

NON-TRADITIONAL SECURITY IN ASIA

2ND REGIONAL PLENARY MEETING

**REPORT OF A MEETING ORGANIZED BY THE
INSTITUTE OF DEFENCE AND STRATEGIC STUDIES
(IDSS)**



**Meritus Mandarin, Singapore
3-4 December 2004**

SPONSORED BY THE FORD FOUNDATION

INTRODUCTION



Professor Amitav Acharya, Deputy Director of IDSS

Amitav Acharya, Deputy Director of the Institute of Defence and Strategic Studies (IDSS), warmly welcomed the participants at the 2nd Regional Plenary Meeting of the Grantees of the Ford Foundation Project on “Non-Traditional Security in Asia”. He expressed his gratitude to the Ford Foundation for funding the event and said that IDSS was privileged to host this meeting for the second time and to facilitate the development of an exciting and timely network of scholars working on non-traditional security (NTS). The first objective of the meeting was therefore to continue the process of networking. As a pan-Asian gathering, it was an opportunity to interact between South Asian, Southeast Asian and Northeast Asian specialists on non-traditional security. This could culminate in creating a sense of community and an informal peer review process.

Acharya highlighted a second aim, namely, the publication of a volume that would bring together the approaches and findings of each of the eleven grantees projects. He also said

that the Ford Foundation had suggested publishing a brochure about the nature of the NTS research project to provide it an identity.

Andrew Watson, Ford Foundation Representative in China, explained that the Ford Foundation was honoured to support this important work. He noted that it was an extensive project involving South Asia, Southeast Asia and East Asia. It provided opportunities in building a regional discourse as well as a set of regional concepts and analyses of non-traditional security and human security. The Ford Foundation began its support of this project in 1998 through the first phase of research projects coordinated by the Research Centre for Strategic Studies in Colombo, IDSS in Singapore and the United Nations University in Tokyo. The second phase began in 2003 with the selection of new projects.

Watson highlighted that the 2nd Regional Plenary Meeting acted as a mid-term review of all the research projects as well as laying the foundations for a final conference to be held in late 2005. Watson also outlined the need for a short pamphlet that would establish the identity of the different

Professor Andrew Watson, Representative for China of the Ford Foundation, making his opening remarks



research programmes. Since 1998, debates and research on non-traditional security and human security have increased in importance. Such concepts have also begun to make their way into formal discussions on security. Watson highlighted a number of central issues, including the definition and object of security—being either the state, individual, region or the sub-region. A second set of issues revolved around the nature and role of the state in providing both traditional and non-traditional security as well as the role of the military and non-governmental organizations. Watson also highlighted the types of governance needed to address these issues. He questioned whether concepts of failed and fragile states were still valid, for instance. Such matters also apply to the domestic role of the state—its success or failure to provide security and good governance for its citizens as well as questions of sovereignty, humanitarian intervention and mechanisms to prevent domestic conflict. Watson concluded his opening remarks by highlighting the core issue of security beyond the traditional notion of state security and the role of the state in managing and resolving new non-traditional challenges. He highlighted the role of a diverse mix of actors, including non-governmental organizations, in addressing human security.

SESSION I

HUMAN SECURITY IN SOUTH ASIA: DISCOURSE, PRACTICE AND POLICY PROPOSITION

– *Bangladesh Institute of International
and Strategic Studies, Bangladesh*

The project focuses on three aspects of human security: discourse, practice and policy proposition. **Abdul Rob Khan** shared how his institute had designed the research project and gone through half of the implementation phase. The project consists

of country papers and essay thematic papers. For each of the papers, the scholar involved concentrates on the available discourse in the country examined or in the context of the theme studied. The researcher works on social cultural practice, legal administrative as well as policy discourse. In the thematic papers, the authors have been asked to do two country comparisons. For the country papers, the respective authors are expected to offer a country general set-up on the socio-economic background related to the respective themes. Khan was happy to report that, except for three projects, all the researchers had met the criteria of either being able to complete the whole length of the programme or completing three or four chapters of the research.

Khan pointed out a theme that was evident in all the research works, namely, the role of the state in human security and governance. He indicated that the Human Security Index was a particularly interesting study. The institute is hopeful that both the conceptual issues around human security

Dr Abdul Rob Khan presenting the BIIS research project



and the empirical issues on collectivities like groups or individuals would be completed successfully. In a recently organized work-in-progress workshop, they had distributed papers to ten local experts so that they would act as peer reviewers and get comments on the particular work. This assessment would take place along with the project management institute BISS, which is also closely monitoring the outcome of this research project.

THE DYNAMICS OF SECURITIZATION IN ASIA
– *Institute of Defence and Strategic Studies, Singapore*

Mely Anthony explained that the second phase of the IDSS-Ford study on NTS goes beyond the identification of non-traditional security issues by examining the important questions of how and why these issues are considered as non-traditional security. To do so, the IDSS team applies the securitization framework of the Copenhagen School to investigate the following questions: (a) What are the issues that are being securitized? (b) Who are the securitizing actors? (c) How does the process of securitization take place?

Ralf Emmers went on to explain the conceptual framework of the project. The methodology not only draws upon but also modifies the securitization theory. Indeed, the IDSS team have highlighted shortcomings with the model and addressed them in their theoretical framework. Some key issues of the project are therefore to identify whether there is a consensus among the various actors involved on the nature of the threat, to examine the dynamics in the process of securitization and to highlight some of the problems and dangers of invoking national security while securitizing an issue. The process of securitization is a central element in the analysis. Great attention is given to the language of security (Speech Acts) as well as to the outcomes of acts of securitization, namely

the degree of securitization and the impact of the threat itself.

Anthony added that the project consists of 20 case studies that explore questions such as whether securitization is more likely to succeed in an authoritarian state and in states where the military plays an important role in domestic politics. Anthony explained that while securitization is an innovative approach that enables us to trace how non-traditional issues are considered as existential threats to specific referent objects, it might not necessarily contribute to a solution, in which circumstances desecuritization may instead be a better approach. She also repeated that the findings of the second IDSS-FORD Workshop have been published in a made-available report and that the final papers will be published as a volume by the end of 2005.

**UNDERSTANDING AND RESPONDING TO
“TERRORISM” IN SOUTH ASIA**

– *Regional Centre for Strategic Studies, Sri Lanka*

Sridhar Khatri pointed out the two main areas of the project, namely, understanding the phenomenon of terrorism and responses to it in South Asia. The third and fourth parts of the project would involve the development of a database of terrorist group profiles and terrorist events in South Asia. Khatri indicated that this was a regional project not supported by the Sri Lankan government. The RCSS project was conscious not to be influenced by the current, global war on terrorism as it would affect the research done.

The first part of the project questions the notion of terrorism by re-conceptualizing the whole issue. It does not think of terrorism as a conspiracy engineered by non-state actors but as a problem of structural configuration within the state that has an impact on society and how society responds to these developments. The second part looks at the

response of South Asian states to terrorism. Although most of the study looks at the military dimension of state responses, this is primarily because there has not been much development in South Asia in terms of dealing with terrorism. The studies include five country studies on the responses, which are followed by studies on political economic consequences of terrorism in addition to the role of third parties and civil societies in addressing the problem. The research is ongoing and the findings are preliminary.

Khatri noted, however, that terrorism is a process in which the state, for various shortcomings of its own, provides the breeding ground for self-destructive cycles. Terrorism is less about conspiracies by state or non-state actors than about mis-governance, failure of the state to redress the grievances of its citizens, intolerance by dominant groups in society of the demands of the minority and the less privileged elements. There is therefore a need to re-conceptualize terrorism in South Asia by examining it from the notion of conflict in modern society where the state's role as a neutral mediator may be lacking. The key areas of interest are the role of the state, terror and the law, the mis-governance factor, the marginalization factor as well as the insecurity of political leaders and lack of political vision.

Khatri concluded that there is no mechanism of institutional learning within and among the states in South Asia in dealing with the threat of terrorism as each new threat finds the state virtually reinventing the wheel in terms of dealing with terrorism. There is no sharing of experiences even among security agencies and governments in South Asia in dealing with terrorism.

COMMENTARY AND DISCUSSION

Paul Evans made six observations. First, the vocabulary of non-traditional security is being used formally but all the speakers use



Professor Paul Evans delivering his comments

the phrase “human security” as the broader generic category. He sensed therefore that the human security phrase was part of the broader regional discourse, if not the framing part of the discourse. Second, he did not believe that there was a pan-Asian idea on non-traditional security emerging, noting for instance that Northeast Asians generally buy the logic that lay beneath it for reasons of history, culture and state formation specific to their region. Third, he pointed out that the Asian voice with regards to global governance efforts to operationalize the human security agenda has been relatively mute. In response, Evans believed that this plenary meeting formed the perfect group to insert some of the ideas to the existing international discussions. Instead of just reacting to international reports, this group could become the perfect constituency to respond to the United Nations and generate a distinctive and identifiable contribution to the international discussion.

Fourth, Evans commented on the IDSS

approach to depart from the Copenhagen School and noted that the Singapore project had gone so far on securitization that it was no longer just an application of the model. Instead, he expected the end product to identify a theoretical approach to security discourse that would be rooted in Asian practices. Fifth, he felt that from the discussion, there were two universes that were living side by side without touching each other. The papers and proposals were stimulating and academically rich in implications but they were apart from mainstream discourse on almost all of these issues. This group would need therefore to examine some possible measures to penetrate the mainstream world and state practices.

Finally, Evans pointed out that an interesting aspect was how the United States was missing from the discussion. For instance, he asked whether the arguments presented by the Sri Lankan colleagues intersected with US views on the war on terror. Evans suggested that the US involvement against terrorism opened up issues for non-traditional security and human security advocates, including the changing understanding of borders and changes on how insurgencies should be fought. The US has been spending a great deal of time to get a sense of local dynamics to anticipate what is necessary for strategies in the ongoing war on terrorism. By not thinking about US interests and policies in the region, the parallel universes mentioned earlier would not move closer together.

Amitav Acharya commented on the missing pan-Asian approach. One way of dealing with this would be to synthesize all the papers as well as to compare individual projects and see whether there are any common patterns emerging. He pointed out that the IDSS securitization framework could be one way of bringing together and comparing findings emerging from the

individual projects. On another note, he pointed out that the role of global actors and regional institutions is different in Southeast Asia, as there is an exchange of information, intelligence and, in some cases, best practices.

Dewi Fortuna Anwar followed up by arguing that, in South Asia and Southeast Asia, what is now regarded as non-traditional security has in fact been the primary security preoccupations of most of these countries. The conception of security in Southeast Asia has always been comprehensive, focusing on non-military aspects. Southeast Asian states have been concerned with state and nation building, ethnic, communal and religious conflicts, separatism, poverty, and environmental degradation. Western theories have only discovered such issues after the end of the Cold War and the war in Kosovo. Moreover, she highlighted that in the case of Indonesia, little money had been allocated in recent decades to conventional defence but rather to national building and economic development. China, as a developing country, is also facing the same problems as the Southeast Asian states. Hence, she argued that regional scholars had to question the basics of non-traditional security. She recognized, however, that there was a difference in Northeast Asia due to the Korean peninsula. Anwar also stressed the need for building upon the existing scholarship of the Copenhagen School and to re-conceptualize security theories from an Asian perspective. Rather than being consumers of theories developed in the West, it was worthwhile pursuing this project so as to contribute to the body of knowledge.

Shridhar Khatri pointed out that issues discussed at the global level are not highlighted in South Asia. He went on to argue that parallel universes might intersect when it comes to responses to terrorism. In South Asia, the response has been mostly military. Regional states are not only using

the US war on terror for their own individual and political purposes but also as a state policy to further military means. According to **Krishna Hachhethu**, responding to terrorism and insurgency in the long run would need to include a process of de-securitization rather than securitization.

Peter DeSouza commented on the crucial juncture that exists between the issues of human security and non-traditional security. Desouza endorsed Evans' comments on the importance of the vocabulary. Yet he stressed that even the new vocabulary needed to be grounded and problematized. To do so, there is a need to engage other universities of social sciences as well. **A. K. M. Abdus Sabur** mentioned that human security should come from the margins to the mainstream. He also agreed with Anwar's suggestion that we must develop theories and concepts from an Asian perspective.

Andrew Watson was particularly interested in the discussion on whether Northeast Asia was different from South and Southeast Asia in terms of conceptualizing non-traditional security. He mentioned, for example, that in China the term "non-traditional security" is used by the deputy foreign minister. He

was wondering whether the differences were derived from the various security pre-occupations of the different regions, as indicated previously by Anwar. With regards to the role of actors, Watson explained that in China, NGO's and other types of civil society actors are limited in their contribution to security dialogues whereas in the Philippines or South Asia the situation is remarkably different. In response, **Zhang Yunling** explained that he had convened a conference earlier this year looking at the role of NGOs in security provisions. He noticed regional differences that might result from differences in issues and actors.

SESSION II

CHINA AND NON-TRADITIONAL SECURITY
– *Institute of World Economics and Politics,
China Academy of Social Sciences,
China*

Wang Yizhou set out the main objective of the project, namely, to promote capacity building when it comes to NTS in China. He mentioned that one of the challenges was to

From left to right: Professor Zhang Yunling, Dr Mely Anthony, Dr Ralf Emmers, Dr Peter DeSouza, Dr Krishna Hachhethu, and Professor Paul Evans





Professor Wang Yizhou

promote the understanding of the term “non-traditional security”. He further went on to explain the steps undertaken to promote capacity building in China. In 2003, his institute set up the foundation by launching the first academic national level conference on non-traditional security, gathering 150 scholars, government officials and media workers from China, Taiwan, Hong Kong and Canada. Wang also mentioned that they had set up a special column on non-traditional security in the monthly journal *World Economics and Politics*.

Wang then explained the third step, namely, to build up an ambitious plan to publish three textbooks in China on non-traditional security issues. The textbooks are going to focus on feminist IR theory, global issues and globalism, and on non-traditional security. **Yu Xiao Feng** went on to give a brief description of the NTS textbook in Chinese. This textbook would be different from other traditional textbooks in the sense that, rather than focusing on security from a national standpoint, it would deal with human security and social security at the

global level.

Wang highlighted some of the difficulties they are facing, including long-distance studies as well as the need to examine NTS issues in Northeast, Southeast and Western China. In Western China, the main NTS concerns are terrorism, separatism, conflicts and religious fundamentalism. In Southeast China, the situation is similar with that of the ASEAN countries, namely, more attention is given to criminal activities, migration, health issues and others. These differences make it difficult to find a common ground and a consensus on non-traditional security in China.

**DEVELOPMENT GAP AND ECONOMIC
SECURITY IN ASEAN ECONOMIES**
– *Institute of World Economy, Vietnam*

Bui Quang Tuan highlighted the three main parts of the project. The first part focuses on the aims and scopes of the research, the second introduces the conceptual framework of the project that deals with issues of development gap, non-traditional security and human security, and the third part focuses on the major findings with some hypotheses to be derived from the results. He went on to elaborate on the different parts by sharing the objectives of the research and focusing on the economic aspects rather than all the various elements of the issues under study. Under the conceptual framework, the project includes two types of research: one is thematic and concentrates on the underlying issues of the research project, and the other consists of country research papers. Concepts such as development and developmental gap, non-traditional security and economic security would be studied as they apply to Vietnam. **Nguyen Duy Loi** added that he would be happy to hear suggestions and advice on how to improve the quality and relevance of the study.

**BRINGING POLITICS BACK IN:
GLOBALIZATION, PLURALISM AND
SECURITIZATION IN EAST ASIA**
– *Ilmin International Relations Institute,
Korea University, Korea*

In-Taek Hyun explained that their research project goes beyond the Copenhagen school and attempts to build another theoretical model. **Guen Lee** highlighted the three central parts of the project: first, the research framework that includes the aim of the project, a new approach of “intermestic” (international + domestic) politics and research questions; second, the theorizing on globalization, pluralism and securitization that includes propositions, hypotheses and research outcomes; and finally, the different empirical case studies. The first aim of the project is to develop a theoretical framework to analyse the securitization process of non-traditional security issues in East Asia. The second is to create a nexus between globalization, pluralism and securitization

in East Asia. The third aim seeks to grasp the “intermestic” political processes of East Asian countries. Fourthly, the project aims to examine the process of regional securitization with a focus on preference configurations of diverse actors in the region, represented by each government respectively. Finally, the project aims to make policy recommendations.

Guen Lee emphasized the point that the project was taking a new approach to the securitization process, defined by a liberal approach. They saw securitization as a political process that settled the issues of who gets what, when and how, and which involves various political coalitions within a country. Guen Lee proceeded to outline a few research questions, including why and how only some non-traditional security threats are securitized while others remain unsecuritized in East Asian countries and what explains the variance among East Asian countries regarding the degree of securitization and desecuritization of identical non-traditional or traditional security issues.

Sung-Han Kim presented the empirical case studies by highlighting the country analysis and regional analysis parts. The aim of the studies is to find out the unique domestic preference, formation and representation processes of each East Asian country. Secondly, the cross-country differences in the securitization of diverse new security issues are also addressed. With regards to the regional analysis, Sung-Han Kim indicated that the primary aim was to examine the regional process of securitization and desecuritization and, in particular, the factors that make the East Asian securitization process unique. It also involves examining the role of extra regional powers like the United States. Sung-Han Kim proceeded by introducing ten research papers. In-Taek Hyun concluded by sharing the future plans of the project, which are divided into three phases: theory building,

Professor In-Taek Hyun introducing the Korean research project



empirical country analysis and integration. An edited volume will also be published in English and Korean.

COMMENTARY AND DISCUSSION

Dewi Fortuna Anwar congratulated all the project coordinators. She indicated her excitement for the China project and its revolutionary attempt to deal with non-traditional security issues in China. Anwar wondered whether security was a contested concept in China and whether there was a growing pluralism in terms of security issues. She indicated that this was an elite-centric project and noted that in cases of extremism, terrorism and separatism, one has a tendency to look from the top rather than going deeper and trying to have a bottom-up process. She therefore suggested the need to incorporate marginal voices in the project. Anwar re-emphasized that security was a contested concept. Whose security and whose perspectives are we talking about? The whole point of non-traditional security is therefore to raise awareness that security is not an objective construct. She asked whether this new awareness of the growing plurality of security issues could change the conceptualization of Chinese foreign policy. However, what were missing, in her view, were the implications for new domestic policies in China and how they might impact on social and political formulations in the country.

Anwar also congratulated the Korean project for raising awareness of security issues. She asked whether the scholars doing the empirical studies were using tools developed in the theory sections and if the empirical findings also fed into the development of the theoretical model. Anwar also highlighted the domestic political competition in terms of who is doing the securitization. In the case of the war on terror, domestic political actors in Asia have been jumping on the bandwagon to get



Dr Dewi Fortuna Anwar

US support not just in financial terms but also to win ground against their domestic opponents. She also pointed out the need for historical comparisons and whether there were similarities in the language of securitization between the Cold War period and post-9/11.

With regards to the Vietnamese project, Dewi Fortuna Anwar asked why the scholars had decided to solely focus on economic security, although it was mentioned that it impinges on social and political security. She questioned whether this is related to current state ideology in Vietnam where non-traditional security is still primarily associated with economic security. Anwar suggested that the developmentalism approach also includes a growing demand for pluralism, democratization and other human security aspects. She recommended the study to not only associate human security with economic security but to integrate into the conceptual framework other elements like human and civil rights.

Wang Yizhou explained that it is complex to study the variety of NTS problems in China due to its large territory, numerous ethnic groups and other factors. They also need to be sensitive when addressing questions like



Dr Tasneem Siddiqui, Dr Sumona DasGupta and Mr Abdus Sabur having a discussion during tea break

separatism, terrorism and fundamentalism. Wang reflected on the similarities with Indonesia under President Suharto when it was difficult to discuss the independence of East Timor or Aceh. He highlighted two angles on non-traditional security, one being the official national stand and the other, the civil society and global community stand. Wang mentioned that their project focused on policy recommendations and that capacity building in response to NTS was still a new term in China.

In-Taek Hyun responded to Anwar's question on theory building and empirical case studies by explaining how the project had been formulated. Several brainstorming sessions had led to the theoretical foundations and the preparation of the first draft. After the submission of the theoretical papers, they were circulated to all the participants and discussed at the first meeting in Seoul. This was followed by a second meeting in Hong Kong that gathered both the theoretical and empirical groups. A third meeting was held in Seoul to reflect on the theoretical and empirical findings. Guen Lee noted

how the outcomes of the empirical studies had reflected on the theoretical findings. He also responded to the desecuritization recommendation made by the liberal theorists John Ikenberry and Andrew Moravcsik. They had asked at the start of their research whether it was good to securitize NTS threats. They had concluded that a better approach to examine security threats was to analyse them within the context of "intermestic" politics.

Bui Quang Tuan responded to why their project focused only on economic security and whether it should include other issues like human rights. He argued that they had adopted a comprehensive understanding of NTS but that they had decided to confine their research to one of its elements, economic security. Their application of economic security touches on numerous questions such as economic development, sustained productivity, national growth and others. Moreover, he explained that they had approached economic security at different levels, including its connection to the question of human security. The latter

involves more than freedom from want and fear; it also involves rights to be included in the national decision-making process. Finally, Bui Quang Tuan highlighted that economic security started with material concerns before leading to other aspects of human security. Only people who could achieve basic material needs could start thinking about human and social rights as well as their involvement in the decision-making process.

Amitav Acharya commented that the Korean project could, due to its theoretical perspective on securitization, be compared and contrasted to the IDSS research project. He also noted that it raised some interesting questions on how to develop a regional perspective on securitization.

SESSION III

DEVELOPMENT, PLURALISM, STATE AND SECURITY: UNDERSTANDING NON-TRADITIONAL SECURITY IN A CHANGING EAST ASIA

- *Institute for Asia Pacific Studies,
Chinese Academy of Social Sciences,
China*

Zhang Yunling stated that the project focuses on transitional issues in East Asia and is divided into three parts. The first part deals with pluralism and society and is concerned mainly with religion, culture and how to create cohesion to meet new challenges in transitional processes. Each country is quite different; some are more coherent and stable than others. He explained that they therefore try to analyse the issue on a case-by-case basis. Also, some societies are divided by ethics, religion and other factors. The project tries to analyse these kinds of issues and how to create cohesion. Another focus of the project is the social roots of extremism, using a comparative approach. Extremism and terrorism have also been distinguished.



Professor Zhang Yunling and Professor James Tang

The second part of the project focuses on development, migration and security. The third part is the role of the state in managing transition. Zhang informed the audience that they have four papers identifying challenges to governments. Issues like regional differences, urbanization, emerging nationalism, political transitions, anti-terrorism and governance are further explored. Another focus is on NGOs and civil society. It addresses questions like whether an NGO equals civil society. The role of NGOs has been increasing in civil societies, for example, in China and Cambodia. Are the NGOs therefore supplementing the government's role? NGOs can also become part of the problem. Lastly, he said that all the papers are different in that they are less theory driven as they do put theories into practice. They plan to publish four books.

Elaborating on the second part of the project, Dewi Fortuna Anwar explained that it was an empirical study and that it did not try to create any new theoretical approach. She observed that there has been a nexus between migration and security but very few books have been written about all the three issues—development, migration and security.

The first part of the project focuses on development and migration. She noted that the literature on migration has been from south to north and lately the issue has been on how to stop migrants from coming to developed countries. In East Asia, internal migration is a crucial question. For instance, in China and Thailand, security issues have also found their origins in communal problems like in Aceh and Papua respectively. Anwar noted the need to pay more attention to migrant workers within the issues of horizontal conflicts like those in Indonesia and the Philippines. The second part of the study focuses on cross-border migration and security. It also focuses on transnational crime problems (drugs and human trafficking), terrorism, irregular migrant workers in East Asia and the case of Australia as a destination for asylum seekers. Anwar concluded that all these questions are not just human security concerns but also inter-state issues.

SECURITIZATION AND DESECURITIZATION OF MIGRATION: THE SOUTH ASIAN EXPERIENCE

– *Refugee and Migratory Movements Research Unit, Bangladesh*

Tasneem Siddiqui started her presentation by stating that there are contradictory perceptions about migration—one is that migration is an integral part of development and the other is that migration impacts security. Siddiqui offered a brief history of migration and touched on the question of migration and development. She also defined the phenomenon of irregular migration as a movement of people not authorized by either the receiving or sending country. There is an estimated 30 million irregular migrants in the world who guarantee an important transfer of capital back to their home countries.

On the issue of migration and security, Tasneem Siddiqui observed that after

the terror attacks on 11 September 2001, irregular migration has increasingly been regarded as a non-traditional security issue. Migration has been perceived as a source of ethnic conflict and violence as well as a source of terrorist and criminal activities. As part of the securitization model, migration has been regarded as a threat to societal security. She stressed that migration had, for instance, been securitized in South Asia and indicated that this act of securitization was complicating rather than addressing the issues. Siddiqui then proceeded to describe the research project, including the conceptual framework, the work of some of the authors, as well as the eight collaborative research institutions involved in the different South Asian countries. Siddiqui stressed that the research project calls for the need to desecuritize migration and highlighted the role of civil society. Two books are expected to come out of the research project.

COMMENTARY AND DISCUSSION

James Tang, in his comments, noted that the China project indicated a great desire to understand the processes associated with non-traditional security. It therefore had a lot to contribute to some of the theoretical assumptions made in this area as well as to the Asian scholars working on NTS. Tang questioned how states could go about managing these new issues and noted that political transitions are already underway in many countries. Tang also discussed how the area of non-traditional security is being viewed and discussed in different parts of Asia, stressing the need to make comparative studies. He wondered who should be regarded as the main actor, the state or the growing influence of civil society as indicated in the research project of Zhang Yunling. Moreover, Tang discussed the fact that current tools to address NTS issues may not be adequate. On migration,

Tang mentioned the importance of empirical work and the need to recognize some of the limitations in applying theoretical models. He also examined the importance of speech acts with regards to migration issues and the kinds of language used in different parts of Asia on migration. In his view, the complex issue of migration indicated the limitations of the Copenhagen School and its securitization framework.

Paul Evans noted how the use of some concepts had a direct impact on how one looks at the issue of migration. He also asked what the policy prescriptions were of the two research studies. Dewi Fortuna Anwar observed that only when a certain issue becomes securitized, does it benefit from the required attention from national and international state actors. She discussed the issue of transmigration in Indonesia and looked at the impacts of the securitization process. She wondered whether governments are no longer concerned about issues of nationalism and only take notice once they have been transformed into national security questions. Anwar also indicated that one should differentiate between securitization and militarization in the Asian context.

Tasneem Siddiqui mentioned the difficulties and risks that come with making broad generalizations when discussing migration issues. Her research project was therefore asking for the desecuritization from a state perspective of irregular labour movements. She argued that the securitization of migrants made them even more vulnerable and insecure. She noted also that human trafficking is a form of forced migration against which international protocols already exist. She stressed, however, that it was essentially a problem of implementation.

Wang Yizhou noted the difference between South Asia and Northeast Asia when it comes to civil society and research. He stressed how dominant the government

still was in China and how different Bangladesh NGOs were, for instance, from the ones working in East Asia. In response, Siddiqui argued that civil society was playing a very active role in South Asia.

SESSION IV

STATE OF DEMOCRACY IN SOUTH ASIA – *Centre for the Study of Developing Societies, India*

Peter DeSouza explained that the project had carried out approximately 16 series of dialogues on the state of democracy in South Asia and 17 case studies in 2004. The dialogues consisted of inviting people to spend time to get to know each other and to articulate ideas on democracy and security. They hoped to be able to publish these dialogues in an edited volume, as they had been very successful and valuable. The case studies had also proven to be very useful. They had been chosen by asking themselves what exactly they wanted the case studies to do. Did they want them to illustrate issues

Dr Peter DeSouza making his presentation



or focus on undermining factors? They finally decided to choose the latter, ending up focusing on “inconvenient facts”. Finally, DeSouza mentioned a qualitative assessment that would examine people’s attitudes to security.

Krishna Hachhethu presented the results of one of the surveys carried out on the state of democracy in Nepal. The responses to the survey in Nepal were very much dependent on the formulation of the questions. In order not to compromise their high standards, the sample sizes were based upon systematic selection. The survey revealed that perception could explain the differences in results. He added that the surveys proved that anti-social sentiments were the primary source of social insecurity in Nepal. In general, the surveys show that many do not feel free to discuss politics openly, and with the insurgency, only 55% feel less safe living in the city. He commented on the civilians’ trust in institutions and the “cold treatment”. He concluded with his findings on women’s rights.

Dr Sumona DasGupta



GENDER AND NON-TRADITIONAL FORMULATIONS OF SECURITY: THE NEW FRONTIER

– *Women in Security, Conflict Management and Peace, Foundation for Universal Responsibility, India*

Sumona DasGupta provided a context to interrogate the existing security discourse and thus the apparent binaries of the “traditional” and the “non-traditional” formulations on security. The project tried to see whether there were possibilities of evolving a shared vocabulary through which non-traditional security issues in South Asia could be located.

DasGupta explained that there is a transcending conflict between gender and non-traditional securities. The term “transcending conflict” has now been changed as it seems to only refer to active conflict. They intended to look at “peace” types of conflict, for example, congealed violence. While these are not situations of active combat, they can still be of mind-blowing proportions. DasGupta was also no longer comfortable with the term “non-traditional security” and she was increasingly inclined to contest the very existence of NTS as a concept. While there are NTS threats that can be measured, the field of study may in fact not exist.

DasGupta indicated that their research project had just emerged from their review process. She also expressed that they had problems with collapsing human security with non-traditional security issues. In terms of gender, this was indeed creating problems for non-traditional security. The idea of gender is not just about biological differences or women’s perceptions. Gender inequality is in fact inequality in a form of social exclusion. Basically, patriarchy is a non-traditional security threat and they have coined the term “missing women” in their work instead.

**“FISH FIGHTS OVER FISH RIGHTS” AND
NON-TRADITIONAL SECURITY ISSUES IN
SOUTHEAST ASIA: IMPLICATIONS FOR
MANAGING OVERCAPACITY IN FISHERIES**
– *International Centre for Living Aquatic
Resources Management, Malaysia*

Len Garces explained that in Cambodia, the Philippines and Thailand, fisheries are a source of food for the poor and a livelihood base for fisherfolks. Additionally, they are also a government’s source of income from export revenues and provide employment to skilled workers in processing and ancillary fishery sectors. There are currently many disputes over legal claim and various conflicts in fisheries.

Garces explained that the aim of the project was to examine the nature of conflicts that arise in fisheries in selected countries representing a variety of fishing environments and condition; identify where and when these conflicts may arise; and who are the stakeholders in the conflicts. The team has chosen to work on three countries—the Philippines, Cambodia and Thailand—and have also conducted national (country) workshops. There are five types of fishery conflicts identified and documented in the three countries of analysis. The centre plans to do a consolidation workshop and some regional institutions have indicated interest in attending. They hope to complete the report by June 2005.

Nerissa Salayo elaborated on the details of the project. The locations for data collection were in three sites: in Cambodia; near the Mekong River in Thailand; and near Cebu in the Philippines. They chose the primary conflicts of each area and focused on them. In Cambodia, the focus has been on conflicts to open access rights and operations in large fishing lots. In the Philippines, the focus has been on rivalry between small and commercial fishers. And finally in Thailand, the focus has been on the gear conflict

between small and large-scale fisheries egg anchovy.

Based on their findings, Salayo indicated that there were four types of security concerns, namely, livelihood/income, food security, environmental degradation and threats to lives. The team also recommended exit strategies like banning the use of some gears, establishing protected areas and alternate livelihood. In conclusion, managing fishing capacities is crucial and urgent. There is a need to review and update existing laws and Salayo also questioned whether fisheries in Southeast Asia should be securitized.

COMMENTARY AND DISCUSSION

Carolina Hernandez prefaced her comments by noting that as far as ASEAN and Japan are concerned, the idea of security has always been connected to politics and society. It is a function of democratization. She also commented on the building up of national militaries to respond to threats and how security has become a concern for other non-military actors. Globalization has also increased the porosity of national borders, leading to the penetration of borders by ideas and ideologies. On the distinction between traditional and non-traditional security issues, she argued that non-traditional security seeks to empower non-state actors as it is traditionally only the state that defines security.

Hernandez indicated her support for Desouza’s dialogues and case studies. Dialogues help create confidence and are a great learning tool for analysis. She also liked the notion of ‘inconvenient facts’. These could include issues of corruption as well as deep cultural roots and differences. Hernandez also enjoyed Hachhethu’s study on the Nepalese people’s perceptions on security and democracy. Such survey studies are of great academic value. She asked whether he would be accounting for the



Dr Carolina Hernandez delivering her comments

differences found in his research.

Hernandez commented on Sumona DasGupta's powerful presentation. Even though DasGupta had challenged many aspects of the framework in her way of looking at traditional and non-traditional security, she never examined those questions in isolation. Hernandez agreed that non-traditional security concerns had to be viewed not just as security concerns but from a much wider perspective. Hernandez also argued that DasGupta's approach towards gender and security would represent an important step in the study of these issues.

On the third presentation, Hernandez discussed the kinds of insights for NTS issues that could be derived from the "Fish fights and fish rights" study. Insights could be drawn that may be useful both for the IDSS securitization framework as well as for more specific policy implementation and recommendation. Such recommendations should be made not only to governmental officials but also to all relevant actors (including non-state actors). She stressed

that it was important to let all players know of their responsibilities. Otherwise the situation would not be able to progress and the problem would be left hanging.

Hernandez concluded that good governance was very critical in the fisheries project. Questions of who has access and who enforces are critical. In the fisheries, there are problems of corruption and collusion (big fishermen and law agencies) but also of enforcement. Moreover, Hernandez explained that it was important to look both within countries and at the regional level. There is insufficient understanding on the exclusive economic zones in Southeast Asia and there is an urgent need to come up with common rules on fishing.

Dewi Fortuna Anwar raised a series of questions, including what exactly were the real threats to human security, what the differences were between these threats and if they could all be put into one basket of security concerns. She also wondered whether there must be conflict before an issue can be termed as a threat. In view of this, Anwar also asked whether the other social science disciplines like sociology would give way to security studies when it comes to threats and security concerns. Anwar also recommended that the project on fishing rights dedicate a chapter on transnational issues as there are many instances in the region where fishermen between countries are having conflicts.

David Capie commended the remarkable piece of research done by Krishna Hachhethu and Peter DeSousa. He recognized that there are times when researchers are reluctant to go out into the field, much less try to obtain inconvenient facts. Capie also commented on the methodology and outputs. Referring to another project he was involved in, he felt that this team would be able to teach valuable insights on methods and fieldwork. He urged them to share with the participants on how they had engaged the groups and how they were able to carry out their

research.

Andrew Watson commented on DasGupta's project and her rejection of the notion of non-traditional security because of its state-centricism. He wondered how the state and its central position could be ignored. While studies vary, human security focuses on economic security and the safety of people, which very much depend on the state.

Sridhar Khatri commented on DasGupta's presentation by raising the issue of gender and security in times of conflict. He liked her interrogation on whether the field of non-traditional security should be taken away from the state and felt that it was still a wide-open field with no orthodoxy. Khatri also posed the following questions: What should be securitized and what should not? Are we differentiating the two or lumping them together? And whether such questions really represent security challenges or just policy problems?

James Tang asked why academics in the discipline of international relations seem to be trying to incorporate everything. He noted that these projects were all important contributions that would affect the perceptions of people on security issues. He also discussed the scepticism in terms of resource allocation that still prevails in certain countries. Tang hoped that the different reports could help change perceptions and offer a better understanding of non-traditional security issues.

Peter DeSouza mentioned that their fieldwork had included a huge dissemination exercise and that they had also created a website to influence policymakers. In addition, the team has also been supported by the media and that has helped heighten their impact on policy. He added that political aspects were very central to their study.

Sumona Dasgupta explained that the state is the very institution that society turns to for protection. There must therefore be

considerations on how the state interferes with the security of the society. On the issue of policy recommendations, she asked how one could package their recommendations. One of the methods that could be used would be dialogue. However, there is a problem of terminology. What can be done is that policymakers can also be invited into these dialogues so as to minimize misunderstandings on the terminology used, and subsequently remove barriers.

Nerissa Salayo argued that their project needed to focus specifically on domestic issues and not on transnational concerns at this stage. Their objective is to provide recommendations to the stated countries, and hence their focus on conflicts within countries. However, the team has built long regional partnerships and often invites country officials to dialogues and training courses. In addition, there is also significant capacity in building partnerships within Cambodia and the team is establishing their presence there. With regards to governance, she felt that it was going to be a major concern. As these are still preliminary reports, they will have a more comprehensive report in due course.

CONCLUSION

Amitav Archarya stated that the 11 research approaches would be put together into an edited volume. While the projects rely on different backgrounds and levels of interest and expertise, it was hoped that the concept of non-traditional security could be discussed and understood on a similar level. Acharya stressed nonetheless that no boundaries should be imposed. He went on to explain the steps in the process of securitization that could offer a basis for developing a framework for comparison. He defined securitization as "a process whereby purposeful actors, for example, governments, civil societies and international

organizations, frame new or previously ignored challenges as existential threats to the survival and well-being of peoples, states and the international community". He added that one could easily go beyond this definition. He added that one should also keep in mind that securitization might not necessarily be a positive development and that it could have negative effects as well.

Acharya then suggested a framework of analysis that could be undertaken in the various research projects. He stressed the need to focus on the formulation of recommendations to governments, the international community and regional institutions or organizations. He highlighted possible findings in terms of several questions: what (issue area), who (actors), whose (referent object), why (motivations), how (process), where (levels), how much (outcome), impact on issue and finally governance. He concluded that non-traditional security had become a policy issue and it would be beneficial therefore if every research project were to be framed as a policy project. The 11 institutions could therefore combine and create meaningful generalizations about Asia.

Guen Lee noted the risk of making wrong policy recommendations and stressed that while securitization is one issue, policy recommendation is another one altogether. He also found a tension between national security and non-traditional security, leaving policymakers with a dilemma. Carolina Hernandez did not believe that adopting a positive response to NTS led the state to be sidelined as it would still be the state that would implement the policy. Finally, she added that in order for policy recommendations to get to policymakers, there would be a need for allies in the domestic context. While dialogue is helpful, publishing is often insufficient without the help of civil society and the government's assistance.

Peter DeSouza emphasized the need to

establish dialogue and indicated that the ability to change mindsets had so far been quite successful. The interaction with civil society actors is also very useful and this can be done through dialogue. He explained that for their current project, there are already 350 institutions waiting for their findings. Therefore, it is definitely of interest to other actors. He also agreed with Carolina Hernandez that allies in the bureaucracy are needed.

Sridhar K. Khatri stated that the outline Acharya had presented was very helpful. Yet he stressed that developing an Asian experience would be difficult and recommended instead to tie up the loose ends of the project on South Asia itself. Due to differing time frames, interests and regions, generalizations may in fact dampen the overall effect of a certain policy. He added that policies have to be specific in each area. Abdus Sabur argued that the framework had certainly been useful and that many would be able to utilize it. He added that participants should not be overly concerned about whether the recommendations are right or wrong. As far as policymakers are concerned, they do not take recommendations word for word, but rather use them as guides.

Zhang Yunling explained that in China most of the debates still relate to state security and called this an extension of the traditional national security concept. He also thought it was impractical to securitize all issues and said that the problems were identified as non-traditional security but the recommendations were all conventional. If one does not handle this properly, we would find ourselves handling more tensions than expected. Emerging requirements in a changing society creates new expectations of the government. Additionally, the government's policy now focuses on the rights of people and looks into how to protect them. All in all, he felt that, because of cultural differences, there is still a problem getting NTS issues well accepted



Participants of the 2nd Regional Plenary Meeting of the Grantees of the Ford Foundation Project on Non-Traditional Security in Asia

as policy in China.

Tasneem Siddiqui raised the issue of who the policy objects were. In the case of migration, it had to be not just states but the UN, civil society organizations and human rights groups involved in certain areas as well. She had seen governments take up recommendations when civil society pushes for changes and when the recommendations were doable and legitimate. Sumona DasGupta thanked Carolina Hernandez for saying that the term “non-traditional security” is an adjective and not a noun. She thought this was the crux of their project.

Paul Evans argued that this project is essentially about human security, not

non-traditional security. Having listened to the vocabulary used, he noted that it had been more precise than non-traditional security. He also reminded all that NTS is a state project, including a Chinese project on NTS and an ASEAN-China agreement to cooperate in this area. Evans noted the richness of scholarship and the in-depth projects presented at the seminar but argued that it was not connected to policymakers and policy debates. Finally, he suggested that it was time to go global with ideas on NTS. These issues needed, for example, to be brought to the United States by a small team of scholars.

MEETING PROGRAMME

Thursday 2 December 2004

Arrivals

1930 Welcoming Dinner
Triple Three Buffet Restaurant
(Grand Tower, Level 5)

Friday 3 December 2004

0830–0915 Registration
Belvedere II (Grand Tower,
Level 4)

0930 **Opening Remarks**
Welcome Address
Amitav Acharya, Deputy
Director, Institute of Defence
and Strategic Studies
Andrew Watson, Ford
Foundation

1000 Session I

Chair:

Kwa Chong Guan, Head
(External Programmes),
Institute of Defence and
Strategic Studies

Presenters:

Abdur Rob Khan & A.
K. M. Abdus Sabur,
Bangladesh Institute of
International and Strategic
Studies, Bangladesh

Mely Anthony & Ralf
Emmers, Institute of
Defence and Strategic
Studies, Singapore

Sridhar K. Khatri & S. B.
Atugoda, Regional Centre
for Strategic Studies, Sri
Lanka

Commentator:

Paul Evans, University of
British Columbia, Canada

1100 Coffee/Tea Break

1115 **Discussion**

1215 Lunch
The Mezzanine Café & Bar
(Grand Tower, Level 2)

MEETING PROGRAMME

1315 Session II

Chair:

Kumar Ramakrishna,
Head (Studies), Institute
of Defence and Strategic
Studies

Presenters:

Wang Yizhou & Yu Xiao
Feng, Institute of World
Economics and Politics,
China Academy of Social
Sciences, China

Bui Quang Tuan & Ma
Nguyen Duy Loi, Institute
of World Economy,
Vietnam

In-Taek Hyun, Sung-Han
Kim & Geun Lee, Ilmin
International Relations
Institute, Korea University,
Korea

Commentator:

Dewi Fortuna Anwar, The
Habibie Center, Indonesia

1515 Coffee/Tea Break

1530 Session III

Chair:

Ralf Emmers, Institute
of Defence and Strategic
Studies

Presenters:

Zhang Yunling, Institute
for Asia Pacific Studies,
Chinese Academy of Social
Sciences, China

Dewi Fortuna Anwar, The
Habibie Center, Indonesia

Tasneem A. Siddiqui &
Chowdhury R. Abrar,
Refugee and Migratory
Movements Research Unit,
Bangladesh

Commentator:

James Tang, University of
Hong Kong, Hong Kong

1715 **End of Programme for Day
One**

19:00 Dinner
House of Peranakan Cuisine,
1020 East Coast Parkway

MEETING PROGRAMME

Saturday
4 December 2004

0900 **Session IV**

Chair:

Mely Anthony, Institute
of Defence and Strategic
Studies

Presenters:

Peter R. DeSouza & Krishna
Hachhethu (Nepal), Centre
for the Study of Developing
Societies, India

Meenakshi Gopinath &
Sumona DasGupta, Women
in Security, Conflict
Management and Peace,
Foundation for Universal
Responsibility, India

Len Garces & Nerissa
Salayo, International
Centre for Living Aquatic
Resources Management,
Malaysia

Commentator:

Carolina Hernandez,
Institute for Strategic and
Development Studies,
Philippines

1100 Coffee/Tea Break

1115 **Wrap Session**

Amitav Acharya, Deputy
Director, Institute of Defence
and Strategic Studies

1230 Lunch

Pine Court Restaurant (Grand
Tower, Level 35)

LIST OF CHAIRS, PARTICIPANTS & COMMENTATORS

1. Dr. Chowdhury R. Abrar
Professor in International Relations
Coordinator, Refugee and Migratory
Movements Research Unit
University of Dhaka
4th Floor, Sattar Bhaban, 3/3E
Bijoynagar
Dhaka 1000, Bangladesh
Tel: 880 2 9360338
Fax: 889 2 8362441
E-mails: cabrar@citechco.net
rmmrubj@aiktlbd.net
2. Dr. Tasneem A, Siddiqui
Professor of Political Science
Chair, Refugee and Migratory
Movements Research Unit
Bangladesh
3. Dr. Abdur Rob Khan
Research Director
Bangladesh Institute of International
and Strategic Studies
1/46 Elephant Road, Dhaka 1000
Bangladesh
Tel: 880 2 934 7984
Fax: 880 2 831 2625
E-mail: ark@biiss.org
4. Mr. Abdus Sabur
Research Director
Bangladesh Institute of International
and Strategic Studies
Bangladesh
E-mail: sabur@biiss.org
5. Professor Wang Yizhou
Deputy Director and Senior Fellow
Institute of World Economics and
Politics
Chinese Academy of Social Sciences
Beijing, 100732, China
Tel: 6512 6105
Fax: 6512 6180
E-mail: wyz@public.bta.net.cn
6. Professor Yu Xiao Feng
International Culture School of
ZheJiang University
310027, HangZhou
China
Tel: 86 0571 87996282
Fax: 86 0571 87952117
E-mail: yuxiaofeng@zju.edu.cn
7. Professor Zhang Yunling
Director
Institute of Asia-Pacific Studies
Chinese Academy of Social Sciences
No. 3, Zhang Zizhong Rd
Beijing, China 100007
Tel: 86 10 6406 3922
Fax: 86 10 6406 3041
E-mails: ylzhang@cass.org.cn
yunling@public.bta.net.cn
8. Dr. Peter R. DeSouza
Professor and Visiting Senior Fellow
Lokniti Institute for Comparative
Democracy
Centre for Study of Developing
Societies
29 Rajpur Road, Delhi 110054
India
Tel: 91 11 2398 1012
Fax: 91 11 2394 3450
E-mail: peter@csdsdelhi.org
9. Dr. Krishna Hachhethu
Associate Professor
Centre for Nepal and Asian Studies
Tribhuvan University
Kirtipur, Kathmandu
Nepal
Tel: 4331 7409
Fax: 4331 184
E-mail: wl2599@wlink.com.np

LIST OF CHAIRS, PARTICIPANTS & COMMENTATORS

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>10. Dr. Meenakshi Gopinath
Honorary Director
Women in Security, Conflict
Management and Peace
Foundation for Universal Responsibility
Core 4-A, Upper Ground Floor, India
Habitat Centre
Lodhi Road, New Delhi
India
Tel: 91 11 2464 8450
Fax: 91 11 264 8451
E-mail: meenug@vsnl.com</p> <p>11. Dr. Sumona DasGupta
Senior Programme Officer
Women in Security, Conflict
Management and Peace
Foundation for Universal Responsibility
India
E-mail: sumonadg@hotmail.com</p> <p>12. Professor In-Taek Hyun
President
Ilmin International Relations Institute
Korea University
5F, Incheon Memorial Building, 5-1
Anam-dong, Sungbuk-ku
Seoul 136-701, Korea
Tel: 82 2 923 2416
Fax: 82 2 927 5165
E-mail: ithyun@chol.com</p> <p>13. Professor Kim Sung-han
Institute of Foreign Affairs and
National Security
1376-2 Socho 2-Dong, Socho-Gu
Seoul 137-072, Korea
Tel: 82 2 3497 7644
Fax: 82 2 575 5245
E-mail: ksunghan@chol.com</p> | <p>14. Professor Geun Lee
Graduate School of International Studies
Seoul National University
San 56-1, Shillim-dong, Kwanak-gu
151-742, Korea
Tel/Fax: 82 2 880 5114
E-mail: gnlee@snu.ac.kr</p> <p>15. Dr. Nerissa Salayo
Project Leader
The WorldFish Center
(International Center for Living Aquatic
Resources Management)
Jalan Batu Maung, Batu Maung
11960 Bayan Lepas, Penang
Malaysia
Tel: 604 626 1606
Fax: 604 626 5530
E-mail: n.salayo@cgiar.org</p> <p>16. Mr. Len Garces
Research Fellow (Coastal Fisheries)
The WorldFish Center
(International Center for Living Aquatic
Resources Management)
Tel: 604 620 2173
Fax: 604 626 5530
E-mail: l.garces@cgiar.org</p> <p>17. Professor Amitav Acharya
Deputy Director and Head of Research
Institute of Defence and Strategic
Studies
Nanyang Technological University
Blk S4, Level B4, Nanyang Avenue
Singapore 639798
Tel: 65 6790 6213
Fax: 65 6793 2991
E-mail: isaacharya@ntu.edu.sg</p> |
|--|--|

LIST OF CHAIRS, PARTICIPANTS & COMMENTATORS

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>18. Dr. Mely Anthony
Assistant Professor and IDSS-Ford
Project Coordinator
Institute of Defence and Strategic
Studies
Singapore
Tel: 65 6790 5886 / Fax: 65 6793 2991
E-mail: ismcanthony@ntu.edu.sg</p> <p>19. Dr. Ralf Emmers
Assistant Professor
Institute of Defence and Strategic
Studies
Singapore
Tel: 65 6790 4340
Fax: 65 6793 2991
E-mail: isremmers@ntu.edu.sg</p> <p>20. Mr. Kwa Chong Guan
Head of External Programmes
Institute of Defence and Strategic
Studies
Singapore
Tel: 65 6790 6975
Fax: 65 6793 2991
E-mail: iscgkwa@ntu.edu.sg</p> <p>21. Dr. Kumar Ramakrishna
Assistant Professor and Head of Studies
Institute of Defence and Strategic
Studies
Singapore
Tel: 65 6790 6924
Fax: 65 6793 2991
E-mail: iskumar@ntu.edu.sg</p> <p>22. Professor Sridhar Khatri
Executive Director
Regional Centre for Strategic Studies
2, Elibank Road, Colombo 5
Sri Lanka
Fax: 94 1 2599 993
E-mail: edrcss@sri.lanka.net</p> | <p>23. Mr. S. B. Atugoda
Associate Director
Regional Centre for Strategic Studies
Sri Lanka
Tel: 94 11 2599 7345
Fax: 94 11 2599 993
E-mail: atugoda@rcss.org</p> <p>24. Dr. Bui Quang Tuan
Director
Department of Development Studies
Institute of World Economics and
Politics
176 Thai Ha St. Dong Da District
Hanoi, Vietnam
Tel: 844 857 4289
Fax: 844 857 4316
E-mail: dgns@hn.vnn.vn</p> <p>25. Mr. Nguyen Duy Loi
Research Fellow
Institute of World Economics and
Politics
Vietnam
E-mail: loinguyen duy@hotmail.com</p> <p>26. Professor Andrew Watson
Representative for China
Ford Foundation Beijing Office
Suite 501 International Club Office
Building
No 21 Jianwai Dajie
Beijing, China
Tel: 86 10 6532 6668
Fax: 86 10 6532 5495
E-mail: a.Watson@fordfound.org</p> |
|---|---|

LIST OF CHAIRS, PARTICIPANTS & COMMENTATORS

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>27. Professor Paul Evans
Professor and Acting Director
Liu Institute for Global Issues
University of British Columbia
Vancouver, British Columbia
Canada V6T 1Z2
Tel: 604 822 9957
Fax: 604 822 6966
E-mail: paul.evans@ubc.ca</p> <p>28. Dr. Dewi Fortuna Anwar
Director for Program and Research
The Habibie Center
Jl. Kemang Selatan no. 98
Jakarta Selatan 12560
Indonesia
Tel: 62 21 781 7211
Fax: 62 21 781 7212
E-mails dfanwar@habibiecenter.or.id
fortuna@lipi.go.id;</p> | <p>29. Dr. Carolina Hernandez
Chair, Board of Directors
Institute for Strategic and Development
Studies
Professor of Political Science
University of the Philippines
Commonwealth Avenue, Diliman
Quezon City 1101
Philippines
Tel: 63 2 929 0889
Fax: 93 2 929 0890
E-mail: cgh@cnl.net</p> <p>30. Professor James Tang
Dean, Faculty of Social Science
The University of Hong Kong
Room 104, Meng Wah Complex,
Pokfulam Road
Hong Kong
Tel: 852 2859 2982
Fax: 852 2517 0806
E-mail: jthtang@hku.hk</p> |
|--|---|

The Institute of Defence and Strategic Studies (IDSS) was established in July 1996 as an autonomous research institute within the Nanyang Technological University. Its objectives are to:

- conduct research on security, strategic and international issues;
- provide general and graduate education in strategic studies, international relations, defence management and defence technology; and
- promote joint and exchange programmes with similar regional and international institutions, organize seminars/conferences on topics salient to the strategic and policy communities of the Asia-Pacific.

Constituents of the IDSS include the International Centre for Political Violence and Terrorism Research (ICPVTR) and the Asian Programme for Negotiation and Conflict Management (APNCM).

RESEARCH

Through its Working Paper Series, *IDSS Commentaries* and other publications, the Institute seeks to share its research findings with the strategic studies and defence policy communities. The Institute's researchers are also encouraged to publish their writings in refereed journals. The focus of research is on issues relating to the security and stability of the Asia-Pacific region and their implications for Singapore and other countries in the region. The Institute has also established the S. Rajaratnam Professorship in Strategic Studies (named after Singapore's first Foreign Minister) to bring distinguished scholars to participate in the work of the Institute. Previous holders of the Chair include Professors Stephen Walt (Harvard University), Jack Snyder (Columbia University), Wang Jisi (Chinese Academy of Social Sciences), Alastair Iain Johnston (Harvard University) and John Mearsheimer (University of Chicago). A Visiting Research Fellow Programme also enables overseas scholars to carry out related research in the Institute.

TEACHING

The Institute provides educational opportunities at an advanced level to professionals from both the private and public sectors in Singapore as well as overseas through graduate programmes, namely, the Master of Science in Strategic Studies, the Master of Science in International Relations and the Master of Science in International Political Economy. These programmes are conducted full-time and part-time by an international faculty. The Institute also has a Doctoral programme for research in these fields of study. In addition to these graduate programmes, the Institute also teaches various modules in courses conducted by the SAFTI Military Institute, SAF Warrant Officers' School, Civil Defence Academy, Singapore Technologies College, and the Defence and Home Affairs Ministries. The Institute also runs a one-semester course on "The International Relations of the Asia-Pacific" for undergraduates in NTU.

NETWORKING

The Institute convenes workshops, seminars and colloquia on aspects of international relations and security development that are of contemporary and historical significance. Highlights of the Institute's activities include a regular Colloquium on Strategic Trends in the 21st Century, the annual Asia Pacific Programme for Senior Military Officers (APPSMO) and the biennial Asia Pacific Security Conference (held in conjunction with Asian Aerospace). IDSS staff participate in Track II security dialogues and scholarly conferences in the Asia-Pacific. IDSS has contacts and collaborations with many international think tanks and research institutes throughout Asia, Europe and the United States. The Institute has also participated in research projects funded by the Ford Foundation and the Sasakawa Peace Foundation. It also serves as the Secretariat for the Council for Security Cooperation in the Asia-Pacific (CSCAP), Singapore. Through these activities, the Institute aims to develop and nurture a network of researchers whose collaborative efforts will yield new insights into security issues of interest to Singapore and the region.

