

RAPPORTEURS REPORT

Towards A New Asian Order February 16-18, 2011



Extracts from the papers presented at the 13th ASC

Vincent Weicheng Wang, Professor and Chair of the Department of Political Science, University of Richmond.

'The Rise of China, the Rise of India, and the Changing Geopolitics of Asia'

China and India are two large developing countries, both making remarkable transformation. Their choices, including interpreting the other's intentions, will importantly shape the future world. Alexander Wendt cogently said, "Anarchy is what states make of it", the future of Indo-Chinese relationship is not condemned to rivalry and hostility. Nor will a "Chindia naturally result, just because it "makes sense." The constructivist's paradigm would have it that much depends on the evolving structure of elite identities and preferences, informed by the three paradigms (geoeconomic, geopolitical and geocivilisational) and socialized through interactions.

Dr. Masako Ikegami, Professor of Political Science, Department of Political Science, Stockholm University

'Challenges of Rising China: A New Cold War or Neo-Imperialism?'

China has an aggressive stance employing the quasi-Manchukuo strategy of 'stealth imperialism' to expand its strategic frontiers. China needs to carefully Japan's pre-war Manchukuo strategy that triggered the catastrophic war to ruin Imperial Japan in the end. This is a lesson to ponder and helps envision a new world order free of coercive system of empire.

Bakhtier Khakimov, Director, Department of Asia and Pacific Cooperation, MFA of the Russian Federation

'Building of a new architecture of security and cooperation in Asia: Russian vision'

There are several regional organizations. An additional one for the Asian order is not recommended. What needs to be done instead is to adopt 'Network Diplomacy' to make these function effectively for facing future challenges. Russia intends to stay engaged with Asia as a Eurasian power and to develop its Far East in conjunction with its neighbours.

Dr. Mumin Chen, Associate Professor, Graduate Institute of Political Science, National Chung Hsing University, Taichung, Taiwan

'Realist and Pragmatic Elements in China's Grand Strategy: Assessments of China's Relations with Japan, Taiwan, and India in 2010'

Chinese leaders tended to tread a neighbor in a more aggressive way when the later demonstrates more potential to challenging China's strategic interest at present. This explains why Beijing dealt Japan and India in different way. Second, Chinese government sometimes adopted a two-way strategy in dealing with its neighbor: it behaved assertively but showed more benevolence in words. This trend is obvious when Chinese leaders interacted with their counterparts from Taiwan and India. Finally, although China's political system remains authoritarian by nature, the leaders have learned to be more responsive to the growing nationalistic sentiments from the society. Imposing more influence on the Chinese public, particularly 450 millions of internet users, is perhaps a better way for neighboring countries to drive China into a more cooperative course in foreign policy.

Prakash Menon,

‘Indo-Pak relations and the Balance of Emotions’

Fear, hope and humiliation as dominant forms of public emotion have played up in myriad ways on the Asian sub-continent. The Indian and the Pakistani state are now apparently at opposite ends of humiliation and hope respectively. While India has continuously cruised along the trajectory of “hope” which in turn has tempered its long standing political culture, style and temperament, the state of Pakistan on the other hand has consistently fumbled along with self conceived images of fear and humiliation. Notwithstanding their past and present policies, it is viewed that there lies sufficient negotiating space between the regional power play and the mutual animosity between the two countries. India and Pakistan need to shed the acuity of the emotional baggage of the past, and construct new ways and means to build a new future for its people. This alone can bring lasting peace and stability in the region.

Paul Salem, Director, Carnegie Middle East Center, Beirut, ‘Building Cooperation in West Asia’ (Point in paper – Not from presentation on Skype focusing on current issues)

The United States and the international community should recognize that global stability and cooperation rely on regional stability and cooperation. Playing one regional power against another might provide temporary gains but creates patterns of disorder, distrust, and tension that serve no one’s long-term interests. The United States has encouraged opposition between the Arab countries and Iran since that country’s 1979 Islamic revolution. This policy has led to escalation of tensions, arms races, and the rise of right-wing leaders in Iran and Israel. However, Washington should consider encouraging more engagement between its Arab allies and Iran. As the US encourages a peace process between the Arabs and Israel and aims toward the establishment of a post-peace regional framework between them while all the time recognizing the security concerns of all involved, the US should also contemplate encouraging more engagement between its Arab allies and Iran as part of an approach to addressing key issues with the eventual aim of establishing a post-agreement regional framework.

Joseph Liow, Associate Professor and Associate Dean, S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS), Nanyang Technological University, Singapore,

‘The East Asia Summit and the Security Architecture in the Asia-Pacific’

While the EAS is proving to be a major pillar of the emergent regional architecture, it is still confronted by several major challenges arising out of three unresolved tensions in East Asian regionalism: between inclusive and exclusive regionalism, between process and membership, and finally, between ASEAN centrality and major power leadership...At this early stage of the game, that members of the EAS must establish a level of comfort amongst themselves. Needless to say, institutions with no other aim in sight other than confidence-building do not go far. It is therefore critical that the EAS move forward in due course to substantive collaboration on the complex issues and challenges that affect the region.

Tetsuo Kotani, Special Research Fellow, Okazaki Institute
‘Maritime Security in Asia’

Countries in this region should establish a consortium of seafaring nations to avoid naval arms race while preserving good order at sea. Under the consortium, member nations should establish crisis management measures and deepen confidence building. Member nations should also deepen cooperation for nontraditional security issues while reaffirming the provisions of the Law of the Sea. There are at least three layers of multilateral security cooperation. The first layer is traditional power-based mechanism such as the hub and spokes U.S. alliance network in the region. The second layer is ad-hoc and/ or functional

mechanism such as the ReCAAP, the WPNS, and the Indian IONS. The third layer is comprehensive and overall mechanism such as the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF), the ASEAN Defense Ministers' Meeting Plus (ADMM+), the East Asia Summit, and the United Nations. The East Asia Summit is the most appropriate mechanism since it is a summit level forum including all the major players.

V Gundlupet, University of Texas, San Antonio

'Nuclear Threats and Diplomacy: An Analysis of Indian, Pakistani and Chinese Use of Nuclear Threats'

Regional powers can use nuclear threats to assure survival and territorial integrity (like avoiding a capture of a large part of state's territory), but they are unlikely to use such threats for compellence. Attempts attempt to use nuclear threats for compellence or for security threats not involving survival are likely to fail. If regional powers are unlikely to use nuclear weapons for compellence purposes, it follows that the fear about nuclear proliferation is somewhat exaggerated. In fact, states concerned about proliferation of nuclear weapons seem more likely to be motivated by threat to their sphere of influence and ability to compel other states than necessarily security threats in stopping proliferation. What nuclear weapons can do for regional powers is to assure them security and thus escape from coercion of the dominant states.

Saleem Shahzad, Correspondent, Asia Time

'Lessons from Pakistan's Counter-terrorism Policy for Asia'

Al-Qaeda's structure is its ideology—it is ideology which has a great capacity to create frictions and polarization in any society and provides Al-Qaeda a chance to expand its war theatre. While the counter terrorism establishments, whether they hail from America or Pakistan, might be able to inflict repeated defeats on Al Qaeda and kill one generation of militants, another generation of militants are likely to surface in a short space of time and the counter terrorism war machine would ultimately run out of steam, become demoralised and lose the will to fight. Pakistan still asserts the need to speak with the Taliban. It aims to use Muslim countries like Saudi Arabia and UAE to open a broader channel of dialogue with all insurgents. This is the last chance and if it is not availed, the result would be total catastrophe. This method of violence was and is morally wrong and politically of absolutely no use.

Niklas L.P. Swanström, Director, Institute for Security and Development Policy, Stockholm
'Globalization and the rise of Asia'

Asia as a region, as well as its sub-regions, no longer lacks regional organizations or cooperative structures in the economic field. In many ways the regions have multiplied their cooperative structures more than is necessary in terms of the quantity of structures, but unfortunately the depth of the cooperation is shallow...despite the modest progress made in the economic field there has been even less success in the security field...What is needed is a greater effort to prevent crises from erupting in the first place, something that requires a much greater political will and more financial integration than any of the states at present desire to commit. It will have to be accepted that a minimum loss of sovereignty will create a tremendous increase in economic stability.

Sean M. Lynn-Jones, Editor, International Security, International Security Program, Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs, Harvard
'Globalization and Asian Security: Promise or Peril?'

The logic of the liberal theoretical propositions about globalization suggests that globalization should make peace likely, but globalization also may raise the risks of international war, internal conflict, and

terrorism. The precise effects of globalization will depend on the conditions under which it occurs, and conditions vary widely across Asia.

Countries with a high level of political, economic, and administrative capabilities also are better positioned to conduct effective foreign policies, defeat insurgencies, and prevent or respond to terrorism.

Western countries, financial institutions, and economists are often obsessed with the need to promote even greater trade and financial liberalization. In practice, however, this approach does not necessarily produce the best economic or political outcomes. Countries that play by the orthodox rules (e.g., Mexico, El Salvador) have fared worse than those that have resisted liberalization (e.g., China, Vietnam). Reduced tariffs and freer capital markets are no guarantee of prosperity or domestic political stability.

Professor Sumit Ganguly, Rabindranath Tagore Chair in Indian Cultures and Civilizations, Indiana University, Bloomington
'Obama Administration and South Asia'

US policy toward South Asia faces three critical challenges. The key challenge remains the necessity of inducing the Pakistani military to sever their ties to the Afghan Taliban and to then end their sanctuaries within Pakistani territory.

The second challenge - It will need to decide on the level of commitment, both military and civilian, that it expects to maintain in Afghanistan after the drawdown of US forces in July 2011...an open-ended commitment to Afghanistan remains untenable.

Third, the administration must come to terms with the fact of Indo-Pakistani competition in Afghanistan.

Dr. Zhenjiang Zhang, Associate Professor, Jinan University, Guangzhou, China
'A Hunting Ghost: West European Integration in East Asian Regionalism Studies'

First, it is the responsibility to do better studies on EAR, especially for scholars living in Asia because WEI (west European integration) provided many experiences and lessons already. Second, it is not easy but a great challenging task to make a comparison and draw proper lessons from WEI. Third, but before we start this great enterprises, it is most important to know first what could not compared and copied from WEI. Original theoretical innovation for describing and explaining the process, achievements, motivations and problems in EAR is required.

Adib-Moghaddam, University Lecturer in Comparative and International Politics, SOAS, University of London
'Iranian-American relations and the future security architecture in western Asia'

The foreign Policy cultures of Iran and the United States and the corresponding strategic preferences clash along four binaries: a) unipolarity versus multipolarity; b) America's pro-Israeli policies versus Iran's subversion of Israeli power within the region and beyond; c) America's efforts to contain populist Islamic movements such as HAMAS and Hesbollah versus Iran's support for them; d) and the United States' opposition to populist leftist movements especially in Latin America which clashes with Iran's close cooperation with them.

US and Iran are not perennial enemies. What can be hoped for in the short run is Cold Peace which can be achieved within three interrelated interests: In Iraq where both the US and Iran have an interest in the stability of the al-Maliki government; in Afghanistan, where both states have an interest to stem the

resurgence of the Taliban; and generally on a global scale, both the US and Iran are enemies of al-Qaeda type movements.

Syed Iqbal Hasnain – Stimson Center

The Geopolitics of Himalayan-Tibetan Glacier Melt

Glaciers in the region are undergoing accelerated retreat, though the extent differs according to location. The ice cover in southern and eastern plateau has shrunk more than 6 per cent since the 1970s and the damage is still greater in Tajikistan and northern India, with 35 percent and 20 percent declines respectively over the past five decades. If the current trend holds, Chinese scientists believe that 40 percent of Plateaus glaciers could disappear by 2050. Full scale glacier shrinkage is inevitable and it will lead to ecological catastrophe.

Brahmaputra - Chinese scientists hold that dams would alleviate floods and erosion in the Brahmaputra. This makes little sense, since flooding could actually get worse due to relentless silting which, will be accelerated by the slowing down (reduced velocity) of the river flow. Currently, there is lack of political will in India to take up issues related to reservoir construction and diversion of water. The reality is that China has already commenced the project.

IWT - The treaty is very robust and fully safeguard the interest of Pakistan as lower riparian. The government of Pakistan diverting water consciously to please Punjab farmers and blaming India

Dr. Uttam Sinha, RF, IDSA –

‘Himalayan Hydrology and the Hydropolitics’

The Himalayan watershed region desperately requires framework on ‘water resources management’ and ‘hydrosolidarity’

China’s water development approach in Tibet is unilateral and bound to affect downstream riparian both in terms of water flow and ecological consideration. A coalition of lower riparian coming together specifically to draw China into a water dialogue is conceivable in spite the fact that many of them have a strategic partnership with China. China’s expertise and knowledge on dam building helps to enhance its power and influence and importantly weaken lower riparian coalition.

Tai Ming Cheung, University of California Institute on Global Conflict and Cooperation –

‘Security and State Development in East Asia: Balancing Between Nationalist and Globalist Forces’

In the technological realm factions of techno- globalists compete against techno-nationalists. A third more centralist coalition exists in which moderate elements of these two other groups come together to advocate a techno-hybrid approach.

This new global technology order cannot simply be left to market forces. Governments, especially from catch-up economies, have a critical role to play to ensure their countries reap the benefits.

Technology-related tensions have already been growing between the U.S. and China in the past few years, especially in cyber-security and China’s development of asymmetric military capabilities such as anti-satellite weapons and ballistic missiles.

Yaacov Vertzberger – Hebrew University,

Calls for a global regime-type approach to coping with the globalization of disasters.

States, multilateral organizations and non-state actors will all be assigned an active role in the regime's operations, and that "free riding" would be reduced to a minimum. The regime's grand design should take a top down approach, i.e., from the global level, through the regional and national levels to the local operations' level. Yet, the actual construction of the regime should advance step by step from the bottom up, i.e., from locally based capacities to national, regional and global capacities.

Iqbal Singh Sevea, Assistant Professor and Coordinator of the Contemporary Islam Program, S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies, 'Regulating' Islam in the Asian State'

States have increasingly moved from policies of benign neglect towards religion to active management or regulation of religious activities. Attempts by states in Asia to regulate Islam have ranged from the recognition of select Islamic authorities to the control of mosques to state censorship of Friday sermons delivered in mosques.

Attempts to 'reform' sharia have proven to be controversial in Muslim minority states as illustrated by the controversy over the validity of the triple *talaq* in India.

It is important to consider the following points:

- is the liberal model of 'upgrading' religions – i.e. state attempts, on the one hand, to modernize and secularize religions (not solely Islam) and, on the other, to raise educational levels of communities – in itself sufficient;
- what impact do a state's attempts at homogenizing and centralizing Islam have on the discourse and practice of Islam;
- the potential of policies of managing Islam to result in the 'enclavement' of the Muslim community;
- does state monopolization and centralization of Islamic authority result – in some cases – in Muslims forsaking national Islamic authorities and looking instead to other transnational and perhaps more radical interpretations of Islam;
- the potential vulnerability of states which have - to varying extents – sought legitimacy on the basis of Islam to charges that they are not Islamic in practice;
- the possibility that a market place of ideas about Islam will lead to greater plurality in the definition of Islam/Islands as the state will have to draw from competing ideas rather than being guided by any single authority on Islam.

Alexander Lukin, Director, Center for East Asian and SCO Studies, Moscow State, Institute of International Relations (University), MFA of Russia – 'Russia and Geopolitics of Asia'

The evolution of Russian policy towards East Asia since the emergence of the Russian Federation in place of the former Soviet Union can be traced in terms of four major factors:

1. The objective of greater integration into the world economy;
2. New principles and approaches in Russian diplomacy, including an emphasis on multilateral approaches in dealing with issues and problems;

3. Recognition of the distinct interests and orientation of Russia's Asian regions
4. A more pragmatic and dynamic pursuit of economic and strategic objectives

It seeks genuine pragmatic cooperation with as many partners as possible aiming not at global dominance but its own development. But, unlike the US, Russia is an integral part of East Asia. Its Siberian and Far Eastern regions which constitute two thirds of Russia's giant territory and where most of Russia's natural resources are located are situated in East Asia. This makes Russia a natural participant in regional cooperation which Russia needs to solve its strategic task of developing the Russian Far East.

Arvind Gupta, Lal Bahadur Shastri Chair in Strategic and Defence Studies, IDSA
'How is India managing its Asian challenge?'

For India, several new security challenges have arisen due to the shifting of geo-political landscape in Asia. The rise of China is one such challenge. Terrorism, maritime security and instability in parts of South Asia are some other challenges. The main argument is that while India has sought to engage with Asia and has been able to convert these challenges into opportunities through a combination of political, economic, and foreign policy measures, its approach in managing them has been ad hoc and not based on a forward looking grand strategy. Given the rapidity of change, India finds itself constrained by a number of developments which come in the way of deepening its engagements with Asia. Of the several challenges India is facing, management of its relationship with China will be the foremost in the near future. The lack of diplomatic capacities is also hampering India's capabilities to engage with Asia more intensely. India needs to articulate for public and the world at large its own view of how India is going to manage its relation with the rapidly changing region.

William R. Thompson, Indiana University, Bloomington -
'Patterns of Conflict and Stability in the Asian Region From a Long-term Perspective'

The Asian region, encompassing east, southeast, south, and central Asia and probably the south Pacific, is a super-region in formation. In that respect, it does not have much of a history as a super-region. Yet it is possible to use information on older Asian and European dynamics to develop some things to look for in evaluating questions of future regional stability. The European past need not be Asia's destiny but it is not inconceivable that Asian international relations will come to resemble in some ways those of an older Europe. The question is in which ways.

Session I: The Geopolitics of Asia

Chairperson : Mr. Siddharth Varadarajan

Prof. Vincent Weicheng Wang	Prof. Masako Ikegami	Amb. Bakhtier Khakimov	Dr. Mumin Chen	Lt. Gen. Prakash Menon
-----------------------------	----------------------	------------------------	----------------	------------------------

The opening session was chaired by Siddharth Varadarajan who laid out seven key features that define the growing interest in this region in recent years:

1. Asia as an engine of world economic growth
2. Increasing military capabilities of the constituent actors
3. Weight of historical baggage among the key actors
4. Role of outside powers in the region
5. Absence of a pan-continental security architecture
6. Presence of strong sub-regional groupings, and
7. Increasing interaction within these groupings

Dr. Wang's paper on "The Rise of China, the Rise of India, and the Changing Geopolitics of Asia: Contending Perspectives on India-China Relations" highlighted the strong economic performance of China and India. In PPP (purchasing power parity) terms, China's economy is next only to that of the United States and India's economy is also rapidly closing the gap with the Japanese economy. If these trends continue China and India would be the 2nd and 3rd largest economies in 5 to 10 years. Apart from this, the rise of both players has also been for the worse; for example, greenhouse gas emissions. According to Dr. Wang, the Chinese have followed a strategy of economic development consistently for the last three decades combined with a low profile foreign policy. This has been possible, according to him, through the pursuit of the 'peaceful development' strategy to create a harmonious society. He discussed projections for Comprehensive National Power (CNP) of China and India to be at the 2nd and 5th place respectively in 2020. He underscored China's better performance in implementing economic reform compared to India, even as both have gathered substantial military capabilities. His paper also traced the levels of interaction both countries have had over the years – starting from limited historical interaction to colonialism (which brought them nearer starting from the opium war which involved British India) to Independence when, finally, India and China came closer, but history was unkind to the two with the border issue in the subsequent years. In the Cold war years the relationship was not normalized. Recent years have seen China focussing on SCO and India pursuing a 'Look East' policy. The favourable aspect, according to him, was that India and China have learnt to compartmentalize the controversial aspects of their relationship. He discussed the existence of complementarities in their economic growth models which lead analysts to formulate the idea of *Chindia*, though this is yet to take off. Another favourable dimension of their rise has been their ability to move together to fill the democratic deficit in international financial institutions and other global bodies (even though at some levels, for instance, India's aspiration for the UNSC permanent membership is met with a cold response by China).

Discussing the perception of elites, Dr. Wang noted that the Chinese view on India is primarily informed by the realist paradigm (war, territorial disputes, spheres of influence, relative gains considerations). Chinese elites have a negative assessment on the rise of India where India's diversity is seen as a handicap, while centralized authoritarian rule in China is considered superior. But China is accepting that India is rising. The silver lining was that trade is improving, despite the border issues and the issues of Tibet and

Pakistan. The Indian perspective on China, according to his research, was informed by the geopolitical paradigm, followed by the geo-economic paradigm (cooperation) and the geo-civilizational (historical mutual admiration). For Dr. Wang, the shift from cooperative and competitive relationship in the India-China equation to one of affinity - would require a leap of faith. However, of the three Scenarios that he presents for the future (Rivalry, Chinindia, Pragmatic Management involving both cooperation and competition), he chooses the third option of pragmatic management as the most likely way forward:

The introductory paper was followed by the Inaugural Session addressed by the Raksha Mantri. In his formal introductory remarks the Director General of the IDSA welcomed the audience and shared his view of the key features of an emerging Asian order. These features, according to him, included the use of technology to empower people across the world (Egypt is a case in point), Asia's return to the global stage, the widening gulf between US and China, the challenge of integration (unlike Europe, the emerging powers, even democratic ones, have distinct agendas making integration and cooperation on global issues a challenging task), the emergence of non-state powers and diffusion of power, the unsustainable debt of the US, shortage of "food, fuel, water", resurgence of religion (violent or accommodating is uncertain), fertility implosion (working age population reduces, thus raising the financial burden of several nation states), and education and innovation playing the key role in determining the dynamics of geopolitics.

After the formal speech by the Defence Minister ([available on this website](#)), and the vote of thanks by Dr. Arvind Gupta, the First Session was resumed with Dr. Masako Ikegami's paper on "Challenges of Rising China: A New Cold War or Neo-Imperialism?"

According to Dr. Ikegami, Asia is full of opportunities and potential risks. Here, China's posturing on matters such as Iran, North Korea, non-proliferation, currency manipulation, censorship, human-rights abuse - all raised questions on China's rise as a responsible power. According to her US-China co-management on several issues was not really working (for instance, North Korea and Taiwan). She outlined China's assertive actions in the maritime sphere and the visible frictions emerging from that as key evidence. Discussing China-Japan relations she argued that the relationship had been poisoned by media control within China (which ignores 60 billion dollars of Japanese aid in last 20 years; regrets of Japanese emperor or premiers never get reported). She went on to highlight the key infrastructure projects in China that have been financed with Japanese aid.

Discussing the regional dimension, Dr. Ikegami argued that China has been propping up anti-US alliances across Asia (coalition making). China was the largest arms buyer and remained a major arms exporter as well. China's presence in global SLOCs is also visible – and soon, according to Dr Ikegami, this would be a field of collision for US, India and China. According to her, China is following a 'quasi-Manchukuo' policy by supporting politically vulnerable regimes such as those of North Korea (regime's lifeline; plus monopolizing natural resources) or Mongolia (strong trade ties), or Myanmar (largest source of economic aid to the junta). According to her, Myanmar is the key for China to avoid the Malacca dilemma. She terms all of these actions as "Stealth imperialism" – a strategy for a new comer to evade collision with other existing imperial powers, much on the lines of Japan's Manchukuo strategy in the early 20th century. According to her, China does not abide by the Westphalia system (strategic frontier can expand with rising national power) and is instead a "new hybrid empire" of the 21st century (CCP centralised power). She believes that Asia has not enjoyed the peace dividend of the end of the Cold War – and that a new Cold War may erupt with the shift of hegemony (USA vs China). India's role, according to her, becomes critical under such circumstances.

Amb. Bakhtiyer Khakimov spoke on "New architecture of security and cooperation in Asia-Pacific region: Russia's perspective". He was very bullish about regional cooperation being the way forward for the New Asian order. According to him, the Asia Pacific was leading in economic indices demonstrating great

economic promise. He feels multi-polarity offers a unique chance to the region, which face both non-traditional threats (terrorism, piracy or climate change) and Traditional threats (regional conflicts and territorial issues). According to him, bilateral alliances cannot provide full-fledged architecture for Asian security and instead a multi-dimensional, multi-layered, architecture should be pursued. He felt “Network Diplomacy” (highlighted first in 2004 in Tashkent) was imperative to create agreement between various fora (regional organizations) and was the best way to demonstrate commitment to “equal” and “indivisible” security (even as SCO, ARF, ASEAN would play ever important roles linked to EAS as the umbrella).

Russia, according to him, was engaging with both Europe and Asia (trying to integrate economically with the Asia-Pacific region). Russia also prioritizes relationship with India and supports India’s full membership in the SCO. According to him, Russia-India-China setting was an essential element of a multi-polar world order and that the shaping of a new architecture was irreversible.

Dr. Mumin Chen’s paper on “Realist and Pragmatic Elements in China’s Grand Strategy: Assessments of China’s Relations with Japan, Taiwan, and India” discussed two key debates:

Is China rising? [i.e. is the CCP capable of ensuring continued high economic growth plus domestic stability?]

Will China’s rise alter the power structure of East Asia?

According to Dr. Chen, instead of discussing China’s strategic intentions the focus of analysis should be on China’s strategic behaviour. According to him, China’s grand strategy is not just informed by Realism – but there has been pragmatism on display in the last several years (more flexibility).

He uses three cases to discuss China’s strategic behaviour:

1. China-Japan relations (The Senkaku/Diaoyutai islands controversy could most likely drag both countries into conflict; recent Fishing boat incident also revealed how public sentiments have been turned hostile).
2. China-Taiwan (post-KMT victory in 2008, there has been substantive improvement in ties with greater economic opening. However, a peace agreement is a far way off since Taiwanese are not treating politics with the same pace as the economic relationship being pursued with China)
3. China-India (this was difficult to assess, according to him, since it reveals aspects of cooperation and disputes. He does point out the perceived shift in China’s Kashmir policy in the last two years, and China’s expansion into the Indian Ocean and the “string of pearls” strategy)

Dr. Chen concluded that China will not be a benevolent power as long as territorial disputes are not solved, though these will not escalate into military confrontation.

Lt. Gen. Prakash Menon, in his paper “Indo-Pak relations and the balance of emotions”, highlighted how the “emotions of people” shape the India-Pakistan relationship. According to him animosity in India-Pakistan relations is at the national level and not at the individual level. He defined two emotional strains in Pakistan:

1. Humiliation (where Pakistanis blame the West for their perils)
2. The “India-threat”

According to Lt. Gen. Menon, this emotional jelly must be changed by engaging with people at all levels (scholars, lay people, military representatives, among others). Most importantly, he feels one must get trade/economic relationship into play in a big way.

The Question-Answer session saw clarifications being sought from the speakers (who mostly underscored the key points of their presentation). The session ended with the Chairperson Siddharth Varadarajan concluding the session by sharing his observations on the geopolitics of the region, viz:

- While the US alliance system may reveal itself to be frail in recent years, America was still an Asian power.
- Rise of Asia was a story beyond the rise of China - and the rise of Indonesia, ROK, India are all integral to this process.
- Russian re-discovery of the Asia-Pacific was welcome.
- West Asia, an extension of our understanding of Asia, would alter the dimension of the security architecture.
- The presence of nuclear weapons states in the region needed to be factored in.

And finally, he stressed on the need for “thick connections” - more engagement at all levels.

(Report prepared by [Joe Thomas Karackattu](#), Associate Fellow, Institute for Defence Studies and Analyses, New Delhi)

Session II : Traditional Security Challenges

Chairperson : Lt Gen (Retd) S Nambiar

Dr. Paul Salem	Dr. Joseph Liow	Mr. Tetsuo Kotani	Dr. Vaidya Gundlupet	Mr. Syed Saleem Shahzad
----------------	-----------------	----------------------	-------------------------	----------------------------

The second session of the 13th Asian Security Conference focused on prevailing traditional security issues in the largest and most populous continent. The Chairperson, Lt. Gen. (Retd.) Satish Nambiar, in his introductory remarks, said that the world today is facing a range of traditional security challenges, with those posed by the non-state actors occupying a prime position. However, conventional war has become a remote possibility in today's world considering the cost incurred and advances in the weaponry possessed by the states.

The session comprised of the following five presentations:

- Paul Salem-Building cooperation in West Asia.
- Joseph Liow-The East Asia Summit and the Security Architecture in the Asia-Pacific.
- Tetsuo Kotani-Maritime Security in Asia.
- Vaidya Gundlupet- Nuclear Threats and Diplomacy: An Analysis of Indian, Pakistani and Chinese Use of Nuclear Threat.
- Syed Saleem Shahzad- Lessons from Pakistan's Counter-terrorism Policy for Asia.

The first speaker, Paul Salem, addressed the conflict via Skype. He noted that the Middle East is undergoing a set of transforming, historic events. Events such as ongoing happenings in Egypt and Yemen are all set to bring about a new era in the Arab world. The events, particularly those in Egypt, are deemed as revolutionary as the events of 1952, which brought Nasser to power. Change is affecting every state and power centre in the region, causes of which are not unknown. On the political side, the Arab model has been marred by lack of political participation and repression. While on the economic side, jobless growth, rising inequalities between the lower strata and the super-rich are increasingly prominent. Years of ignorance have led to the widening of socio-economic disparities. Adding to this is growth of the Pan-Arab satellite television channel Al Jazeera. Al Jazeera along with the new tools of social communications viz. Facebook and Twitter has created a new space which is beyond the control of the states. He further said that the developments in the region have been quick and unpredictable. What is predictable, however, is the likely emergence of democratic space alongside a more responsible military.

Dr. Joseph Liow, in his presentation titled 'The East Asia Summit and the Security Architecture in the Asia-Pacific', noted that the 21st century is 'the age of multi-polarity in Asia'. In that regard, ASEAN has been trying to maintain what is popularly called 'ASEAN Centrality', through a number of initiatives in order to secure the region against destabilizing trends. While the ASEAN Regional Forum and ADMM+ (ASEAN Defence Ministers Meeting) have helped shape the agenda in the East Asian region, the East Asia Summit (EAS) is proving to be a major pillar of the emergent regional architecture. However, it is still confronted by a number of challenges arising out of three unresolved tensions in East Asian regionalism: between inclusive and exclusive regionalism, between process and membership, and finally, between ASEAN centrality and major power leadership. Nonetheless, the achievements of EAS have been remarkable considering the fact that it is the only summit level meeting which involves active membership of the US, China, Japan and India as members.

The next speaker, Mr Tetsuo Kotani, in his paper 'Maritime Security in Asia', highlighted the importance of security of the Oceans in Asia. He argued that the geographical term 'Asia Pacific' may be insufficient for describing the dynamism in this region given Asia's population and its size. Maritime Asia along the Indo-Pacific Rim has the potential to reach unprecedented levels of prosperity, freedom and stability in the twenty-first century. However, the region is facing a number of challenges including naval arms race, the problem of preservation of order at sea and the issue of partnership building. Kotani suggested the establishment of a 'consortium'. According to him, there are at least three layers of multilateral security cooperation. The first layer is traditional power based mechanism such as the hub and spokes US alliance network in the region, which can be used to hedge against any violations of international laws and norms. The second layer is ad-hoc and functional mechanisms such as the ReCAAP, the WPNS and IONS. These could provide venues of functional cooperation. The third layer, which comprises of regional institutions such as the ARF, ADMM+ and the EAS, could be used to promote the consortium of seafaring nations.

Dr. Vaidya Gundlupet ignited the debate on utility of nuclear weapons in the regional context through his presentation titled, 'Nuclear Threats and Diplomacy: An Analysis of Indian, Pakistani and Chinese use of Nuclear Threats'. He noted that unlike the great powers, regional powers have not been able to use nuclear threats as a diplomatic tool, except for the situations where the very survival of such powers was at stake. He further substantiated his argument by pointing out that in the regional context states have tried to avoid playing the nuclear card. The Korean crisis, Kargil and Falklands crisis are a few examples in this context. He discussed the Kargil crisis in great detail and argued that India did not react strongly during the crisis as Pakistan, by way of launching the offence, handed over international support to India on a platter. India successfully managed to gather international support as it was seen as the 'status quo' power. This was coupled with the fact that no country wanted 'nuclear blackmail' to succeed.

Mr. Syed Saleem Shahzad's presentation drew fresh insights on Pakistan's counter-terrorism policy for Asia. He noted that Pakistan has applied the most modern techniques that involved meticulous planning and well executed counter terrorism operations to fight against Al-Qaeda led militants. However, failure to grasp the significance of many underlying factors was the reason that the country could not achieve the results that it desires. He said that Pakistan could have isolated the Islamic insurgency and ensured that it remained confined to its border tribal areas immediately after the Taliban defeat in Afghanistan by undertaking political measures according to the local tribal traditions and customs. To him, unnecessary American pressure and unreasonable demands the US made on Pakistan for untimely military operations and crackdowns on the Jihadi outfits complicated the situation. This has over time resulted in expansion of radicalism in Pakistan and elsewhere. His recommendation was to cease employing the military option, and adopt a political approach favouring negotiations.

The presentations were followed by the question and answer session where the audience and the speakers discussed the issues at length.

(Report prepared by [Rahul Mishra](#), Research Assistant, Institute for Defence Studies and Analyses, New Delhi)

Session III: Globalization and the Rise of Asia

Chairperson : Dr. Sanjaya Baru

Dr. Niklas L.P. Swanström	Mr. Sean M. Lynn-Jones	Prof. Sumit Ganguly	Dr. Zhenjiang Zhang	Dr. Arshin Adib-Moghaddam	Atul Aneja
---------------------------	------------------------	---------------------	---------------------	---------------------------	------------

The Third Session of the 13th Asian Security Conference, “Globalization and the Rise of Asia”, focused on two Asias: A Rising Asia in the East and a Troubled Asia in the West, as well as at the region in the centre, South Asia.

The chairperson, Dr. Sanjaya Baru, began the session with his introductory remark where he underlined the positive shift in India’s attitude towards the issue of globalization and interdependence.

The session comprised of the following papers:

- *Niklas Swanström* – ‘Regional Cooperation to Sustain Economic Stability in Asia’
- *Sean M. Lynn-Jones* – ‘Globalization and Asian Security: Promise or Peril?’
- *Sumit Ganguly* – ‘The Obama Administration and South Asia’
- *Zhang Zhenjiang* - ‘A Hunting Ghost: West European Integration in East Asian Regionalism Studies’
- *Arshin Adib-Moghaddam* – ‘Iranian-American relations and the future security architecture in western Asia’
- *Atul Aneja* – ‘Implications of Developments in the Arab World’.

Dr. Niklas Swanstrom, in his paper ‘Regional Cooperation to Sustain Economic Stability in Asia’, argued that despite increased intra-Asian trade there is a failure to engage regionally to sustain economic stability in Asia. There are a great number of cooperative attempts in the Asian region but many of these are empty shells with little impact on economic stability. He identified the lack of connection among different cooperative structures, bilateral trade, distrust and fear towards other states of the region, complex and a multitude of mechanisms, many competing ideas about how to structure regional integration, power struggle between different actors, and lack of a leader as some of the hindrances to an effective mechanism and a regional structure. In short, regional structures currently established are flawed and there is a need to further strengthen them in order to realize the economic potential that Asia holds and on which the world economy will be increasingly dependent. He argued that among the existing organizations, ASEAN has the legitimacy to lead the regional structure in Asia. ASEAN, as a driver of regionalism, is more acceptable to many Asian states rather than a single state. There is a continued need for China, India and Japan to take regional responsibility, but leadership from these states is not feasible in the short and intermediate terms. ASEAN and its model is a perfect model for the problems that Asia is now facing. He concluded by saying that if Asian states are not able to coordinate their efforts in the economic field there will be even greater difficulties in managing traditional and non-traditional security threats.

The second paper of the session ‘Globalization and Asian Security: Promise or Peril?’ by Sean M. Lynn-Jones, considered the lessons of previous eras of increasing economic interdependence and globalization in international politics, including the relations of the European great powers prior to World War I. However, he acknowledged the fact that it is not easy to draw general conclusions about the effects of globalization and their impact on Asia and Asian security. The logic of the liberal theoretical propositions about globalization suggests that globalization should make peace likely, but he argued that globalization also may

raise the risk of international war, internal conflict, and terrorism. The precise effects of globalization will depend on the conditions under which it occurs, and conditions vary widely across Asia. Nevertheless, Dr. Jones prescribed the following general policy recommendations that may enable countries to maximize the benefits of globalization while managing some of its potentially adverse consequences:

- Pursue further globalization
- Build state strength and state capacity
- Increase the capacity to counter terrorism
- Endorse flexible responses to globalization

Dr. Sumit Ganguly's paper, 'The Obama Administration and South Asia', gave a brief overview of the recent US involvement in South Asia. The paper argued that there are important continuities and discontinuities in the Obama administration's policies towards the region. Unlike in the second Clinton administration and the two Bush administrations which had both, to varying degrees accorded a certain priority to Indo-US relations, the Obama administration, at least in its initial year, chose not to do so even though South Asia as a region remained an important priority. According to Dr. Ganguly, US policy towards South Asia faces three critical challenges: the first challenge is the necessity of inducing the Pakistani military to sever its ties to the Afghan Taliban and to then end their sanctuaries within Pakistani territory; the second challenge is to decide on the level of commitment, both military and civilian, that it expects to maintain in Afghanistan after the drawdown of US forces in July 2011; and third is the Indo-Pakistani competition in Afghanistan. The paper also traced the systemic, national and personal factors that led to important changes in the Indo-US relationship with potentially significant ramifications for South Asia and especially US-Pakistan relations.

Dr. Zhang Zhenjiang, in his paper, 'A Hunting Ghost: West European Integration in East Asian Regionalism Studies', presented a comparative study of East Asian regionalism, which has been an emerging issue in the international political economy in East Asia since the end of the Cold War and the West European integration from the 1950s. He argued that there are differences between these two regionalisms and that each is unique in its own way. East Asian Regionalism and West European Regionalism are different in developmental processes and occurred for different reasons, in different ways and with different outcomes. Therefore, Dr. Zhang called for a original theoretical innovation for describing and explaining the process, achievements, motivations and problems in East Asian Regionalism.

Arshin Adib-Moghaddam's presentation on 'Iranian-American relations and the future security architecture in western Asia', evaluated the prospects of dialogue and reconciliation between Iran and United States. Starting with an analysis of Iran's strategic preferences with a particular emphasis on the country's self-perception in international politics before and after the Islamic revolution of 1979, Dr. Adib-Moghaddam carved out areas of mutual interest between Iran and the US and areas of potential conflict. He argued that pacifying relations between Iran and the US is central to any viable security architecture in Western Asia and beyond.

Mr. Atul Aneja gave an overview of the current developments in Egypt and their implication for the Arab world. The speaker argued that the foremost example of non-violent pro-democracy uprising in West Asia (which is not yet finished), was greatly benefited from the East European experience particularly that of Serbia. According to Mr. Aneja, the Egyptian uprising is not a spontaneous movement as believed by many. It is a well organized uprising which has been prepared for since 2008. The uprising was initiated by the youth and eventually participated in by all spectrums of the society. According to the speaker, it is a secular and liberal uprising which is not guided by the ideology of the Muslim Brotherhood. The Muslim Brotherhood supported the uprising from behind, but did not assume a leadership role. Focussing on the role of the army, the speaker argued that there exist cleavages among the protesters in the Egypt on the

issue. While one section favours the military, another demands a five member presidential council in which the military will hold only one seat. There also exists a leftist non-violent group that demands grassroots democracy. The uprising has already spread to Bahrain and it is likely to spread to other parts of West Asia as well. In Bahrain there is a demand for constitutional monarchy. If it succeeds in Bahrain it will have a tremendous impact in other monarchies in the region. Mr. Aneja also mentioned the impact of the uprising on oil prices and on Israel.

The presentation of the papers was followed by question and answer session where the speakers clarified various points raised by the audience.

(Report prepared by Gulbin Sultana, Research Assistant, Institute for Defence Studies and Analyses, New Delhi)

Session IV : Non-traditional Security Challenges

Chairperson: Dr. Radha Kumar

Prof. Syed Iqbal Hasnain	Dr Uttam Kumar Sinha	Prof Xia Liping	Dr. Tai Ming Cheung	Prof. Yaacov Vertzberger	Dr. Iqbal Singh Sevea
-----------------------------	-------------------------	-----------------	------------------------	-----------------------------	--------------------------

The fourth session of the 13th Asian Security Conference was chaired by Prof. Radha Kumar. There were six presentations which focused primarily on non-traditional security issues such as water, energy, democratization and the role of technology in Asia.

Prof. Syed Iqbal Hasnain in his paper “the Geopolitics of Himalayan-Tibetan Glacier Melt” highlighted the geo-political significance of the “greater Himalayan region”. He emphasized that the region holds the key to South Asia’s ecological and social security by virtue of its being a centre of biological and cultural diversity, the final destination of its life-sustaining monsoons, and the storehouse for water and other natural resources. However, the retreating glaciers, melting permafrost and degrading ecosystems with monsoon variability are the consequences of ongoing global and regional climate change. Prof. Hasnain pointed out that a resurgent China has commenced construction of large and mega-sized dams on the east-flowing Brahmaputra and Mekong rivers to harness their energy and water potential and also to meet its future water demands. As a result, it is moving fast to dam and divert water resources of the Tibetan Plateau which will change the water equation for South Asian countries. He was of the view that climate change has provided an opportunity for the countries of the region to join hands and advocate the establishment of a new regime, that is, “An international treaty for the protection and sharing of the Tibetan Plateau.”

Dr. Uttam Kumar Sinha presented the second paper of the session on “Himalayan Hydrology and the Hydropolitics”. Dr. Sinha argued that rivers are a prominent feature of the Himalayan mountain system, physically linking upstream and downstream users. The glaciers that are a source of these rivers are vulnerable to various exogenous impacts including global warming. The future changes in water demand and availability will directly affect the hydropolitics of the region. He said that while undoubtedly the Himalayan hydrology offers ample opportunity for harnessing development benefits thus serving as a cornerstone for cooperation, it equally, given the competitiveness of the users (riparian states) and the uses of rivers (primarily in terms of consumptive utilisation), can potentially trigger tension and strife. He felt a need for looking at water critically through different perspectives such as conceptually, institutionally, ethically and politically. According to Dr. Sinha, the Food-Energy-Water connect is critical and pointed out that the Himalayan hydrology will be one of the critical frontlines in the global approach to mitigate the impact of climate change on water resources. He stated that unchecked climate variation can cause unprecedented challenges to the waterways of Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, China, India, Myanmar, Nepal, Pakistan and the countries in the Mekong basin. He suggested that the Himalayan watershed region desperately requires a framework on ‘water resources management’ and ‘hydropsolidarity’ that includes multi-purpose beneficial utilization of water resources with active participation of the lower riparian basin states.

Prof. Xia Liping in his paper “Energy Security and Asian Regional Architecture” argued that energy security, as one of non-traditional security issues, has been more and more important in Asia as well as in the world. He, however, felt that it is more and more difficult for a single country to ensure its own energy security in the globalized world. On China and India’s energy cooperation, he said that as two major developing countries in the world, China and India are working to cooperate in the energy sector in line with common benefits. This relationship helps to avoid bitter competition between the two countries, and reduce

unnecessary use of diplomatic and economic resources. Ultimately, this cooperation could ensure their economic recovery and growth in the post-crisis era. But there are some contradictions and competition between them since both are large energy consumers and importers. He suggested that Asian countries must make greater efforts to realize a regional mechanism of energy cooperation. In the future, there should be a multi-level, multi-channel and multi-model Asian regional architecture of energy security.

Prof. Yaacov Vertzberger in his paper “Towards an Architecture of a Global Disaster-Management-Regime: A Roadmap” focused on a key acute non-traditional security issue, specifically coping with and mitigation of both nature-caused and man-caused disasters. Prof. Vertzberger observed that the post-disaster worldwide outpouring of compassion and offers of assistance to the affected countries and people, following events like the Asian tsunami, reminded the need to effectively harness and channel international cooperation, generosity, resources, and capabilities in a manner that will result in the most efficient practices for pre-disaster preparedness, for the containment and management of the impacts of disaster on people and their social and physical environments. Prof. Vertzberger laid out the framework and components for the construction of what repetitive events in the last decade in Asia and elsewhere have proven to be critically essential – a global disaster management regime. He said that the collective objectives of the international community should focus on proactive measures to anticipate and prevent the worst outcomes of disasters through early warning and by providing quick, efficient and comprehensive relief assistance. These goals will be best served by reliance on the combined resources of the international community as a whole including states, multilateral institutions, and NGOs rather than relying on unilateral efforts. He was of the view that this goal can only be achieved through a carefully designed and constructed architecture that will ensure a systematic and broadly integrated treatment of all dimensions of coping with disasters, from early warning through relief efforts to recovery.

Dr. Tai Ming Cheung in his paper “Technology, Security and State Development in East Asia: Balancing between Nationalist and Globalist Forces” examined the role that technological development has played in shaping the relationship between economics and security among states in Northeast Asia over the past 60 years. Defining techno-nationalism, techno-globalism, and techno-hybridism and their place in grand strategic thinking, Dr. Cheung argued that technological development and innovation is a critical but understudied source of power, influence and change in international relations. States across Northeast Asia regard technological innovation and development as vital to their economic competitiveness and national security. On China’s efforts to become a world-class technological leader, he said that the stated goal of the country’s leadership to catch up technologically by 2020 has led to a concerted mobilization of the country’s burgeoning economic, political, organizational, military, and scientific resources to meet this challenge. While China’s military technological capabilities still lag behind that of the US by at least one to two generations, Dr. Cheung felt that this gap will gradually narrow so that China may be in position to begin challenging US military technological dominance in several strategic areas within another 10 to 15 years.

Presenting the last paper of the session on “Regulating’ Islam in the Asian State”, Dr. Iqbal Singh Sevea highlighted two important aspects: i) the regulation of Islamic institutions such as mosques, sharia courts, waqf and madrasas; and ii) the negotiation, recognition and establishment of Islamic authority. He explained that governments across the globe are taking greater interest in both Islamic discourse and the functioning of Islamic institutions. As states seek to develop mechanisms to regulate Muslims and Islam, the practice of Islam within the state is increasingly becoming the focus of intense government intervention. However, the attempt to develop mechanisms to manage Islam is by no means a new phenomenon. A number of Asian states such as Indonesia, Malaysia and Singapore have developed various means and mechanisms to regulate Islamic institutions with a view towards monitoring, controlling and even shaping Islamic discourse. He argued that in attempting to regulate Islam, the state is essentially involved in negotiating the space for and scope of Islamic institutions; competing over the interpretation of Islamic

sources/symbols and control of the institutions which produce them; and legitimizing, delegitimizing and even constructing Islamic authority.

These six presentations were followed by the question and answer session where intensive and scholarly discussions were held on issues such as energy security, water management, role of technology development and regulating Islam. The chairperson, Prof. Radha Kumar, in her concluding remarks stressed the importance of non-traditional security issues and the necessity of institutional and collective management of these security challenges. She said that this kind of deliberations is useful and would help policy makers of Asian nations in formulating common strategies in managing and countering these threats. The resolution of these security issues can provide a foundation of stability within and between nations

(Report prepared by Dr Saroj Bishoyi, Research Assistant, Institute for Defence Studies and Analyses, New Delhi)

Session V : Managing the Challenges

Chairperson : Amb. Leela K. Ponappa

Prof. Robert J. Art	Prof. William R. Thompson	Dr. Alexander Lukin	Prof. Mustafa Aydin	Dr. Arvind Gupta
---------------------	---------------------------	---------------------	---------------------	------------------

The fifth session ‘Managing the Challenges’ was chaired by Amb. Leela K. Ponappa.

The first speaker, Prof. Robert J Art (via Skype), in his paper ‘US-China Relations and Implications for India’ addressed two questions through the realist prism and balance of power analysis: What will US-China relations look like over the course of the next decade or two? And second, what were the implications of US-China relations on U.S.-India relations? First focusing on US-China relations, Prof. Art argued that the possession of nuclear weapons by both sides has a restraining effect. High economic interdependence and the lack of intense ideological competition also help to reinforce the pacific effects. China is dependent on access to the U.S. market. Similarly, China holds a powerful financial lever over the United States. A third way to assess the future of Sino-American relations, by considering the nature of U.S. and Chinese interests in East Asia, yields a mixed picture. There are a few serious differences, but there are also important shared interests. On a positive note he said that the course of the Sino-American relationship is not yet cast, leaving room for compromise and wise diplomacy. Whether that relationship takes a mostly conflictual or a mostly cooperative, or a mixed character will depend on China’s ability to manage its nationalism and especially its nationalistic urban public, on how much restraint it exercises in the region as its economic and military power continues to grow, on the U.S. continuing to pursue a patient engagement strategy backed by sufficient military power in East Asia, and on the U.S. ability to avoid overreacting to China’s forays.

Coming to the second question on what were the implications of the foregoing analysis for U.S.-India relations, Prof. Art pointed to three major concerns that powerfully affect U.S. policy towards India: the state of U.S.-China relations; the war in Afghanistan; and U.S. desire for access to Indian market. The first and last concerns work in ways that cause the United States to “woo” India. The second concern works in ways that cause the United States to pressure India. The effects of US-China relations on U.S.-Indian relations should be clear. If Sino-American relations prove to be highly conflictual because China has become militarily stronger and has become assertive, the United States will want Indian cooperation to balance against China. If relations are mostly cooperative and the US can counter China’s military power on its own, then the US will lessen Indian cooperation against China.

Prof. William R. Thompson, in his paper ‘Patterns of Conflict and Stability in the Asian Region From a Long-term Perspective’, tried to discern patterns for understanding Asian regional dynamics (stability/instability) by using regional geopolitical history and utilising theories. He examined the problem with the European past as a model and by relying on Asia’s own history as a predictive guide. He asserted that as a larger Asia is characterized by multiple subsystems and multiple contenders for the central position in the region, it has come to look more like the older Europe. He argued that if we need to be cautious in using European regional history as a template for possible future international relations in the Asian region because old Europe does not resemble future Europe in some respects, it does not mean that we cannot draw on European history in other respects. He drew five clusters of structures and processes from the older European experience that might be of use in thinking about the course of Asian developments: 1) challengers and leaders, 2) coalitions and bipolarization, 3) increases in economic competitiveness, 4) multiple rivalries and 5) relatively weak Kantian constraints. He pointed out that it is possible that none of

these will be applicable to the future of Asian international relations. Yet that seems most unlikely since they are already evident in various stages of progress. Moreover all of them need not be present. None are necessary or sufficient factors for regional instability. To the extent that they represent emerging Asian realities, however, the prospects for something like older European international relations have a greater probability of occurrence. Asian international relations are not likely to work exactly as European international relations played themselves out. Not all of the mix of factors is identical. But as Asia appears to be moving toward multi-polar contests over regional hegemony, he concluded that Asia is becoming more like older Europe.

Dr. Alexander Lukin in his paper, 'Russia and Geopolitics of Asia' focused on East Asia. The evolution of Russian policy towards East Asia since 1991 can be traced in terms of four major factors: the objective of greater integration into the world economy; new principles and approaches in Russian diplomacy, including an emphasis on multilateral approaches in dealing with issues and problems; recognition of the distinct interests and orientation of Russia's Asian regions; and more pragmatic and dynamic pursuit of economic and strategic objectives. For new Russia, achieving greater integration into the world economy has been a principal means of transition to a market-based, democratic system. In East Asia this has meant increased interaction, trade and investment with neighbouring countries: China, Japan, the two Koreas and Mongolia. The defining concept was "from the system of security towards a system of economic cooperation in East Asia." Russian policy in East Asia has developed within the framework of Russia's "New Diplomacy" which has evolved to reflect the interests of the new state after December 1991. Multilateralism is an important element in the new foreign policy with increased emphasis on membership and active participation in international organizations and other multilateral mechanisms (including international economic institutions and regional organizations) to address issues and problems. Moreover Russia engages with the East Asian region through Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO) and ASEAN, among others. In East Asia, Russia has applied its New Diplomacy in several principal directions: Constructive support for stability and security, to provide a stable external environment; virtual non-involvement with the Asia-Pacific economy pre-1992 has been replaced by a wide-ranging policy of promoting international trade and investment in East Asia and the Pacific; Russia has sought membership in all existing regional cooperative structures and forms of regional integration; and development of stronger, mutually beneficial bilateral relations with key East Asian countries—China, Japan and the two Korean states.

Dr. Mustafa Aydin in 'Developments and Changes Since The End Of The Cold War: West Asia and Central Asia' focused on the Caucasus region and key West Asian states—Turkey, Iran, Jordan, Syria, etc. He examined these two different sub-regions of Asia and tried to find commonalities that are applicable to the whole region: overwhelming Muslim population; dependence on and rich in oil and natural gas resources; and both regions have been volatile since the end of Cold War. The collapse of the Bloc system and 9/11 events have redefined geo-politics within these regions. This has led to internal and external weakening of sovereignty—external due to the intervention of international actors. He laid out six challenges faced by these two sub-regions: problem of religion and ethnic identity; rise of Islamic radicalism; lack of democracy and economic equality; presence of authoritarian regimes; issues of resource management and security of transportation; and militarization and proliferation of WMDs. Lack of institutional cooperation within regions and the tradition of dialogue and compromise have led to tensions. He concluded by posing three alternatives that states in these two regions can emulate: revolutionary Iran, conservative Saudi Arabia or a liberal Turkey.

Dr. Arvind Gupta, in 'How is India Managing its Asian challenge?' summarized the broad geo-political and security changes in Asia. By looking into the challenges India has faced in the last twenty years as a result of these changes, he examined the Indian approaches to managing these challenges. His main argument was that while India has sought to engage with Asia and has been able to convert these challenges into opportunities through a combination of political, economic, and foreign policy measures, its approach in

managing them has been ad hoc and not based on a forward looking grand strategy. The changed security environment led India to exercise its nuclear option. Moreover its well being was jeopardised due to major economic changes in the world. It converted these challenges into opportunities through a combination of policy measures which included inclusive economic growth, diversification of foreign policy, focussed diplomacy and participation in Asian regional institutions and building its military strength. Dr. Gupta cautioned by pointing to the two key challenges for Indian policymakers: to minimise the negative impact of instability in some parts of South Asia and managing the relationship with a growing and assertive China. In this regard, he recommended that India should maintain its economic growth intact; build adequate economic, military, diplomatic and other capabilities; deepen engagement with Asia; and strive for an accommodative Asian order and articulate for the public and the world at large its own view of the changes in the Asia and how it is going to manage its relations with the rapidly changing region.

The presentation of the papers was followed by question and answer session during which the speakers clarified various points raised by the audience.

Prepared by Joyce Sabina Lobo, Research Assistant at IDSA.