes, and we plan to produce some more policy commentaries in the future. Let me also briefly address our future plans. We will also hold a colloquium in New Delhi in January, there will be two more policy media briefings, and international workshop held in D.C., and as I mentioned before, we'll continue to produce policy commentaries on all on progressions. Thank you.

Moderator: Feng Zhu

Thank you. So, Dr. Raghavan, please?

Srinath Raghavan

At the Centre for Policy Research, we basically got a project which dealt with the prospects for regional cooperation, as it was suggested, we got a much more cautiously optimistic approach to this, and we are quickly going to figure it out that the best way to start exploring prospects of cooperation would be to actually figure out what are the drivers behind security and then get a more analytically sound perspective on some of the key problems in the region at the moment. Since we identify Southern Asia as stretching from Afghanistan to Burma, and China to Sri Lanka, pretty much every country has got one, if not more than one, major problem related to security issues. So we

have divided our research into four themes around which our project evolves, the first theme looks at the links between domestic politics to political economy and security to foreign policy of countries in the region, which we think is much neglected area of research in this, within this theme, we have commissioned five research papers which are under way at this point of the time, focusing on issues ranging from identity to civilian-military relations to issues like strategy culture. The second theme that we want to focus on would be Southeast Asia and the world, looking both at the role of extra-regional major powers, United States and China particularly, but also looking at issues like the relationship between India and China, and also the rise of India and China and what it means for architecture of global governance. So, looking at the impact of South Asia on the world more broadly. And these are the first two themes we have commissioned research in this year, and we are holding our first workshop in later this year in November over the Thanksgiving weekend, when we hope that we'll be able to get together participants and take a rigorous look at what we have done thus far, and then moving on to finalization three months later.

The second set of papers, which we hope to commission between now and early next year, focuses on two themes: the first one will be on the issues of ethnic conflicts in the region, and we will not be focusing so much on conflicts, maybe putting it a little strongly, but focusing on ethnic issues which are drivers of interstate problems. We are looking at things like Pashtuns within Afghanistan and Pakistan, we are looking at the role of Tamils in India and Sri Lanka, and we are looking at Tibetans within China and India, and looking at the seeds of conflicts which centered in northeast of India and India's neighbors. And last cluster of studies that we will commission next year will focus on more non-traditional security concerns, about issues which are increasingly coming to the fore, things like water, demography, and other things. So the plan really is that we hope that we'll be able to bring out two sets of ten papers each, the first set hopefully coming sometime early next year falling from the workshop this year, and similarly a year later will be followed by the next sets.

In terms of publication, we have been wondering what would be the best way to do it. I mean, given the sort of format in which we selected them, we could do two edited volumes, but we are possibly considering the option of doing stand-alone monographs, because we've asked our researchers to write substantial papers so they could form stand-alone studies in their own right. So that's something we've been debating, what's the best model to do. Any suggestions, any comments about what your experience has been would be very useful for us.

Apart from the main meet of the project, which we really see as this body of research, we've been engaging with King's College in London, conducting trilateral dialogue between India, Pakistan and Afghanistan, we've done two rounds of those meeting together with people who have policy experience, military backgrounds, journalism, etc. The next round is scheduled for September this year, and that I think, gives us a good handle on contemporary day-to-day development in the region, periodic talks on what are the problems, what are the kinds of issues which are likely to emerge in the near future. The other thing, of course, is about contributions by way of op-eds and writing more popular pieces which have greater outreach that has traditionally been one of Centre for Policy Research's (CPR) strength, most of our active members write regularly for newspapers and magazines and as part of the Asian Security Initiative we've done a considerable amount of work there. So, going forward, we really look forward to the workshop scheduled for this November, and for the rest of the major research works and papers.

Moderator: Feng Zhu

Great. John?

John Ravenhill

Many thanks. The ANU project runs on the general heading of policy alternatives for integrating bilateral and multilateral regional security approaches in the Asia-Pacific. The principal organizational basis for our project is for focus on study groups. The first looks at processes for achieving bilateral and multilateral security, the second is a

project on alliance and coalition initiatives on broader security challenges, the third addresses economics and security nexus, and we are, of course, very conscious of the work that our good friends at Tokyo, Korea University and IGCC are doing in this general area. I think we are very confident that we have a very good division of labor within. The fourth focus group is looking at arms control and nuclear non-proliferation. We don't have a formal institutional partner for any of these projects, but we have lots of very good individual partnerships, we have 25 participants in our focus groups from various institutions including a number of people around this table, and people from other institutions funded by the MacArthur Security Initiative, and people from non-MacArthur funded institutions. We had a initial meeting of our four focus groups in March of this year two of them met in Canberra, one in Tokyo and one in Manila, at which the participants presented an outline of their papers, I think we were all very pleased at the quality of the overall discussion that came from this opportunity for everyone to get together.

There have been a number of other activities, interviews conducted by Bill Tow and by the projects of a post-doctoral fellow on perceptions of change in alliance relations, interviews conducted in various capitals around the region, and post-doctoral fellows have been busy putting together bibliographical database, which I think is available for everyone as well as people in our projects. Our flagship event will be held in November of this year when we will stage major international conference in Canberra. At this, members of the focus groups will present what will be a complete and pretty much close to final draft of the papers, and here the intention of course is to get these published as soon as possible thereafter either as a special issue of the journal or as an edited book. The second part of the Canberra meeting will be a major simulation exercise with 25 participants from the focus groups who we hope will be joined by about 50 people drawn from public service, defense, and what we are hoping to do is to get people to think creatively about alternative scenarios for regional security and that the work of the focus groups will fit into the scenarios that will be developed.

Also we have various publications that come out of the project with co-sponsored a number of lectures, and visiting fellows, Bill may want to add to what I've said.

William Tow

Thank you, John. I'd just like to add perhaps two code-words to synopsise what we've been doing. The first is dove-tailing, and second is networking. Dove-tailing is essentially taking a look at a number of projects we've been engaged outside the MacArthur umbrella, but bringing them into the MacArthur project to make a bigger yet hopefully more cohesive umbrella. So we've engaged in a number of projects with Australia's department of foreign affairs and trade. For example, one dealing with the Australia-South Korea relationship in a security context, another dealing with the Australia-Japan relationship in a security context, another dealing with human security problem involving Japanese and Chinese scholars. So what MacArthur has done has actually allowed us to galvanize these separate projects in a way that we can bring them under the MASI banner, if you will.

I think other aspect of this is that this project actually has a teaching or pedagogical component to it in two areas I'd like to emphasize here. The first is working with so-called emerging young leaders, and in that sense, I'd particularly like to highlight Ralf Carlson and Brad Glosserman's visit to ANU not too long ago, where they met with about twenty of our so-called best and brightest Master's and Ph.D. students, which I thought was not only successful but I thought reflected a genuine process of community building on both sides of the Pacific. And in the same context, hosting a series of visiting fellows, all of us were not only inspired by professor Pempel's obvious intellectual contributions and capabilities in the field, but also, since he left, just about every member of the academic staff has taken up some form of jogging or tread milling or some other. That might be the analogy per se. We've also been privileged to host Ralf Emmers, we've also been privileged to host or will be hosting several other scholars.

In one other aspect of dove-tailing to bringing into account is the incorporation of advanced information

technologies. We actually have a project which is sponsored by the Australia-Japan Foundation of the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade where we are actually going out to academic colleagues in other parts of the region and bringing them into the ANU classroom. In particular, University of Tokyo and Keio University were involved in this, we actually had a first dry-run, or test-run, in mid-May. It worked brilliantly, and now we are going to integrate this technology into our post-graduate coursework curricula for teaching Asian security politics next year. I might just add that we also incorporated this technique in the several of our workshops, including, for example, Peter Hayes who was speaking from Berkeley at a special conference we convened under the arms control component of our MacArthur project, where he was using power points slides and we really couldn't tell that he wasn't in the room if you weren't looking at the screen, because it was that smooth. We were again incorporating these types of technologies into essentially our teaching processes.

In terms of networking, let me just indicate that again, MacArthur has worked beautifully. Because, in essence, we had already started an emphasis on, to use Fujiwara's phrase as he deployed so eloquently this morning, that global, regional nexus per se through a project conducted with international alliance of research universities and so, it was a very short step to move from that point into such work we're doing for MacArthur. We should also mention that we value very much our association with the RSIS in Ralph's project, we've been dove-tailing and networking essentially in terms of his Southeast Asia component, and last but not least, of course, Lowy Institute. Malcolm was a valued discussant in marked sessions, Malcolm, and Andrew, and several other colleagues came over to launch, if you allow, our speaker series earlier this year in terms of their particular project, and perhaps they were too modest to note, but they came back to Canberra to launch their particular study on power, and of course, no less person than Curt Campbell, who is actually the person that launched that, and I think the Lowy should be quite proud of the fact that it attracted someone of that weight in relev-

ance. So I thought that just a few supplementary comments here might be useful around the dynamics of our project development. Thank you.

Moderator: Feng Zhu

Thank you, Bill. Yep, John.

John Schaus

Thank you, Dr. Zhu. The CSIS project has focused on two non-traditional security threats and responses in the region: climate change being the first, and the disaster systems and recovery functions. The title of the report is, short and easy to remember, "Climate Change and Natural Disasters: Implications for an Evolving Regional Architecture." It's broken into two parts, as the title would suggest, and Bill's reference to networking, I think, adequately encapsulates what we tried to do in our study. We had seven different scholars and their teams spread out across the region on multiple trips in conversations with dozens of people in the academic and policy communities within each country. In addition to that, we had a series of commission papers from people within each country we looked at, trying to get at the meat of the issues. In the disasters systems question, it was how people in countries are coming together, what are they accomplishing, and how quickly they are doing it.

On the climate change side, it was looking at internal political obstacles or incentives towards pushing for climate change action. And as you would imagine, there were a wide range of national responses on climate change, both for quick action and slow action. The report is slated to be rolled out next Friday, in Washington, I think it will be on the website just before that, the working papers will be published as an edited volume, hopefully in August but I'm not sure how quickly that would happen, I don't know if that would be web-only or also in hard copy. The results, the findings and the conclusions are all in the reports, I don't want to go through to make details with that, especially since I'm the last one and I think people's attention span is waning. Thanks.

Moderator: Feng Zhu

Thank you, John. Time is almost up. Brad?

Brad Glosserman

I would reminisce in the spirit of networking community. Most of you, and I want to thank Bill for jogging this and for giving us the plug for young leadership program. Most of you are aware that we have an effort, a project that brings people, next generation's security specialists to all of our meetings. Ages 22-35, we have a fairly healthy budget to support their participation. That's not to say we won't help take your money if you want to help us out, but I'd urge all of you, if you had young people in your institutions between the ages of 22 and 35, or people that cross your path, and for those of you behind us as well, if you have, it's not just academics, in fact I'm looking to branch out beyond that. If you had young folks that you think would benefit by both having input into the process, because we seek to get next generation's views, learning more about the process, having a chance to meet with their peers, I urge you, please, have them contact me, send me their C.V., we'll do what we can to bring them into our conferences. I'm running about 25 meetings around the Pacific Rim each year. And I'm brining different people, trying to bring different and similar folks to all of those meetings. I'm always looking for sharp, youngsters so please, please get them in touch with me. Thank you.

Moderator: Feng Zhu

Ok, now, wonderful, Brad. I think we have no time to just have discussion about the rest of the things. May I just suggest some sort of idea concerning next year's annual meeting? First, is it possible first to shift the date? Now it's just late July or something like that, July in Beijing is very very hot. So my suggestion is that we shift to the end of June or end of August. Because that also, well, end of university does not just end a lot of stuff there, so it'll be easy to recruit staff to prepare the conference. End of August is getting cooler, I think the weather is getting better, so then staff are also back from summer vacations.

Second is, next year is punctuation of three straight

year for our research project. So then, I think the main subject for the next year's annual conference is exhibition of our research project. While such an exhibition and interactions within a cluster also could just go, very successful, it's a striking point to me. So then our exchange on e-mail is all free, my best thinking is that I hope each cluster research member institutions could just handing in, for example, five thousand words, some sort of introduction or summary of your research project, and the project proceeding that we can put them together, making it a good collections of research projects. And based on that, we can also have a good design for one day long's workshop. We can just roughly sort of have different sessions, round up all people in Beijing into different session that work an hour or so, this cast, then, based on our next year's result, when in the last workshop, then we can also have some sort of cluster-based research in a report or something like that. Also, the second point now is occurring to me. The last one is that, just as I say, I know a couple of guys will also have a meeting in Beijing, so my view is that is it possible to coordinate days and venue, then we can invite MacArthur Foundation people there and just give them some sort of impressive impacts of what we could do in Beijing, it's not just a single annual conference, it's also a series of some sort of punctuating attempt at research project. Now it's a coffee break. Afterwards, I simply can exchange e-mails so I will very carefully follow your suggestions and circulate among all you know, clusters. Thanks. ■