



**Strategic Objectives in the New Asian Century:
Next Generation Strategies**



Issues & Insights
Vol. 11 – No. 3

Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia
March 2011

Pacific Forum CSIS

Based in Honolulu, the Pacific Forum CSIS (www.pacforum.org) operates as the autonomous Asia-Pacific arm of the Center for Strategic and International Studies in Washington, DC. The Forum's programs encompass current and emerging political, security, economic, business, and oceans policy issues through analysis and dialogue undertaken with the region's leaders in the academic, government, and corporate arenas. Founded in 1975, it collaborates with a broad network of research institutes from around the Pacific Rim, drawing on Asian perspectives and disseminating project findings and recommendations to opinion leaders, governments, and members of the public throughout the region.

The Young Leaders Program

The Young Leaders Program invites young professionals and graduate students to join Pacific Forum policy dialogues and conferences. The program fosters education in the practical aspects of policy-making, generates an exchange of views between young and seasoned professionals, promotes interaction among younger professionals, and enriches dialogues with generational perspectives for all attendees. Fellows must have a strong background in the area covered by the conference they are attending and an endorsement from respected experts in their field. Supplemental programs in conference host cities and mentoring sessions with senior officials and specialists add to the Young Leader experience. The Young Leaders Program is currently supported by Chevron, the Henry Luce Foundation, and the Yuchengco Group, with a growing number of universities, institutes, and organizations also helping to sponsor individual participants. For more details, see the Pacific Forum CSIS website, www.pacforum.org, or contact Brad Glosserman, director of the Young Leaders Program, at brad@pacforum.org.

Table of Contents

	Page
Acknowledgements	iv
Introduction	v
Conference Report	
By Aaron Connelly and Dominic J. Nardi, Jr	1
Embedding Liberal Norms in the Global Commons	
By Aaron Connelly	5
Japan’s Role in the Asian Century	
By Kei Koga	11
US Interests in the Asian Century	
By Kevin Shepard	15
A Middle Way to Mandalay?: Reevaluating US Policy Toward Burma	
By Dominic J. Nardi, Jr.....	17
Pre-Conference Essays	23
Appendices	
Appendix A: About the Authors	A-1
Appendix B: Young Leaders Agenda.....	B-1

Acknowledgements

As always, the Pacific Forum CSIS would like to thank the Luce Foundation for its support for the Young Leaders program. In addition, Ambassador Alfonso Yuchengco has been a generous patron of the Young Leaders through his endowment of the Yuchengco Fellows.

A special thanks to John Brandon at The Asia Foundation and to Dr. Tang Siew Mun at ISIS Malaysia for their support and efforts to facilitate YL attendance at the Asia Pacific Roundtable. Pacific Forum is always grateful to Tan Sri Mohamed Jawhar Hassan, a longstanding supporter of the Young Leaders and a good friend of Pacific Forum. Pacific Forum thanks Tan Sri Hamy Agam, Dr. Yusof Ahmad, Dr. Rizal Sukma, Prof. Simon Tay, Tan Sri Jawhar Hassan, and Prof. Carol Hernandez for taking the time to provide insights and guidance during Young Leader roundtable sessions.

Introduction

In 2004, Pacific Forum CSIS founded the Young Leaders program because it had become apparent that a generational transition was underway in the Asia-Pacific region and many of the assumptions that guided thinking about regional relations were being re-examined. The YL program has tried to hone in on the seeming divergence of views. It has become one of Pacific Forum's most important initiatives: after seven years, we have over 370 alumni from over 26 countries. In addition to providing a platform for this group's views, it has offered them unparalleled access to decision makers, unique insights into how track-two and foreign-policy decision making processes work, and, perhaps most significantly, has offered this group a chance to begin the process of community building. If confidence, trust, and respect are the cornerstones of effective foreign policy, then the Young Leaders program is laying a foundation for the future.

In 2010, ASEAN ISIS, the network of think tanks in Southeast Asia that hosts the annual Asia Pacific Roundtable (APR), The Asia Foundation, and the Pacific Forum CSIS held a Young Professionals Program that added an extra day of Young Leader roundtable discussions with a select number of senior leaders at the APR. Fifteen Young Leaders from 11 countries took part in the Young Professionals Program, exchanging views and interacting with senior participants in exclusive, off-the record panel discussions. Panel discussions held prior to the APR plenary sessions gave Young Leaders a background in Malaysian foreign policy, while the half-day Young Leader discussion held immediately after the APR gave Young Leaders a chance to analyze issues discussed during the APR.

Prior to the conference, Young Leaders were asked to identify their country's most important foreign and security policy and what their government should do to secure that priority. Many YLs addressed rising regional powers and how their countries will fare in the multitude of regional security mechanisms. After the program, a few Young Leaders expanded their pre-conference essay to address issues covered during the APR conference with specific reference to an APR session titled *Dawn of the Asian Century*. YLs assessed how the foreign and security policies identified in their pre-conference essays are helped or hindered by the rise of Asia. Some YLs were given the option to evaluate their state's policy toward a specific Asian country and to provide policy recommendations going forward.

The first US author sees the rise of Asia as a manageable phenomenon so long as liberal norms continue to be a part of the global commons. In contrast, the second US author has a negative impression of the dawn of the Asian Century and predicts a tense interdependence between the US and China that eventually hampers disarmament efforts. Our third author, a Japanese YL, concludes that Asia's rise demands delicate balancing to secure Japan's security interests and place in Asia. Another US YL argues that a rising Asia will reinforce US interests if America strengthens its ties with Asian partners and maintains a leadership role in the security architecture. A fourth US evaluates US policy toward Burma and recommends a policy of phased engagement.

Conference Report¹

By Aaron Connelly & Dominic J. Nardi, Jr.

OPENING DISCUSSION

During the opening session of the Young Professionals' Program (YPP), participants discussed conceptions that undergird the relations of East Asia, such as *order*, *leadership*, and the *liberal international order*. Participants focused on normative questions presented by the moderators, including whether US power is benign and whether the economic crisis would affect the US role in the region. The breadth of the discussion and brief time allotted did not allow for a consensus to emerge on any of these questions, but encouraged an exchange of views from participants from diverse backgrounds.

MALAYSIAN FOREIGN POLICY: GOALS, POLICIES, AND ASPIRATIONS

The first speaker explained the historical development of Malaysian foreign policy, citing Malaysia's negotiated independence from the United Kingdom contra its neighbors, which fought for their independence. Partly as a result, under Malaysia's first prime minister, Tunku Abdul Rahman, the country was pro-West in a region divided by the Cold War. The speaker described Malaysia's shift to a more non-aligned stance as the Cold War progressed, and finally the foreign policy under Mahathir Mohamad, which he described as "its own animal," and "assertive" in its advocacy of developing world interests. He suggested that under the previous premier, Abdullah Badawi, the outlook remained the same but was pursued more softly. He predicted continuity under the government of Najib Razak, though with a great focus on bilateralism.

The presenter talked about Malaysia's relationship with multilateral organizations, calling on his experience as the country's former permanent representative to the United Nations. He wondered aloud about the future of the Non-Aligned Movement, suggested the Commonwealth was not very relevant to Malaysians, and noted that ASEAN remained the core institution for the country. He admitted that Myanmar had caused problems for ASEAN, but maintained that ASEAN's expansion to 10 members was a "good idea."

ASEAN: ADVANCING COMMUNITY BUILDING

A Malaysian Ministry of Foreign Affairs official who spoke at length on his skepticism of ASEAN's ability to reach its community goals by 2015, noted that Secretariat responsibilities are often unclear and that funding problems persist. He argued that ASEAN should be the "driving force" behind East Asian regionalism. He vigorously defended Malaysia's position that the ASEAN+3 and East Asia Summit mechanisms ought to have different (more and less substantive) roles, and defended the Malaysian government's diplomacy leading up to the first East Asia Summit in 2005.

¹ In accordance with the Chatham House Rule, all names of speakers have been omitted in this report.

Asked by a YPP participant how ASEAN leaders could expect to build a community around an elite organization, binding countries that do not even share common values or norms within their domestic politics, the speaker said that he and other public officials around the region were working on it, and told the group that he intended to develop a strategic plan for ASEAN to reach the grassroots.

THE DYNAMICS OF EAST ASIAN SECURITY

The third speaker from CSIS in Washington presented what he believed were five trends in East Asia that he argued were historically unprecedented, and would shape East Asian security. First, China and Japan are now powerful at the same time. Second, East Asia had reached its highest-ever degree of economic interdependence. Third, he argued that nationalism was a bigger factor than at any previous point. Fourth, he suggested that democratic norms were an unprecedented success. And finally, he noted the increased threats of the proliferation of nuclear and missile technology.

The presenter believed these trends made it difficult to know whether the region was headed toward conflict or peaceful coexistence. He added that the enormous impact of globalization on normal people's lives was an additional wild card. And finally, he noted that there was very little confidence in regional institutions to deal with these issues.

YPP participants questioned the speaker's assertion that democratic norms were ascendant in the region. The presenter noted the success of these norms in Indonesia, and the recent appearance of a second party in Japan and the Republic of Korea. While he admitted Cambodia and Thailand were moving backward, and offering that he did not believe democracy would necessarily prevail, he suggested these examples proved progress. He noted that corruption was the greatest threat to democratic progress.

In response to questions, the speaker told the group that he found the thesis that the PRC could collapse, leading to a second rise of Japan, far-fetched. He argued that the Obama administration's policy of engagement with Myanmar had not worked, and it was time to move toward sanctions. He noted that the Korean model of development could emerge as a counter to Chinese influence in mainland Southeast Asia. Finally, the presenter postulated that President Obama would move toward a greater focus on foreign policy should the midterm elections in the United States in November diminish his chances of passing more domestic reform programs.

CLOSING DISCUSSION

The final YPP Roundtable featured several senior members of ASEAN-ISIS. The first presenter explained the history of the APR as well as the view that some APR participants had allowed national interests to obscure academic analysis. Focusing more specifically on the problems of democratization in ASEAN, she discussed a new ISIS program designed to encourage ASEAN leaders to discuss democracy candidly. Taking the Philippines as an example, the presenter argued that recent elections focused more on celebrity than substance.

The second presenter tied the interests of all YPP participants together by discussing Burma/Myanmar. As he pointed out, ASEAN initially accepted Burma in

order to counter Chinese influence. Especially since the 2007 crackdown on monks – which he characterized as the “worst form of brutality” – ASEAN has become more critical of the regime, but it still adheres to the principle of non-interference. He left open the question of how ASEAN should react to the October elections, but was pessimistic about the prospects for change.

The third panelist was also a YPP participant. He defined democracy as elections combined with public participation and good governance. On these terms, he predicted that Cambodia would remain a single-party state for the next 10 years. He also offered his interpretation of Cambodian-Thai relations, suggesting that Cambodia supported Thailand’s Red Shirts and hoped for ASEAN intervention.

During the ensuing question and answer discussion, several YPP participants asked about ASEAN’s relevance to ordinary citizens. One panelist pointed out that while ASEAN was still an elite organization, it did consult with experts in the drafting of the Charter. However, consultation with civil society has been more problematic, as suggested by the failure of the ASEAN People’s Forum. A second panelist likewise argued that although the Charter begins with “we the peoples,” the list of NGOs listed as partners is rather shallow, including many “hobby clubs.”

In the next session, a Japanese official discussed climate change and its implications for Asia. He framed climate change as a potential second industrial revolution, in which developing countries could gain an advantage by investing in green technologies. Stating that “Red China has become Green China,” he described how Chinese companies, such as SunTech and the BYD car, were remodeling green technologies and reselling them at lower costs. During the discussion that followed, a YPP participant pointed out that while Chinese technology might be cheaper, some buyers preferred more reliable Japanese products. Other panelists and participants also pointed out that much depended upon the consumption habits and preferences of Chinese consumers. The Japanese official was skeptical about climate negotiations, but hopeful that pride would encourage Chinese leaders to continue green reforms.

Finally, the YPP participants discussed the APR and YPP format. Many YPP participants expressed their belief that the APR sessions did not really allow policymakers and panelists to express uncensored views. Some wondered whether the APR was too large for Track II diplomacy, especially noting the presence of media during Prime Minister Najib’s speech. By contrast, they felt that younger scholars, such as fellow YPP participants, were both more willing to challenge conventional wisdom. There was a consensus that the APR should promote more youth participation, such as a panel of young scholars and a greater effort to select younger audience members for questions during plenary sessions.

Embedding Liberal Norms in the Global Commons²

By Aaron L. Connelly

There is some debate over the appropriateness of the term “Asian century.” On the one hand, it is not at all clear what the coming 90 years will look like. Despite genuine and earnest predictions of the “rise” of Asia, a number of serious scholars of the region – and in particular, of its biggest country, the People’s Republic of China (PRC) – question whether the PRC and the rest of the region will be able to sustain the rapid rates of GDP growth and military modernization efforts, amidst daunting challenges.³

In the PRC, for instance, social unrest and labor tensions could derail efforts to move up the production value chain from its current position as “the world’s factory” to a knowledge-based economy. A consensus appears to have emerged in the last several years among economists that, unlike many of Asian tigers of the previous century, China will face an extended turning *period* in its development, rather than a turning *point*.⁴ On the other hand, even if current rates of economic growth, increases in standards of living, and military modernization efforts continue more slowly, those rates of change will still be substantial; the power Asian countries in the economic and military terms will thus also be increased relative to powers outside Asia.

This paper acknowledges the debate surrounding Asia’s “rise,” but assumes a gradual growth in economic and military power among most countries of Asia through most of the next 90 years. When we assume this growth as exogenous, it frees us to think of how this century might differ from the past, and how governments ought to adjust policies accordingly. As an US, I hope that this thought experiment, when repeated by others over an extended period of time, will provide a foundation for smart future policy toward the Asia-Pacific region.

How Will the World be Different?

One question that the participants in the Young Professionals’ Program batted around in Kuala Lumpur was basic: assuming a stronger Asia, what will be different? This question can be examined across many areas of interest – economics, security, social organization, systems of government, codes of international diplomacy. It can also be examined across several levels of analysis. At the most practical level, there is a question of whether a general rise in power and influence on the Asian side of the Pacific will allow East Asian states, institutions, corporations, or individuals to prevail over non-Asian counterparts in ways that they currently cannot.

² The author would like to thank Pacific Forum CSIS for its generous funding of the author’s attendance at the conference.

³ See, for example, Minxin Pei, “Think Again: Asia’s Rise,” *Foreign Policy*, July/August 2009. Available Online at http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2009/06/22/think_again_asias_rise.

⁴ See, for example, Ross Garnaut, “The Turning Point in China’s Economic Development: A Conceptual Framework and New Empirical Evidence,” presentation delivered at the Australian National University’s China Update, July 14, 2010. Available Online at http://epress.anu.edu.au/china_update2010/pdf/ch02.pdf.

Moving up a level of analysis, we ought to ask if the international system will be organized differently. For example, how will the system of interstate relations be organized? Will new commercial networks emerge with new nodes in Asia or less emphasis on those in the West? Will new international institutions privilege Asian prerogatives in the way that, for example, the United Nations Security Council privileges European prerogatives (with three of its members hailing from that continent).

Third, how will norms and narratives change as a result of the rise of Asia? This is the most foundational of the three levels, determining the ideational context within which much else will be determined. For example, whose history will be read by schoolchildren in international schools of the cosmopolitan capitals of region? Will corporate accounting standards set long ago by Western institutions remain unchanged, or will they bow to Asian cultures that demand greater flexibility? Will governments place greater emphasis on communitarian principles than on liberal principles?

The Example of Climate Change

The only issue on which US and Asian delegates at the Asia Pacific Roundtable were clearly divided was climate change. The panelists chosen to discuss the issue, though cordial, appeared to be talking past each other. US representatives criticized what they characterized as Chinese obstructionism at last year's United Nations Climate Change Conference in Copenhagen, recalling US President Barack Obama's remark that without transparent verification of carbon emission reductions by developing countries, their promises would be "empty words on a page." Asian delegates, led by a South Korean ambassador, rejected these arguments, suggesting that Asian preoccupations with the sanctity of their sovereignty prohibited a vigorous verification regime. Moreover, several Asian panelists argued that even *developed* Asian countries should be given a pass on the most stringent requirements of any global agreement on carbon, because of the history of imperialism in the region.

The debate allows us a peek at how norms might change as Asian countries rise. First, the imperialism narrative, which has largely disappeared from mainstream Western political discourse, is alive and well in intellectual communities in developed and developing countries in Asia. Second, the norm of sovereignty holds a particularly elevated status in Asian countries, many of which faced down Western attempts to chip away at their sovereignty during the colonial age. Incremental steps to erode that sovereignty in the name of international cooperation are met not just with skepticism, but with outright hostility and suspicion.

Assuming that an agreement can be reached, it will have to be renegotiated at various times. A carbon emissions agreement negotiated by a much stronger China in 2050 might privilege these two norms by continuing to prevent verification of emissions reductions, or require less from Asian countries that once lived under colonialism. Such an agreement would alter the international economic system, which at that stage will likely be strongly influenced by a global carbon trading scheme. It would also directly benefit Asian countries at the expense of their Western counterparts, and Asian

corporations at the expense of their Western counterparts. The change in norms would have an impact on all three levels of analysis.

The same is true as applied to other important questions about Asia in the 21st Century. How will regional institutional architecture change? How will commercial patterns change? Will norms of good governance be different? In business, will accounting standards or contract law be governed by current international principles, or will those be modified by the inclusion of indigenous principles?

What This Means for the United States

The United States must evaluate its interest in the Asia-Pacific region, determine what interests are important to us, and determine how those interests can be safeguarded in a 21st century of Asian dominance. Though the temptation is to list every area of marginal interest to the United States, I highlight four interests in particular, all of which pertain to the global commons.

Keeping International Waterways Open

The United States rose to power as a trading country on the high seas. It fought several wars to defend its merchant marine's right to free passage on the high seas.⁵ For over 100 years, it has used its military muscle to protect those rights for others, as well, and its protection has led to an unprecedented growth in global commerce from which all nations have benefited.

Countries that cannot boast this historical commitment to freedom of navigation will be more difficult to trust to protect it. For this reason, the United States has a strong interest in maintaining its role as the guarantor of freedom of navigation in the Asia Pacific. In order to accomplish this goal, the United States needs two things. First, it needs to consolidate the norms of freedom of navigation set down in the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea. It would be helpful, if US officials plan to laud these principles, as Secretary of State Hillary Clinton did at the most recent ASEAN Regional Forum in Hanoi, for the United States to ratify the document. It currently finds itself in the company of North Korea, Thailand, and Timor-Leste as the only countries in the region yet to do so.⁶ The United States already honors most of the provisions of the convention – and indeed, its official position is that it will do so as a matter of international customary law – and most of the objections that thwarted ratification in the 1980s were ideological reservations by conservative senators. Those objections can easily be overcome given the right political climate, and the president should seize the first opportunity to do so.

⁵ Among these are the engagements against the Barbary Pirates, the Quasi-War against France, and the War of 1812 against France and the United Kingdom. Depredations on neutral merchant vessels were also a major irritant leading to the U.S. entry into the First World War.

⁶ For a list of countries which have ratified the convention at http://www.un.org/Depts/los/reference_files/chronological_lists_of_ratifications.htm.

Second, the United States needs bases and military prerogatives to ensure freedom of navigation. This means maintaining a strong force projection capability and access to overseas bases from which its Navy can operate. Though the level of access is not at risk, tensions between local populations and US military forces in Korea and on Okinawa in recent years have created situations in which large constituencies are demanding the departure of US forces.

The United States can insure against the potential loss of bases in these areas by using its partnership with Singapore as a model. After the government of the Philippines chose not to renew the US Navy's lease on their base at Subic Bay, Singapore offered use of Changi Naval Base as a substitute. Singapore then upgraded the base to specifications for US aircraft carriers in 2004. To the extent possible, the United States should seek such arrangements with other countries, rather than permanent bases, because their smaller footprint makes the arrangement more stable and less susceptible to political protests in the host country.

The United States must also pay attention to its blue-water and green-water naval capabilities. US military planners have already focused a great deal of attention on this issue, and will continue to do so.

Building Upon the Liberal System of International Trade

The United States has long stood for a liberal system of free trade in Asia, although this record is more flawed than our record regarding freedom of navigation. For several decades now, trade negotiations have been fraught with risks for US politicians. Members of Congress who vote for liberalization are characterized as having "shipped jobs overseas" by challengers at the polls. But those public servants have a responsibility to explain to their constituents that these agreements help US firms find markets overseas, growing revenues and payrolls back home.

Many US participants at the Asia Pacific Roundtable expressed hopes that President Obama would pivot toward a trade-friendly stance following midterm elections in November of 2010, urging passage of a long-delayed free trade agreement between South Korea and United States (the KORUS FTA). This would be immediately helpful, but bilateral FTAs like the KORUS will not preserve the norms of free trade against challenge in out years. Rather, forward-thinking leaders should start the difficult task of recreating a centrist caucus in favor of trade, which would enable the United States to reduce and then eliminate farm subsidies. Such a bold step would empower US negotiators to achieve a comprehensive global agreement on the ambitious goals of the Doha Round of trade negotiations, an achievement that would go much further toward locking in the norm of free trade in the region into the next century.

Creating Space for International Civil Society

As Tocqueville noted in *Democracy in America*, USs often work through civil associations to improve conditions and negotiate new social settlements. The late 20th

century saw a USization of space in which international organizations operate. Institutions like the International Labour Organization and the United Nations find themselves increasingly marginalized compared to more nimble groups like the aid organization CARE, or the advocacy organization Transparency International. These groups advocate for freer and more just societies with much greater credibility than the US government. Government efforts in these areas are often compromised by the need to tend to strategic interests or moral failures of individual officials. International civil society groups have simpler, purer mandates, and are thus able to better establish credibility in support of specific reforms. Moreover, government efforts often anger other governments, many of which are particularly sensitive to lectures from foreign powers on domestic policymaking. The diverse makeup of many civil society organizations around Asia means that their leaders often hail from countries being lobbied.

Creating space for these groups to flourish throughout Asia is a righteous cause unto itself, but it is also indirectly in the US's interest, as they push Asian countries into compliance with international standards for human rights, transparency, good government, and environmental sustainability. Progress on these fronts will ease obstacles to commercial and official relationships between developed democracies and developing countries.

When it comes to sensitive policies of Asian governments, it is often better for US diplomats overseas to create space for civil society, and to protect groups' ability to disseminate their findings and advocate for reforms; but *not* for those diplomats to publicly report on specific issues themselves, or to advocate for specific policy changes in foreign countries. Diplomats now tasked by US law with writing up reports on everything from human rights to religious freedom to trafficking in persons – reports that are normally compiled from NGO data anyway – could spend their time more effectively by lobbying for space for international civil society in each country, and then allowing groups bolstered by that defense to report on particular conditions in each country with much greater expertise and credibility.

Liberal Political Rights in the Global Commons

The establishment of liberal norms in international navigation and international trade might have been enough to preserve US interests in Asia in the 19th century and early 20th century. In the 21st century, however, our understanding of the global commons must be updated to keep up with advances in technology. Information travels more quickly and more cheaply than ever before – by orders of magnitude. The technological advances have empowered individuals and civil society groups by making it easier to communicate with the outside world without a large budget or support staff. Previously only governments or wire services possessed the resources to deploy multiple diplomats and journalists to remote areas of China, and quickly report on any labor disputes that should emerge. Today, governments and wire services are more likely to pick up the tip from a social media site.

The new communications channels created by these new technologies have become the frontiers of the global commons. Information is exchanged and commerce is carried out through electronic communication. The iteration of these transactions has quickly developed into a virtual international community. To restrict these transactions to privilege one firm over another, or one philosophy of governance over another, is no different than attempts to restrict the flow of ideas and goods via the high seas.

The construction of the online world as the newest space in the global commons, rather than sovereign territory to be conquered and regulated, makes natural the extension of liberal norms to the governance of this new space. Developing a program of liberal political rights in the online commons would foster a culture of openness and equal opportunity, which would promote transparency, accountability, and good governance. All these values are consistent with US liberal internationalism, and would protect the interests of all states – not just the US – from infringement in a 21st century dominated by other powers.

Conclusion

Embedding liberal norms in the global commons has long been a successful feature of US foreign policy. The continuation of this policy, updated for the 21st century, should ensure that the interests of all countries in the region, including the United States, are not grossly violated. More than that, it should ensure peace and prosperity in the decades to come.

Japan's Role in the Asian Century

By Kei Koga

Since the beginning of this century, Asia has become the center of international attention in various dimensions. Economically, despite the 1997/1998 Asian financial crisis, the economy has recovered and contains the most dynamic economies: China and India, the world's two most populous countries are projected to surpass US economic capabilities in 2030 and in 2050, respectively. In fact, although the "Great Recession" has created difficulties for many states, Asian economies maintain relative economic stability. The G20 includes five countries from Asia – China, India, Indonesia, Japan, and South Korea – and increasing international emphasis on G20 rather than G8 illustrates the growing importance of Asian countries. Politically, ASEAN attracts regional great powers to join the ASEAN-led framework. While ASEAN institutions create intra-regional and inter-regional political networks through the establishment of the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF), Asia-Europe Meeting (ASEM), ASEAN+3, and the East Asia Summit (EAS), the United States and Russia have showed interest in becoming members of the EAS. Furthermore, in terms of security, despite the political and military tensions stemming from remnants of the Cold War, including the Korean Peninsula, the Taiwan Strait, and the South China Sea, military conflicts have been contained due to the US-led bilateral security alliances and ASEAN-led institutions for confidence-building measures. Since the foundation of regional economic prosperity also depends on regional stability, these factors create the image of "the rise of Asia" and "the dawn of the Asian century."

Nonetheless, these trends do not necessarily mean that Asia's future is bright. From a broader perspective, Asia now seems to maintain regional stability and show economic dynamism, yet it contains various precarious elements, especially in the field of security. Recent phenomena illustrate this point. In April 2010, China undertook large military exercises close to *Okinotori-shima* (Okinotori Island – Japan's farthest southwest island), which was a concern for Japan. In addition, North Korea's nuclear program continues, and the Six-Party Talks have been stalled since 2007. The sinking of the South Korean corvette *Cheonan* in March 2010 further intensified political tensions not only with North Korea but China too because Beijing refused to support the findings of an international investigation of the incident. With the failure of the UN Security Council to put sanctions on North Korea, the political rivalry between the United States and China is growing.

Politically, while ASEAN-led institutions are useful for discussing various issues, they cannot mitigate traditional security issues and do not have legal means to constrain state behavior. With its proliferation of "institutionalization without teeth," ASEAN's leadership capability has been increasingly in doubt. In addition, democratic societies in Southeast Asia are still fragile, considering the recent Thai "red-shirt" demonstration against the current government and the Indonesian government's inability to reduce corruption. From a longer-term perspective, Asia as a whole has been experiencing a demographic shift and is facing an aging society. With Japan in the lead, followed by Korea, China, and Southeast Asian countries, Asia is aging like the demographic "flying

geese” model, which would have economic impact on the region in the long-term. Plainly, precarious elements persist in the region.

In this context, Japan needs to identify its short- and long-term foreign and security policy priorities: structural constraints force Japan to focus on immediate threats vested in its own neighbors. The most important foreign and security policy priority for Japan is to maintain stability in East Asia, because regional order benefits Japan’s security and economic interests. To this end, Japan needs to deal with two issues: the North Korea problem, including nuclear and missile development, in the short-term, and the rise of China, and its corresponding military capabilities, over the long-term. Although other global security agendas such as countering international terrorism and managing climate change are important for Japan’s security, it is necessary to put foreign and security policy priorities in these two states since East Asia still rests on state-centric security concerns.

First, North Korea poses serious security threats to Japan due to its nuclear and ballistic missile programs combined with its brinkmanship. No state, even China, knows what, when, and how Pyongyang will behave in the international arena. The 1998 *Taepodong* missile incident and nuclear development since 2002 illustrate this point and they raised serious security concerns for Japan. Moreover, the abduction issue has yet to be resolved, and the Japanese felt betrayed about forgoing the 2002 Japan-DPRK Pyongyang Declaration. Moreover, considering its geographical proximity and historical antagonism, Japan’s short-term threat perception has been geared toward North Korea.

Second, uncertainty regarding China’s future behavior poses security concerns for Japan. Increasing military capabilities without transparency is one factor fueling such concerns. With the naval military exercise around *Okinotori-shima* in April 2010, Japan became more concerned about China’s military capabilities, especially in terms of Sino-Japanese territorial disputes such as *Senkaku* Islands/*Diaoyutai* and East China Sea. Furthermore, these concerns also derive from ideational factors. As an authoritarian state, China does not share the same respect for human rights and rule of law. China has historical antagonism on the basis of legacy of World War II toward Japan, which is often utilized by China’s government to justify CCP reign. China’s business practices still fall short of international standards, including food security and business management. Although each of these incidents can be found in any society at any time, accumulation of them will likely solidify Japan’s mistrust of China, which also affects Japan’s security perceptions.

For Japan, these foreign and security policy priorities are fundamental, and they are not likely to change in the near future. However, unless carefully managed, preoccupation with China and North Korea would lead Japan only to exacerbate political and military tensions with them. Many states are concerned about China’s rise and North Korean’s brinkmanship and admit deterrence is vital to maintaining the status quo. However, they are not eager to attain stability solely from the balance-of-power concept because it may hinder cooperation. Therefore, Japan’s policy priorities and the “rise of Asia” is not mutually exclusive. Tokyo needs to walk a fine line between promoting

cooperation among Asian states and maintaining the regional balance of power in Northeast Asia. Therefore, the issue is not the foreign and security policy priorities Japan possesses, but ways to achieve these priorities. To this end, four policies need to be taken simultaneously.

First, the US-Japan alliance needs to be strengthened. The alliance is a primary tool for ensuring Japan's security by countering threats from North Korea and shaping China's behavior. Also, it prevents Japan from rapidly increasing its military capabilities, and thus provoking a regional arms-race. By expanding its roles and missions of the alliance in the region, such as disaster management, Japan should emphasize the public-goods provided by the US-Japan alliance. In so doing, the US-Japan alliance can be a multi-functional tool for regional stability, and be part of an East Asian security mechanism.

Second, Japan should work together primarily with the United States and South Korea to coordinate policy toward North Korea, which continually attempts to drive a wedge between these three states. South Korea is expanding the scope of the US-ROK alliance to deal with regional affairs besides the Korean Peninsula. Japan should join them to discuss potential regional security cooperation.

Third, Japan and China need to enhance political and functional cooperation through regional and global institutions, such as the Japan-China-ROK, ARF, and ASEAN+3 for confidence building purposes. Proliferation of institutions may increase the possibility of confusion; however, if they maintain consistency of principles, such as good governance, democratic values, and human rights, and connect to the international institutions such as the United Nations, redundancy is not necessarily negative but strengthens political cohesion among participating states.

Fourth, Japan needs to signal international society about the security role it wants to play regionally and internationally. Japan's domestic politics does not provide useful information about its foreign and security role in the region although the Japanese public and politicians show a willingness to strengthen the alliance with the United States. East Asian states doubt Japan's political intention or, at worst, marginalize it as an irrelevant actor. Therefore, Japan should provide its own national security strategy report, which would describe its regional role within the context of the US-Japan alliance, economic development, nontraditional security issues, and even sharing experiences on demographic change to ensure its commitment to the region.

US Interests in the Asian Century⁷

By Kevin Shepard

The most important foreign and security policy for the United States is creating an international order in which our country plays a leading role in ensuring our people, allies, and partners the freedom from fear of oppression and violence. As is stated in the 2010 National Security Strategy, the United States seeks an international order that can resolve the key security issues now faced by USs and others. We seek to counter violent extremism, prevent the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction – nuclear weapons, in particular – and secure nuclear materials, and to address climate and environmental threats in a manner that will allow for sustainable growth and help underdeveloped countries secure access to food and medicines.

Over the past decade, these and other post-post-Cold War threats to security have grown, yet previous, misguided foreign policies out of Washington drove a wedge between the United States and many allies and friends. Unilateral and undiplomatic actions by the previous administration severely hindered the United States' ability to lead with any moral authority. The escalating wars in Iraq and Afghanistan and the Bush administration's vocal appeal for support in the war against terror, caused many allies and partners in Northeast and Southeast Asia to express concerns of neglect.

There are now three priorities that the United States must focus on to restore our leadership. 1) The United States must renew its leadership and work with allies and partners to resolve imperfections in international institutions, rather than simply opt out of frameworks with which we have concerns. 2) Washington must assure allies of unwavering commitment to defense and deterrence, and show them that we will work both multilaterally and bilaterally, taking point on issues in Iran and North Korea ensuring that allied interests are protected. President Obama needs to make good on his offer to extend a hand to adversarial leaders while supporting international institutions and encouraging their involvement in global issues. 3) In light of the growing importance of Asia, we need to ensure that we do not appear aloof. While claims that "we're back in Asia" were more a political swipe at the previous administration than an accurate description of policy shifts, it is an image that needs to be reinforced, especially now that Washington has highlighted engagement in Asia as a diplomatic and security strategy.

To promote these fundamental rights while protecting the security of USs and our friends, engagement alone will not be sufficient. A strong and competent military will remain a critical part of the US's security strategy, and we will continue to fight and to defeat those who seek to harm us. However, the Obama administration prioritizes comprehensive diplomatic engagement, and seeks to "build new and deeper partnerships in every region, and strengthen international standards and institutions." It is through

⁷ The views expressed here are solely those of the author and do not reflect the views of the U.S. Government.

these relationships that we can promote the rights and values on which our country is founded, including democracy, open and free markets, and the protection of the basic rights of human dignity.

The United States stands to gain considerably from strengthened ties with Asian partners and allies. As was pointed out at the 24th Asia-Pacific Roundtable, we are at the ‘Dawn of a New Asian Century.’ The concurrent emergence of a number of unprecedented and significant factors in South and East Asia demands Washington’s attention. For the first time, both Japan and China are powerful forces in Northeast Asia, and while outright conflict is unlikely, unhealthy rhetoric and hypersensitive nationalism could overshadow opportunities for cooperation. Worse, power struggles and increased tensions could hinder US efforts to shape China’s emergence and stoke Beijing’s drive for a stronger navy. This would cascade into increased tensions and conflict over Taiwan and other territories in the South China Sea. At the same time, regional economic integration and interdependence is at a historical high. This offers many benefits to US economic as well as security strategy, as trade opportunities could both benefit US manufacturers and ensure US presence in the region at a time when there are discussions on regional communities excluding Washington. South Korea’s quick recovery from the latest international financial crisis and China’s vital role in reversing the fallout of the US sub-prime loan market collapse underscore the need for Washington to be further involved in Asian finance; while Beijing’s suggestions of a move away from the US dollar as the global standard went largely unrecognized, conversations on an Asian alternative, or a new Beijing Consensus, were worth noting. The region is not yet ready to turn away from the United States, but Washington must begin considering the significant regional economies as partners rather than clients.

As extremism and ethnic unrest continue to be a problem, particularly in Southeast Asia, economic integration and growth would help alleviate many of the factors driving youth into the separatist and religious groups that threaten regional stability and US interests. Some benefits of economic growth are already apparent, as there has been considerable success of efforts to embed democratic norms in emerging partners, such as Vietnam and Indonesia. In order to successfully prosecute US security strategy, it is not only vital to nurture these budding democracies as examples of successful governance, their initiatives in regional institutions advance US global security interests, and often do so by engaging with governments not prone to take similar assistance or guidance from Washington. In light of the high degree of access these governments – and often nongovernment actors – have gained to nuclear and other dangerous technology, US goals of preventing proliferation and keeping weapons of mass destruction out of the hands of terrorists require close coordination with Asian partners.

The Obama administration’s pledge to strengthen US diplomatic currency and pursue interests such as nonproliferation and democracy are not independent from the need to strengthen ties with Northeast and Southeast Asian partners and allies. This is the dawn of a New Asian Century; it is time for reinvigorated US efforts to pursue a rising Asia that will support US security interests, boost US economic endeavors, and reflect US democratic and humanitarian ideals.

A Middle Way to Mandalay?: Reevaluating US Policy Toward Burma

By Dominic J. Nardi, Jr.

Secretary of State Hillary Clinton announced the Obama administration's "pragmatic engagement" policy toward Burma (officially known as Myanmar), but thus far we have seen neither pragmatism nor genuine engagement. The contrast with Henry Kissinger détente towards Burma's northern neighbor is instructive. Kissinger pointedly did not arrive in Beijing insistent upon political reconciliation between Mao and Chiang Kai-Shek the way that US envoys have demanded reconciliation between Burma's junta and the democratic opposition. Unfortunately, in the short-term, radical political change in Burma appears unlikely. In the meantime, US policymakers should focus on concrete, pragmatic measures to build confidence between our governments and lay the groundwork for future progress.

"Full of sound and fury, signifying nothing..."

After decades of socialism in Burma, a new junta, later christened the State Peace and Development Council (SPDC), opened its doors to foreign investment and trade in 1988. However, a weak business climate and consumer boycotts conspired to limit economic ties with the US, with two exceptions. First, the US became the largest importer of Burmese textiles, reaching \$356 million by 2002. Second, UNOCAL helped finance the Yadana pipeline in southeastern Burma, which currently provides Thailand with over 20 percent of its energy needs.

As US awareness of and outrage with Burmese human rights violations increased, so too did demands for punitive action. In 1997, President Bill Clinton signed an executive order prohibiting new investments in Burma (with the convenient exception of UNOCAL's pipeline). In May 2003, SPDC-backed thugs attacked and imprisoned democracy icon Aung San Suu Kyi and members of her National League for Democracy (NLD). Congress responded by passing the *Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act*, which prohibited imports of Burmese products. After the Burmese military cracked down on protests led by Buddhist monks in late 2007, Congress passed the *Tom Lantos Block Burmese JADE Act*, which closed a loophole by prohibiting imports of Burmese jade and rubies. In addition, the law expanded financial sanctions and visa bans against SPDC leaders and cronies.

Sanctions against Burma have generated much heated rhetoric but little political reform. Sr. Gen. Than Shwe seems more firmly in control than ever before. In the early 1990s, the regime negotiated ceasefires with several ethnic insurgent groups and has nearly defeated the rest on the battlefield. Last year, the SPDC prosecuted Suu Kyi and extended her house arrest. The NLD decided to boycott the Nov. 7, 2010 elections to protest the restrictive electoral laws. With the deck cleared, the regime's proxy, the Union Solidarity and Development Party, looks ready to claim an overwhelming victory.

While some sanctions advocates have responded by demanding even tougher sanctions,⁸ in reality few countries outside the European Union have followed the US's lead. ASEAN has advocated "constructive engagement," accepting Burma into its club in 1997. Meanwhile, China scrambled to exploit Burma's natural resources, particularly natural gas and timber. After initially supporting the democracy movement, India now competes with Beijing for influence in Naypyitaw. Last year alone, Burma earned over \$5 billion in export revenues. In short, the regime can stay afloat – and even wealthy – without the US.

Even more problematic, sanctions have rarely been effective in promoting regime change in single-party or military regimes (one need only consider Cuba).⁹ The US's Burma policy is particularly counterproductive because it conditions removal of sanctions on the release of Suu Kyi and political reform. While these should remain long-term policy goals, in the short-term it is naïve to believe Burma's leadership would commit political suicide to access Western markets or aid. More often, authoritarian regimes respond to sanctions by increasing patronage to elite allies and repressing opponents.¹⁰ Since seizing power, the SPDC has increased military spending to an estimated 30 percent of the budget, while neglecting public services.

"We are not monkeys..."

The potential benefits of normalization between the US and Burma are considerable. Burma's per capita GDP was estimated at around \$334 in 2007 – the lowest in Southeast Asia. However, it receives less per capita official development assistance than Sudan – a country whose president was indicted by the ICC – in part because Washington refuses to give any multilateral development aid to Burma. Normalized trade relations would give US companies access to a largely untapped market of over 50 million people and possibly spread corporate social responsibility practices. Furthermore, a larger US presence would counter China's influence along the Bay of Bengal.

But engagement thus far has proven frustrating. By and large, this is not the Obama administration's fault. Despite Sen. Webb's frequent juxtaposition of Burma with Vietnam, the two cases are quite different. By the late 1980s, Vietnam had committed itself to economic reforms (*doi moi*), withdrew from Cambodia, and cooperated in the search of US POWs. In short, Vietnam *had* changed significantly by the time Washington was willing to normalize relations. By contrast, rumors of a nuclear program have raised doubts about the generals' willingness to pursue good faith negotiations.

⁸ While in theory the Treasury Department could impose financial sanctions under § 311 of the *Patriot Act* against foreign banks dealing with Burma or force Chevron to divest from Yadana pipeline, there seems to be little political will for such measures.

⁹ Abel Escriba-Folch and Joseph G. Wright, "Dealing with Tyranny: International Sanctions and Autocrats' Duration," *Institut Barcelona d'Estudis Internacionals Working Paper 16* (2008).

¹⁰ Abel Escriba-Folch, "Authoritarian Responses to Foreign Pressure: Spending, Repression, and Sanctions," *Institut Barcelona d'Estudis Internacionals Working Paper 21* (2009).

The US also bears some of the blame. In a telling exchange several years ago, when the United Nations proposed granting Burma \$1 billion in aid in exchange for political reconciliation, Foreign Minister Win Aung responded, "This is like offering a banana to a monkey and asking it to dance. We are not monkeys. We won't dance." The Obama administration is repeating that mistake by conditioning further engagement on the release of Suu Kyi; a dialogue with the prodemocracy opposition; and a halt to military offensives against ethnic insurgents – quite a lot of dancing for rather small bananas. Recent news that the administration would support an international tribunal to investigate war crimes only deepened the mistrust.

It does not take much imagination to realize how Naypyitaw perceives this dialogue. The Burmese army has perpetuated horrible war crimes – which Washington should condemn – but asking the military to simply halt offensives against ethnic insurgents undermines its *raison d'être*. Many of these insurgent groups began their fight against the democratic government right after independence and nearly overran Rangoon. Since 1962, the military has justified its hold on power as necessary to preserve national unity and oppose internal separatists. In the US context, this would be akin to Victorian London making trade relations with the US dependent upon Washington's willingness to end hostilities and negotiate with the Confederacy. I doubt Abraham Lincoln would have viewed that as an "outstretched hand."

At the end of the day, US policymakers lack the political will for genuine engagement. As David Steinberg notes, Burma is "boutique issue" – no administration will expend political capital necessary for genuine engagement.¹¹ Advocates of sanctions also tend to be more passionate and organized in their lobbying efforts. Indeed, even Obama's limited "pragmatic engagement" received vocal criticism from human rights activists and Republicans. Meanwhile, Burma's generals are not going to pursue reform based upon the US political cycle. This is simply a recipe for frustration. Already, Assistant Secretary of State Kurt Campbell has expressed his "profound disappointment" with Naypyitaw.

"Small is Beautiful"

In 1955, British economist E.F. Schumacher became a consultant to the fledgling Burmese government. The experience challenged his faith in Keynesian economics and convinced him that economies should limit technology to "appropriate" levels in order to maximize employment opportunities.¹² Decades later, the US's experience with Burma has challenged our faith in both sanctions and engagement. Perhaps it is time to develop a Schumacherian approach to Burma policy, in which the US will be better positioned to bring meaningful change to Burma if it pursues a more appropriate, limited diplomatic initiative rather than pining for a dramatic breakthrough.

¹¹ David I. Steinberg, "The United States and Myanmar: a 'boutique' issue?" 86(1) *International Affairs* 175-194 (2010).

¹² E.F. Schumacher, *Small Is Beautiful: Economics as if People Mattered* (1973).

It seems proper to restart our Burma policy by resolving a highly symbolic yet low-cost dispute, such as confusion over the country's name. In 1989, the junta changed Burma's official English-language designation to "Myanmar." While the U.N. and most countries accepted the change, much of the English-speaking world still uses "Burma" (the EU compromises with "Myanmar/Burma"). Some claim that rejecting "Myanmar" denies the regime legitimacy and shows our solidarity with prodemocracy activists. This overstates the case. "Burma" is derived from the spoken form of Bamar, while "Myanmar" comes from the literary form. Within the country, most people, even those who strongly support the NLD, use both. For the SPDC, the US's refusal to use "Myanmar" might be exasperating, but does not constitute an existential threat.

Although this debate over the name is divisive, it can be resolved through creative thinking. After all, many countries possess different English and foreign-language names (for example, "Deutschland" vs. "Germany"). When the People's Republic of China retook its seat at the UN, the US began to refer to the government on Formosa as "Taiwan" rather than the "Republic of China." While this could have been interpreted as legitimizing the PRC's claim over the island, US's security guarantees and occasional arms sales demonstrate our commitment to Taiwanese democracy better than any choice in names. Likewise, the U.N. did not allow a long-running dispute between Athens and Skopje over the name "Macedonia" to prevent that country's admission (albeit as "the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia").

After the November elections, the US should work with Naypyitaw to agree upon an official English-language name. One proposal might be to change the name to "the Union of Myanmar (formerly Burma)" ("Myanmar" is a better translation of the Burmese term). This would recognize the underlying dispute, but at the same time hopefully reduce its divisiveness (in this spirit, I will use "Myanmar"). While a new name will obviously not revolutionize US-Myanmar relations, it could build trust and confidence, particularly demonstrating that the US is willing to compromise with Naypyitaw. Moreover, diplomats and officials from both sides would have the opportunity to meet and work together on a concrete problem. These contacts could prove invaluable if the US-Myanmar dialogue expands into more substantive issues.

In addition, the US should negotiate more academic and cultural exchanges with Myanmar, such as Fulbright Fellowships and the Peace Corps. While this might prove more difficult, the benefits would be incalculable and would circumvent one of the main concerns regarding aid to Myanmar – namely, that the military might steal it. With the Peace Corps and Fulbright, the US would send people, not money. In addition to improving livelihoods, USs could prepare Myanmar for the subtleties of democratic life under apolitical themes, such as living with ethnic and religious diversity. Burma's military will undoubtedly be very suspicious of any influx of USs into their country. However, the Embassy's US Center in Rangoon has successfully provided English courses and cultural events for several decades. Other programs operate less publicly but no less effectively. Naypyitaw would probably insist upon a commitment that volunteers refrain from engaging in political activities – a relatively minor commitment given that the State Department already discourages USs from participating in politics aboard.

Finally, when political conditions in both countries allow, the US should readjust our sanctions to clear, realistic benchmarks – ones that do not constitute existential threats to the elite. For example, it might be possible to condition removal of certain sanctions on Naypyitaw’s willingness to require human rights training for military officers and pass stricter laws governing the use of force. There is some precedent for such an arrangement: in the early 2000s, Australia ran a series of workshops for government officials on human rights.¹³ Other benchmarks could include serious economic and anticorruption reforms, for which the US would waive objections to aid from the multilateral banks. If progress is made with one set of benchmarks, then both sides could move forward toward more ambitious targets. If Myanmar refuses to fulfill the terms, then the US will have lost little and sanctions can remain in place. Hopefully, a more nuanced, incremental approach over time will lead to more substantive reforms. The alternative – waiting for an unlikely “color revolution” – will condemn us to disappointment.

¹³ David Kinley and Trevor Wilson, “Engaging a Pariah: Human Rights Training in Burma/Myanmar,” 7 *Asia Rights* (2006).

Pre-conference Essays

*What is your country's most important foreign and security policy priority? Why?
What should your government do to secure that priority?*

Aaron L. Connelly (US)

The security and foreign policy priorities of the United States are diverse, spanning every region of the globe and every area of concern. In the Asia-Pacific region however, the overarching priority is the maintenance of the US position as a powerful external arbiter for the region, charged with preserving peace and stability throughout the region. As an external power with a sustained commitment to free trade, the United States is uniquely suited for this task. Its few territorial interests in the region allow the United States to deploy tens of thousands of troops to the region, not in service of US territorial security or expansion, but in service of regional stability. Its foundational commitment to free trade – though not always as active as its proponents would like – means US naval forces patrol sea lines of communication, providing a regional public good. Moreover, the United States is the only power willing to spend hundreds of billions of dollars each year and keep thousands of its young men and women deployed overseas to provide these public goods.

The United States must remain vigilant, however, to maintain its position. Four challenges to that position have emerged in the last few years that must be addressed in the decades to come.

First, the US public and government must transition from the post-September 11 focus on counter-terrorism. Terrorism is a minor threat to human security, and only a slightly larger threat to international security. Public officials in the United States must do a better job of explaining these facts to a skeptical public, so that they can move on to the much greater challenges in the Pacific and elsewhere. Focus on these issues in this region has diluted our reputation as a disinterested external arbiter seeking to uphold stability in the region.

Second, the United States must ensure its engagement with any new regional institutional architecture that emerges from the negotiations undertaken in earnest in the first half of this year. An East Asia Summit composed of the ASEAN+8, combined with a downgrading of the APEC Leaders Meeting, as proposed by former Australian Prime Minister Kevin Rudd, may be the best option.

In the future, Americans will need to help manage the rise of Chinese power in the region, integrating the PRC into a security system that Americans currently dominate, without sacrificing the principles upon which maintenance of the system rests.

Finally, to support these activities, the US government must do the work that needs to be done at home to ensure that the US economy remains vibrant – an engine of growth for the region, and one that funds a continued military and diplomatic presence here.

Haironesah Domado (Philippines)

One of the most important foreign and security policy priorities of the Philippine government is the growing flexibility and opening that allows the foreign or international community to engage in peace and conflict management work. In the past, the donor community poured resources and engaged mostly in development assistance to conflict-affected areas in the southern part of the Philippines. The Philippine foreign policy recognizes the growing importance of multilateral and inter-regional organizations in the promotion of the Philippines' internal stability. Apart from providing humanitarian and development assistance to areas in the Philippines that are challenged and threatened by conflicts or violence, the international community plays a significant role in helping the Philippine state address its domestic conflicts.

Noting that conflict prevention and resolution is rooted in a conventional concept of militarization which does not bring the promise of sustained peace in the Philippines, the role of the international community has been important in bringing the conflicting groups – the Philippine government and the revolutionary groups – to the negotiating table and keeping them talking until they reach an agreement. This has been manifested in the signing of the Final Peace Agreement (FPA) between the Philippine government and the Moro National Liberation Front in 1996 in Tripoli, Libya where the mediation efforts of the Organization of Islamic Conference, particularly that of Indonesia and Libya, were an instrumental factor.

After a breakdown of talks in August 2008, the enhanced third party participation brought the Philippine government and the Moro Islamic Liberation Front to resume formal talks by late 2009. The framework agreement developed for the International Contact Group sustained Malaysia's as the lead facilitator of negotiations between the two parties but the collective commitment of states, namely the United Kingdom, Japan, and Turkey; and of international non-government organizations (INGOs), namely The Asia Foundation, Centre for Humanitarian Dialogue, Conciliation Resources and Muhammadiyah, provided a stronger push for renewing the talks.

Even as the Philippines holds paramount the principles of national sovereignty, territorial integrity, national interest, and the right to self-determination of the state, healthy foreign policy provides a crucial role for the international community to engage in "internal peace processes" without the risk of being branded as an intruder on the domestic affairs of the states. The shared interest of the Philippines and the international community for improved stability and for the peaceful resolution of conflicts are a strong basis for increased international involvement in peace talks. The involvement of the international community in the peace talks, essentially an internal concern for the Philippine government, not only enhances the credibility of the negotiations between conflicting parties but also fosters a more meaningful collective role among participating countries (and INGOs) as it highlights their commitment even during post-conflict reconstruction and rehabilitation. Reaching an agreement is a huge task by itself but making that agreement work after the parties sign is the real litmus test for successful peace negotiations.

Mark Garnick (US)

The US has many strategic challenges and security concerns. One strategic challenge is preventing terrorist activities from being carried out on US soil. In the last decade, the US has pursued a strategy that targets non state actors from conducting terrorist activity in the US. This has led the US to target al-Qaeda, or terrorist groups in Iraq and Afghanistan. The US has deployed military troops overseas since 2001 to deter terrorism. However, the socio-economic factors that influence terrorism have not been resolved and Afghanistan and Iraq continue to hinder US foreign policy. Domestic political challenges, such as the US economy, continue to deteriorate creating further divisions between Republicans and Democrats. This is exacerbated by the global war against terrorism which requires substantial financial resources to counter terrorist activities. Terrorism continues to grow within the Middle East, especially in Pakistan. The recent car bombing by a Pakistani-born US proves that terrorism is continuing and remains a significant security challenge. Security of nuclear materials is another strategic challenge that is related to terrorism. The US has identified preventing non state actors from acquiring nuclear material as a priority. Terrorism dominates US security calculus; however, the US must also consider its commitments to extended deterrence.

The US has allies in Asia, Europe, and the Middle East which requires a commitment to ensure defense of those allies. So by extension, US strategic concerns are tied to its allies' national security. North Korea's provocative activity threatens South Korea and Japan, and requires the US to reaffirm its commitment to their defense. The same can be said for Israel where in the past, Iran has threatened the existence of Israel. The US must ensure the security of its allies. This leads to significant challenges for diplomacy. There is a concern of escalation of conflict that will result in a full-scale war as a result of a terrorist or conventional attack against a US ally.

The US has taken assertive actions to prevent terrorism; however, they have been largely unsuccessful. The US has attacked terrorist training camps and key figures to staunch terrorist activity. However, some argue that these attacks only strengthen anti-US sentiment within the region. The US has also pushed for UNSCR 1540 and UNSCR 1887, which seek to prevent the spread of WMDs to non-state actors by preventing the export of sensitive dual use materials, and to secure nuclear material from theft or sabotage by non-state actors. These strategies have been largely unsuccessful due to noncompliance by the collective international community. Many nations have enacted legislation, rules and regulations, but there has been little done to effectively enforce measures to detect, investigate, deter illicit trafficking, and secure nuclear material. These problems continue to harm the US and their allies, and require a new approach to solving these challenges.

K'ng Yee Pei (Malaysia)

The principles of the Association of Southeast Asian Nation (ASEAN), the Organization of Islamic Conference (OIC), Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) and the

United Nations (UN) have been the axis of Malaysia's foreign policy. In recent years, an ascending rapport with Middle Eastern countries due to close socio-economical alignment and religious affinities can be observed. The Israeli-Palestinian conflict and the war on Iraq have been of main concern to most of the Muslim world and Malaysia is not an exception. Malaysia has been participating steadfastly in the war against terrorism especially after Sep. 11, 2001. As a moderate Islamic nation, Malaysia can find the leverage to fill the gap and become the conduit that bridges the West and the Muslim world. If Kuala Lumpur can perform these maneuvers adroitly, it will help Malaysia gain trust and leadership among its Muslim allies, as well as rewarding in terms of increasing financial and trading partnerships.

Since his swearing in, Prime Minister Najib has enunciated his clear vision for building closer rapport with the United States under President Obama. Better relations picked up after Najib's visit to Washington in April 2010 at the sideline of the Nuclear Security Summit. However, Najib's friendly relations with the US have been slammed by Mahathir. This is not new as Malaysia's relation with the West were frosty and rocky during the two-decade tenure of Mahathir with his robust and scathing criticism of Western powers wanting to conquer the world. Relations improved after Abdullah took office in October 2003, but his conciliatory approach to the West resulted in Mahathir's assertive and combative bashing in 2006. While the US is not omnipotent, no nation can ignore the importance of the United States in world politics. This is especially true for Malaysia as the US is an important trade partner, achieving a two-way trade of more than \$30 billion in 2009.

It is beneficial to Malaysia to work out a strategic imperative and play the 'bridging role' between the Muslim world and the West in general and the United States in particular. However, Mahathir's shadow on Malaysian politics will not only hobble any amicable intention but hinder further cooperation. To be outspoken and audacious is one matter, but to undermine national interests with accusations is another. While gaining US recognition is an encouraging indicator, the significance of gradually improved Malaysian-US relations is gaining more confidence from the third-world and Islamic nations. Therefore, Najib's administration should gain more leverage to become the real leader among the Islamic nations as well as a strategic player on the world stage.

Le Hong Hiep (Vietnam)

Adopted in 1986, the *Doi Moi* policy has been a driving force of change in Vietnam. The policy has brought significant developments not only to the country's domestic political and economic life but also to its foreign relations. Under the *Doi Moi*, Vietnam has become a more open, active and constructive player in the region. This was mainly attributable to the country's policy of pursuing regional and international integration, which is Vietnam's most important policy in terms of security and foreign relations.

More than 20 years ago, Vietnam was an internationally isolated, war-torn country on the verge of an internal crisis. The international image of the country at the

time was darkened by its stationing of troops in Cambodia, which was envisioned to enhance the country's security but turned out to be counter-productive. The country faced international hostility and suspicion abroad while at home its resources were drained, further weakening the country's fragile economy and threatening its national security.

However, within a decade, the country's foreign relations and national security greatly improved thanks to its policy of actively pursuing international and regional integration. Vietnam's withdrawal of its troops from Cambodia in 1989 paved the way for the normalization of relations with China and the United States in 1991 and 1995, respectively. These two events facilitated the country's "multilateralization" of its foreign relations, with its entry into ASEAN and ARF as the first landmarks, followed by accession to a series of international institutions and fora, including APEC, ASEM, ASEAN+3, and WTO.

In contrast with the situation more than 20 years ago, when Vietnam struggled to maintain relations with a small number of countries mainly in the communist bloc, Vietnam today enjoys a broader range of relations with more than 180 countries and various international institutions. The enhanced profile helps the country to play a more active international role. In 2008 and 2009, Vietnam served for the first time as a non-permanent member of the UN Security Council, and earlier this year the country assumed the chairmanship of ASEAN, all which were unthinkable more than 20 years ago.

It is hard to overstate the importance of international integration for Vietnam, especially in terms of economic development. The policy has helped to create an external environment conducive to its domestic economic reform. Exports today account for more than two-thirds of the country's GDP, while capital flows from foreign countries play a crucial role in keeping the national economy growing steadily over the last two decades. A stronger economy means that the country is in a better position to deal with threats to its security. Moreover, the complex external interdependence that the country has been developing through the process of international economic integration also helps to provide a cushion for potential conflicts with foreign partners, especially its regional neighbors, thereby strengthening security of the country as well as the region.

In sum, the policy of international integration under the Doi Moi policy has played a crucial role in promoting Vietnam's foreign relations and national security. The Vietnamese government should secure this priority by further promoting economic liberalization while taking bolder steps to engage more deeply into the international and regional community. At the same time, to make sure that pursuing international integration will not hurt the people at home, the government should pay more attention to solving the growing development gaps between regions within the country. Building institutional capacity to better handle problems arising from deeper international integration should also be a priority. As Vietnam promotes its economic reform, international integration, just like globalization at a global scale, has become an irreversible trend for the country. The problem now is how to wield it in the interest of the country's greater security, prosperity, and influence.

Kei Koga (Japan)

The most important foreign and security policy priority for Japan is to maintain stability in East Asia, whose regional order benefits Japan's security and economic interests. To this end, Japan needs to deal with two issues: the North Korea problem, including nuclear and missile development, in the short-term, and the rise of China, meaning its increasing military capabilities without transparency, in the long-term. Although other global security agendas such as countering terrorism and managing climate change are important, it is necessary to put foreign and security policy priorities since East Asia still rests on state-centric security concerns.

North Korea poses serious security threats to Japan because it not only develops nuclear and missile capabilities, but also because it exhibits unpredictable behavior. No state knows what, when, and how the DPRK is going to behave. The 1998 *Taepodong* missile incident and nuclear development since 2002 illustrate this point. Moreover, the abduction issue has yet to be resolved, and Japan felt betrayed by North Korea's abandoning of the 2002 Japan-DPRK Pyongyang Declaration. Moreover, considering its geographical proximity and historical antagonism, Japan's short-term threat perception has been geared toward North Korea.

Uncertainty about China's future behavior poses security concerns for Japan. Increasing military capabilities without transparency fuels such concerns. These are illustrated by the naval military exercise around Okinotori-shima (Okinotori Island – Japan's farthest southwest island) in April 2010, which China does not recognize as an "island." Thus, Japan becomes more and more concerned about China's military capabilities, especially in terms of Sino-Japanese territorial disputes such as the Senkaku Islands/Diaoyutai and East China Sea. These concerns also derive from some ideational factors. As an authoritarian state, China does not share the same level of respect for human rights and rule of law. China has historical antagonism on the basis of the legacy of World War II toward Japan, which might be always utilized by China's government to justify the CCP's reign. China's business practices still fall short of international standards, including food security and business management. Although each of these problems can be found in any society in any time, accumulation of them will likely solidify Japan's mistrust toward China, which also affects Japan's security perception.

To deal with these two problems, several policies need to be taken simultaneously. First, the US-Japan alliance needs to be strengthened. The alliance is a primary tool for ensuring Japan's security by countering threats from North Korea and shaping China's behavior. Second, Japan should work together primarily with the United States and South Korea to coordinate its policy toward North Korea, which attempts to drive a wedge between these three states. Third, Japan and China need to enhance political and functional cooperation through regional and global institutions, such as the Japan-China-ROK, ARF and ASEAN+3 for confidence building purposes. Fourth, Japan needs to signal the international society what security role it wants to play regionally and internationally in the future.

Pia McKay- (New Zealand)

The top security priority for New Zealand should be nontraditional security, especially in the areas of environmental and societal security. For New Zealand to play an important role in shaping aspects of the international relations of the Asia-Pacific region, it must be seen as an example of economic dynamism.

In the Asia-Pacific regional security architecture, big players do not always play the big roles. This is shown in the role played by the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), which has assumed the “driver’s seat” in constructing the region’s international relations.¹⁴ ASEAN is composed of 10 states which are not leading players in greater Asia in terms of military or economic might, and yet they are able to set the agenda and lead engagement at the ASEAN Regional Forum, the grouping of Asean+3, the East Asia Summit, the Asia Europe Meeting, and the ASEAN-Russia Summit.¹⁵

To the benefit of New Zealand, it appears that initiative and style of interaction are highly important to relations in the Asia-Pacific region, not simply military might. In light of this, the top priority for New Zealand is to create a niche for itself based on expertise it can bring to new security concerns, especially in the areas of environmental and societal security. New Zealand’s major opportunity for security engagement of this sort comes through its participation in the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF). New Zealand has been a dialogue partner with ASEAN since 1975, and has benefited from high-level engagement through the ARF structure since its creation in 1994. Within the ARF, 25 states and the European Union engage in dialogues to build cooperative security. As well as the emphasis on security through cooperation, the ARF places emphasis on new “non-traditional” types of security. This focus is, at least in part, a reflection of the global security environment, which has qualitatively changed during the post-Cold War period. Caballero-Anthony and Emmers write that “...the referent object of security is now no longer confined to the state and its defense from external military attacks but also includes societies and human collectivities.”¹⁶

Major areas of nontraditional security in which New Zealand should play a leading role are environmental security and societal security. Influence in these two areas would put to use New Zealand’s good standing in relation to the environment (in the areas of environmental conservation, eco-tourism, and research into green technologies), and consolidated democracy (as a highly transparent multicultural system with a firm commitment to human rights). To remain relevant, and use its good standing to its greatest benefit, New Zealand must build on its economic success. To this end, New Zealand must seize opportunities to form closer ties with rapidly developing markets. New Zealand has secured free trade agreements with China (in 2008), and ASEAN (along with Australia in the AANZFTA, 2007) and is currently in negotiations with India.

¹⁴ Acharya, A., 2001, *Constructing a Security Community in Asia: ASEAN and the Problem of Regional Order*, Routledge, London, www.aseansec.org, accessed 25-05-2010

¹⁶ Caballero-Anthony, M., & Emmers, R. (eds), 2006, *Non-Traditional Security in Asia: Dilemmas in Securitisation*, Ashgate, England

Added to these agreements, the New Zealand government should encourage the pursuit of opportunities in the highly dynamic economies of Vietnam and Indonesia.¹⁷ From a position of economic competitiveness, New Zealand will be well-placed to increase its contribution to nontraditional security dialogues in its areas of expertise.

Dominic Nardi (US)

With the decline in US power and the rise of China, the greatest US foreign policy challenge is to define and stabilize a new international order. Few great power transitions have been peaceful. The Punic Wars, Thirty-Year War, Napoleonic Wars, and world wars all occurred when the international system lacked a clear hegemon and rivals competed for great power status. Peace was only restored when a new hegemon emerged, such as Rome or the US, or existing powers limited their ambitions, such as with the Treaty of Westphalia.

By contrast, the current international dynamic is a historical oddity. After the fall of the Soviet Union, it seemed the world would depend upon US hegemony, as during the 1991 Gulf War. However, the US no longer enjoys overwhelming supremacy over rivals. The situation is especially perilous because, unlike the last great-power handoff from Britain to the US, the US and China fundamentally mistrust each other and hold diametrically opposed views on everything from human rights to currency regimes.

The current US policy – “Norman Angell liberal internationalism” – attempts to give China a greater stake in the post-World War II system through deeper economic integration and more responsibility in multilateral institutions. However, there is no guarantee that China would uphold the international system once it gains enough influence to demand changes.

Likewise, the US should reject the “G-2” relationship proposed by Zbigniew Brzezinski. G-2 would raise China to the level of a co-equal, creating an inherently confrontational “Cold-War” bipolar scenario. Moreover, excluding the rest of the world from major decisions would alienate our allies.

“Offensive realism,” advocated by John Mearsheimer, would involve retarding China’s economic growth and containing it militarily before China has a chance to become a rival superpower. This approach would definitively solve the problem. However, because of the interdependence between China and the US (“Chimerica”), offensive realism also raises the specter of economic havoc.

A more realistic and rewarding policy would be to gradually reduce China’s relative power while raising that of the US – an “inoffensive realism.” Paul Kennedy argues, state power is directly linked to a strong economy. As such, the Obama administration must reform entitlement programs and encourage green energy, biotech,

¹⁷ IMF World Economic Outlook 2010, available at: <http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/weo/2010/01/index.htm>, accessed 25-05-2010

and nanotech – industries where the US’s financial and intellectual capital still give it a comparative advantage over China.

Second, the US must improve relations with non-aligned middle-income countries. The Bush administration began this process with its nuclear agreement with India. The Obama administration’s Comprehensive Partnership with Indonesia will likely add to it. However, the US should look beyond the usual suspects. Russia is an attractive candidate for a new strategic partnership – Obama allegedly considers Medvedev a friend and the Kremlin has its own concerns about a rising China.

Finally, the US should dampen China’s economic growth through the promotion of alternative investment and trade partners. The Obama administration should encourage more regional free trade areas that can harness economics of scale comparable to China’s enormous market. Fortunately, with the BRICS, plus Indonesia and Turkey, US businesses should have plenty of opportunities elsewhere.

China’s massive holdings of US debt – around \$877 billion – presents the greatest risk to this policy. Fortunately, Beijing depends upon economic growth to maintain domestic legitimacy and would be hesitant to destroy the market of its largest export partner. Furthermore, unlike Mearsheimer’s proposal, inoffensive realism eschews any notion of sanctions or containment.

Ultimately, our goal is to avoid bipolar US-China competition to reach a world in which the US remains preeminent among a field of other powers. The alternative or status quo risks potentially calamitous great power confrontation.

Suwita Randhawa (Malaysia)

Under the leadership of Najib Razak, a central priority of Malaysia’s foreign policy agenda will concern the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN). Since ASEAN was established, it has represented a cornerstone of Malaysia’s foreign policy. Indeed, an underlying principle that guides Malaysia’s foreign policy has been confidence in the belief that fostering and strengthening cooperative relationships with members of ASEAN is both an economic necessity and a strategic imperative. Like his predecessors, Najib Razak can be expected to dedicate considerable foreign policy resources to Malaysia’s Southeast Asian neighbors.

However, it is plausible to expect this broad continuity to be complemented by some unique foreign policy endeavors. As the one-year mark of Razak’s premiership has passed, commentators and observers of Malaysian foreign policy will be closely watching Razak’s diplomatic initiatives to ascertain how, and in what ways, Razak will leave his mark on Malaysian foreign policy. It is reasonable to expect Razak to distinguish himself from his predecessors by carving out a more assertive role for Malaysia within developments surrounding the Asia-Pacific’s regional architecture. This has emerged as a central issue across the region and developments pertaining to Asia-Pacific’s regional

architecture are of immense importance to Malaysia: the structure of the region's architecture will not only affect ASEAN's future place within the broader Asia-Pacific region, but it can either facilitate or hinder Malaysia's bilateral relationships with other states of the Asia-Pacific, such as the United States and Australia. It therefore seems likely that Razak will come to regard developments concerning the Asia-Pacific security architecture as a key foreign policy and security priority.

Under Najib's leadership, Malaysia can be expected to formulate an official position on which institutions should form the underlying basis of the region's security architecture. Central to this will be determining the contours of Malaysia's vision for the region's architecture and ensuring that this vision can successfully reconcile the collective goals and interests of ASEAN across the Asia-Pacific region on the one hand, and Malaysia's bilateral relationships with key Asia-Pacific states, such as Australia, China, Japan and the United States. In short, Malaysia's foreign policy and security priority under the Najib administration will revolve around securing Malaysia's and ASEAN's position within the future Asian-Pacific order to enable both to adequately advance their specific regional and international goals.

Hafiz Salae (Thailand)

Domestic and international security circumstances are more complex and interconnected than ever. In Thailand, security issues – both traditional and nontraditional – arise from various threats, such as natural disasters, environmental degradation, pandemic diseases, natural resource competition, poverty, human trafficking, the Deep South insurgency and political conflict. Of these problems, the two most important issues with significant implications for the foreign and security policy of Thailand are the Deep South unrest and political conflict. The Thai government must see both problems as the major priority in its foreign and security policy because they are equally important and share some elements: the large number of lives lost and properties damaged, hostile feelings toward the state, and an effort to internationalize the problem.

Although their causes and durations are different, both problems generate deep-rooted divisions among Thai people and bring about the extensive loss of lives and damage of properties. Over the six years of the Deep South insurgency since 2004, the total casualty was approximately 10,600 individuals – 4,100 deaths and 6,500 injuries and the casualty rate will escalate in the ongoing violence. The other conflict has existed since PM Thaksin Shinawatra was ousted by a bloodless coup in 2006. During the long protest calling the government to dissolve Parliament by the United Front for Democracy against Dictatorship (UDD) – so-called Red Shirts – from March 15 to May 19, 2010, 88 people were killed and nearly 2,000 injured. The assessed economic impact exceeds 100 billion baht from the losses in tourism, investment, and property damage including many banks and department stores. Apart from the damage caused by the brutally exposed resentment of the protesters, the more crucial problem is the intense hatred and genuine grievance of many locals toward the government; even the prime minister was resisted many times by opponents and many obvious symbols of the government power were

destroyed. There is also a growing trend that the Red Shirts will go underground and become further radicalized.

All these instances reduce the legitimacy of the government and result in efforts from opponents to internationalize problems. The uncontrolled incidents have attempted to draw international organizations such as the United Nations and the Organization of Islamic Conference (OIC) into situations, while the government insists that they are under control.

To resolve such political difficulties, key measures should be enacted by the government. All actions, essentially, must be based on good governance which is internationally accepted. Solving problems with military force, controlling the area by special legal measures such as martial laws and Decree on Public Administration in Emergency Situations side by side with emphasizing the democratic and peaceful resolution of problems is not sufficient as the violence could only be reduced and controlled to a certain level, but there would still be problems of human right violations and grievances. Consequently, to satisfy and maintain the confidence of all people, the government must scrupulously follow legal and judicial processes – even punishing corrupt officials – and endeavor to find solutions to structural and basic problems.

Sunny Tanuwidjaja (Indonesia)

Although Obama's plans to visit (and sadly the multiple cancellations) have been the focus of many Indonesians, it is balancing and maintaining strong and trusting relations with both China and the United States that should be the main focus of Indonesia's foreign policy.

With China, the implementation of CAFTA should be the top priority of Indonesian foreign policy makers. The CAFTA issue should be a high priority for Indonesia because it directly affects the livelihood of many Indonesians. Failure to respond properly can lead to long-term disaster and Indonesia will be left behind in seizing economic opportunities that will emerge from CAFTA.

With the United States, Indonesia should define more concretely in both security and economic bilateral relations. Security-wise, there is no doubt that the US looks to Indonesia to help its relations with the Muslim world. The US also tries to help ASEAN avoid becoming another breeding ground for terrorism and thus seeks to assist Indonesia in counter terrorism efforts. The economic relationship is less defined. Indonesia should realize that the US has a huge market in terms of both population and purchasing power. In addition, Indonesia has to further diversify US investment in Indonesia.

Alongside the economic change in the ASEAN region, terrorism has disturbed Indonesia's stability and this should be our main security focus. Arrests made in the last several months have shown how terrorism is a fact of life in Indonesia. Whether it has taken root is a question that requires further evidence.

Indonesia's bilateral relations with China and with the US demand not just diplomacy but domestic homework. First, Indonesia has to strengthen its domestic investment climate to optimize gains from CAFTA. Second, Indonesia has to strengthen its domestic industry in order to compete well with China. Third, Indonesia has to identify strategic domestic industries that it has to protect from competition without damaging long-term development of its competitiveness and without creating conflicts under the CAFTA agreement.

With regard to relations with the US, Indonesia has to maintain its centrality in the Muslim world. Indonesia's democratic consolidation has been the main interest of the US and the Muslim world. Indonesia's success will create opportunities for others to learn and follow. On the terrorism issue, it is important that the Indonesian security force maintain its credibility and success. To increase investment from the US, Indonesia has to learn from China and improve its domestic investment climate. Indonesia has to develop a mechanism in which US investment not only provides financial profits but also technological transfer that allows long-term benefits for Indonesia.

On the security dimension, Indonesia has to create a blueprint to curb terrorism and identify the main causes of terrorism – not only why its appeal spread in the last several years but who, when, where, and how it spreads. The combination of both a security and socio-cultural approach should be used to have a long-term solution to this issue.

Sulathin Thiladej (Laos)

Over the past 30 years, Laotian foreign and security policy has undergone major changes in many spheres. The policy reform that includes the foreign and security policy launched in Laos in 1986 is known as the New Economic Mechanism (NEM) – an open-door policy. This policy has brought profound changes to the country, including enlargement of relations with all countries

With the changing international situation, uncertainties of global economies and politics, as well as emerging global issues like terrorism, nuclear weapons, diseases, and natural disasters, have imposed a threat to many nations' security. The policies of peace, independence, friendship, and cooperation are key policies for Laos' stability in developing the country out of poverty.

Laos is one of the least developed countries with a GDP per capita under \$1000. There is no doubt, therefore, that Laos' foreign and security policy has to be aligned with the nation's stability and development. The policy of peace, independence, friendship, and cooperation can support the Laos' socio-economic development. The policy also guides a strategy of increasing allies and reducing enemies, as Laos is firmly committed to being on friendly terms with all countries. These approaches are in line with Laos' policy to integrate itself into the region and the world.

Laos has emphasized strengthening relations and cooperation with its neighboring countries, and actively participating in regional and sub-regional activities. It has promoted bilateral and multilateral cooperation between these countries.

Larger countries like China, Japan, the US, Australia, and India have played significant roles in the political and economic development of Southeast Asia. The region is hardly to refuse their influences. The most important policy of Laos toward these larger countries has been to maintain good relations and strengthen cooperation. These countries have provided assistance and support for institutional and legal reforms that allow Laos to smoothly integrate with the region and the world, i.e., in the preparation process of Laos joining the WTO.

The policy will implement international conventions, including conventions on human rights. Human rights is a sensitive issue in Laos. In the past, Laos has been criticized significantly by western countries, especially the US. Thus, the policy has to support solving this issue to protect the nation's security. In addition, the policy has to be aligned with the international community's directions in the fight against controversial issues like climate change.

To strengthen the policy of peace, independence, friendship, and cooperation, Laos has to ensure national stability and substantial development. Hence, the Lao government should take the following approaches:

- Pursue a policy of peace to make the nation and the region stable and prosperous.
- Foreign and security policy should continue to place priority on cooperation with neighboring countries and with the whole region such as ASEAN. As Laos seeks to deepen integration, its policy needs to emphasize further integration.
- The Lao government should continue to implement the national socio-economic development plan as the key factor for determining national survival. The foreign and security policy should be presented as an opportunity for the country to improve well-being, social, and economic situation for the Lao people which will help to achieve the nation's security and prosperity.
- The policy should address emerging challenges in terms of peace and cooperation to deepen reform and reap the benefits of regionalization and globalization.
- Rivalry among the powerful countries on Southeast Asia has become a challenge for the region. To overcome these challenges, Laos should continue playing its neutral role together with ASEAN and the international community to find a common solution to deal with global issues.

Chen-Dong Tso (Taiwan)

Our top priority in foreign and security policy comprises three goals: survival, prosperity, recognition.

First, survival means continuation of the current polity and economy in its long-standing distinctive form. In the second half of the 20th century, our survival was threatened by the socialist regime in mainland China due to the cross-strait confrontation originating from the Cold War. After the end of the Cold War, cross-strait relations change variably with different policy courses taken by different administrations in the country as well as reactions from the mainland regime.

Second, economic performance is vital to any regime as the government's legitimacy is based upon its ability to achieve prosperity. In the 1950s, the government relied upon establishment of basic infrastructure such as currency credibility, price stability, and rudimental transportation facilities to achieve prosperity. With the maturity of the economy, it becomes more important to keep upgrading industries and to create a friendly trading environment for national firms. Both require the government to obtain access to important technological sources worldwide and to maintain good connections with all major trading countries, which became more difficult given the country's diplomatic isolation.

Third, recognition has been the most difficult issue in the country since the 1970s when the country was excluded from the United Nations and de-recognized by most of the countries in the world. Since the 1990s, the ruling government has tried to reactivate its membership in United Nations and major international organizations. While it has not yet brought about significant results, the domestic political repercussions are formidable. The current administration elected in 2008 is working to maintain a balance between rising domestic expectations and severe international constraints on this issue.

To achieve the above three goals, the government has taken the following course of actions integral to its foreign and security policy. The first is to keep the relationship with the United States as strong as possible and to secure an undisturbed access to weaponry necessary for the defense of the country. The second is to improve cross-strait relations to the extent that will keep dialogues between the two sides continuous and productive. The third is to maintain sufficient representative operations in all major trading countries to create space for trade, finance, and investment exchange. The final policy is to participate in important international organizations such that the country and its people shall not be excluded from the workings of global governance that are rapidly growing in coverage and significance.

Chheang Vannarith (Cambodia)

Cambodia has gone through more than three decades of civil war which was mainly driven by differences in ideology and intervention by superpowers. Learning from historical experiences, Cambodia has been committed to pursuing a neutral foreign and security policy without taking sides and having an alliance with any country. As one of the least developed countries, Cambodia is struggling with poverty and food security. Foreign policy is used as a strategy to reduce poverty in Cambodia through foreign assistance, foreign direct investment, and international trade.

There are six pillars of Cambodia's foreign policy:

- 1. Neutrality and independence.** To stay neutral within the competition between and among superpowers is the greatest challenge for Cambodia's foreign policy since this country has relied on foreign financial assistance either bilaterally or multilaterally for its national administration expenditure and investment. Cambodia believes that through solidarity and friendship with its neighbors and the ASEAN family, it can stay neutral and better balance different interests between the superpowers. The triangle traditional friendship among Cambodia-Laos-Vietnam is important to these three countries to help them stay independent and neutral.
- 2. No enemy.** Cambodia is practicing a "No Enemy" foreign policy which means that Cambodia is friend to all countries – of course with different levels of significance.
- 3. Regional and Global Cooperation and Integration.** Designing a foreign policy that supports national economic development is the cornerstone of Cambodia. Regional and global cooperation and integration are regarded as the viable strategy to develop Cambodia's economy through trade and investment.
- 4. Cambodian identity.** After about 100 years as a French Protectorate and more than three decades of political upheaval, regime changes, and armed conflict, Cambodia almost lost its identity. Revitalizing Khmer or Cambodian identity is one of the objectives of Cambodian foreign policy. Cambodia has been working hard to promote Cambodian identity to the world through cultural exchanges and events and tourism.
- 5. Peace Building.** Although Cambodia just emerged from protracted armed conflict and mass atrocities, it has committed itself to sharing its experiences and building peace in the region and the world. Cambodia has sent peacekeeping forces to several conflict zones in Africa and other regions under the framework of the United Nations.
- 6. Democratic values.** Although Cambodia is one of the youngest democratic countries in the region, Cambodia is supporting and promoting democratic principles in the country and the region. Cambodia understands that there is no sustainable development without democratization.

Patricia Vazquez Marin (Mexico)

Since its establishment as a nation state in 1821, Mexico has been characterized as a peaceful country. This hallmark is in the constitution, dating back to 1917, which establishes the guiding principles of foreign policy based on the quest for peace and security. Corollary to this, the concept of security in Mexico has specific characteristics

inherited from a historical, social, and political process that is deeply linked to democracy. Indeed, Mexico went from a fledgling democracy to a democracy in the process of maturation with the Institutional Revolutionary Party (PRI) ruling the country since 1929 until the presidential elections held in 2000. During this period, the regime's security was tantamount to national security as the hegemonic party was the standard of stability both internally and abroad.

The correlation between protection, subordination, and violence started to crumble the one-party system in Mexico. Consequently, drug trafficking, violence, and organized crime began to slip out from the controlling hand of government. During the Fox administration, along with the change of government and ruling party, began a period of rising violence and crime caused by the war between drug cartels and their territorial struggle, exacerbated by the intervention of a corrupt military combating drug trafficking, and the consequent increase in the number of civilian deaths in a tragic triangle of drug cartels, the military, and society.

Subsequently, in 2006 as a result of the party competition in one of the hardest-fought elections in the country's history, national security policy was almost overlooked, leading to a wave of direct confrontations between criminal organizations not only linked to drug trafficking but also those engaged in extortion, kidnapping, and trafficking of people and materials in pursuit of territorial control and influence over key government institutions.

In this scenario, the current president, Felipe Calderón, set six goals for national security and 12 for foreign policy, the cornerstone of them all being "sustainable human development throughout the country," derived from the National Development Plan that each administration issues to define the guidelines for each sector. The Mexican government divided security matters into two areas: internal security handled by the Department of Public Safety and Homeland Security under the Ministry of National Defense. Agreements such as Plan Merida to fight drug trafficking, signed with the United States, formed a cornerstone within the framework of national security and foreign policy given the current confrontation between drug cartels.

Mexico's foreign policy is circumscribed to strengthening the sustainable development of its people through the signing of international agreements on investment and economic development and the country's active participation in international fora that allow Mexico to position itself strategically in the world. Likewise, due to the proximity to the United States and derived from the phenomenon of migration, protection of compatriots abroad is a foreign policy priority, as for instance the issue relating to Senate Bill 1070 in the state of Arizona.

It is clear that for the government to guarantee sustainable development of the population, the implementation strategy has to be reviewed and adjusted since key elements have been minimized as the police and military presence is not enough to end the lack of security. A more holistic approach is required to strengthen the social fabric and its milieu.

Appendix A

About the Authors

Mr. Chheang Vannarith is Executive Director of the Cambodian Institute for Cooperation and Peace, a member of ASEAN-ISIS and CSCAP. He graduated from the Institute of International Relations (Vietnam) in 2002 and holds an MA in international relations from the International University of Japan in 2006. He received a graduate certificate in leadership from the East West Center (USA) in 2009. He received a PhD degree in Asia Pacific Studies from the Ritsumeikan Asia Pacific University in 2010. His research interests include international relations in East Asia and Cambodian political economy.

Mr. Aaron L. Connelly is a visiting fellow at the Centre for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) in Jakarta. His research focuses on the increasing role of the Indonesian legislature in making foreign policy, and the role of national identity in shaping ideas about national interest. Aaron worked in the private sector as a research analyst at BrooksBowerAsia, helping Fortune 100 companies and NGOs understand the political environment in Indonesia, Malaysia, and the Philippines. Aaron was a research assistant to former Secretary of Defense William S. Cohen in Singapore, and at the Japan Chair of the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) in Washington, and as a staffer for the US-Japan Legislative Exchange Program. He is pursuing an MA in security studies at Georgetown University and holds a BA in international affairs from George Washington University.

Mr. Mark Garnick is a Monterey Fellow at the Pacific Forum CSIS. He is pursuing his MA in international policy studies with a concentration in East Asia studies at the Monterey Institute of International Studies. He is also a part of the James Martin Center for Nonproliferation Studies, East Asia Nonproliferation Department where he researched China's Aerospace industry, and China's military modernizations. He holds a BA in International Relations from California State University Sacramento.

Mr. Kei Koga from Japan, is a 2009 Vasey fellow and a PhD candidate in international relations at the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University. His research interests include international relations theory, international security, terrorism, East Asian regionalism, US-Japan relations and ASEAN. Before attending Fletcher, he served as a research fellow at the Japan Forum on International Relations (JFIR) and as assistant executive secretary at the Council on East Asian Community (CEAC). He also teaches international relations and East Asian security at the Open University of Japan. He received an MA in international affairs at the Elliott School of International Affairs, George Washington University, and a BA in international affairs at Lewis & Clark College.

Ms. K'ng Yee Pei is a MA candidate at the University of Malaya focusing on South Korean foreign policy, South Korea-ASEAN relations and East Asian regionalism. She also teaches Korean language at the National University of Malaysia. She has research stints at the Institute of Foreign Affairs and National Security (IFANS) under the ASEAN-ROK Academic Exchange Program; Hanguk University of Foreign Studies as a Korean Government Scholarship Program recipient, and the University of Tokyo with the Japan-East Asia Network of Exchange of Students and Youths (JENESYS) Program. She spent one year as a Korea Foundation Korean Language Training Fellow at Korea University. She received her BA from the Korea Studies Program at the University of Malaya in 2006.

Mr. Herizal Hazri is a Program Director in The Asia Foundation's Malaysia office. He is responsible for program design and coordination for the Foundation's programs in Malaysia. Prior to joining the Foundation, Mr. Hazri served as a consultant with several think tanks and public policy consulting firms internationally as well as in Malaysia. He is known for his civil society development efforts in Malaysia, particularly in the area of human rights and democracy. He has worked in 12 Asian countries under the Asian Network for Free Elections (ANFREL) to promote democratization efforts, namely Indonesia, East Timor (now Timor Leste), Thailand, Philippines, Cambodia, Myanmar, Pakistan, Afghanistan, Sri Lanka, Bangladesh, Taiwan, and his home country, Malaysia. In 2004, Mr. Hazri managed the only International Election Observation Mission for the Afghanistan Presidential Election and deployed 45 long-term and short-term observers to Pakistan, Afghanistan, and Iran. Mr. Hazri holds a BEc in Economic Development, with honours, from the University of Malaya, and an MSc in Global Politics from the University of London, United Kingdom.

Mr. Hiep Hong Le is a lecturer at the Faculty of International Relations, College of Social Sciences and Humanities, Vietnam National University (VNU) in Ho Chi Minh City. He is teaching International Political Economy, Advanced English of International Relations, and developing other courses on International Negotiation and Asia Pacific Security, which are also his research interests. Before starting his academic career at VNU, Hiep had a stint working for the Department of International Law and Treaties, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Vietnam for three years, from 2004 to 2006. Hiep obtained a BA from the Vietnam Institute of International Relations in 2003. In 2008, he earned his MA in International Relations and Master of Diplomacy from the Australian National University by an Australian Leadership Award.

Ms. Pia McKay is working toward an MSc. in IR on a Singapore Technologies Engineering scholarship at the S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies at Nanyang Technological University in Singapore. She was awarded a BA with First Class Honours in IR in 2008 from Victoria University of Wellington in where she focused on International Relations (IR) and won the Asia Politics Prize in 2007.

Mr. Dominic Nardi is pursuing a career in international law in Southeast Asia. He studied environmental law in Southeast Asia at Georgetown University's School of Foreign Service. For his thesis, he traveled to the region for two months to conduct interviews with government officials, Buddhist monks, and environmental activists. He is pursuing a JD from Georgetown and an MA in Southeast Asian Studies from Johns Hopkins SAIS. At Georgetown Law, he studied how Asian courts take social and political factors into account when deciding cases. Mr. Nardi interned at the Asia Foundation office in Manila, where he advised Filipino attorneys about remedies to extrajudicial killings under international human rights conventions.

Ms. Suwita Hani Randhawa is a researcher at the Bureau of Foreign Policy and Security Studies of the Institute of Strategic and International Studies (ISIS) Malaysia. She recently completed an MA (International Relations) at The Australian National University in Canberra, Australia. Her undergraduate studies were undertaken at the University of Pretoria in Pretoria, South Africa, where she completed the following degrees: BA (Law, Political Science, International Relations); LLB and BA (Honours) (International Relations). She will be commencing her PhD studies, a DPhil in International Relations at the University of Oxford, in October 2010.

Dr. Kevin Shepard is a Kelly Fellow at the Pacific Forum CSIS and a research fellow with the Institute for Far Eastern Studies, Kyungnam University. He recently earned his PhD in North Korean Politics and Unification Policies from Kyungnam University, Graduate School of North Korean Studies. He also holds an MA in International Policy Studies from Sydney University and an MA in Korean from the University of Hawaii. He has contributed chapters to *The Dynamics of Change in North Korea* (Kyungnam University, 2009), and the forthcoming *A Roadmap for Expanding US-ROK Alliance Cooperation* (The Asia Foundation, 2010) and *Joint US Academic Studies Volume 20 – Navigating Turbulence in Northeast Asia: The Future of the US-ROK Alliance* (Korea Economic Institute, 2010). His articles have appeared in *Asia Business and Technology Report*, *IFES Forum*, and *ICNK Forum*.

Mr. Sunny Tanuwidjaja is a researcher in the Department of Politics and Social Change at the Centre for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS), Jakarta, Indonesia. He received his BA in Chemical Engineering at the University of Wisconsin, Madison in 2002, and his MA in Political Science at Northern Illinois University. His MA thesis was titled "Comparative Study of Fiscal Decentralization: The Cases of Indonesia and India". He is working on his doctoral dissertation on local political coalitions in Indonesia. He is a lecturer in Pelita Harapan University. Prior to joining CSIS, he worked at the Sociology and Political Science Quantitative Research lab in Northern Illinois University.

Mr. Sulathin Thiladej graduated from the Diplomatic Academy of Vietnam and undertook research at Reitaku University under APIC Ushiba Memorial Fellowship. He served in various positions including the Secretariat Office to Lao Deputy Prime Minister and Foreign Minister (2005-2006). Currently, he serves as researcher at the Institute of Foreign Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Laos, and as a lecturer in the Faculty of International Relations, National University of Laos.

Dr. Chen-Dong Tso is an associate professor at the Department of Political Science, National Taiwan University. He is also an executive editor of the journal *Asian Ethnicity* published by Routledge. In addition to teaching at NTU, Dr. Tso serves as consultant for the Asia Foundation headquartered in San Francisco. He obtained his Ph.D. degree in international studies from University of Denver, Colorado, USA. His research focuses on technology policy and international political economy and has published in a number of local and international journals, including *Journal of East Asian Studies*, *Issues and Studies*, and *Australian Journal of Public Administration*.

Appendix B



PACIFIC FORUM CSIS
YOUNG LEADERS

24TH ASIA-PACIFIC ROUNDTABLE
Sheraton Imperial, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia

Jointly organized by
ASEAN-ISIS, the Asia Foundation and the Pacific Forum CSIS

Agenda

Monday, 7 June 2010

- 1200-1400 Working Lunch
(Briefing and Introduction)
- 1400-1515 **Session 1: Malaysian Foreign Policy: Goals, Challenges And Aspirations**
YBhg Tan Sri Hamy Agam
- 1515-1530 Refreshments
- 1530-1645 **Session 2: ASEAN: Advancing Community-Building**
Amb Ahmad Shahizan Samad (TBC)
- 1645-1800 **Session 3: The Dynamics Of East Asian Security**
Prof. Dr. Michael Green
- 1830-2030 APR Welcoming Dinner

Tuesday, 8 June 2010

- 0900-0905 Welcoming Remarks
- 0905-0930 **Keynote Address**
By The Hon. Dato' Sri Mohd Najib Tun Abdul Razak
- 0930-1000 Refreshments
- 1000-1130 Plenary Session 1:
China's Relations with Asia: Past, Present and Future

- 1130-1300 Plenary Session 2
The Asia Pacific's Regional Architecture
- 1300-1400 Lunch
- 1400-1530 Plenary Session 3
The Dawn of The Asian Century: Southeast Asian Perspectives
- 1530-1700 Plenary Session 4
ASEAN Connectivity: Advancing Economic Development and Community-Building
- 1700-1715 Refreshments
- 1715-1845 Concurrent Session 1
Enhancing Maritime Security
- Concurrent Session 2
Making Responsibility to Protect (RtoP) Work In The Asia Pacific
- 2000 Dinner Talk
Continuity and Change In Japanese Foreign Policy Under The Hatoyama Administration

Wednesday, June 9, 2010

- 0730-0830 Breakfast meeting
 - Dato Dr. Mahani Zainal Abidin (Malaysia)
 - HRH Prince Samdech Norodom Sirivudh (Cambodia)
 - Amb. Kishan Rana (India)
- 0900-1030 Plenary Session 5
Addressing Climate Change: Moving Towards Cop16
- 1030-1100 Refreshments
- 1100-1230 Concurrent Session 3
Prospects for Peace in The Korean Peninsula
- Concurrent Session 4
Counter-Insurgency and Nation-Building in Afghanistan: Challenges and Prospects
- 1230-1330 Lunch

- 1330-1500 Plenary Session 6
US Asia Policy: A New Paradigm?
- 1500-1630 Plenary Session 7
Is Myanmar Changing or Has Myanmar Changed US?
- 1630-1645 Refreshments
- 1645-1815 Plenary Session 8
India's Engagement with East Asia
- 1815-1845 **Closing Address**
By The Hon. Tan Sri Muhyiddin Hj. Mohd Yassin

Thursday, June 10, 2010

- 0830-1000 **Young Leaders Roundtable** with senior members of ASEAN-ISIS
- Emeritus Prof. Dr. Carolina Hernandez
 - Dato' Dr. Mahani Zainal Abidin
 - Dr. Rizal Sukma
- 1000-1015 Refreshments
- 1015-1115 **Session 4: Climate Change and Development**
Distinguished Speaker: H.E. Amb. Mutsuyoshi Nishimura
- 1115-1215 **Session 5: Reflections On Regional Issues**
- 1215-1300 Wrap-Up Session
- 1300 Lunch