

# Conference Booklet

## 10<sup>th</sup> Asian Security Conference On 'Asian Security in 21st Century'

(February 5-7, 2008)



**Institute for Defence Studies and Analyses (IDSA)  
No.1, Development Enclave, Rao Tula Ram Marg  
New Delhi-110010**



# Concept Note

## Concept Note

The 10th Asian Security Conference (ASC 2008) is a major calendar event of the Institute for Defence Studies and Analyses (IDSA), New Delhi. Since 1999 when the conference was first held, it has become an important forum for debating issues relating to Asian Security. The ASC has provided a forum for ministers, diplomats, scholars and security analysts, both from India and abroad, to share their views on the security challenges facing the continent.

The 10th ASC attains particular significance in view of the continuing trouble spots in the continent and the wider implications these would have for international stability and security as a whole. The conference would, therefore, focus on the myriad challenges to Asian Security in the 21st century with particular reference to the strategic outlook of major political actors in Asia; the emerging challenges to the nuclear order; the future of Afghanistan; the challenges posed by transnational terror networks and sectarian violence; and the multilateral framework for managing conflict and fostering cooperation among the political actors in Asia.

The contemporary strategic context is increasingly defined by the rapid growth of major Asian economies and the rapidly increasing interest the major powers are evincing in the region. It has also resulted in a perceptible shift in power to the Asian continent. An assessment of how each of the major Asian powers and important external actors are responding to these developments is necessary for understanding the underlying concerns about peace and security in Asia in the 21st Century. The conference would debate the strategic outlook from the perspective of major political actors in Asia.

While the emerging power shift is full of promise and opportunities, there are important concerns that cannot be ignored. Asia's statesmen face a variety of challenges, which, if ignored or viewed with lesser concern, could lead to further instability and insecurity in the region. The foremost among these concerns is the emerging challenges to the nuclear order in Asia. The conference will debate the nuclear stability/equation in Asia; the threat of nuclear proliferation among states and the potential dangers of non-state actors gaining access/acquiring nuclear technologies; the consequences of proliferation for strategic stability and the possibilities for cooperative preventive measures.

The conference will take stock of recent developments in Afghanistan followed by a discussion on the future of peace and stability in these conflict zones. What is the character of the conflicts in Afghanistan? What are the current trends? What is the

role of regional actors? What is the nature of engagement of US and its allies? What is the assessment of future course of action by major actors? What is the role played by INGOs and international community? What could be done to stabilize Afghanistan? These are some of the questions that the participants will address during their deliberations on the future of Afghanistan.

The emerging trends in transnational terror networks and sectarian violence will form an important part of the conference deliberations. Participants will address the following questions: What are the lessons of the US-led 'Global War on Terror'? Has the 'GWOT' weakened the transnational terror networks such as al Qaeda? What is the impact of 'GWOT' on state actors with links to transnational terror networks? What is the role of intelligence sharing in the fight against terror networks? What are the trends in religious sectarianism? What implications do the emerging trends in sectarian violence hold for peace in Asia?

While Asian states are better positioned to secure their interests than they ever were, the importance of multilateral institutions/efforts for better securing economic integration and security concerns cannot be ignored. There is a clear and recognized need for both reinforcing the existing institutions and founding of others that could be useful for addressing specific concerns. The conference would provide a forum for assessing the adequacy of existing multilateral institutions, identify their weaknesses and suggest a road map for effective cooperation in the future.

The 10th ASC will feature six sessions, would comprehensively seek to address the major trends in the Asian strategic context; assess major challenges for peace and stability; and suggest creative solutions for management of conflict and cooperation in the new century.

\*\*\*\*\*

## **Participants' Profiles & Abstracts**

# **Chinese Nationalism and Implications for Asian Security**

**Abanti Bhattacharya**

Amidst the growing pace of globalisation in the post-Cold War era, nationalism has emerged as paradoxical force guiding world developments. It is not homogeneous phenomenon but has acquired diverse forms in countries across the globe. In China, nationalism in its present form has emerged with the gradual erosion of communist ideology and an increasing use of nationalism by the Chinese government. There however, exist various perspectives explaining the rise of Chinese nationalism and its implications for regional security. This study defines Chinese nationalism from entwined aspects of China's incomplete nation building process and its aspirations for a great power status. These two aspects while shape the present form of nationalism in China, also guide China's foreign policy making and its strategic behaviour. Contrary to the Chinese view that nationalism aims at a peaceful foreign policy strategy. The paper attempts to explore that how China has employed nationalism as a tool to promote an assertive foreign policy. Such a policy is geared to not only protecting its national interests but also shaping its security environment conducive to its national interests and growth. Essentially thus, Chinese nationalism seeks to build an alternative international order which would evidently challenge the US-dominated world order and its unilateral policies.

## **Abanti Bhattacharya**

Associate Fellow  
Institute for Defence Studies and Analyses (IDSA)  
1, Development Enclave  
New Delhi -110010  
Tel: +91-11-26717983  
Email: awanti\_b\_711@hotmail.com

Dr Abanti Bhattacharya is an Associate Fellow at IDSA. She completed her Masters in History from Jadavpur University, Kolkata and doctorate from Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi. A recipient of the University Grants Commission's Fellowship in History, she was also awarded a Chinese government scholarship, as part of which she pursued a one-year intensive Chinese language course at Fudan University, Shanghai.

Her select publications include: "Chinese Nationalism and the Fate of Tibet: Implications for India and Future Scenarios," (*Strategic Analysis*, vol. 31, no. 2, March 2007); "Chinese Nationalism and China's Assertive Foreign Policy," (*Journal of East Asian Affairs*, vol. 21, no. 1, Spring/Summer 2007); "China's Foreign Policy Challenges and Evolving Strategy," (*Strategic Analysis*, vol. 30, no. 1, Jan-Mar 2006); "Chinese Nationalism Contested: The Rise of Hong Kong Identity," (*Issues & Studies*, vol. 41, no. 2, June 2005) and "Revisiting China's Peaceful Rise: Implications for India," (*East Asia: an International Quarterly*, vol. 22, no. 4, Winter 2005).

## **A K Antony**

Defence Minister  
Ministry of Defence  
South Block  
New Delhi-110011  
India

Shri A K Antony, the Union Defence Minister of India and President IDSA, has held several important positions. He had earlier been the Union Cabinet Minister of Civil Supplies, Consumer Affairs & Public Distribution from 1993-1995. A member of the ruling Indian National Congress, he is presently, a Member of Parliament in the Upper House (Rajya Sabha). He has earlier been a Rajya Sabha Member on two occasions – from 1985 to 1991 and again from 1991 to 1995 and served as the General Secretary of All India Congress Committee from 1984 to 1987.

He has been the Chief Minister of Kerala thrice. He has also been a member of Kerala Legislative Assembly for five terms and the President of Kerala Pradesh Congress Committee from 1973-1977, from 1978 to 1982 and again from 1987 to 1992.

He worked as the Editor of a Malayalam weekly – “KALASALA” from 1964-1966. He was also the Editor of a Malayalam daily – “VEEKSHANAM” from 1978-1982.

## **Afghanistan: The Struggle to Regain Momentum**

**Ali A. Jalali**

There are increasing concerns, both internationally and domestically, that Afghanistan faces the distinct possibility of sliding back into instability and chaos. The country is challenged by a revitalized Taliban-led insurgency, record rise in drug production, deterioration of the rule of law, and weakening national government in the regions outside the major cities.

These troubles come amidst a changing political and military environment in and around Afghanistan compounding effective responses to the emerging challenges. Domestically, the political consensus of 2001 has been lost to disruptive factionalism. The regional actors who collectively supported the post-Taliban political transition have diverging views. Moreover political changes in the region have strongly influenced the attitudes of a number of the regional actors. Internationally, the coalition of nations involved in Afghanistan is divided and does not share a unified vision. Nor have the members of the coalition states provided the same level of political and military commitment.

In spite of these troubling developments, there is still hope that the decline can be reversed with a new strategic approach. The significant institutional, social, and economic achievements made during the past six years provide a solid foundation for building a modern democratic Afghanistan. In order for Afghanistan and its international partners to reverse these negative trends, a thorough and realistic assessment of the situation needs to be conducted along with the creation of a strategic action plan addressing immediate and long-term security challenges. Given the compounded political and security environments, stability cannot be achieved through traditional means. Nor will any minor, inconsequential changes or modifications salvage the situation. Major political and strategic shifts at the national and international level are required to secure Afghanistan's future. The strategy needs to be formulated by a consensus of domestic and international actors, who agree upon effective use of ways and means to achieve peace and stability. Implementation will require a "capacity surge" both nationally and internationally.

## **Ali A. Jalali**

**Distinguished Professor**

Near East South Asia Center for Strategic Studies (NESA)

Washington D.C. 20319-5066

Tel: 202-685-2249

Email: jalalia@ndu.edu

Dr Ali A. Jalali, a former Interior Minister of Afghanistan (January 2003-September 2005), is currently Distinguished Professor at the Near East South Asia Center for Strategic Studies (NESA) and a researcher at the Institute for National Strategic Studies (INSS). His areas of interest include the reconstruction/stabilization and peace keeping operations in Afghanistan and regional issues affecting Afghanistan, Central and South Asia.

Prior to assuming his post as Minister, Dr Jalali was Director of Afghanistan National Radio Network Initiative and Chief of the Pashto Service at the Voice of America (VOA) in Washington, D.C. He is a reputed multi-lingual and political analyst and has native fluency in English, Pashto, Dari, Persian (Farsi) and Tajik, is fluent in Russian, fluently translates from French and has functional knowledge of Arabic, Turkish and Urdu. He has directed broadcasts in Pashto, Dari and Farsi to Afghanistan, Iran and Tajikistan.

As a journalist, he traveled extensively while covering the war in Afghanistan (1982-1993) and the former Soviet Central Asia (1993-2000). He has written extensive analytical reports for VOA on political, economic and social developments in the region. He is a frequent commentator on Afghan issues at major U.S. and European TV and radio networks. He has published in three languages (English, Pashto, Dari/Farsi) and the author of numerous books and articles on political, military and security issues as well as the Islamic movements in Afghanistan, Iran and Central Asia.

He is a former Colonel in the Afghan Army and a graduate of high command and staff colleges in Afghanistan, the United Kingdom and the United States and served as a top military planner with Afghan Resistance following the Soviet invasion in 1979.

## Arundhati Ghose

C – 1903  
Palam Vihar  
Gurgaon – 122017  
E-Mail: arundhati39@hotmail.com

Ambassador Arundhati Ghose joined the Indian Foreign Service in 1963. She worked in various capacities in the Embassies of India in Austria, The Netherlands and Belgium; and as Ambassador of India to the Republic of Korea, Ambassador and Permanent Representative to UNESCO; Ambassador of India to Egypt; Ambassador and Permanent Representative of India to UN Offices in Geneva, and the Conference on Disarmament. She was also posted to Kolkata in the Branch Secretariat of the Ministry of External Affairs to liaise with Bangladesh leaders in Mujibnagar during 1971. She was in charge of Economic Relations in the Ministry of External Affairs in 1990-91. She was Member/Chairperson, UN Secretary-General's Advisory Board on Disarmament (1998-2001); and Member of the Union Public Service Commission (1998-2004). She is a member of Pugwash India, and is on the editorial board of *Disarmament Times* (New York) and *Faultlines* (New Delhi). She has been writing on arms control issues including small arms.

## **Reconstructing Afghanistan after the Overthrow of the Taliban**

**Anita Inder Singh**

America's war against global terrorism began in Afghanistan, where the Taliban government harboured Osama Bin Laden, who masterminded 9/11. The overthrow of the Taliban was intended as the first step in the fight against international terrorism. By November 2001 the Taliban had been defeated and the US, along with its Afghan and European allies, and the UN, devised plans to establish an interim government in Afghanistan as a precursor to elections in 2004. Three years later, the holding of presidential elections – the first in Afghanistan's history - in October 2004 was a success for the United States, but what was their significance in the war against international terrorism?

Anti-terrorism and the reconstruction are the twin strands of international players in Afghanistan. This paper will examine the link between NATO's aims in Afghanistan and America's global anti-terrorist strategy. What problems have had to be faced; what is Western strategy in Afghanistan and how well is it working? What needs to be done to enhance legitimacy and build stable institutions there? What is the role of international intervention in shaping a benign or not-so-benign future for Afghanistan?

## Anita Inder Singh

Visiting Professor  
Centre for Peace and Conflict Resolution  
Jamia Millia Islamia  
New Delhi  
Email: anitaindersingh@hotmail.com

Dr Anita Inder Singh is currently Visiting Professor at the Centre for Peace and Conflict Resolution, where her special task is to frame a graduate course on Development and Security. Earlier Dr. Singh has taught International Relations at Oxford University and the London School of Economics (as Leverhulme Fellow in the Department of International Relations). She took her D.Phil from Oxford University in 1981.

Her Oxford doctoral thesis *The Origins of the Partition of India, 1936-1947* was first published by Oxford University Press (OUP) in 1987. Subsequently she published several books including *The Limits of British Influence: South Asia and the Anglo-American Relationship 1947-56* (1993) and *Democracy, Ethnic Diversity and Security in Post-Communist Europe* (2001). Her articles also have been published in various renowned journals and newspapers including the *International History Review*, *International Affairs*, (Royal Institute of International Affairs, London), the *Journal of Contemporary History*, the *Round Table*, the *Times Literary Supplement*, *Guardian*, *Far Eastern Economic Review* and *Wall Street Journal*.

Her academic interests include nationalism, security, diversity/integration in South Asia and Europe in particular and democracy, governance, and international organisations and security in general.

# **Post-Taliban Afghanistan: Conflict, Violence and Regional Stability**

**Anup Datta**

Post-Taliban Afghanistan is witnessing serious challenges-both in terms of state-building and security. Endorsed at the London conference and UN Security Council, the so-called Afghan compact remains still unrealized today. The reconstitution of Afghanistan was based on three main themes of activity-security, governance and the rule of law and ensuring human rights with social and economic development. For a state which remains underdeveloped, massively exploited, ravaged and, fragmented by deeply embedded regional, intra-Islamic and ethnic-tribal conflicts, the reconstitution of the state requires-both achievement of human security and consolidation of a broadly representative authority. While the new state under Karzai's Interim and Transitional Authorities have been characterized by factional conflicts and the resurgence of Afghan drug economy, the new government is composed of militarily strong Tajik, Uzbek and Hazara factions and a weak Pashtun majority.

The existence of competing power-brokers and well-armed militia's jockeying for power has complicated the democratization process. The Al Qaida and their remnants are still strongly active, in Southern and eastern part of the country and are at large on both sides of the Pakistan-Afghanistan border as well as the militant Islamic cadres who create irritants in the Jammu-Kashmir borders. Indeed, India's interests in Central Asia would be at stake, if resurgence of Talibans continues.

Against this broad spectrum of issues, the paper would purport to analyze the crises in Afghan polity and it's spill-over on the regional scene; it would examine the impact of drug economy, in the context of Globalization and interdependence of the economies of South Asia. To what extent the transnational threats-ranging from Islamic militancy to terrorism and subversion pose significant threat to the Asian region and India, in particular? How far are the regional actors active in consolidating the democratization process in Afghanistan and foster peace and stability in the region?

## **Anup Kumar Dutta**

Professor  
Department of Political Science  
University of North Bengal  
Darjeeling  
Email: dattaanup@hotmail.com

Dr Anup Kumar Dutta is a Professor, Department of Political Science, University of North Bengal, Darjeeling. Earlier from 1972-1976, he was a Research Fellow, Centre of South, South-East and Central Asian Studies, School of International Studies, Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi. He was a Lecturer, North Bengal University and a Visiting Associate, Institute of South East Asian Studies, Singapore (June 1980-October 1980). He was a Reader in 1984, Head of the Department (1985-86), Political Science, University of North Bengal, Member, Board of Research Studies, Centre for Himalayan Studies 98-99, Professor, (2003) Department of Political Science, University of North Bengal, Darjeeling, Academic Coordinator, Strategic and Area Studies (MA programme), Centre of Himalayan Studies, North Bengal University, Darjeeling, West Bengal, India. He did his PhD from University of Calcutta (2003) and M. Phil from Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi New Delhi (1974).

His Research Projects include Identity, State and Crisis of Modernization; Bhutanese Politics at the Cross roads (UGC Major Project, 1994-1997, International Economics Cooperation in a Post –Bipolar World: Crisis and Challenges in Global Polity (ICSSR, Major Project 1996-2000), Ethnicity, Social cleavages and Primordial identities: Identity system and social mobilization in Darjeeling Himalayas (UGC Minor Project, 1987-1989), Globalization, state-civil society conflicts and democratization in south Asia (UGC project, 2006-2008).

## **Regional Cooperation on Terrorism: The Southeast Asian Experience**

**Arpita Anant**

Starting from 1968, Southeast Asia (and Oceania) has suffered approximately 1620 incidents of terrorism caused by 68 terrorist groups. Approximately 74 per cent of these incidents, 77 per cent of the injuries and 25 per cent of the injuries that have resulted from terrorism have occurred after 9/11. This, in conjunction with international developments, has been the key factor that has driven regional cooperation on terrorism in the region, though such regional cooperation precedes 9/11.

However, Southeast Asia is not an exception, rather the rule, in this trend of regionalization of security concerns with regard to terrorism. This is evidenced in the plethora of declarations, conventions and cooperative arrangements that have been adopted by regional organizations, sub-regional organizations and multilateral associations the world over. The nature and extent of such cooperation varies across regions but it also has certain similarities considering the involvement and direction of UN Security Council's Counter Terrorism Committee.

This paper attempts to understand the dynamics of regional security cooperation on terrorism in Southeast Asia. While doing so, it will highlight the role of regional organizations and institutions and identify the key challenges to such cooperation in the region. Considering the limited regional cooperation on terrorism in the South Asian region, the paper will draw lessons from the Southeast Asian experience to suggest whether or not they might be useful for emulation in the South Asian region. Also, considering the serious implications of Southeast Asian terrorism for international, South Asian and specifically Indian security, the paper will explore the merit and possibility of the extent of India's involvement in the ongoing processes of regional cooperation on terrorism in Southeast Asia.

## **Arpita Anant**

Associate Fellow,  
Institute for Defence Studies and Analyses,  
New Delhi  
Email [arpita\\_anant@yahoo.co.in](mailto:arpita_anant@yahoo.co.in)

Dr Arpita Anant is an Associate Fellow in the Institute for Defence Studies and Analyses. She holds a Ph.D from School of International Studies, Jawaharlal Nehru University (New Delhi). Her doctoral thesis is on “Group Rights in the Indian and International Discourses”. She was awarded the ICSSR Doctoral Fellowship and the Commonwealth Visiting Fellowship for the year 2001-02 to undertake doctoral research. Prior to joining IDSA, she has worked at the Strategic Foresight Group (Mumbai) and the National Centre of International Security and Defence Analysis (NISDA) University of Pune. Her current areas of research interest are regional security and identity politics affecting internal and international security

Her publications include *Terrorism: The Matrix of Regional Security Perspectives and Responses* (NISDA Occasional Paper Series, March 2007) and book review of Maya Chaddha, *Democracy in South Asia: India, Nepal, Pakistan* (New Delhi: Vistaar Publications, 2000) (*South Asian Survey*, 12(1), 2005).

# **Japanese Nationalism: Implications for The Asian Security**

**Arpita Mathur**

Customarily, Japanese nationalism conjures up the image of a militarist country inching its way towards militarization. Contemporary Japanese nationalism, however, is far from such an image. This wave of what can be perceived as assertive nationalism can best be described as the principal force behind Tokyo's quest for a redefinition of its national identity in consonance with its international and regional status and role. The principal variables driving this nationalism are Japan's security concerns emanating from China and North Korea, the imperatives arising out of the security alliance with Washington, and domestic propellants like economy being in doldrums, a generational change less open to the need for being apologetic for the wartime past and the dominance of the conservative Liberal Democratic Party in politics.

The major manifestations of contemporary Japanese nationalism can be located in its stance on the legacy of history, the sharp and vocal leadership responses to developments impinging on Japanese security and also in the posture on prominent symbols of nationalist pride like the pacifist Constitution, the Emperor and the National Flag and Anthem. However, in sieving the kind of nationalism pervading the state and general populace, it is noted that the 'hard' nationalism which was the hallmark of Japanese leaders till former Prime Minister Shinzo Abe softens considerably as it trickles down to the masses.

Japan's oft mentioned steps towards 'normalization' and its quest for a redefining of national identity has ruffled many feathers in the Asian region, which tends to view these developments through the prism of history. This paper will make an attempt to delve into the impact of this shade of nationalism on the region and decipher how Japan would emerge as a significant player in the Asian construct.

## **Arpita Mathur**

Associate Fellow  
Institute for Defence Studies and Analyses  
1, Development Enclave  
New Delhi -110010  
Tel: +91-11-26717983  
Email: arpitamathur@hotmail.com

Dr. Arpita Mathur is an Associate Fellow with the IDSA since 2003. Her areas of interest include Japan's foreign, domestic and security policies on which she has published a number of articles. Her select publications include: "Japan's Self-Defense Force: Towards a Normal Military," (*Strategic Analysis*, vol. 31, Issue 5, September 2007), "Japan's Contemporary Nationalism: Trends and Politico-Security Drivers," (*Strategic Analysis*, Vol. 31, No. 1, January-February 2007); Japan's Security Concerns and Policy Options," (*Strategic Analysis*, Vol. 30, No. 3, July-September 2006) and Japan's Changing Role in the US-Japan Security Alliance," (*Strategic Analysis*, October-December 2004).

She was a Researcher with the Institute from 2001-2003, and has also prepared the daily web page for the weekly newspaper *India Abroad*. She has been the recipient of the Okita Memorial Fellowship (1995-96), the Japan Foundation Fellowship (2000-01) by the Japan Foundation, Tokyo and was invited by the Japan Defense Agency under the 'Program for Opinion Leaders' in 2004.

## **Situating Iraq into a Discourse on Asian Security**

**Arshi Khan**

After the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989, there has occurred a decisive shift in the realm of strategic concerns particularly in the context of international relations which has created snow-ball effects on the discourse on national and global security. As a result, former communist countries of the Eastern Europe were aided by its Western counterpart and most of them were integrated into the larger family of the European Union. It is at this juncture, leading Asian countries particularly India needs to take into account the round-up of strategic shifts in Asia and its implications for national security.

Situation in Iraq needs to be a serious concern for India and it can define its constructive role in the larger interests of Asian security. Pre-March 2003 Iraq was neither a terrorist state nor possessor of the weapons of mass destruction. However, the continuing aggression on different provinces of Iraq has uprooted over 25% of its population with the acute shortage of basic necessities, stability, national security, freedom of speech, movement and freedom of privacy. Trifurcation of Iraq, control over its oil-wells and building of about 16 military bases inside Iraq have also significant message for India which has sensitive regions, national minorities, and ethnic violence.

Similarly we can find Western involvement in Shia-Sunni violence in Iraq, *de-facto* partition of Iraq into three pieces (earlier promoted through safe-haven and no-fly-zone methods) which do give some important lessons to India. Most friendly Iraq is fully occupied. India's good neighbours in Central Asia are deeply penetrated by the foreign military bases. It is also under external pressures to support pro-Western forces against the Myanmar's regime. The National Security Strategy, along with the Quadrennial Defense Review Report give a pretty clear picture of U.S. policy in the Middle East-which is essentially to control the natural resources and the shipping lanes. It would not be irrational to state that India security is also the constituent of Asian security as the Iraqi security was for West Asia.

At present, future of Iraq is to eliminate all resisting forces and to sponsor like-minded administrators with controlled elections and embedded journalism. It is in this context, Asian security can be discussed in the larger interests of India and the region. India has a lot to contribute to Iraq provided such intentions are accepted by the occupying powers.

## Arshi Khan

Reader

Department of Political Science

Aligarh Muslim University

Email: khan\_arshi@hotmail.com

Dr Arshi Khan is a Reader, Department of Political Science, Aligarh Muslim University since September 2006. Earlier he was a Senior Lecturer in the Centre for Federal Studies, Hamdard University, New Delhi. He is a Member, Editorial Committee of *Indian Journal of Federal Studies*, New Delhi.

He did his PhD on "Democracy and Party Politics in Turkey: 1960-90", from the School of International Studies, (SIS) Jawaharlal Nehru University and M. Phil. with Dissertation entitled, "Turco-Greek Relations - 1974-88" from the same University. Some of his important publications include, "Police Prejudice against the Muslims", Asghar Ali Engineer and A.S. Narang, eds., *Minorities and Police in India* (New Delhi: Manohar Publishers and Distributors, 2006), pp. 141-162, "Debating Emergency Provisions in India's Federal Governance", Akhtar Majeed, ed., *Federalism Within The Union: Distribution of Responsibilities in the Indian System* (New Delhi, Manak Publications, 2004), pp. 77-107., "Minority Rights and Liberal Neutrality: Identity Consciousness and Marginalisation of the Minority Groups", Akhtar Majeed, ed., *Nation and Minorities India's Plural Society and Its Constituents* (New Delhi: Kanishka Publishers and Distributors, 2002), pp. 30-58., "Constitutional Working For Federal Nation Building", in Akhtar Majeed., ed., *Constitution and Nation Building in India* (New Delhi, Manak Publications, 2001)., "Coalition Politics in India Since 1967", in Akhtar Majeed, ed., *Coalition Politics and Power Sharing* (Delhi: Manak, 2000), pp. 131-175., "Situating Federalism, Minorities and Communalism in the Indian Polity", *European Yearbook of Minority Issues*, 4 (2004/2005), (ISBN 9004 14XXX X), pp. 85-115, 2006 Koninklijke Brill NV. Printed in the Netherlands, "Federalism and Non-territorial Minorities in India", in Alan Tarr, Robert F. Williams and Josef Marko, eds., *Federalism, Sub national Constitutions and Minority Rights* (Connecticut, Westport, London: Praeger-Greenwood Publishers, 2004), pp. 199-212.

## **Regional Security and Regional Cooperation: A Comparative Analysis of ASEAN and SAARC.**

**Bharti Chhibber**

The paper begins with a brief theoretical understanding of concepts of security and regional cooperation. With this background we have further examined the inter-relationship between regional associations and regional security in South East Asia and South Asia through a comparative study of ASEAN and SAARC.

The end of the 20th century is marked by profound changes in the structure of international relations. The revolution in science and technology has resulted in the shortening of distances. The development of modern weaponry, particularly weapons of mass destruction, has already undermined the defensibility of territorial boundaries. The rise of 'issue areas' has further led to an age of stronger international interdependence. The response of states to these developments can be seen in the process of internal and external adjustment in all spheres-economic, political and military. The dimension of external adjustment is manifested in the process of regional associations, which is gaining ground steadily since the Second World War

A change in military technology, especially the development of nuclear weapons and missiles, has undermined the physical defensibility of all states. The dynamics of technology have also led to a shortening of social, economic, geographical and political distances and the greater movement of people, ideas and information. Thus, modern technology and expanding economies have made states interdependent and have forced them to take a broader view of their individual political and economic interests. Moreover, states today face many problems such as transnational organized crime, including terrorism and drug trafficking, that need coordinated multinational effort if they are to be overcome.

It is in this context that a regional approach is seen as an effective way of binding a regional predominant power to regional welfare and the process of regional security.

## **Bharti Chibber**

Lecturer  
Department of Political Science,  
Miranda House  
University of Delhi  
New Delhi  
Email: b.chhibber@gmail.com

Dr Bharti Chhibber has done her B.A. (Hons) and M.A. in Political Science from Lady Shri Ram College, University of Delhi. Thereafter she did her M. Phil and Ph. D from the School of International Studies, Jawaharlal Nehru University. Dr Chhibber was awarded Senior Research Fellowship by the UGC for her doctoral research in International relations. Presently she is teaching Political Science at Miranda House, University of Delhi.

She has contributed articles and book reviews to many mainstream journals. Her areas of research interest are Regional Security and Regional Cooperation in South Asia and South East Asia.

# **Insurgencies and Transnational Linkages: A Case Study of Indian Experience in NorthEast India**

**Bibhu Prasad Routray**

Insurgency movements operating in India's Northeast have benefited from the region's contiguity with the neighbouring countries. Insurgents have found it easy to crossover the porous borders to seek safety within the foreign locations. Some of these neighbouring countries have even gone a step forward to arm and finance these outfits. In Bangladesh, for example, the Pakistani Inter-Services Intelligence (ISI) has cast its web wide on these outfits by training and arming their cadres and financing their activities. In Myanmar, insurgent camps have survived the temporary and intermittent military operations since the 1980s. Safety of these foreign locations, today is one of the most crucial factors behind the survival of these militant outfits. As a result, security force operations within the northeast continue to be severely handicapped as far as neutralising these outfits is concerned.

India could neither have chosen its neighbours, nor could it have instilled a sense of cooperation in them to act against the insurgents. With the exception of China (which stopped sponsoring the insurgents on its own by the early 1980s) and Bhutan (which launched a much delayed military assault on the ULFA, NDFB and KLO militants in December 2003), neither Bangladesh nor Myanmar have followed up on their assurances of acting against the insurgents.

The paper seeks to examine the nuances of the linkages between the insurgents and their trans-national force multipliers, in terms of a client-patron relationship. It analyses the dynamics of the relationship in terms of the challenges posed by India's porous and unmanaged international border with hostile/ unfriendly neighbours, easy availability of small arms and explosives in those countries and the nexus between insurgency and the thriving organised crime. The paper analyses India's success and failures in disrupting these linkages and seeks to chart out a future course of action for the security planners of the country.

## **Bibhu Prasad Routray**

Research Fellow  
Institute for Conflict Management  
New Delhi

Dr. Bibhu Prasad Routray is a Research Fellow with the Institute for Conflict Management, New Delhi. He was Director of the Institute's Database and Documentation Centre on Conflict & Development (DADC) at Guwahati in Assam between August 2001 and February 2005. His recent publications include: "Tibetan Refugees in India: Religious Identity and the Forces of Modernity" (*Refugee Survey Quarterly*, UNHCR, July 2007) and *Northeast: Failure of Peace Processes* (Armed Conflicts and Peace Processes in South Asia: Sanskriti 2006). His current research interests include Systematizing Response to Urban Terrorism in India and Survey of Armed Conflicts in India's Northeast.

## **The History and Practice of Unilateralism in East Asia**

**Bruce Cummings**

The fundamental reason why multilateralism is so weak in East Asia goes back to the post-World War II settlement and the Korean War. Cold War divisions hindered (and often completely blocked) horizontal relations and communications among the East Asian countries. Most diplomatic communication was vertical, that is, from the foreign ministries in Tokyo, Seoul, Manila or Taipei to Washington and back again. This vertical diplomacy was punctured horizontally by economic forces, which since the 1960s have eroded and bypassed Cold War boundaries, bringing former adversaries together—but primarily through business contacts and pop culture, not through multilateral institutions. China's turn outward to the world economy and its rapid growth is the best expression of this tendency today, but China is also replicating what Japan, South Korea, and Taiwan did in the past. If the first phase of the Cold War emphasized security considerations and divided the region, and the second phase exemplified the ascendancy of economic development and accelerated regional integration, it is important to remember that both these tendencies occurred primarily because of basic shifts in American foreign policy and the resulting pressures on East Asian states. Contemporary obstacles to deeper integration in the region also trace back to Washington (although not only to Washington). Rightly or wrongly, the U.S. still holds the key to East Asian regional security and cooperation.

## Bruce Cummings

Professor  
Department of History  
The University of Chicago  
1126 E. 59th Street, Mailbox 91  
Chicago, IL 60637  
Fax: (773) 702-7550  
Office: (773) 834-1818  
Email: rufus88@uchicago.edu

Dr. Bruce Cumings is Professor of History at The University of Chicago since 2006. Previously Dr. Cumings was Professor of International History and East Asian Political Economy, at The University of Chicago (1994-2006) and has held appointments at the Northwestern University (1994-1997), Department of East Asian Languages and Civilizations, University of Chicago (1987-1994), University of Washington (1977-87), Swarthmore College (1975-1977) and in the U.S. Peace Corps, Seoul, Korea (1967-68). He was educated at Denison University (BA Psychology), and Columbia University (PhD East Asian Studies).

Amongst other publications, he is the author of *The Origins of the Korean War: Liberation and the Emergence of Separate Regimes, 1945-1947* (1981); *Korea: The Unknown War* (1988); *Child of Conflict: The Korean-American Relationship, 1943-1953* (1983); *War and Television: Korea, Vietnam, and the Gulf War* (1992); *Parallax Visions: Making Sense of American—East Asian Relations at the End of the Century* (1999); *Inventing the Axis of Evil: North Korea, Iran and Syria* (co-authored, 2004). He has just completed *Dominion From Sea to Sea: Pacific Ascendancy and American Power*, which will be published by Yale University Press. Apart from many monographs, book chapters, his research articles have appeared in leading refereed academic journals such as *Bulletin of Concerned Asian Scholars*, *Contemporary China*, *Journal of Korean Studies*, *British Journal of International Studies*, and *New Left Review*.

His first book, *The Origins of the Korean War*, won the John King Fairbank Book Award of the American Historical Association, and the second volume of this study won the Quincy Wright Book Award of the International Studies Association. He is the editor of the modern volume of the Cambridge History of Korea (forthcoming), and is a frequent contributor to *The London Review of Books*, *The Nation*, *Current History*, the *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, and *Le Monde Diplomatique*. His research focus is on 20th century international history, United States and East Asia relations, East Asian political economy, modern Korean history, and American foreign relations.

## **Impact of the GWOT On Talibanization and Militancy in Pakistan**

**C Christine Fair**

Pakistan has been long known as a source of militants who have fought in Kashmir and in Afghanistan and as a destination for radicalized persons seeking militant training. Following Musharraf's agreement to participate in the US-led global war on terrorism, Pakistan has increasingly become a victim of various forms of militancy that has included an expansive insurgency throughout the Pashtun belt, the introduction of suicide attacks against Pakistani security forces in 2006 as well as numerous attempts on high-value civilian and military leadership. This paper will present data from a recent poll that explores Pakistani attitudes about the militant threat increasingly confronted by the state and the various means by which the Pakistani government has sought to contend with this threat. This paper argues that Pakistan—due to U.S. pressure and due to Musharraf's own preferences—has pursued a number of policies that has precipitated a wider conflict radiating from the tribal areas. Yet, while many Pakistanis (a majority in most cases) find these groups to comprise a real threat to Pakistan's national security, they have not yet embraced the global war on terror as their own.

## C. Christine Fair

Senior Political Scientist  
RAND Corporation  
United States  
Email: c\_christine\_fair@yahoo.com

Dr. C. Christine Fair is a senior political scientist with the RAND Corporation. Prior to rejoining RAND, she served as a political officer to the United Nations Assistance Mission to Afghanistan in Kabul and as a senior research associate in USIP's Center for Conflict Analysis and Prevention. Previously she was an associate political scientist at the RAND Corporation. Her research focuses upon the security competition between India and Pakistan, Pakistan's internal security, the causes of terrorism in South Asia, and U.S. strategic relations with India and Pakistan. She holds PhD (Asian Studies) from University of Chicago.

Dr. Fair has authored and co-authored several books including *The Madrassah Challenge: Militancy and Religious Education in Pakistan* (USIP, 2008), *Fortifying Pakistan: The Role of U.S. Internal Security Assistance* (USIP, 2006); *Securing Tyrants or Fostering Reform? U.S. Internal Security Assistance to Repressive and Transitioning Regimes* (RAND, 2006); *The Counterterrorism Coalitions: Cooperation with Pakistan and India* (RAND, 2004); *Urban Battle Fields of South Asia: Lessons Learned from Sri Lanka, India and Pakistan* (RAND, 2004) and has written numerous peer-reviewed articles covering a range of security issues in Pakistan, India, Sri Lanka and Bangladesh. She is a member of the International Institute of Strategic Studies (London) and is the managing editor of *India Review*.

## **Emerging Asian Security Order: India's Eight-fold Path**

**C. Raja Mohan**

For many decades, India and East Asia were considered two very different entities living in separate political universes of their own. Amidst the new awareness of the emergence of India as a major power, the worldwide interest in the rise of Asia and its implications for the international system, the current dynamics in favour of Asian economic integration, and the unfolding debate on the construction of a new security architecture for the region have made it very reasonable to discuss the evolving Indian role in East Asia. India, itself, has a complex history of more recent interaction with East Asia—involvement during the colonial age as part of British India, an important effort from mid 1940s to mid 1950s to lay the foundations for Asian unity and solidarity, turning away from the region from the late 1950s to early 1990s, and the post Cold War diplomatic initiative—the Look East policy—to reconnect with the region. Although India has been a part of the East Asia Summit process, since its launch in 2005, there is considerable ambivalence in the region about the potential role of India in shaping its future.

It is in the aforementioned context that the paper lays out eight propositions on India's unfolding policy towards the construction of new security architecture for the region. The first is India's old claims to a leadership role in Asia and its relevance to the present. The second is whether India has or needs a grand strategic conception of its own emergence as a great power and its implications for Asia. The third proposition examines whether India might change its traditional attitude towards alliances and discard the principle of non-alignment. The fourth is about the prospects for a change in the current Indian perception about the leading role of the ASEAN in shaping the Asian security order. The fifth reviews the historic Indian ambivalence about notions of collective security in Asia and the likelihood of rethinking on the subject in New Delhi. The sixth proposition delves into the nature of the membership and composition of the EAS system. Seventh, the paper looks at India's approach to the debate on Asian values. The last proposition takes stock of India's approach to the pace of building an Asian community.

## **C. Raja Mohan**

Professor  
S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies  
Nanyang Technological University  
Singapore  
Email: iscrmohan@ntu.edu.sg

Dr C. Raja Mohan is Professor at S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies, Nanyang, Technological University, Singapore and is acknowledged as one of India's leading foreign policy analysts. He has a Masters Degree in Nuclear Physics and a PhD in International Relations. Earlier he was Professor of South Asian Studies at Jawaharlal Nehru University (2003-05) and Editor (Strategic Affairs) with the *Indian Express* and Diplomatic Editor and Washington Correspondent of the Hindu. Dr Mohan was a member of India's National Security Advisory Board during 1998-2000 and 2004-06. His recent books include *Crossing the Rubicon: The Shaping of India's Foreign Policy* (New York: Palgrave, 2004) and *Impossible Allies: Nuclear India, United States and the Global Order* (New Delhi: India Research press, 2006).

## **Transformation of the Nuclear Proliferation Problem– the Increased Importance of South Asia and the Middle-East**

**Chaim Braun**

A basic transformation of the concerns related to global nuclear proliferation is now emerging. Concerns are now mounting with regards to South Asia and the new Middle-East countries interested in nuclear power as a counter to the Iranian nuclear program. Whereas Northeast Asia seems to be moving away from clandestine nuclear programs (viz. North Korea), fissile materials production and the possibilities of latent proliferation are rising in South Asia and the Middle East. Different issues emerge with regards to South Asia or to the Middle East. Further concerns relate to the nature of the possible nuclear programs in a rogue state like Myanmar and an unstable state like Bangladesh. In the Middle-East concerns relate to the nature of the proposed nuclear power programs and their corresponding fuel cycle plans. Two major issues are emerging here: various countries in the region (with outside states support) might combine clandestine programs into joint proliferation attempts labeled as ‘Proliferation Rings’; and a nuclear dominoes effect, or a tipping points effect, might emerge, where the approach to nuclear weapons capability by one country might spur other countries to more vigorously pursue their own clandestine programs, thus encouraging additional countries to follow suit and so on.

In South Asia separation of the civilian and military side of the national nuclear programs might allow the safeguarding of both civilian nuclear programs by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). In the Middle East, nuclear power programs should be preceded by strengthening of the regional safeguards regime for all countries concerned, including the signing and ratifying of the Additional Protocol as a condition of nuclear power plants supply. Further measures might include agreement by all countries to abstain from domestic fuel cycle facilities construction and rely instead on regional facilities located outside of the region and greater reliance on IAEA sponsored- nuclear fuel supply arrangements.

More importantly the possibility of a mutual inspections regime of the civilian programs similar to the ABACC organization in South America might eventually emerge. In case none of these proposals are accepted, the concept of a temporary moratorium on nuclear plants supply in this unstable world region might be considered, as has recently been proposed.

## **The Collapse of America's Bipartisan Center: Implications for U.S. Strategy**

**Charles A. Kupchan**

According to mainstream opinion, the Bush Administration's grand strategy represents a temporary departure from the traditional foreign policy of the United States, one that will be rectified by a change of personnel in the White House in 2009. This interpretation of recent trends in U.S. policy is incorrect. The Bush Administration's foreign policy, far from representing an aberration, marks the end of an era; it is a symptom, as much as a cause, of the unraveling of the liberal internationalist compact that guided the United States for over half a century. The geopolitical and domestic conditions that gave rise to liberal internationalism have disappeared, eroding its bipartisan political foundations. The paper will chronicle these tectonic changes in the politics of U.S. foreign policy and examine their implications for U.S. engagement in Asia and beyond.

## Charles A. Kupchan

Professor

School of Foreign Service & Government Department

Georgetown University

Washington D.C. 20057

Email: kupchanc@georgetown.edu

Dr. Charles Kupchan is Professor of International Affairs in the School of Foreign Service and Government Department at Georgetown University. He is also Senior Fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations. During 2006-2007, he held the Henry A. Kissinger Chair at the Library of Congress and was a Fellow at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars. Previously he was Director for European Affairs on the National Security Council (NSC) during the first Clinton administration. Prior to government service, he was an Assistant Professor of Politics at Princeton University, and visiting scholar at Harvard University's Center for International Affairs, Columbia University's Institute for War and Peace Studies, the International Institute for Strategic Studies in London, and the Centre d'Etude et de Recherches Internationales (Paris), and the Institute for International Policy Studies (Tokyo). He received a B.A. from Harvard University and M.Phil. and D.Phil. degrees from Oxford University.

Dr. Kupchan has authored many books including *The End of the America Era: U.S. Foreign Policy and the Geopolitics of the Twenty-first Century* (2002), *Power in Transition: The Peaceful Change of International Order* (2001), *Civic Engagement in the Atlantic Community* (1999), *Atlantic Security: Contending Visions* (1998), *Nationalism and Nationalities in the New Europe* (1995), *The Vulnerability of Empire* (1994), *The Persian Gulf and the West* (1987), and numerous articles on international and strategic affairs.

## **Peace-Building in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Towards Greater Operational Coherence and Relevance**

**Greg Mills**

Since 1989 the UN Security Council has authorised a succession of international interventions to monitor, stabilise and where possible, conclude violence between and within states. Of the more than sixty UN missions and a further thirty organised by regional coalitions or individual states, more than one-third have responded to 'complex emergencies'.

The international response has evolved swiftly during the post-Cold War period, growing in cost, muscularity and its degree of intrusion. But greater capability has not brought greater success. However, despite being widely supported, the military forces and the co-existing array of civilian agencies have not yet effectively stabilised or secured southern and eastern Afghanistan. If the mission fails, international resolve for another operation of this size will be difficult, if not impossible, to muster for some time.

How might international actors' best assist national efforts to create long-term development and security in post-conflict societies? This challenge is articulated as one of peace-building: the promotion of conflict termination, reconciliation and state-building in failed states, often in conjunction with the deployment of international peacekeepers and a measure of local approval. The paper delineates some challenges to peace building by take account of some empirical case studies. Common threads, goals, strategies and principles of peace building are some core choke points around which the paper revolves.

# **The European Union and Asia in the Emerging Strategic Context**

**Gudrun Wacker**

The European Union cannot be called a strategic actor in Asia (yet?). The EU only just began to develop a common foreign and security policy (CFSP). Even with the Lisbon treaty signed in October 2007 by the heads of all 27 member states, the EU will have a long way to go. As a result, a mixture of a multilateral/regional approach and bilateral activities will characterise European policy vis-à-vis Asia for the years to come.

Until recently, the EU and its member states had their main focus in Asia on China. Over the last two years, however, the disenchantment with China has led to a stronger European interest in relations with other countries in Asia, including Japan, India and the Asean states.

Since the EU has no military presence in Asia (with the notable exception of the participation in the UN-mandated NATO-led campaign in Afghanistan), it is quite different from the United States. At least for the Asia-Pacific region/East Asia, the United States has been the main provider of security (and one could argue at times insecurity) after World War II. Nevertheless, the EU and its member states have a keen interest in peace and stability in Asia, and they have also demonstrated their willingness to become more active, for example in conflict prevention and peacekeeping in the region. This interest in peace and stability mainly derives from the EU's growing economic involvement in all Asian sub-regions. Moreover, the EU and its member states are aware that for all global challenges, be it proliferation of WMD or climate change, solutions can only be found in cooperation with the major political actors in Asia.

## **Gudrun Wacker**

Head of Research Unit Asia  
Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik (SWP)  
German Institute for International and Security Affairs  
Ludwigkirchplatz 3-4, 10719 Berlin  
E-mail: gudrun.wacker@swp-berlin.org

Dr. Gudrun Wacker is Head of Research Unit Asia at Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik (German Institute for International and Security Affairs), Berlin. His previous positions include: Cologne (Federal Institute for Russian, East European and International Studies) (1992-2000), member of academic staff at the department of Sinology (University of Tübingen) (1983-1992). His main focuses of research are Chinese foreign and security policy; EU-China relations, Sino-Russian and Sino-Central Asian relations; China and the Asia-Pacific region; Chinese domestic development and minority policy (with special consideration of Xinjiang).

His publications include: "Similarities and differences", in *China-EU: A Common Future*, (ed. by Stanley Crossick and Etienne Reuter, 2007), "EU-China Relations: The Issue of the Arms Embargo", *Euro Future* (Spring 2006), and "China's Rise: The Return of Geopolitics?", *SWP Research Paper* (2006).

## **Role of Multilateral Institutions in Asia with special Reference to India in 21<sup>st</sup> Century**

**Harinam Singh**

Most international organizations, such as the United Nations and the World Trade Organization, OSCE are multilateral in nature. The present study elaborates the role and function of the United Nations, the World Bank and International Monetary Fund, Regional Development Banks, and World Trade Organization. The present study also elaborates the role of other multilateral institutions such as SAARC, ASEAN, International Donor Community, etc.

MDGs present an integrated plan of action for development and security. The purpose of Millennium Development Goal Reports (MDGRs) is to help countries raise public awareness; promote study, scholarship, and debate around the great development challenges; forge stronger alliances; renew political commitment; and help poor countries and donors create the deep, better financed and trusted partnerships that will be needed for success.

The World Bank and the IMF have their mandate to engage in policy dialogue with member countries and report to their respective executive Boards. The World Bank uses its Country Policy and Institutional Assessment (CPIA) for IDA-eligible countries in the context of the implementation of its Performance-Based Allocation (PBA) policy. The IMF has a mandate, under its surveillance policy to monitor macroeconomic and exchange rate policies in developed and developing countries.

The World Trade Organization (WTO) complements information collected by other institutions by providing data on country-specific trade policies. The Development Assistance Committee (DAC) monitors data on aid flows and donor policies. The Development Committee (DC) is mandated to provide a focal point in the structure of international economic cooperation on overview of diverse international activities and to coordinate international efforts on financing development.

## Harinam Singh

Director  
Academy for Asia-Pacific Studies  
Delhi  
Email: harinam\_4a41@rediffmail.com

Dr Harinam Singh is Director, Academy for Asia-Pacific Studies and also the editor of Asia Pacific Panorama. He did his Ph.D from the School of International Studies, JNU, in 1982. He has a Teaching experience in graduate/undergraduate courses like India's Foreign Policy, South Asian Politics and Theory of International Politics. During January-April, 1999 he was a Fulbright Visiting professor on South Asian studies at the University of West Florida, Pensacola, and December 2002 to March 2003 he was a Shastri Indo-Canadian Fellow at the University of Alberta.

He has published 8 books and 90 research papers in referred journals such as "Globalizations Poses New Challenges to South-South Solidarity". In Govind Prasad etc. (ed), *Globalization: Myth and Reality* (Concept, New Delhi, 2004), "New Delhi Beijing – Moscow Trilateral Initiative: A Long View", (*Contemporary India*, Vol. 3 No.1, 2005), Quest for Empowerment of Aboriginal People Under Canadian Federation," *Asia Pacific Panorama*, Vol. 4, no.1, 2005.

## **The Quadrilateral Initiative: An Emerging Alliance**

### **Indranil Banerjee**

When the Portuguese mariner Vasco da Gama burst upon the shores of India, little did Asian rulers of that time realise how profound that event was destined to be. Within a very short time, the European mariners were to drastically change the order of things in the Indian Ocean and beyond. Moreover, the entry of European mariners was to forever change the geopolitics of all of Asia. The Arab dominance of maritime trade and rule was the first casualty. Kingdoms declined and new colonial empires emerged. The Turk controlled Asian-European land trade dried up. The dynamic set in motion by Vasco da Gama has survived for more than 500 years. This dynamic resulted in the dominance of the Western powers, including ultimately the dominance of the late comer United States. However, for the first time in centuries it appears that major geopolitical shifts are occurring in the Asia-Pacific region. These changes could be as profound as those set in motion by Vasco da Gama. Asian powers are once again building powerful navies and merchant fleets to develop and protect their growing economies. The big question is how this development will affect the Western dominance of the Indian Ocean and other seas in the Asia-Pacific region.

As significant perhaps as the rise of regional navies is the recent US prompted initiative to bring together four significant Asia-Pacific players – India, Japan, Australia and Singapore. Will this move, dubbed the “Quadrilateral Initiative”, is still at a very nascent stage and is more of an initiative than even an informal alliance, the grouping of these four nations itself could have a major impact on the changing geopolitics of the region. This paper will look at the larger maritime geopolitics of the region and the likely impact the emerging quadrilateral initiative could have.

## **Indranil Banerjee**

Founder & Executive Director  
SAPRA India Foundation  
New Delhi

Mr Indranil Banerjee is the founder and Executive Director of the SAPRA India Foundation, a New Delhi based independent think-tank. He established the foundation in 1995 to promote strategic thinking and the understanding of national security issues in India. The Foundation has focused on research on terrorism, weapons of mass destruction, military, international relations and internal security.

He has travelled widely in the region and has visited a number of countries including, Pakistan, Afghanistan, Nepal, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Myanmar, Thailand, Malaysia, Singapore, Turkey, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan, Australia, United States, Switzerland and the UK. As head of the Foundation, he has led two Indian delegations to WashingtonDC.

Mr. Banerjee has been a journalist for over 20 years and has worked with reputed media organisations, including the Living Media group (India Today), Ananda Bazar Patrika Group (The Telegraph & Sunday magazine) and NDTV (The World This Week). During this period, he travelled widely in India and wrote over a thousand news and feature articles. He has made over 40 documentaries and current affairs programmes on Indian national security issues, which have been telecast on the national television network. He has edited a book titled “India and Central Asia” that was published by Brunel Academic Publishers, London, in June 2004. He currently edits the monthly journal SAPRA India Bulletin, which focuses on national security issues and world affairs.

## **Australia and the Asian Strategic Context: Balancing Relations with the Major Powers**

**James Cotton**

During the tenure of the government led by John Howard (from 1996) Australia's strategic priorities largely conformed to those of the United States and the Bush administration. Despite unfavourable public sentiment, Australia participated in the invasion of Iraq in the 'global war on terrorism'. There was close cooperation with Washington including significant personnel and intelligence exchange and on proliferation issues Australia was an early and enthusiastic partner in the Proliferation Security Initiative. In pursuing wider global objectives a similar alignment was in evidence: the government negotiated a Free Trade agreement with the United States even though many key agricultural interests were adversely affected. Having insisted upon a very advantageous national arrangement Australia refused then to accede to the Kyoto Protocol on dealing with climate change.

The continuing rise of China and especially the growing economic bilateral exchange between the two countries has posed particular dilemmas. Despite taking great trouble to facilitate mutually beneficial trading relations, the Howard government nevertheless pursued the institutionalisation of defence cooperation with Japan as well as trilateral defence relations also involving the United States. Following the Bush initiative to supply civilian nuclear technology to India, the government announced its intention to make available (under negotiated safeguards) Australian nuclear materials for the Indian market.

The advent of the Rudd Labor administration in December 2007 has already pointed towards a significant course correction. With Southeast Asia of enduring strategic relevance, and Jakarta and Canberra facing the common dangers posed by Islamic extremism, a network of law enforcement, counter-terrorism and human security links with Indonesia were forged, culminating in the bilateral Framework for Security Cooperation adopted in November 2006. Critics while in opposition of uranium supply to India, that country remains outside of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. However, to what extent circumstances will permit a recalibration of the relationship with Washington is far from clear, as the United States remains by far the most significant of Australia's strategic partners, as well as the principal source for the Australian Defence Force of global intelligence and advanced weaponry.

## James Cotton

Professor  
University of New South Wales  
Australian Defence Force Academy  
Canberra, Australia  
Email: [j.cotton@adfa.edu.au](mailto:j.cotton@adfa.edu.au)

Dr. James Cotton is Professor of Politics, University of New South Wales at the Australian Defence Force Academy, Canberra and he is also Adjunct Professor, Faculty of Asian Studies, Australian National University. Prior to his present assignment, he held many positions including a graduate fellow at Princeton University, Centennial Professor in International Relations in the Asia Research Centre (2001), Visiting Professor, Department of Politics and Public Administration, in University of Hong Kong (2004) and a foundation member of the Foreign Minister's Advisory Council convened by the Foreign Minister of Australia (1997-2003). He holds PhD from London School of Economics.

He is the author of over 200 publications on Asian politics and on political thought including articles in *Asian Survey*, *The Pacific Review*, *Pacific Affairs*, *Contemporary Southeast Asia*, *Government and Opposition*, *Political Studies*, *Political Theory*, *Survival*, and *Comparative Political Studies*. His most recent books are: *East Timor, Australia and regional order: intervention and its aftermath in Southeast Asia* (RoutledgeCurzon, 2004) and (edited with John Ravenhill), *Trading on Alliance Security: Australia in World Affairs 2001-2005* (Oxford University Press/AIIA, 2007).

## **Jasjit Singh**

Air Commodore (Retd) Jasjit Singh is a former Director of Operations of the IAF and former Director of the Institute for Defence Studies and Analyses (IDSA). he is one of the leading analysts of Indian military and strategic thought. He has published extensively and is the author and editor of more than two dozen books on strategic and security issues of South Asia, including - *Air Power in Modern Warfare*; *Non-provocative Defence*; *Nuclear India*; *Kargil 1999: Pakistan's Fourth War for Kashmir*; and *India's Defence Spending: Assessing Future Needs*. Dr Jasjit Singh is also a visiting lecturer at defence and war colleges in India and abroad. He was member of the International Commission for a new Asia, consultant to the Standing Committee of Defence of the Parliament; Adviser and Member of National Security Advisory Board.

## **Religion and Terrorism: Past, Present and Future: A Review of Assessment**

**Jean-François Mayer**

While the concept of “religious terrorism” is disputed, there has been a strong increase in terrorist groups claiming religious justifications over the past twenty years. Although there are some isolated instances in other religious traditions, most of those groups are influenced by a jihadi ideology. Religion is not the root cause of such terrorist activities, but provides militants with justifications and a doctrinal framework. One of the major challenges posed by jihadi groups is their claim to relate to a wider religious tradition. A key issue for counter-terrorist efforts will be to delink jihadi claims from wider constituencies.

Jihadi groups have political goals, and most of them should be seen as rational actors. Religious dimensions and considerations may however also influence the selection of some targets. Moreover, a discourse using religious tones and labels tends to turn the struggle into a religious one as well.

The spread of the idea of a global jihad tends to make every local cause part of a wider, and consequently endless struggle. However, this is not the case with all militant forms of Islam.

Like other highly ideological organizations, jihadi groups can also be undermined by fissionary tendencies. Debates between proponents of various views have accompanied those groups for a long time already, and are likely to develop.

## **Jean-François Mayer**

Consultant & Lecturer  
Department of Religious Studies  
University of Fribourg  
Switzerland  
Email: jf@mayer.name

Dr. Jean-François Mayer received both his master's degree (1979) and his doctorate in history (1984) from the University of Lyon. He taught at the University of Fribourg as a lecturer in religious studies from 1999. In the past he worked with Swiss Radio International (1985-1986), in charge of a research project attached to a programme on "Cultural Pluralism and National Identity" of the Swiss National Science Foundation (1987-1990) and an analyst in strategic and international affairs for the Swiss Federal Government between 1991 to 1998.

In 2007, Jean-François Mayer founded Religioscope Institute. He is contributing editor of Religion Watch, a New York based newsletter monitoring trends in contemporary religion, which will be published by Religioscope Institute from January 2008. Dr Mayer also has been working since 2006 as a scientific advisor to a new project, "Religion and Politics", launched by the Program for the Study of International Organization(s) (PSIO) at the Graduate Institute of International Studies (Geneva). He also provides services as a consultant through JFM Recherches et Analyses since 1999.

He is the author of over ten books (in six languages) and numerous articles, primarily dealing with religious developments in the contemporary world.

## Global Jihadist Threat

**Jolene Jerard**

*“We actually misnamed the war on terror. It ought to be (called) the struggle against ideological extremists who do not believe in free societies and who happen to use terror as a weapon to try to shake the conscience of the free world.”*  
– George Bush, President of the United States of America, 2004

Al Qaida became the beacon of the global jihad movement, its leader Osama Bin Laden became both an icon and a symbol for the Jihadist Movement after its iconic attacks on 9/11. Six years after 9/11, the current threat presents itself not only in the form of a single group Al Qaeda but a myriad of groups, cells and individuals espousing Al Qaeda’s ideology – Al Qaedaism.

In combating the threat of terrorism, there is a need for academics and policy makers alike to continuously reassess the threat of terrorism. The asymmetric threat posed by terrorists is never static. Terrorists constantly respond to the environment within which they operate. The ability of terrorists to adapt to counter terrorism measures put in place would mean that just like the terrorist the counter measures undertaken would also need to constantly adapt. Sound knowledge of the enemy is key in creating an efficient and effective response to the threat.

This paper will shed light and explore the two fold nature of the current terrorist threat. First and foremost the threat posed at present by network terrorism. Whilst individual groups are still of concern, the current threat of terrorism today is founded on extensive networks built between and amongst terrorist organisations. Second the threat posed by the rise of the self radicalised and homegrown jihadists. The sustenance of the ideological infrastructures have resulted in the battle of ideas remaining untouched.

The threat of terrorism has moved from the periphery to the centre. The effectiveness and efficiency of any counter terrorism endeavour needs to take this into due consideration. The movement of terrorism to the heart of society has been facilitated by technological progress and limited efforts undertaken to target terrorist ideology and the creation of an environment that is hostile to the terrorists. The nuanced nature of the current terrorist threat summons the need for a recalibration of future responses.

## **Jolene.A. Jerard**

International Centre for Political Violence and Terrorism Research  
Singapore  
Email: jsjolene@ntu.edu.sg

Ms Jolene A Jerard, Terrorism Specialist, International Centre for Political Violence and Terrorism Research (ICPVTR), and a specialist on counter-ideology and detainee rehabilitation. She holds a Masters of Science in Strategic Studies with a Certificate in Terrorism Studies from the S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies at the Nanyang Technological University, Singapore. Jolene's work at the centre focuses on terrorist and extremist groups. Her research interests include political violence and terrorism, counter terrorism strategy and negotiation and conflict management.

## **North Korea's Nuclear Card**

**Konsam Ibo Singh**

North Korea's nuclear weapon's test conducted on 9 October 2006 invited international condemnation including a unanimous resolution adopted by the Security Council of the United Nations. Though the Joint Declaration for a Non-Nuclear Korean Peninsula of 31 December 1991 was the initiative of both the countries and Agreed framework of October 1994 signed by the US and North Korea appeared to solve North Korea's nuclear weapons programme. President Bush's new policy complicated a soluble issue into an insoluble one. The fallouts were felt as shockwaves in South Korea and Japan two of the allies of the U.S in Northeast Asia.

North Korea's nuclear card is used to normalise relations especially with U.S. and Japan in the present context. In the Post Cold War political and economic scenario North Korea needs improvement of relations with its neighbouring countries for various reasons. Isolated, desperate, friendless and poor it urgently needs international aid, investment. Branding it by the US as a member of the 'Axis of Evil' and 'outpost of tyranny' especially after 9/11 and its go slow policy humiliates North Korea. Moreover opinions of experts greatly differ regarding US policy towards the country. Some experts strongly feel that there is a need for peace and stability in the Korean Peninsula which had remained so tense throughout the Cold War days and even after. Others belief hardliner policy adopted by the US would bring nothing. Some call for US policy changes as insincere, some says it is following "crime and punishment theory". Some Japanese experts say not to be carried away by emotions and suggest following 'punishment and incentive' theory and remaining stuck to its three non-nuclear principles and under the US nuclear umbrella still. North Korean Nuclear crisis is concern of all its neighbours.

The Six-Party negotiations of February 2008 and its outcome- North Korea's acceptance to dismantle its nuclear programme in return for US security guarantees and energy aid is a welcome sign. The solution to North Korea's weapons programme will depend much on its declaration on 4 January 2008 of its complete nuclear programme and how the U.S. responds to it.

## **K Subramanyam**

Mr K Subramanyam is the highly distinguished doyen of the community of Indian strategic analysts, was designated as the first convener of National Security Council Advisory Board (NSCAB). He was also the Chairman of the Kargil panel, a commission set up by the Indian government to analyze the Kargil War. In November 2005, Mr Subrahmanyam was appointed as head of a task force on 'Global Strategic Developments'. He is also a well known writer in several Indian newspapers and at various times he served as consulting editor at the *Business and Political Observer*, *The Economic Times* and *The Times of India*.

He received a M.Sc. in Chemistry from Madras University in 1950 and joined the Indian Administrative Service the next year. From 1966 to 1967 he served as a Rockefeller Fellow in Strategic Studies at the London School of Economics. Upon his return to India, he served as the Director of the Institute for Defence Studies and Analyses (IDSA) until 1975. He held a number of top government positions - including Chairman of the Joint Intelligence Committee, Home Secretary for Tamil Nadu and Secretary for Defence Production in the Ministry of Defence - before returning as Director of IDSA from 1980 to 1987. From 1987 to 1988, he returned to England as a Visiting Professor at St. John's College, Cambridge. Between 1974 and 1986, Mr Subrahmanyam also served on a number of United Nations study groups on issues such as Indian Ocean affairs, disarmament and nuclear deterrence.

Subrahmanyam is the author or co-author of fourteen books, including *The Liberation War* (1972) with Mohammed Ayoob about the Bangladesh Liberation War, *Nuclear Myths and Realities* (1980) and *Superpower Rivalry in the Indian Ocean* (1989).

## **Regional Security Structures and the Rise of Islamic Militancy in South Asia**

**M. A. Muqtedar Khan**

The paper will explore how the rise of Islamic militant movements such as the Taliban and Al Qaeda and their various affiliates and copycat movements in South Asia has transformed the regional international system and thereby not only destabilizing its security but also questioning the identity of various actors in the region.

It will be informed by a modified constructivist paradigm which recognizes not only the imperatives of identity but also the limits on agency imposed by power and essentially map how the regional international structure has evolved in the last thirty five years. Taking off from the mid 1960s after the wars of '62 and '65 and looking at the structure as it stands today, the paper argues that causal powers are the material resources available to an actor and constitutive power comes from norms, identity, ideology and legitimacy (a complex and constructivist understanding of soft power).

A model is used to explain the structural changes taking place in the region and what they mean to each actor. This understanding would advance policy recommendations on how to safeguard their mutual interests. The paper will argue that there is a structural opportunity for India to become a regional hegemon if it can advance a vision of the region in its foreign policy that will enable Pakistan to align itself with India and prefer Indian regional domination over that of the US.

## **M. A. Muqtedar Khan**

Associate Professor &  
Director of Islamic Studies  
Department of Political Science and International Relations  
University of Delaware  
Email: mkhan@udel.edu

Dr. M. A. Muqtedar Khan Associate Professor & Director of Islamic Studies at University of Delaware and Fellow at AlWaleed Center, Georgetown University. He holds doctorate in International Relations and Islamic Political Thought from Department of Government, Georgetown University and MA from Florida International University. His past assignment includes: Assistant Professor at university of Delaware (2005-2007), Assistant Professor of International Affairs, Adrian College (2000-2005), Visiting Professor, Washington College (1999-2000) and Georgetown University (1998-99).

Dr. Khan has written many books and research articles in reputed journals such as Global Dialogue, American Journal of Islamic Social Science, Current History, Middle East Affairs and foreign policy. His books includes: Debating Moderate Islam: The Geopolitics of Islam and the West (2007), Jihad for Jerusalem: Identity and Strategy in International Relations (2004), American Muslims: Bridging Faith and Freedom (2002) and Islam, Democracy and Political Theory (Edited Volume, 2006).

He has received many prestige awards and fellowships including, Nonresident Fellow, Saban Center for Middle East Policy, The Brookings Institution (2003-2007), Fellow, AlWaleed Center for Muslim-Christian Understanding, Georgetown University (2006-present), Nominated for excellence in teaching award, University of Delaware (2005-06 & 2006-07), Tides Foundation Grant (2006), and United States Institute of Peace Conference Grant (2004).

He has participated and presented papers at many international conferences and also organized over 20 academic and policy conferences on the last 8 years.

## **Advocacy Group, State and Multilateral Institutions Exploring the Security-Development Linkage**

**Medha Bisht**

Multilateral institutions are generally associated for facilitating cooperation in regional and global level. Providing stability, peace, security and development are the normative goals associated with these institutional mechanisms. However, of late this role is being questioned and challenged for its effectiveness by grassroots organizations and advocacy groups. The traditional understanding of security is changing and the discourse on human security has further broadened this concept to various issue areas, which often overlap with development issues. The present paper explores the linkage between these security and development concerns from an Indian perspective. It attempts to identify how these concerns are being redefined and how they are being articulated in order to facilitate a bottom-up approach rather than a top-bottom one. The paper situates the potential role played by advocacy groups in challenging the development policies of multilateral institutions in developing countries through an illustrative case study of Narmada Bachao Andolan, an advocacy group in India. The paper focuses on exploring the primary tools employed by advocacy groups for negotiating development concerns at the international and domestic level. This focus furthers the analysis on the “leverage” that advocacy groups possess in shaping the policies and politics of multilateral institutions.

Section One throws light on the overlapping development and security concerns in 21<sup>st</sup> century. How these development concerns are articulated and what implications these concerns have to the broader discourse of security studies will be the focus of this section. Section Two of the paper looks at the relationship between multilateral institutions and the development policy of the state on one hand and the role of advocacy groups in influencing the policies of these institutions on the other. Section Three would focus on the various negotiating and bargaining strategies employed by Narmada Bachao Andolan on pressurizing the World Bank, to review its policy on large dams on large dams. The last section offers conclusions, thus providing a critique on the role of multilateral institutions and also highlighting at the same time the influence of advocacy groups in challenging the role of the state and the multilateral institutions in contemporary world politics.

## Medha Bisht

Research Assistant  
Institute for Defence Studies and Analyses  
1, Development Enclave  
New Delhi -110010  
Tel: +91-11-26717983  
Email: medha.bisht@gmail.com

Ms Medha Bisht is a Research Assistant at the Institute of Defence Studies and Analysis and is currently working on conflict resolution and negotiations. She has done her History (Honors) from Miranda House, Delhi University and Masters in International Relations, Jawaharlal Nehru University. At present she is a doctoral student at the Diplomatic Studies Division, Disarmament and Diplomacy Division, JNU. Her research interests include international negotiations: theory and practice, state-civil society interaction, gender, armed conflict, governance, security and development policies. She has also taught graduate and post-graduate students. She has presented papers at national conferences and was invited to present a paper at Charles University, Prague and McGill University Canada. She was also accepted as a doctoral candidate at the Institute of Social Studies, The Netherlands. Before joining IDSA she worked with the Institute of Social Studies Trust, NGO with a special consultative status with the ECOSOC, UN and has carried out projects for the UNDP, UNIFEM, IDRC, Canada and the Government of India. She is also one of the Indian researchers for the Landmine Reporter (International Campaign to Ban Landmines, Canada).

Her select publications include: *Dyadic Relationship Between Conflict Dynamics and Negotiations: Exploring the Linkages* (forthcoming issue of Strategic Analysis, Chapters for *Progress of Women in South Asia, ISST-UNIFEM* (2008), *Sanitation and Waste Management: A Perspective of Gender and Diplomacy* in Ratna Sudharshan, ed., *Ensuring Public Accountability through Community Action*, ISST (2007), *Power and Decision-Making*, & *“Women And Media”* [Chapters] in UNIFEM’s *Progress of Women in South Asia*. (2005).

## **Implications of Iranian Nuclear Crises for Asian Security**

**Michael D Yaffe**

In its December 2007 National Intelligence Estimate (NIE) the U.S. intelligence community concluded that Iran halted its nuclear weapons program in 2003. Publication of portions of the declassified document is largely speculated to have dampened international initiatives restraining Iran's efforts to acquire full enrichment capability. But this does not put the issue to rest. Less acknowledged is the NIE's other conclusion that Iran still harbors nuclear weapons ambitions and could likely produce enough uranium for a warhead by 2009, and more in the 2010-2015 period. Such a development is likely to have far-ranging strategic implications not only for Iran's immediate neighbors in the Persian Gulf and Middle East, but also for countries in South Asia and beyond that obtain much of their oil imports from Iran and the other Gulf states. On top of these issues, the emergence of a nuclear-armed Iran will be a critical challenge to the wherewithal of the global nuclear non-proliferation regime. This paper will explore some of those implications. Underscoring this analysis are questions about how Iran's current complicated set of foreign relations will be altered if Iran becomes a nuclear power, what are the potential dangers and likely reactions to those perceived dangers by Iran's neighbors, and what can the international community do to stabilize the situation

## **Michael D. Yaffe**

Academic Dean  
Near East South Asia Center for Strategic Studies  
National Defense University  
Washington, D.C.  
Email: yaffem@ndu.edu

Dr. Michael Yaffe is the Academic Dean and Professor at the Near East South Asia Center for Strategic Studies. Prior to joining the NESAC Center in 2001, Dr. Yaffe was a career Foreign Affairs Officer in the U.S. Department of State where he concentrated on Middle East security and nuclear weapon nonproliferation. From 1993 until 2001, he served on the U.S. delegation to the Middle East Peace Process. In the immediate aftermath of the attack on September 11, 2001, he served as a coordinator on the counter-terrorism task force in support of “Operation Enduring Freedom.”

As an expert on arms control and confidence building measures, he focused on nuclear proliferation in the Middle East and served as the senior advisor and lead U.S. negotiator on Middle East issues to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty Preparatory Committees and Review Conferences, as well as the annual General Conferences of the International Atomic Energy Agency. He writes and lectures on strategic studies, Middle East regional security, Gulf security architecture, border security, weapons of mass destruction proliferation, and diplomatic history.

He was a recipient of two State Department Superior Honors Awards, a Group Meritorious Honors Award, and a Department of the Army Certificate of Appreciation. Dr. Yaffe received his Ph.D. from the University of Pennsylvania and a Masters degree in International Relations from the London School of Economics and Political Science. He was awarded post-doctoral fellowships at Harvard University’s John M. Olin Institute for Strategic Studies and Harvard’s Center for Science and International Affairs at the John F. Kennedy School of Government, as well as a Peace Scholarship at the U.S. Institute of Peace.

## **M. Mayilvaganan**

Associate Fellow,  
Institute for Defence Studies and Analyses (IDSA),  
New Delhi,  
Email: mumayil@yahoo.com

Dr. Mayilvaganan is an Associate Fellow at IDSA since June 2006. His research interests include issues concerning Sri Lanka in particular and Refugees and South Asian issues in general. He has published several articles in Journals and Magazines on issues relating to Sri Lanka and refugees. His publication includes: “Tamil Nadu Factor in India’s Sri Lanka Policy” (*Strategic Analysis*, November–December 2007); “Sri Lanka: Towards Eelam War VI?” (in *Asian Strategic Review*, 2007); and “Sri Lankan Refugees in India: Peace process and the Question of Repatriation” (*ISIL Year Book*, 2005). He has also appeared as a commentator on Sri Lankan affairs in the visual media. He has done substantial research on the Sri Lankan Refugees, Rehabilitation, and role of international community in Sri Lanka. He obtained his doctorate in South Asian Studies from School of International Studies, Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi

# Theorizing the Rise of Asia: Global Power Balances, Shifts and State Responses

Namrata Goswami

How should Asia deal with its rising power? How do older powerful states from Europe like France, Germany and the United Kingdom or the present super power, the United States, view the rise of Asia in global politics? Do these countries interpret the changing power equations at the systemic level—with a distinct tilt towards rising Asian powers like the ASEAN nations, China, Japan and India—as an opportunity or as a threat to their long enjoyed pre-eminence in global politics? How will US primacy in global politics factor into this new Asian power equation? These are a few questions that this paper seeks to answer. The 21<sup>st</sup> century can neither be described nor explained by merely neat “balance of power” theory, which enjoyed a crescendo in policy/academic circles in the 20<sup>th</sup> century, and holds true to a large extent in the present context. But there is a policy requirement to utilize other existing theoretical frameworks in international politics to explain the “high voltage” systemic power changes in the present context. In the light of the above, this paper will explain the “positioning” of states in the rising “Asian power context” and describe states’ responses to this emerging reality by borrowing from three major theoretical frameworks in international politics. These are: **Realism**, which indicate that states in anarchy are mostly functioning within a balance of power context and therefore uncomfortable with the rise of new powers at a systemic level; **Liberalism**, which argues that the internal politics within a state influence the state’s external behaviour and **Constructivism**, which explains that states react to emerging new power blocs, not merely by their physical power or their policies, but by the way that rise to power is described and understood. For example, the Chinese constructed discourse on “China’s Peaceful Rise” and the meaning attached to such construction of identities by other states in the system.

The method will be both deductive and inductive as theoretical arguments will be illustrated by actual state behaviour. The paper will also move across three levels of analysis—**systemic, national and unit**—to explain the various shifts and balancing influences on external behaviour of states in this new emerging Asian power context. In the end, the paper will map out a few plausible scenarios predicting the nature and character of global politics due to the inevitable rise of Asia, both economically and militarily.

## Namrata Goswami

Associate Fellow  
Institute for Defence Studies and Analyses (IDSA)  
1, Development Enclave  
New Delhi -110010  
Tel: +91-11-26717983  
Email: namygoswami@gmail.com

Dr. Namrata Goswami is an Associate Fellow in the Institute for Defence Studies and Analyses working on the project: “Strengthening Indian Federalism is the Key to Resolving Separatist Movements in the North East: Case Studies of the Assamese and Naga Separatist Movements”. She has a Ph.D. from the Centre for International Politics, Organization and Disarmament, School of International Studies, Jawaharlal Nehru University and has been Assistant Editor of the *India’s National Security Annual Review 2005*;

Her publications include “The Naga Narrative of Conflict: Envisioning a Resolution Roadmap, *Strategic Analysis*, vol. 31(2), 2007, “Twilight in Guerrilla Zone: Retracing the Naga Peace Process” in *Frontier in Flames: Northeast in Turmoil* (New Delhi, Penguin, 2007).

## **N S Sisodia**

Director General  
Institute for Defence Studies and Analyses  
New Delhi  
E-Mail: diridsa@hotmail.com

Shri Narendra Sisodia took charge of IDSA in September 2005, after having retired as Secretary in the Ministry of Finance in January 2005. Prior to this assignment, he was Secretary, Defence Production and Supplies, Ministry of Defence.

Born in 1945, Mr. Sisodia graduated from St. Stephens' College Delhi and obtained a Master's Degree from Harvard University, USA, where he was a Mason Fellow. He joined the Indian Administrative Service in 1968 and served as District Magistrate in four districts of Rajasthan. He was later Principal Secretary, Industries & Commerce, Chairman and Managing Director of the State Industrial Development & Infrastructure Corporation and Chairman, Rajasthan, State Electricity Board.

In Government of India, he served as Joint Secretary, Ministry of Defence from 1988-94. As Additional Secretary in the National Security Council Secretariat, he was closely associated with the work of the Kargil Review Committee. Subsequently, he was appointed as a member of the Task Force set up to recommend measures for reforming the management of Defence. He was also responsible for providing resource support to the Group of Ministers on reforming the National Security System. As the first Additional Secretary of the newly constituted National Security Council Secretariat, he was closely associated with the nascent NSCS and other support structures of the National Security Council like the Strategic Policy Group & the National Security Advisory Board. He is a member of the National Security Advisory Board and has also been Vice Chancellor of Mohan Lal Sukhadia University, Udaipur.

## **N.N. Vohra**

Room No. 264  
Vigyan Bhavan Annexe  
Maulana Azad Road  
New Delhi – 110001

Educated at the Punjab and Oxford Universities, Mr. N N Vohra served in the Indian Administrative Service between 1959 and 1994. The positions he held during his career include: Home Secretary Punjab, Additional Secretary Defence, Secretary Defence Production, Defence Secretary, Home Secretary, and Principal Secretary to the Prime Minister. He also served in the Special Services Bureau in the Western Tibet border areas between 1962 and 1964, and underwent training with the British SAS. After retirement, he served as Director of the India International Centre, New Delhi. He was a member of the National Security Advisory Board between 1998 and 2001, Chairman of the National Task Force on Internal Security, Chairman of the IDSA Review Committee, Chairman of the Committee on Review of Military Histories. He is a member of the CSCAP National Committee since 2001, and Co-Chairman of the India-European Union Round Table, also since 2001. He is presently Special Representative of the Government of India for the J&K Dialogue.

## **Cooperative Framework for Asian Security in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century: Climate Change and Environment**

**Col (Retd) P K Gautam**

Till recently, any security issue conceptualised or measured in geological timeframe never excited or animated the strategic community. Developing Asian countries that have a legitimate need for rapid economic growth to lift people out of poverty are the most vulnerable to climate change.

This paper will study the security challenges due to climate change from Asian perspective and will suggest options for comprehensive security. Summaries by the Intergovernmental Panel for Climate Change (IPCC) provide scientific evidence to the onset of anthropogenic adverse impact of climate change. Ignored or not addressed adequately, then they will present themselves as a threat to human, national, regional and global security. Link of climate change (long droughts) and violent conflict has been pointed out by the United Nations in relation to the conflict in Darfur in Africa. Ecosystems of agricultural land, forests and grass lands support a massive agrarian economy. Many countries share water systems in common. Due to climate change, glaciers, permafrost and snow may melt in abrupt events. Floods followed by drought are forecast impacting on food and livelihood security. Sea level rise and storms will adversely impact on human activities and settlements in coastal regions and the river deltas leading to mass migrations within and across borders and possible conflicts. To stop tipping events it needs to be ensured that temperatures do not cross the dangerous two degrees Celsius threshold of which 0.7 rise has already taken place. The discovery of a brown haze called atmospheric brown cloud over Asia is another looming challenge to climate change. Some Western scientists point accusing fingers on its Asian origin to Asian biomass burning and poorly regulated combustion of fossil fuel. It would also need institutional and behavioural changes in economic pathways. This becomes more complex when seen in terms of population growth, rising expectations and resource scarcities. Ecological problems can not be overcome within sovereign boundaries. We lost a decade in reaching a consensus on the science of climate change.

A cooperative framework for Asian security in this regard will guarantee peace and stability.

## **P K Gautam**

Research Fellow

Institute for Defence Studies and Analyses (IDSA)

1, Development Enclave

New Delhi -110010

Tel: +91-11-26717983

Email: pkgautam2003@yahoo.co.in

Colonel PK Gautam is a Research Fellow at IDSA since 2005. He participated in the 1971 War in Bangladesh and has operational experience of Operation Meghdoot (Siachen glacier). He has authored a book *Environmental Security* (2003) through the D S Kothari DRDO Fellowship by the United Service Institute of India(USI), New Delhi for the year 2001-2002. His second book *National Security: A Primer* (2004) is on the recommended reading list in the *Army War College Journal*. His third book on the 1971 war titled *Operation Bangladesh* was released in 2006. His IDSA occasional paper “Composition and Regimental System of the Indian Army: Continuity and Change” is forthcoming. His extensive field work to study the emerging role of the Ecological Task Force of the Territorial Army and also the Satluj and Brahmaputra region will be compiled as a forthcoming book. He has contributed chapters related to the environment and biological warfare in three edited books. His articles on military history, nuclear strategy, military and naval strategy, military sociology, climate change and environment have featured in a number of journals. He was on the editorial staff at the USI from 2002 till mid 2005. He also interacts with school children on environmental issues besides giving presentations on the topic at the IDSA to service , civil service and police officers during training capsules. He is also the cluster coordinator for the” Non- Traditional Cluster”.

## **Shanghai Cooperation Organization and Asian Multilateralism in the 21st Century: A Critical Assessment**

**P. Stobdan**

Originally a talking-shop for the former Communists, the SCO has become diverse and high profile while attracting an array of other players such as India, Pakistan and Iran as observers in 2005. Its key promoters (Russia, China) have skillfully nurtured the grouping as an exclusive nucleus to undercut the US strategic outreach in Central Asia and controlling the region's energy resources. Is the SCO emerging as a distinct pole or is it an opportunistic alliance of desperate states seeking constant readjustments? There is little to suggest the SCO shaping into a complete systemic whole. As Central Asia, SCO's main nucleus continues to suffer from strategic ambiguity; the states there seek varied goals and play major power off each other. The SCO's future hinges on its future security dilemma. The grouping faces myriad and asymmetrical problems. The atmosphere of suspicion remains strong and intra-regional trade record is minimal. In spite of shared interests and concerns for ensuring a multipolar world, there are signs of incipient Sino-Russian rivalry over a host of issues in Central Asia. The SCO, it seems more a façade, behind which two powerful neighbors compete for regional and bilateral influence. China's charm economic offensive boosts local authoritarian regimes but systematically kills Central Asian industries. It is, therefore, unlikely that the SCO would remain a benign phenomenon for a long a time. Moreover, several emotive issues like disputes over territory and water resources with China could burst open any time.

Attempts at experimenting with democracy and economic liberalization have not worked well so far in Central Asia. The intrinsic clan-based power play and personality driven politics hampers regional integration process. All in all, Central Asia would inevitably witness more Islamic, democratic and even violent (terror) expressions.

## **P. Stobdan**

Senior Fellow

Institute for Defence Studies and Analyses

1, Development Enclave

New Delhi -110010

Tel: +91-11-26717983

Email: pstobdan@gmail.com

Professor P. Stobdan is Senior Fellow at the Institute for Defence Studies and Analyses (IDSA). He is a leading Indian expert on issues concerning national and international strategic and security with specific focus on Asian affairs. He has served as Director (First Secretary), ICC, Embassy of India, Almaty; Joint Director, National Security Council Secretariat (NSCS), Government of India; and Director, Centre for Strategic and Regional Studies (CSRS), University of Jammu.

He has written extensively on a wide range of security-related subjects in international journals, books and newspapers both in India and abroad. His select publications include: "Central Asia in Geopolitical Transition," (*Strategic Analysis*, April 1998); "The Afghan Conflict and Regional Security," (*Strategic Analysis*, August 1999); "India's Perspective on Central Asia," *Peace and Security in Central Asia*, (IDSA Occasional Paper Series 2000); and "Central Asia and India's Security," (*Strategic Analysis*, January-March 2004).

## **Pranab Mukherjee**

External Affairs Minister  
Ministry for External Affairs  
South Block  
New Delhi-110011  
India

Shri Pranab Mukherjee is India's External Affairs Minister. Prior to that he has served as India's Defence Minister. He was also the President of the Executive Council of the Institute for Defence Studies and Analyses (IDSA).

He has a long and distinguished political career and was elected to the Rajya Sabha for the first time in July 1969. Since then, he has been member of the Rajya Sabha in 1975, 1981, 1993 and 1999. He was also elected as a member of the 14<sup>th</sup> Lok Sabha in May 2004. He has been Deputy Leader of the Congress Party in the Rajya Sabha between 1978 and 1980 and was leader of the house from 1980 to 1985. He was also Member of the Consultative Committee for External Affairs between 1996 and 1999. He has been Member of the Congress Working Committee from 1978 to 1986 and again from 1997 till date.

In the Union Cabinet, he was Minister of State for Finance(1974-75); Commerce and Steel and Mines (1980-82); Minister of Finance(1982-84); Deputy Chairman, Planning Commission(1991-96); and Minister for External Affairs(1995-96). He was also on the Board of Governors of the International Monetary Fund(1982-85), The World Bank(1982-85), and the 3 Asian Development bank(1982-85).

## **Evolution of Asian Security through ASEAN's Regional Forum**

**Pramod K. Mishra**

ASEAN's Regional Forum (ARF) was formed in July 1994 with a clear mandate issued at the 4th ASEAN Summit in Singapore(1992) which proclaimed the intention of the Heads of State/Governments to “intensify ASEAN's external dialogue in political and security matters and building cooperative ties among the states of the Asia-Pacific region”.

The proposed paper will broadly examine the lack of any common security framework in the Asian continent during the Cold War era. We will also review the gradual evolution of the common security framework in the Asia- Pacific region through the establishment of ARF as it has continued to expand its membership by including several Asia-Pacific countries like USA, Russia, China, Japan, India, Pakistan, Bangladesh and Sri Lanka besides all the Southeast Asian states. The paper will also highlight on the three stage development of the ARF system (like confidence-building, diplomacy and elaboration of approaches to conflicts). Finally, it will also highlight on the active participation of India in all deliberations and consultation - mechanism of the ARF.

Several efforts to forge unity and solidarity among the Asian states through the Asian Relations Conference in New Delhi (1947) and the Bandung Summit in 1955 did not substantially bridge the differences among the newly emergent states of Asia. Only after the Association of Southeast Asian states (ASEAN) was founded in 1967 by the five founding members (Indonesia, Malaysia, Philippines, Singapore and Thailand) that a modest beginning was made to forge some unity among these states. At the first ASEAN summit in Bali (February, 1976), a Treaty of Amity and Cooperation in Southeast Asia was Zone of Peace, Freedom and Neutrality (ZOPFAN) Declaration. In 1995 at the Bangkok summit the ASEAN declared South-East Asia as a Nuclear Weapon Free zone.

While exploring the objectives, determinants and challenges before the ARF, the paper would also examine the different types of networking among the member-states on the issue of national security.

## **Pramod K Mishra**

Associate Professor  
University of Delhi  
New Delhi  
Email: edit\_app@yahoo.com

Dr Pramod K Mishra is an Associate Professor in Politics, University of Delhi and Director, Academy for Asia-Pacific Studies, Delhi. He is also the editor of *Asia Pacific Panorama*. He did his Ph. D from the School of International Studies, JNU, in 1982. He has taught graduate/undergraduate courses on India's Foreign Policy, South Asian Politics and Theory of International Politics.

During January-April, 1999 as a Fulbright Visiting Professor of South Asian studies at the University of West Florida, Pensacola, he taught a full course on South Asia to the graduate and senior undergraduate students. During that period, he delivered lectures at Miles College, Indiana State University, Terre Haute and New York State University. As a Shastri Indo-Canadian Fellow at the University of Alberta From December 2002 to March 2003, he delivered talks on Indian aborigines and Kleptocracy in the Developing University of Calgary, Alberta and in South Asia Research Center in Ottawa. He has published 8 books and 90 research papers in referred journals such as "Globalization Poses New Challenges to South-South Solidarity". In Govind Prasad etc. (ed), *Globalization: myth and Reality* (Concept, New Delhi) pp.372-68, 2004, "New Delhi Beijing-Moscow Trilateral Initiative: A Long View," Contemporary India, Vol. 3 No.1, 2005," Quest for Empowerment of Aboriginal people Under Canadian Federation," Asia Pacific Panorama, Vol. 4, no.1, 2005.

## **Iranian Nuclear Crisis: NIE and After**

**Priyanka Singh**

The NIE or the National Intelligence Estimate which comprises inputs from 16 espionage/intelligence organs of the United States came out with its latest report on 3<sup>rd</sup> December 2007. The report affirmed that the nuclear programme of Iran had come to a halt way back in fall 2003 thereby nullifying allegations against Iran relating to its nuclear ambitions. Not long back the US wanted to have a third round of unilateral sanctions against Iran through the UNSC or perhaps resort to a military option. With the NIE, it will be vital for US to revise its policy on Iran and more broadly give some element of legitimacy to its policy on Middle East in order to project itself as a responsible state in the community of nations. Noteworthy is the fact that the veracity of the present US administration has suffered grossly owing to its earlier claims regarding Iraq's nuclear arsenals.

Subsequently Iran seems to be in a politically contented situation from where it could venture on to some acts of belligerence. Iranian ships confronted the US naval vessels in the Strait of Hormuz which is a major oil shipping route of immense strategic significance. The Pentagon described the incident as 'careless', 'reckless' and 'potentially hostile'. The Iranian Foreign Ministry officials interpreted the incident as "ordinary" and clearly stated that it was not unconventional to question and identify the ships that enter into their regional waters. Nevertheless the fact that the Revolutionary Guards were involved in the incident gives it a particular dimension.

Despite the NIE assessment, the likelihood of Iran going nuclear cannot be denied under any circumstances. The NIE has come out with varied assessments in the past especially on Iraq and Iran, which have not been true. One has to acknowledge the fact that Iran is situated in the most volatile region of the world and keeping in view its past record, a nuclear weapon in its hand would be destabilizing. The paper would seek to draw implications that US adversity in Iraq (and partially in Afghanistan) followed by the latest NIE report would have on its efforts to leash the nuclear aspirations of Iran. It would also gauge the extent to which Iran has benefited from the immense American impasse.

## **Priyanka Singh**

Research Assistant  
Institute for Defence Studies and Analyses (IDSA)  
1, Development Enclave  
New Delhi -110010  
Tel: +91-11-26717983  
Email: priy2007@gmail.com

Dr Priyanka Singh is a Research Assistant at IDSA. She is an alumna of Lady Shri Ram College for Women, University of Delhi and of the University of Lucknow. She was awarded the Gold Medal for having ranked first in MA (Political Science). Her doctoral thesis was titled Indo-US relations in the last decade - 1990-2000: Shifting Paradigms. She was an active member of the National Service Scheme (NSS) in college and has a one year voluntary teaching experience at the "Institution for the Blind" Lajpat Nagar, New Delhi. She was a lead organizer of various literary and cultural activities in LSR College and Lucknow University.

## **Pankaj K Jha**

Associate Fellow,  
Institute for Defence Studies and Analyses (IDSA),  
New Delhi,  
Email: pankajha\_kum@yahoo.com

Dr Pankaj K Jha is an Associate Fellow at IDSA. He is an Economics graduate from Delhi University; Worked on the role of NIEs in the development of ASEAN and its implications for India; Worked with the Ministry of Home Affairs, Government of India for seven years, and has a background in intelligence collection. His select publications include: "Reassessing India's Look East Policy," *World Focus*, Annual Number 2003, "India-Singapore Relations," (*World Focus*, September 2004), "Role of NIEs in the Development of ASEAN: Implications for India" (*Indian Ocean Digest*, January-December 2004), "BIMSTEC: A Sub-Regional Grouping" (*South Asia Politics*, May 2005).

## **The Future of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Regime**

**Rajesh Rajagopalan**

Though the nuclear non-proliferation regime is perennially in crisis, its current difficulties appear particularly serious. It is also somewhat paradoxical, when considered against the record of the Cold War period. We should expect international regimes to prosper under hegemony and wither when there is great power competition because the great powers might differ on issues of regime-maintenance. During the Cold War, despite intense superpower cooperation, the nuclear non-proliferation regime prospered; but hegemonic dominance in the post-Cold War period is witnessing potential regime disintegration. I suggest that what is far more important than material distribution of power (bipolarity vs. unipolarity) is the perception of interest of the dominant power(s). The non-proliferation regime prospered during the Cold War because both superpowers saw the regime as useful.

Many reasons are cited for the current problems afflicting the regime. These include the failure to make progress on nuclear disarmament, unilateral use of force by Washington, the unequal nature of the non-proliferation bargain, cheating by NPT member states, as well as continued non-compliance by the three hold-out states. While all these reasons have some validity, in this paper, I suggest that the key reason is Washington's lack of faith in the institutional arrangements of the regime. The regime's current difficulties are the consequence of Washington's uncertainty about the utility of the regime. If Washington's perception of the utility of the regime changes, it should be possible to repair the regime.

## **Rajesh Rajagopalan**

Associate Professor

Centre for International Politics, Organization and Disarmament

School of International Studies

Jawaharlal Nehru University

New Delhi

Email: rajesh622@yahoo.com

Dr Rajesh Rajagopalan is Associate Professor in International Politics at the Centre for International Politics, Organization and Disarmament, School of International Studies, Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi. Previously, he was Senior Fellow at the Observer Research Foundation, New Delhi, and Research Fellow at the Institute for Defence Studies and Analyses, New Delhi. He also served as Deputy Secretary in the National Security Council Secretariat, Government of India (2000-2001). He has also taught at Hunter College, Brooklyn College, and Queens College of the City University of New York. He has a PhD from the City University of New York (1998).

His areas of research interest are international relations theory, military doctrines, and nuclear weapons and disarmament. His publications include two books, *Second Strike: Arguments about Nuclear War in South Asia* (New Delhi: Penguin/Viking, 2005), and *Fighting like a Guerrilla: The Indian Army and Counterinsurgency* (New Delhi and Abingdon: Routledge, 2007). His articles have appeared in a number of academic journals such as *Contemporary Security Policy*, *India Review*, *South Asian Survey*, *Contemporary South Asia*, *Small Wars and Insurgencies*, and *Strategic Analysis* as well as in Indian newspapers such as *The Hindu*, *Indian Express*, *Financial Express*, and *Hindustan Times*.

# **The Future of Afghanistan: A Perspective from Pakistan**

## **Rasul Bakhsh Rais**

The three cycles of wars that Afghanistan has gone through over the past thirty years have been about defining and shaping its future; how Afghanistan should be ordered as a state and society. The wars over such a long period of time suggest how important, difficult and complex this question is. It remains unsettled even after two interventions by the two superpowers of modern times and many bouts of internal struggles and civil wars among various contestants with a stake in the present and future of the country.

Afghanistan's location at the intersection of three strategic regions and its character as a 'frontier state' invokes natural interest of all its neighbours in its state and nationhood, its political preferences and the foreign policy choices it make. For this reason, some of the neighbouring states have been voluntarily or involuntarily involved in influencing the political direction Afghanistan would take. This involvement has been both defensive—to prevent adversarial states taking control of the country—and offensive to keep other regional rival out.

As the complex conflict prolonged and social and state institutions of Afghanistan began to disintegrate, the effects of power vacuum sucked in dangerous trans-national militants groups with a globalist agenda. Use of Afghanistan as a sanctuary and as a base to strike at targets beyond Afghanistan and the region has brought in powers from too distant places to restructure Afghanistan's state and nationhood. The Afghan groups, regional states and international players, all have a stake in the future of Afghanistan.

The present chapter of Afghanistan's political history that started with the ouster of the Taliban and which involves larger part of international community in rebuilding it as a normal nation and as a state remains unfinished. It is not yet very uncertain what kind a state and nation Afghanistan is likely to be in the coming years and decades. We may however speculate three alternative futures for Afghanistan that will have tremendous impact on the stability and security of the entire region, including its immediate neighbours.

These are: a) Peaceful and stable Afghanistan with effective statehood; b) Afghanistan at war among its internal groups and with foreign forces; c) Internal fragmentation with a nominal state. The paper proposes to examine these alternative futures and raise questions about how realistic they might be or how they may influence other countries.

## **Rasul Bakhsh Rais**

Professor and Head,  
Department of Social Sciences,  
Lahore University of Management Sciences  
Lahore, Pakistan  
Email: [rasul@lums.edu.pk](mailto:rasul@lums.edu.pk)

Dr Rasul Baksh Rais is Professor of Political Science and Head, Department of Social Sciences, Lahore University of Management Sciences (LUMS). Dr Rais has Ph.D. in Political Science from University of California Santa Barbara. Before joining LUMS, he served as Professor/Director, Area Study Centre and prior to that as Associate Professor in the Department of International Relations, Quaid-i-Azam University, Islamabad for nearly 22 years. He was Professor of Pakistan Studies at Columbia University, New York for 3 years, 1991-94. He took Fulbright fellowship at Wake Forest University, 1997-98, Social Science Research Fellowship at Harvard, 1989-90, Rockefeller Foundation fellowship in International Relations at the University of California, Berkeley, 1985-85. He is author of *War Without Winners: Afghanistan's Uncertain Transition after the Cold War* (Oxford University Press, 1996), *Indian Ocean and the Superpowers: Economic, Political and Strategic Perspectives* (Croom Helm, London, 1986), editor of *State, Society and Democratic Change in Pakistan* (Oxford University Press, 1997). He has published widely in professional journals on political and security issues pertaining to South Asia, Indian Ocean and Afghanistan.

## **Dirty Bombs: A Potential Threat in South Asia**

**Reshmi Kazi**

The concept of dirty bomb dawned into public consciousness on 8 May 2002, when Abdullah Al Muhajir was arrested in Chicago by the US Department of Defence and subsequently detained as an enemy combatant. Muhajir, formerly known as Jose Padilla was accused of being an Al Qaida terrorist conspiring to develop and explode a dirty bomb in the United States.

A dirty bomb, also known as radiological weapon, has been defined by the Council on Foreign Relations as a conventional explosive such as dynamite packaged with radioactive material which scatters when the bomb goes off. Detonating radioactive material with conventional explosives results in dispersion of radioactive aerosol in the atmosphere causing serious injury through airborne radiation and contamination. It is primarily for this that radiological weapons are referred to as dirty.

A dirty bomb is in a way similar to a nuclear weapon. However what makes it a particularly worrisome threat is the relative ease in building these weapons. Such bombs do not require any more expertise than what is required to construct conventional weapons.

Radiological weapons are frightening possibility in South Asia, especially in the aftermath of 9/11. The possibility becomes more alarming considering the fact that the sources of radioactive materials suitable for producing an RDD are not well guarded. In India there have been numerous instances of thefts in recent years. In July 1998, more than 8 kilograms of natural uranium stolen from the Indira Gandhi Centre for Atomic Research was seized by the CBI. Unfortunately, radiological sources in the possession of hospitals and industries being outside the direct control of the state are difficult to maintain strict vigilance upon.

The possibility of leakage of radioactive materials is also widely feared from Pakistan. Illicit trafficking in nuclear and radioactive materials through terrorist networks has doubled the capacity of radical groups to trigger crisis. The risk of a radiological attack in India cannot be ruled out outrightly due to the presence of terrorist groups with a penchant for spreading chaos and disruption and the increasing tension between India and Pakistan.

As long as terrorist organizations like the Al Qaida and its affiliates operate within South Asia, the risk for radiological terror and panic remains high. How to combat a possible radiological attack within India and also with South Asia is what this essay will explore.

## **Reshmi Kazi**

Associate Fellow  
Institute for Defence Studies and Analyses (IDSA)  
1, Development Enclave  
New Delhi -110010  
Tel: +91-11-26717983  
Email: reshmikazi@gmail.com

Dr Reshmi Kazi is an Associate Fellow at IDSA. Prior to joining IDSA, she worked as a Research Fellow in the Institute of Peace and Conflict Studies, New Delhi, from December 2003 to September 2007. Her select publication include, “Reliable Replacement Warheads: A Dangerous Expansion,” 30 June 2007, *www.ipcs.org*, “Nuclear Tests: India Cannot Foreclose the Option,” March 2007, *www.ipcs.org*, “Lame Duck Session: US Senate Must Pass the Civilian Nuclear Deal,” (*Mainstream*, November 18, 2006); “Indo-US Nuclear Deal: Delay A Significant Setback,” (*Mainstream*, November 4, 2006); “Bird Flu,” in P.R. Chari (ed.), *Biological Weapons: Issues and Threats* (New Delhi: Manohar, 2005).

# The Role of Multilateral Institutions in Forging Cooperation Among Major Powers: A Framework for Analysis

Robert Ayson

Are Asia's multilateral institutions good for major power relations? Do they increase the chances of effective cooperation between the region's giants? Alternatively, are Asia's great powers good for multilateral institutions? Do they help or hinder the work of these regional groupings?

This paper offers a framework for evaluating the relationship between Asia's multilateral institutions and Asia's major powers. The first part of the framework consists of seven arguments about what institutions can do for the major powers. Some of these are positive arguments. There is the *cooperation* argument that Asia's institutions can encourage patterns of common behaviour amongst the great powers and especially between China and the United States. There is the *security* argument that institutions reduce the tensions between the great powers and the chance of conflict between them. There is the *engagement* argument that multilateral institutions connect great powers to the region and remind them of their interests in remaining engaged. And there is the *sensitivity* argument that institutions encourage great powers to become more aware of the needs and interests of medium and small powers in the region. The *impotence* argument suggests that multilateral institutions have little if any effect on great power behaviour including cooperation. The *self-deception* argument implies that institutions give a misleading impression that the major powers are willing to cooperate. And there is the *avoidance* argument that multilateral institutions distract the region's attention from the fundamental issues which need to be dealt with directly by the major powers themselves.

The second part of the framework includes five arguments about what the major powers can do (or perhaps to) institutions. Most of these are negative arguments. The *paralysis* argument suggests that the great powers stymie the progress of regional institutions including by holding up their agendas. There is the *hegemony* argument that great powers seek to dominate institutions. Closely related is the *competition* argument which suggests that great powers use multilateral institutions as venues to compete for influence and favour. And there is the *irrelevance* argument that great powers can and do ignore multilateral institutions. But there is at least one positive argument about how the great powers affect multilateral institutions. This is the *credibility* argument which suggests that the involvement of the great powers boosts the reputation and even the influence of multilateral institutions.

## Robert Ayson

Director of Studies  
Graduate Studies  
Strategic and Defence Studies Centre,  
Australian National University  
Canberra ACT 0200 Australia  
Email: robert.ayson@anu.edu.au

Dr Robert Ayson directs the Graduate Studies in Strategy and Defence Program where he teaches Strategic Studies and Strategic Concepts. Previously he was a lecturer in International Relations, Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand (1998-2002), and Adviser in Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade Select Committee, (New Zealand) (1997-98). He obtained his PhD from Department of War Studies, King's College London (1997) and MA in Strategic & Defence Studies Centre, Australian National University (1989).

Dr. Ayson has His key publications include: *Strategy and Security in the Asia-Pacific* (co-edited with Desmond Ball, 2006), *Thomas Schelling and the Nuclear Age: Strategy as Social Science* (2004). In addition to publishing books, numerous reports, research monographs and edited volumes, he contributes regularly to leading academic journals, and has written numerous chapters for major volumes focusing on strategic concepts (stability).

His current research projects focus on the requirements for stability in stabilisation operations and the prospects for collaboration between the great powers in Asia. He is a regular media commentator on nuclear issues and the use of force in international politics.

# **Cooperative Framework of Economic Strategy for Asian Security**

**S K G Sundaram**

This paper aims to highlight the need for a cooperative framework for Asian security, through an economic dimension, in this Millennium. The paper begins with an economic profile of Asia that is surging forward rapidly. This is followed by a discussion on the emerging economic security dimensions in Asia. The concept of collective security through appropriate economic relations is discussed next. The imperatives for developing an economically integrated and strong Asia are discussed. Steps needed to secure Asian Collective security are discussed.

Asian security concept is indeed very complex. India-China rivalries, in spite of these countries coming closer, are a cause of concern. Potential flashpoints have also emerged in Myanmar, Nepal, Taiwan and Pakistan. Terrorism and Nuclear arms race are other emerging threats that can turn a fragile peace in Asia into a warring continent. In this environment economic cooperation constitutes an important measure for a collective security in Asia.

A cooperative framework for Asian security must emerge from the economic space available in Asia. China and India must sustain their economic growth and to the extent possible carry it forward. India and China too have mixed feelings with unsolved border problems between them. Russia is rising as an economic power. The Central Asian countries are seeking to develop a clear identity for themselves. Afghanistan and Myanmar pose big question marks. Asian security can only be forged and cemented through economic cooperation. Economic factors are now dominant in a country's foreign policy in Asia. Of course economic rivalries abound but are manageable. Japan must consolidate in Southeast Asia to rope in economies in that region including Taiwan. The Shanghai Cooperation Organization must develop a strong economic dimension. In conclusion it is advocated that cooperation must be sought to transcend political barriers, cultural differences, social heterogeneities and communal divides. Japan must consolidate in Southeast Asia to rope in economies in that region including Taiwan.

## **S.K.G. Sundaram**

Consultant

CIDCO-Navi Mumbai Special Economic Zone

Mumbai, Maharashtra

Email: [skg\\_sundaram@rediffmail.com](mailto:skg_sundaram@rediffmail.com)

Dr S K G Sundaram is presently Consultant to a research study for CIDCO-Navi Mumbai Special Economic Zone on Training and rehabilitation of its PAPs and Member of Research Team Evaluating National Child Labour Project in Maharashtra, study coordinated by VVG National Labour Insitute, Noida-New Delhi. Was faculty for one term (August-December2003) at the University of Regina, Canada, attached to its Department of Economics & Luther college affiliated to it and also TISCO Chair Professor at the Tata Institute of Social Sciences, Mumbai during 2005-06.

He was a Visiting faculty in Economics for postgraduate students and teachers in Arts, Commerce and Management faculties and Guided an Income Tax Commissioner on assignment in taxing agricultural income during 2005-06. He presented paper in many forums, both national and international.

# **Civil-Military Engagement in Post-Conflict Reconstruction: A Study of Provincial Reconstruction Teams in Afghanistan**

**Seema Sridhar**

The US war on terror that began with Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF) in October 2002 has set in motion the arduous long drawn task of post-conflict reconstruction in Afghanistan. The indispensability of combining economic development with security in Afghanistan has been palpable and as an acknowledgement of the primacy of this inter-dependency, the Provincial Reconstruction Teams (PRTs) were undertaken, as an experiment in civil-military engagement in Afghanistan. These are military run enclaves designed to provide safe haven for international aid workers.

This paper examines and analyses the contribution of the PRTs to the security situation in Afghanistan to date. The paper locates the historical context of peace support operations and how they came to encompass new structures such as PRTs within their realm. Several other coalition partners have also taken over US-run PRTs and have started their own as well. However several international aid organizations have been reluctant to take over US-run PRTs as they would circuitously involve them in taking over military duties. Thus the efforts of the PRTs have been rendered uncoordinated and the outcome of the initiative scattered. This paper shall delve into the tensions between civil and military actors operating in the same environment and examine the structures that have evolved to endorse cooperation and coordination between the two actors.

Given the intricacies of a volatile post-conflict situation such as the one in Afghanistan, combat forces are increasingly finding themselves encroaching upon civilian territories of humanitarian assistance and reconstruction. The paper will consider the contribution of the PRTs to the security situation in Afghanistan, by examining them in a broader analytical framework of peace operations and their operating environment. The conclusions drawn from this study seek to make general recommendations as to how decision-makers might continue to make use of the PRT model to improve security in future post-conflict environments.

## Seema Sridhar

Research Scholar  
School of International Studies  
Jawaharlal Nehru University (JNU)  
New Delhi  
Email:seema4peace@gmail.com

Ms. Seema Sridhar completed her Masters from the School of International Studies, Jawaharlal Nehru University (JNU). She worked as Research Officer at the Institute of Peace and Conflict Studies, New Delhi from March 2005 to August 2006 where her areas of specialization included Pakistan, Indo-Pak Relations, and Kashmir. She was a Research Intern at Observer Research Foundation, New Delhi from May 2004 to October 2004. Her select publications include: 'US Role in Afghanistan: Endless Road; Unknown Destination', *World Focus*, No. 332, (August 2007), 'US War on Terror spreads into Pakistan', *Mainstream*, Vol. XLIV, No 9, 18 (February 2006), 'Coping with disaster in J&K: Looking Beyond the Security Forces', *Mainstream*, Vol 43, No. 46, (November 5, 2005), 'Afghan Pragmatism or Surrender?', *India News and Features Alliance*, (October 2007).

## **North Korea and the Future of East Asian Nuclear Stability**

**Selig S. Harrison**

The successful implementation of the Six-Party North Korean denuclearization agreement (the United States, North Korea, South Korea, China and Japan) concluded on February 13, 2007, would greatly enhance the prospects for a stable nuclear order in East Asia. Conversely, a stalemate in the denuclearization process, or its collapse, would accelerate trends in Japan that could lead to the conversion of its sophisticated civilian nuclear capabilities to the development of nuclear weapons. This, in turn, would rekindle sublimated sentiment in South Korea for a nuclear weapons program that could be integrated with that of North Korea when and if Korea is confederated or reunified.

Even if North Korea fully dismantles its nuclear weapons program and surrenders its existing stockpile of fissile material, the possibility of a nuclear-armed Japan should not be underrated, given the volatile character of relations between Japan and China and the strength of the right-wing nationalist forces in Japan committed to the goal of nuclear armament.

The February 13 agreement with North Korea provides for a phased denuclearization process. In the first phase, North Korea fulfilled its commitment to disable its Yongbyon plutonium reactor, and the energy assistance promised as the principal quid pro quo for disablement is being delivered as agreed. North Korea is required to make a declaration of its “nuclear programs” that must address U.S. suspicions of a secret uranium enrichment facility, the United States must take steps to remove North Korea from the State Department List of Terrorist States in the face of Japanese opposition, and North Korea has served notice that the complete dismantlement of its nuclear weapons program and the surrender of its fissile material stockpile would be conditioned on a commitment to provide the civilian light water reactors promised under the 1994 Agreed Framework.

## Selig S. Harrison

Director of the Asia Program  
Center for International Policy  
1717 Massachusetts Avenue NW  
Suite 801, Washington, DC 20036  
E-mail: [sharrison@ciponline.org](mailto:sharrison@ciponline.org)

Mr. Selig S. Harrison is a Senior Scholar at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars and Director of the Asia Program at the Center for International Policy. He has specialized in South Asia and East Asia for 56 years as a journalist and scholar and is the author of five books on Asian affairs and U.S. relations with Asia. His latest book, *Korean Endgame: A Strategy for Reunification and U.S. Disengagement* (Princeton University Press) won the 2002 award of the Association of American Publishers for the best Professional/Scholarly Book in Government and Political Science.

Harrison served as South Asia Correspondent of the Associated Press (1951-54), based in New Delhi, returned as South Asia Bureau Chief of *The Washington Post* (1962-65), and served as Northeast Asia Bureau Chief of The Post, based in Tokyo, from 1968 to 1972. From 1974 to 1996, as a Senior Associate of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, he pursued investigative assignments in a variety of courtiers, including India, Pakistan, China, Japan and the two Koreas.

His reputation for giving “early warning” of foreign policy crises was well established during his career as a foreign correspondent. In his study of foreign reporting, *Between Two Worlds*, John Hohenberg, former secretary of the Pulitzer Prize Board, cited Harrison’s prediction of the 1965 Indo-Pakistan war 18 months before it happened. He was one of the first American to visit North Korea since the Korean war and to interview Kim Il Sung

Harrison is the author of five books: *India: The Most Dangerous Decades* (Princeton, 1960); *China, Oil, and Asia: Conflict Ahead?* (Columbia, 1997); *The Widening Gulf: Asian Nationalism and American Policy* (The Free Press, 1978); *In Afghanistan’s Shadow* (Carnegie Endowment, 1981) and *Korean Endgame: A Strategy for Reunification and U.S. Disengagement* (Princeton, 2002). He is co-author with Diego Cordovez of *Out of Afghanistan: The Inside Story of the Soviet Withdrawal* (Oxford, 1995) and edited *India and the United States* (Macmillan, 1960); and *Superpower Rivalry in the Indian Ocean: Indian and American Perspectives* (1989).

## **Taking Stock of Afghan Conflict**

**Seth S Jones**

In 2002, Afghanistan began to deteriorate into a violent insurgency as the Taliban and other groups conducted a sustained effort to overthrow the Afghan government. The Afghanistan government has been unable to provide key services to the population, its security forces have been too weak to establish law and order, and there have been too few international forces to fill the gap. A growing body of literature suggests that weak and ineffective governance is critical to the onset of insurgencies. For example, James Fearon and David Laitin, who examined all civil wars and insurgencies between 1945 and 1999, found that financially, organizationally, and politically weak central governments render insurgencies more feasible and attractive due to weak local policing or inept counter insurgency practices. Michael Doyle and Nicholas Sambanis found that governance is critical to end civil wars. They argued that success requires the provision of temporary security, the building of new institutions capable of resolving future conflicts peaceably, and an economy capable of offering civilian employment to former soldiers and material progress to future citizens. In addition, Ann Hironaka argued that governmental capacity is a significant predictor of civil wars, and between 1816 and 1997 effective bureaucratic and political systems reduced the rate of civil war activity.

Key steps proposed in the paper include improving the Afghan government's capacity to establish security (especially through the police) and increasing international resources and commitment. NATO must also find a way to deal with the sanctuary for all Afghan insurgent groups in Pakistan. Key questions that the paper addresses are the reasons for the evolution of insurgency and the future implications of the same for Afghanistan. The paper outlines the rising insurgency in Afghanistan and outlines lessons from past insurgencies suggesting steps to deal with the current situation in Afghanistan.

## Seth G. Jones

Adjunct Professor  
Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service  
Georgetown University  
USA

Seth G. Jones is Adjunct Professor at Georgetown University's Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service and a Political Scientist at the RAND Corporation. His research focus in recent times has been on U.S. operations in Afghanistan, including the counter-insurgency campaign and efforts to rebuild the Afghan National Police and Afghan National Army. He has also conducted policy research for senior policymakers at the U.S. National Security Council and Department of Defense (Office of the Secretary of Defense, Special Operations Command, U.S. Army, and U.S. Marine Corps).

He is completing a book on the rise of the insurgency in Afghanistan after the overthrow of the Taliban regime. He is the author of *The Rise of European Security Cooperation* (Cambridge University Press, 2007). He has published articles on stability operations and security in *The National Interest*, *Security Studies*, *Chicago Journal of International Law*, *International Affairs*, and *Survival*, as well as *The New York Times*, *Newsweek*, *Financial Times*, and *International Herald Tribune*. His RAND publications include: *The Beginner's Guide to Nation Building* (2007); *Establishing Law and Order after Conflict* (2005); *The UN's Role in Nation-Building: From Congo to Iraq* (2005); and *America's Role in Nation-Building: From Germany to Iraq* (2003). He received his Masters and Doctorate degrees from the University of Chicago.

## **Taking Stock of the Afghan Conflict**

**Shanthie Mariet D'Souza**

The early claims of success by the Bush Administration of ousting the Taliban- Al Qaeda combine during Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF) notwithstanding, the Taliban and its affiliates are back. In the past year, the Taliban led insurgency has spread their area of influence from the South and East to large parts of Afghanistan. From their sanctuary in the Pakistan –Afghanistan border region, they are able to carry out lethal strikes in Afghanistan wreaking havoc on the fragile security situation, hampering reconstruction effort and eroding the legitimacy of the Afghan government. In the post OEF scenario, Taliban and Al Qaeda combine have further entwined in their goals, planning and operational tactics. They are able to act as significant 'strategic spoilers' seeking to discredit the Afghan government and undermine the will of the coalition and Afghan forces.

Despite the efforts of the international forces in quelling the insurgency in 2007, the Taliban led insurgency has led to greater levels of violence and consequent insecurity. The deteriorating security situation in Afghanistan indicates that the current US strategy of establishing security with a light footprint and aversion to nation -building is floundering. Neither has the issues of sanctuaries and safe haven been addressed by the international community. As international effort in stabilizing Afghanistan falters, the activities of Taliban Al Qaeda combine will portend greater violence and destabilization in the region. In light of the deteriorating security situation in Pakistan and Afghanistan, it is timely to make an assessment of the nature of the threat from Taliban- led insurgency and envision an alternate course of action. This would require greater international effort, with an Afghan face and buttressed by regional efforts.

## **Shanthie Mariet D'souza**

Associate Fellow  
Institute for Defence Studies and Analyses (IDSA)  
1, Development Enclave  
New Delhi -110010  
Tel: +91-11-26717983  
Email: shantied@yahoo.com

Dr Shanthie Mariet D'Souza is an Associate Fellow at the Institute for Defence Studies and Analyses (IDSA), New Delhi where she is currently working on the project "US Counter Terrorism Objectives in South Asia". Her research interests include: US Policy towards Afghanistan, Terrorism, Indo-US relations and Indo-Afghan Relations. She has PhD from School of International Studies, Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi. She has been a Visiting Fulbright Scholar on South Asia Studies, at the The Paul H Nitze School of Advanced International Studies (SAIS), Johns Hopkins University, Washington DC (2005-2006); Research Associate at the Database & Documentation Centre of the Institute for Conflict Management, Guwahati, Assam (2004-05); and part of the editorial staff of the United Service Institution of India, New Delhi (2001). She has participated in the Indo-Canada Youth Exchange Programme (1994-95), the Regional Centre for Strategic Studies Summer Workshop on "Defence Technology and Co-operative Security in South Asia" at Lahore, Pakistan (February-March 2005) and the Regional Counterparts Collaboration Workshop, Hawaii (November 2007), and has conducted field studies in the United States, Canada, Pakistan, Afghanistan, Jammu & Kashmir and India's North East.

## Shigekatsu Kondo

Senior Research Fellow &  
Executive Director  
The National Institute for Defense Studies (NIDS)  
Japan  
Email: pga00473@nifty.com

Professor Shigekatsu Kondo is Senior Research Fellow of National Institute for Defense Studies (NIDS). He graduated from Faculty of Law, Kyoto University in 1969. He joined NIDS in 1974 and left it to be Professor of Osaka International University in 1993. He taught American foreign policy and the history of international relations. He rejoined NIDS in 1997 as Director of First Research Department. Later he was appointed as the first Executive Director of NIDS in 2004. He was also the editor of the *East Asian Strategic Review*, an annual report from NIDS on the security situation of the East Asia, from 1997 to 2007. Also he has research experiences at Institute of South East Asian Studies (Singapore), Arms Control and Disarmament Program of Stanford University, and Program on U.S.-Japan Relations of Harvard University as visiting fellow.

His areas of expertise are international relations, U.S. security strategy and Japan-U.S. security relations. He co-edited *National Defense Policy of the Bush Administration* (Tokyo: Japan Institute of International Affairs, 2002) (in Japanese).

## **Japan and the Asian Security in the 21st Century**

### **Shigekatsu Kondo**

India is emerging as a major power. Along with its economic growth, the relationship between India and the East Asia is improving. Their relationship develops not only at economic level but also at political and military ones. China's rise is also remarkable. This is happening when the United States, which has deeply involved in the security of East Asia, has bogged down in Iraq and the upsurge of anti-American sentiments follows. What impact an emerging China will have on East Asia and the world is a question which needs to be discussed.

If the projection of the Goldman Sachs report, which invented the word, "BRICs," is right, three of the four largest economies in the world will exist in East Asia till 2050. They will be China, India and Japan. The stability of East Asia therefore will be more precious for the development of the world.

Different from Europe, the feature of developing East Asia is in diversity, facing various security problems involving both traditional conflicts and non-traditional threats. The principles of sovereignty and non interference in internal affairs are impeding prospects for regional cooperation. For the time being, inclusive and functional approach is desirable in order to solve the problems the region faces.

Japan needs to adjust itself to the changing regional and international environment by establishing a new grand strategy. Therefore, Japan now needs to establish a more proactive grand strategy in order to involve in making the region and the world more peaceful and prosperous. After the Cold War, Japan has dispatched the Self-Defense Forces to the United Nations Peace Keeping Operations, Iraq and the Indian Ocean within the restriction on the use of force under its constitution. This recent active involvement in international security domain has promoted the debate on the move of Japan to a "normal nation."

## **Iran's Nuclear Engagement: Implications for West Asia Region**

**Sima Baidya**

The dialectics of nuclear question in Iran naturally sparked world wide debate. As a sovereign state of West Asia, Iran has been pursuing her nuclear programme for quite some time. Amidst global uproar against nuclear weapon, nuclear programme in Iran as an Islamic Republic has far fetched consequences in West Asia region.

Global responses towards Iran's nuclear programme is basically shaped by US-Israeli stance. Point to be noted here is that Iran's nuclear programme has started long back with direct assistance of Russian and Chinese nuclear technology along with German help of nuclear reactors.

Leaving aside global reactions, the West Asian region also draws heterogeneous reactions. In Shia- Sunni divided West Asia, empowerment of Shi'ite Iran emboldens the idea of rising Shia Crescent and thus satisfy hegemonic ambitions of Iran. Imagination of nuclear Iran percolates to other West Asian states also. Initially, reactions towards Iran's nuclear programme were ambiguous in West Asia. UAE, Oman, Qatar etc. are not actually scared about Iran's nuclear position. Already some major West Asian countries have started talking about the development of nuclear capability for civilian purposes. There is no doubt that Iran's nuclear programme will accelerate the nuclear competitiveness among the states-which have already started their nuclear research programme long back. Countries like Syria and Egypt can pose challenge to the nuclear order or so to say nuclear ambition in West Asia without confronting Iran's nuclear programme. Even if Iran gets nuclear status, it will be another addition in nuclear power list and in West Asian region second after Israel. Military strategy of "Rocking the Boat" still holds water in West Asian case and stability in the region is a complex concept—that can be or can't be achieved by West Asian security architecture and no way only dependent on Iran's nuclear engagement.

## Sujit Dutta

Senior Fellow

Institute for Defence Studies and Analyses (IDSA)

1, Development Enclave

New Delhi - 110010

Tel: +91-11-26717983

Email: sujit\_dutta29@rediffmail.com

Mr Sujit Dutta is a Senior Fellow at IDSA. He was a journalist with the Press Trust of India before joining the IDSA. He has been a member of the India-China Eminent Persons' Group set up by the two governments in 2001 for high-level track-two dialogue on bilateral problems and diplomatic relations. He has represented the IDSA and the India Committee at the Council for Security Cooperation in the Asia Pacific's Working Group on Confidence Building Measures. He is a frequent participant in national and international conferences, including at Wilton Park, UK, and Sandia, USA. He has lectured and participated in seminars in Germany, China, Japan, and the United States. He is also a regular speaker at India's leading international relations and strategic affairs institutions, including the National Defence College, the College of Warfare, and the College of Naval Warfare.

He is Associate Editor of *Strategic Analysis*, and leads the South Asia programme at the IDSA. His select publications include *India and the World*, co-editor (2005), "China and Nonproliferation: Pragmatism and Adaptation," in C Uday Bhaskar and C Raja Mohan, (Eds.), *India and the NPT* (2005), "China's Emerging Ties with Central Asia," in Nirmala Joshi, (Ed.), *Central Asia: The Great Game Replayed* (2003), "Developing Confidence and Security in South Asia," in Dipankar Banerjee, (Ed.), *South Asia Security: Futures* (2002), "China's Military Role: Implications for South Asia," in Jonathan Pollack and Richard H Yang, (Eds.), *In China's Shadow: Regional Perspectives on Chinese Foreign Policy and Military Development* (RAND, 1998).

# The Asian Transition and India's Grand Strategy

**Sujit Dutta**

Asia is in the midst of a profound transition from being a conglomerate of disparate and essentially agrarian and inward looking states to an increasingly regionally/internationally integrated network of urbanized, industrialized, outward oriented countries. This transition is characterized on the one hand by high rates of growth, the emergence of a set of states with growing international stature, and a pronounced move towards regional and international interdependence.

Four broad strategic forces are shaping this explosive and challenging transition. *First*, the Asian states are increasingly adopting a modernization strategy intricately tied to broader forces of rapid globalization. *Second*, an ongoing realignment of forces is underway in the continent following the disintegration of the Soviet Union with the United States gaining predominant influence and the simultaneous rise of China and the increasing significance of India, a more assertive Japan, Korea, Indonesia, etc. *Third*, armed Islamic groups and terror outfits continue to pose a sustained and often bloody opposition to the region and the US-led the global war on terror. *Fourth*, there has been a significant spread of democracy in Asia since the end of the Cold War and the issue of democratization and rights is very much a core strategic and political issue despite the developmental successes recorded by some of the authoritarian states earlier in East Asia and now in China.

The paper looks at the policy choices India has made since the end of the Cold War and sees them coalescing into a grand strategy that is still evolving. Its essence lies in four elements: One, a steady and often circumspect embrace of globalization; two, engagement and competition with China and close strategic relationship with the US and Japan in order to enhance security and forge a stable Asian balance of power system; three, a long-term struggle against Islamic extremism and terrorism using a combination of engagement and pressure on Pakistan –the epicenter of much of the regional terror network, an internal counter-terror operations and the mainstreaming of Muslim communities so that they fully participate in the secular, democratic, economic modernization process; and four, the leveraging of democracy to engineer a social revolution and a common citizenship that would make caste, community and religious identity-based movements increasingly less significant, and peaceful co existence of diverse communities and equal opportunity the norm not only in India but across its Asian neighbourhood.

## T.V. Paul

Professor  
Department of Political Science  
McGill University  
Montreal, Canada  
Email: t.paul@mcgill.ca

Dr. T.V. Paul is Professor of International Relations in the Department of Political Science at McGill University, Montreal, Canada, where he has been teaching since 1991. He currently serves as the Director of the University of Montreal-McGill Research Group in International Security (REGIS). He specializes and teaches courses in international relations, especially international security, international conflict & conflict resolution, regional security and South Asia. He received his undergraduate education from Kerala University, India; M.Phil from Jawaharlal Nehru University (JNU), New Delhi; and Ph.D. in Political Science from the University of California, Los Angeles. Earlier he was a Visiting Professor of National Security Affairs at the Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, California from 2002 to 2003.

His publications include: *India in the World Order: Searching for Major Power Status* (2002, with Baldev Nayar); *Power versus Prudence: Why Nations Forgo Nuclear Weapons* (2000); and *Asymmetric Conflicts: War Initiation by Weaker Powers* (1994). He is also the editor/co-editor of the volume, *The India-Pakistan Conflict: An Enduring Rivalry* (2005); *Balance of Power: Theory and Practice in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century* (2004); *The Nation-State in Question* (2003); *International Order and the Future of World Politics* (2003); and *The Absolute Weapon Revisited: Nuclear Arms and the Emerging International Order* (2000). He is nearing completion of two book projects: *The Tradition of Non-use of Nuclear Weapons*; and *Globalization and the Changing National Security State*, in addition to working on an edited volume titled *Deterrence and Its Discontents* (with Patrick M Morgan and James J. Wirtz). He has published over 35 journal articles and book chapters and has lectured at universities and research institutions internationally.

Dr. Paul's book, *Power versus Prudence* was selected as an 'Outstanding Academic Title for 2001' by the *Choice Magazine* and as a "Book for Understanding" by the *American Association of University Presses*. In March 2005 *Maclean Magazine's Guide to Canadian Universities* rated Paul as one of the "most popular professors" at McGill University and in May 2005 Paul became the recipient of High Distinction in Research Award by McGill's Faculty of Arts.

# **Nuclear Weapons and Asian Security in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century**

**T.V. Paul**

This paper presents an assessment of the relationship between nuclear weapons and the emerging regional security order in Asia. It focuses more specifically on three dyads that have the most potential for nuclear arms race: US-China, India-China; and India-Pakistan. In addition, the paper will analyze the two states on the nuclear proliferation path — Iran and North Korea — and will address the possibilities for other Asian states seeking nuclear weapons. In the second section, the paper will discuss transnational terrorism and nuclear weapons and their implications for regional order. In the third section, the paper will posit whether deterrence will be robust or will it fail in the Asian continent. While deterrence is likely to be one of the cornerstones of defense policies of nuclear weapon states, and that deterrence is likely to hold at the strategic level, at the sub-strategic and non-state level, deterrence could be challenged in the years to come. The type of deterrence among the principal actors is likely to be general deterrence as opportunities for immediate deterrence may be less pronounced other than in the India-Pakistan and China-US (Taiwan) contexts. The paper will conclude by arguing that nuclear weapons possession will help power transitions in the international system as the rising powers China and India will use their nuclear possession as a means to obtain their peaceful ascendancy, while the declining power US will be constrained in using its advantages to arrest its possible descent through coercive means. Whether the region obtains nuclear peace may be a function of the peculiar lessons each nuclear state learns, especially with regard to the tradition of non-use and the severe constraints in using nuclear weapons as an instrument of statecraft other than for deterrence purposes.

## Thomas Andrew Marks

Head

Irregular Warfare Department

School for National Security Executive Education (SNSEE)

National Defense University (NDU)

Washington, DC

E-mail: tamarks@aol.com

Dr Thomas A. Marks is Head of the Irregular Warfare Department at the School for National Security Executive Education (SNSEE) of National Defense University (NDU) in Washington, DC and the author of *Maoist People's War in Post-Vietnam Asia* (Bangkok: White Lotus, 2007), considered the current standard on the subject of "people's war." A former US government officer who is a member of the editorial board of *Small Wars and Insurgencies* (London), he previously served as the Oppenheimer Chair of Warfighting Strategy at the Marine Corps University (Quantico), where he taught "Insurgency and Operational Art." He is an Adjunct Professor at the US Joint Special Operations University (JSOU, Hurlburt Field, FL) and for 2006 was awarded "Educator of the Year." He graduated from the United States Military Academy and in his Ph.D. work at the University of Hawaii focused on the relationship between popular upheaval and revolutionary crisis (published as *Making Revolution: The Insurgency of the Communist Party of Thailand in Structural Perspective*, Bangkok: White Lotus, 1994). In recent years, Dr. Marks has, in a variety of publications, for a variety of clients, analyzed conflicts as far-flung as those in Nepal, Sri Lanka, Colombia, Peru, Papua New Guinea, Laos, the Philippines, and Northern Ireland. His scholarly and journalistic works number in the hundreds. Among his other significant books are: *Maoist Insurgency Since Vietnam* (London, 1996), *The British Acquisition of Siamese Malaya, 1896-1909* (Bangkok, 1997), and *Counter-Revolution in China: Wang Sheng and the Kuomintang* (London, 1997). His latest monographs, all published by the U.S. Army War College (Carlisle), are: *Colombian Army Adaptation to FARC Insurgency* (2002), *Insurgency in Nepal* (2003), and *Sustainability of Colombian Military/Strategic Support for "Democratic Security"* (2005). His most recent operational endeavor was service, in a contract capacity, as the operations consultant for a newly raised Saudi Arabian commando unit.

## **Taking Stock of the Global War on Terrorism: The U.S. Perspective**

**Thomas Marks**

In fighting terrorism, it is not generally understood that the US must still be capable of covering a full spectrum of threats. Whether to use the “police approach” of the “military approach” is a false choice. As the premier world power, Washington must be able to do it all. Within America, for instance, we must be able to ferret out AQ operatives (police approach); yet simultaneously, we must be able to “take down” an entire country harboring terrorists (e.g., Afghanistan) — and then conduct counter insurgency in it. Likewise, the US must address both radical left wing and Islamist challenges. America thus – as reflected in its instructions to its combatant commanders in the *Irregular Warfare Joint Operating Concept*– is fighting two types of terrorism — as a method and as a logic. They require different approaches, one meeting terror used as a tactic in support of a larger armed political campaign, the other making terror itself a conflation of ends, ways, and means. While understanding of the problem has advanced, as have the ways of dealing with it, there remains no unity of command or execution, even at the theater level. No one is actually in charge of the war against terror, much less of the theaters or even functions within it. The result is fragmentation and consequent dilution of effort, even as key components, such as “soft power,” remain anemic if not completely dysfunctional. Finally, at the grand strategic level, the US has confused national security and fighting terrorism. Fighting terrorism is important, but there are other challenges which are arguably more important — such as our relationship with China and securing our economic health.

## V Krishnappa

Research Fellow

Institute for Defence Studies and Analyses,  
New Delhi-110010  
Email: krishnappache@gmail.com

Wing Commander V Krishnappa is Research Fellow at IDSA since September 2004. He is a serving officer of in the Indian Air Force. He joined Air Force in 1990 and has served in operation units and training establishments of the IAF. A graduate from Defence Services Staff College, Wellington and he is post graduate from Madras University (MSc in Defence and Strategic Studies). His research areas include War and peace studies, civil-military studies, counter insurgency, terrorism, Non- State Armed Groups and West Asia. He is doing a book project on Force, Politics and Diplomacy during the Second Lebanon war and comparative study of select Non-State Armed Groups and Asian Security in the 21st Century.

Wg Cdr Krishnappa is the Book Review Editor of Strategic Analyses. His published articles include: “Who Won Israel’s Second Lebanon War?” (Strategic Analysis, Vol. 31, Issue 1, January 2007), Hopeless Search for Peace in the Aftermath of the Second Israel-Lebanon War” (*IDSA Strategic Comment*, January 25, 2007) and a book chapter “The Second Lebanon War: An Appraisal” in *Asian Strategic Review*, IDSA, 2007.

## Ming-Hsien Wong

Associate Professor  
Graduate Institute of International Affairs and Strategic Studies  
Tamkang University  
Taiwan, ROC

Dr Ming-Hsien Wong is a Senior Advisor in National Security Council, R.O.C and Associate Professor at Graduate Institute of International Affairs and Strategic Studies, Tamkang University. He is also Chairmen of Taiwan Strategy Research Association (Taiwan, ROC). He obtained doctorate from University of Cologne, Germany. His research interest include: National Security Policy, Globalization and National Security, Social Science Research Method, China's National security and defense policy, International Relations Theories under Globalization. Dr Wong publication include: *National Security under Globalization* (2003, in Chinese); "Theater missile defense: Its influence on cross-strait and Asia-Pacific security" in *Defending Taiwan-The future vision of Taiwan's defence policy and military strategy* (2003, in English) and *New Vision of National Security* (2002, in Chinese).

## Xu Xin

Director  
China and Asia-Pacific Studies Program &  
Adjunct Associate Professor  
Department of Government  
Cornell University  
Email: xx12@cornell.edu

Dr. Xu Xin is Associate Director of the China and Asia-Pacific Studies Program and Adjunct Associate Professor in the Department of Government at Cornell University. He was formerly Associate Professor of International Relations in the Department of International Politics at Peking University, and Associate Professor of International Relations in the College of Asia Pacific Studies at Ritsumeikan Asia Pacific University in Japan. He was also a Visiting Research Fellow at the Japan Institute of International Affairs, an International Fellow at the Charles F. Kettering Foundation in the U.S., a Postdoctoral Fellow on national security in the John M. Olin Institute for Strategic Studies at Harvard University, and a Visiting Research Fellow and Acting Director of the Princeton-Harvard China and the World Program at Princeton University.

His areas of interest include the Taiwan issue, East Asian security politics, Asian regionalism and multilateralism, and China's foreign policy. He has published articles and book chapters both in English and Chinese about various issues in these areas. He is currently working on a book manuscript entitled *China and East Asia: Reshaping Power and Identity in the Post-Cold War Era*, and also working on a project about the Beijing Olympics and China's international relations.

## **The Chinese Concept of “Twenty Years’ Strategic Opportunity” and Its Implications for an Asia-Pacific Strategic Order**

**XU Xin**

Is there an overarching concept that can succinctly summarize Chinese strategic outlooks and dynamics of China’s behaviour in the early 21<sup>st</sup> century? Arguably, “a period of strategic opportunity” or simply “twenty years’ strategic opportunity” (*zhanlue jiyu qi*) is the one. Put forth by then Chinese president Jiang Zemin in May 2002, this concept reflects the mainstream Chinese elite worldview against all alternative arguments about what the world strategically is and more importantly, what China should do in the conduct of its domestic and foreign policies in the first two decades of the 21<sup>st</sup> century. Underscoring the concept are three basic strategic judgments: (1) the world’s geostrategic conditions of the early 21<sup>st</sup> century are basically benign and favourable to China’s development, despite all daunting challenges; (2) China should first and foremost concentrate on “its own work” – namely, domestic socio-economic development and comprehensive national power growth; and (3) China should actively and positively participate in global and regional affairs, and boldly yet cautiously seek to be a shaper in the creation of international rules and order. In the past few years, Chinese policy behavior to a great extent manifests this strategic baseline, no matter in which areas of its outside policies – for example, its relations with great powers, its position on world “hot spots,” its involvement in the UN and other multilateral institutions, its new activism in Africa and other developing regions, its approach to regional affairs, as well as its management of the Taiwan issue.

This paper aims to shed light on China’s recent strategic behaviour in the Asia-Pacific region by analyzing the concept of “twenty years’ strategic opportunity.” Against the backdrop of the strengthening of US-led alliance system and the late development of ASEAN-promoted regionalism, the paper will try to illuminate Chinese strategic thinking by focusing the discussion on China’s recent strategic conduct on the Korean Peninsula and in the Taiwan Strait.

## Yevgeniy M. Kozhokin

Director  
Russia's Institute for Strategic Studies (RISS)  
Flotskaya Street  
15, 125413, Moscow  
Russia  
Email: prime@riss.ru

Dr. Yevgeniy M. Kozhokin is Director of Institute for Strategic Studies, Russia since 1994. He holds PhD from Moscow State University in 1981 and Doctor of Sciences (History) from Russian Academy of Sciences (2000). In past he held many prestige's positions including, People's Deputy of the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation (1990-93) Chairman of the Subcommittee for International Relations of the Committee for Foreign Affairs and International Economic Relations and International Security and Intelligence of the Committee of Defense and Security Issues (1990-93).

He is author of the scientific publications concerning the history of Western Europe, the problems of managing and regulating international conflicts, the economic and political relations between Russia and EU-countries, Russia and India, Russia and China. His publications include: NATO: 50 years of History, *Peace and Security* (XXXI, 1999); India and Russia in a New Asia and World, *Encounter* (3(5) 2000); *The Anatomy of Russian Defense Conversion* (Institute for International Studies, Stanford University, 2001); "UN and Weapons of Mass Destruction: a Russian Perspective" in IDSA Asian Strategic Review (2005) and "Concert of Interests: India, Russia as Regional Stabilisers", *The Times of India* (Oct. 4, 2000).

## **Asian Strategic Context Reformatting**

**Yevgeniy M. Kozhokin**

Mutual deterrence of the USA and the USSR was the basic principle of the strategic stability at the time of cold war. As this deterrence had global character, it determined the Asian Strategic Context. The paper proposes that the period of cold war just like intellectuals of renaissance and enlightenment perceived the period of middle age. From the early 1960s through the end of the cold war, the strategic nuclear balance among the great powers was characterized by mutual assured destruction. It seemed that the force component in the international relations was losing its point.

All three post-cold war American administrations shared the same essential strategic goal of consolidating US global hegemony by preventing Russia and China from competing with the United States as “peer competitors”. The end of the cold war drastically changed the Asian strategic context. Beijing also understood the necessity to rethink security and foreign policy paradigms. The disintegration of the USSR and the European system of the socialist countries has resulted in the fundamental changes not only in the sphere of international relations, but in the internal situation in the leading countries, including the USA. This victory has influenced the atmosphere inside the American establishment. Special role in transformation of the military and political thinking of Americans was played by the emergence of “post-heroic” war in Kosovo in 1999 – an American war in which not a single American soldier was killed.

Inadequate understanding of the existing dangers and reactions on one’s own perceptions lead the world to the chaos, unthinkable disasters for millions of people and unpredictability on the world scene. It’s time to make a choice.

## Yiorghos Leventis

Associate Professor  
New York University  
FYROM  
Email: yiorghos.leventis@gmail.com

Dr. Yiorghos Leventis is Associate Professor, Faculty of International Relations, Politics and European Studies, New York University Skopje. He holds MA (Peace Studies) and PhD (European Studies) from University of Bradford, U.K. His past assignments include: postdoctoral fellow at Peace & Governance Programme, United Nations University, HQ, Tokyo, Japan (2004-06), Visiting Scholar, GRIPS, National Graduate Institute for Policy Studies, (2004 – 06) and Visiting Research Associate, King's College, University of London, U.K.(1999 – 2000).

Dr. Leventis has lectured and participated in numerous international conference and member of many prestige bodies like International Studies Association (ISA), San Francisco Convention (US), and British International Studies Association (BISA). In addition to publishing numerous reports, and chapter he has two books in his credit. They are *Cyprus: The Struggle for Self-Determination in the 1940s. Prelude to Deeper Crisis* (2002) and *ESDP in the Eastern Mediterranean: High Time for a Grand Strategy?* (forthcoming 2008).

## **Turkey, Cyprus, the U.K. and the E.U.: Security Dilemmas in the Near East**

**Yiorghos Leventis**

In this rather short paper I will endeavour to raise some central issues with regard to the complex relations between Turkey, Cyprus, the U.K. and the E.U. in the realm of security policy. I examine in turn: Turkish participation in international peace-keeping operations (UN, NATO and the EU); I proceed to give some basic facts concerning the firm military grip which Ankara keeps for long on northern Cyprus and how such illegal military presence impacts on the process of the defence integration of Turkey in the European Defence and Security Policy (ESDP) structures. The analysis bears a particular significance as Turkey strives to join the EU as a full member at a time when the ESDP entertains increasing aspirations to assume a global security player role.

The paper takes the analysis one step further stressing the long-standing commitment and importance of the British military and surveillance installations on Cyprus. Further, it brings out the synergy between Turkey and the U.K. in security and foreign policy vis-à-vis Cyprus, Iraq and Afghanistan as revealed in their Strategic Partnership Agreement signed in London on 23 October 2007. The dual strategic control of the uniquely positioned Eurasian island exercised by the two powerful military, air and naval powers serves their common goals in the Middle East.

Having due respect to the length constraints of this paper, an attempt is finally made for a brief but succinct discussion of the complications which arise in the ESDP decision making processes as a result of the defence row between the Republic of Cyprus, Turkey and the U.K.

