MacArthur Asia Security Initiative Dissemination Meeting on Non-Traditional Security (NTS) 21–22 November 2011

Organised by the RSIS Centre for Non-Traditional Security (NTS) Studies

Centre For Non-Traditional Security Studies

MACATHUR ASIA SECURITY INITIATIVE DISSEMINATION MEETING ON NON-TRADITIONAL SECURITY (NTS)

REPORT

ORGANISED BY
THE RSIS CENTRE FOR NON-TRADITIONAL SECURITY (NTS) STUDIES

FUNDED BY
THE ASIA SECURITY INITIATIVE, THE MACARTHUR FOUNDATION
AND
THE AUSTRALIA RESPONSIBILITY TO PROTECT FUND

21–22 November 2011
SINGAPORE

S. RAJARATNAM SCHOOL OF INTERNATIONAL STUDIES
NANYANG TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY
2011

Recommended citation:
RSIS Centre for Non-Traditional Security (NTS) Studies, 2011, *MacArthur Asia Security Initiative Dissemination Meeting on Non-Traditional Security (NTS) (21–22 November 2011)*, Report, Singapore.

Photo credits:
Cover (from top to bottom, all from flickr): chascar, petitpor, Bikoy.

This report summarises the proceedings of the Meeting as interpreted by the rapporteurs and editors of the RSIS Centre for NTS Studies. Participants neither reviewed nor approved of this report. This meeting report adheres to a variation of the Chatham House Rule. Accordingly, beyond the speakers and paper presenters cited, no attributions have been made.

This publication is also available online at:
www.rsis.edu.sg/nts
Alternatively, access the website using the QR Code on the left.

Table of Contents

About the MacArthur Asia Security Initiative Dissemination Meeting 2011

The MacArthur Asia Security Initiative Dissemination Meeting 2011 showcased the work and research outcomes of the MacArthur Asia Security Initiative projects conducted from 2009 to 2011 by two centres at the S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS) – the RSIS Centre for Non-Traditional Security (NTS) Studies and the RSIS Centre for Multilateralism Studies (CMS).

While the two centres conducted projects on NTS issues and regional security cooperation in their respective research clusters, it came to be apparent that these research areas are increasingly complementary. Many of the findings from the research conducted by the RSIS Centre for NTS Studies demonstrate the significance of multilateral institutions in addressing transnational issues such as disaster management, climate change, energy security, and internal and cross-border conflict. This report focuses on the various research projects conducted under the RSIS Centre for NTS Studies.

Executive Summary

Over the last three years, the Centre for Non-Traditional Security (NTS) Studies at the S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS) coordinated cluster three of the MacArthur Asia Security Initiative, which focused on internal challenges in Asia. The Centre developed an active research agenda that drew on its own resources as well as that of its network partners around the region to deliver policy-relevant outputs. The research addressed many of the most pressing challenges faced by Asia's policymaking communities, from climate change, natural disasters, and energy, to internal and cross-border conflict.

The Centre's research identified a broader and more inclusive understanding of security that sought to open up policymaking to different perspectives. However, there has been a re-emergence of interest in traditional security issues in recent years, even though NTS issues are increasingly prevalent in the Asia-Pacific. This shift illustrates the necessity of continuing to further evidence-based and policy-relevant research to ensure that policy gaps in responding to NTS challenges are effectively addressed.

Climate Change, Environmental Security and Natural Disasters

Over the last three years, the research project on Climate Change, Environmental Security and Natural Disasters focused on a plethora of emerging threats while also illuminating the human resilience of affected communities in the region. Two salient issues that were raised included the role of gender, and the nexus between climate change and migration. Both topics were further developed based on existing knowledge of complex NTS threats in Asia. In doing so, issues relating to the vulnerabilities and resilience of communities in the face of disasters were examined in greater depth. Such perspectives provided an alternative to the doomsday scenarios prevalent in climate change discourse, which often create dystopian images of security risks and threats without giving appropriate credence to the welfare and standing of those most vulnerable to climate change.

Energy and Human Security

Indeed, throughout the three-year initiative, a running theme was the recognition of community resilience in response to the multitude of modern NTS challenges. One of the primary research findings of the research project on Energy and Human Security was that communities and non-state actors can add significant value by influencing the decision-making process as states strive to address energy vulnerability – a key concern in East Asia which is home to net energy-importing countries.

The research findings suggest that there is rising demand from countries for energy but this need not lead to zero-sum games and that efficiency of energy consumption might prove to be as or more important than securing access to more resources. The research highlighted that both state and non-state actors continue to face the challenge of collectively addressing energy supply issues due to limited political and economic integration and openness in the region.

One stream of the research focused on the development of nuclear energy for civilian purposes, which was largely seen as an attractive way to increase local energy supply in the region up until the 2011 Fukushima accident in Japan. Subsequently, the policy debate over nuclear power was rekindled with Japan suspending its nuclear energy plants. Many states in the region do however still see nuclear power playing an important part in their future energy mix. Issues related to plant safety were not the only nuclear policy challenges identified by the research. The ongoing tensions, both in East Asia with the potential development of nuclear weapons in North Korea, and the long-term political stresses in South Asia, illustrate the more geostrategic NTS threats in Asia.

Internal and Cross-border Conflict

While the development of nuclear weapons concerns security policymakers worldwide, the more localised ongoing civil unrest in South and Southeast Asia continues

to stifle democratic consolidation and economic development within the two subregions. Ongoing internal conflicts in Myanmar, Thailand, Indonesia and the Philippines, and the cross-border conflict between Thailand and Cambodia, attest to the need for policy preparations and policy solutions in Southeast Asia.

The Internal and Cross-border Conflict research project highlighted the development of a regional human rights body – the ASEAN Intergovernmental Commission on Human Rights – and the broader ASEAN Political-Security Community. These institutional developments provide the arenas through which more substantive progress can be made to address the root causes and human consequences of the conflicts at the regional level. One key theme has been to document the varying levels of policy traction that the Responsibility to Protect norm generates in Asia. On the one hand, Asian states are notable contributors to UN peace operations, yet there remain many instances of human rights abuses within the region, illustrating the limited progress of security sector reform in Southeast Asia.

The Centre remains committed to mainstreaming NTS in the policy arena, and these efforts have thus far been fruitful as a conduit for engaging policy circles such as those found in ASEAN. However, there remains much work to be done to ensure that policies implemented ultimately also benefit the marginalised and vulnerable sections of society. To this end, given the complexities and nuances inherent in NTS issues, it is vital that the institutions involved in shaping the regional security architecture are broadened and that their interaction with communities and individuals is strengthened. Such consultative and collaborative relationships will be essential for promoting responses to Asia's NTS challenges that are judicious, as well as have the clarity of purpose and the capacities needed for success.

Non-Traditional Security in Asia: Key Issues

The past three years have witnessed the continuation of dynamic growth and social change in Asia alongside a series of environmental disasters, pervasive political tensions and multifarious challenges to stability and human well-being, as well as a seemingly intractable global financial crisis. During this time, the Centre for Non-Traditional (NTS) Studies at the S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS) led the MacArthur Asia Security Initiative research cluster three on internal challenges in Asia and pursued objectives that included fostering creative and innovative analysis on multilevel governance; strengthening research on issues such as climate change and energy security with scientific empirically based findings; exploring how the voices of the marginalised, the displaced, and the insecure could claim more attention and inform policymaking; arriving at a common language to inform policy- and decision-making; broadening the community of individuals and institutions involved in shaping the regional security architectures; and providing a platform to connect researchers, policy analysts, practitioners, corporate actors and civil society organisations. NTS thus looks at an entire gamut of security threats – including those stemming from civil unrest, climate change, resource scarcity, infectious diseases, natural disasters, irregular migration, food shortages and complex combinations of multiple dynamics – to ensure that the survival and well-being of people is not lost in larger security discourses.

The three core programmes of the RSIS Centre for NTS Studies – Climate Change, Environmental Security and Natural Disasters; Energy and Human Security; Internal and Cross-border Conflict – have sought to address pertinent NTS challenges in Asia. The Climate Change, Environmental Security and Natural Disasters Programme led by Professor Lorraine Elliott of the Australian National University has investigated the nature of social and human vulnerability and resilience, and also examined state interactions and the role of regional institutions in developing an effective approach to climate and environmental security and disaster management. To this end, the programme has critically explored issues of gender and environmental management, connections between climate change, human security and migration, and difficult land and water use issues that have arisen throughout the economically dynamic Asian region. All of these issues are exacerbated by the presence of a multitude of stakeholders, many with potentially conflicting positions and unique abilities to influence the future environmental trajectory of the region. Much is at stake here, as environmental stresses threaten to undermine development goals in areas throughout Asia, and the region's socioeconomic future is intricately linked to the future viability and health of its key environmental systems.

The Centre's Energy and Human Security Programme, led by Dr Rajesh Basrur and Professor Zha Daojiong, examined the future of nuclear energy and governance in Southeast Asia, and energy vulnerability and collaboration in East Asia. Often, energy security is discussed within a geopolitical context. The programme however employed the human security paradigm which stresses not just availability, consistency of supply, and non-discriminatory access to energy but also considers other factors such as environmental and security risks. The need for such considerations was emotively brought to the international forefront by the 2011 Fukushima nuclear accident in Japan. The Fukushima crisis demonstrated the need for careful assessments of the costs and benefits of nuclear energy strategies and held many lessons for developing Asian economies. There are currently no operational nuclear plants in Southeast Asia. The same however cannot be said of East and South Asia where geopolitical fragilities coupled with growing nuclear arsenals raise the spectre of nuclear conflicts in the future.

Asia is also home to ongoing militarised unrest which continues to stifle democratic consolidation and economic development. Ongoing internal conflicts in Myanmar, Thailand, Indonesia and the Philippines, and the cross-border conflict between Thailand and Cambodia, attest to the need for policy preparations and policy solutions across the region. Through the Internal and Cross-border Conflict Programme, the RSIS Centre for NTS Studies has sought to unpack the challenges to peaceful conflict resolution in the region.

The Centre's Internal and Cross-border Conflict Programme has, in collaboration with the Centre for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) in Indonesia and the Institute for Strategic and Development Studies (ISDS) in the Philippines, engaged in projects that examine the state of security sector reforms and that provide an assessment of internal conflicts in Southeast Asia.

In addition to these two core streams, the Centre also designed and implemented a project to assess and map the policy traction that the Responsibility to Protect norm has in Asia. The research has produced policy recommendations to help governments to further dialogues, pursue national reconciliation and promote the peaceful resolution of conflicts. The Centre argued that without an inclusive, systematic and evidence-based approach to assess the relationship between various parties to conflicts, the opportunities for a sustainable peace will be compromised.

The Centre (and the internal challenges cluster of the MacArthur Asia Security Initiative) has facilitated the development of the necessary capacity to respond to the myriad and interconnected challenges faced by governments and civil society both in Singapore and the wider region. In particular, it has engaged with the policymaking process at both the national and regional levels in Asia through track one and track two avenues, such as with government officials from across Asia, the ASEAN Secretariat and the Council for Security Cooperation in the Asia Pacific (CSCAP). As the secretariat of the Consortium of Non-Traditional Security Studies in Asia (NTS-Asia), it has disseminated its research, and provided sustainable and multilateral avenues through which to engage with NTS issues. Through these engagements, the Centre has contributed to the building of bridges across the gap between evidence-based research and contemporary NTS challenges.

Keynote Address: Non-Traditional Security – Three Frames of Analysis

Professor Ramesh Thakur
Former Senior Vice-Rector, United Nations University;
Former Assistant Secretary-General, United Nations; and
Director, Centre for Nuclear Nonproliferation and Disarmament,
Asia-Pacific College of Diplomacy,
The Australian National University
Australia

The 21st century has seen pronounced shifts in the international security paradigm. Prior to 11 September 2001, the US was at the peak of its unipolar power. It had seen off the Soviet Union as a military rival, shifted aside the ideological challenge of communism, and seemingly confined the command model of economic growth to the dustbin of history. In absolute terms, the US was the most powerful actor ever in history. In relative terms, only the Roman Empire could compare to its total and unchallengeable dominance over all other actors in the international system of its age. However, it only took small teams of hijackers to change all that. Their actions killed almost 3,000 people.

The last time so many people had been killed in one attack in the US was at Pearl Harbour in 1941. That attack was the archetype of the traditional security paradigm, state on state. The US response then was also totally traditional – an all-out war that ended in the defeat and occupation of the enemy state.

On 11 September, the attackers were not uniformed soldiers. Their number was fewer than 20. Their weapons were box-cutters. The delivery systems and bombs were civilian aircrafts. Their targets were the symbolic headquarters of US capitalism and military power; and the response they provoked was a mixture of traditional military attacks, unconventional counter-insurgency, and non-traditional nation-building.

A decade later, the US still remained the world's foremost power and guarantor of trans-Atlantic, trans-Pacific, and trans-American security order. However, Iraq and Afghanistan had exposed the limits of US power. Its dwindling military muscle, financial frailty and political dysfunctionality have led others to be less fearful of superior Western powers. Meanwhile, the financial tribulations in the West have also eroded confidence in the 'Washington Consensus' on economic growth.

As such, there is an increasing appreciation of the myriad threats – traditional and non-traditional – faced by states and societies. One of the most authoritative accounts of contemporary security in recent decades, a 2004 report by the UN Secretary-General's High-level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change, argued that no country can afford to deal with today's threats alone and no threats can be dealt with effectively unless other threats are addressed simultaneously. The report identified the major threats as war and violence among and within states, the use and proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, terrorism, transnational organised crime, poverty, infectious diseases and environmental degradation. In other words, the security discourse has moved beyond the protection of states and territorial integrity, political independence, and sovereignty, to embrace such issues as the plight of children in armed conflict, gender violence, ethnic cleansing, genocide, terrorism, piracy, trafficking (in arms, narcotics, and people), the spread of infectious diseases, environmental degradation, food security, global warming, cyber security and financial instability in world markets.

These non-traditional threats do not fit neatly into the traditional security paradigm of pressures on the state and defence organised around territorial borders. As such, they are not given the same level of importance as traditional security concerns and there is a lack of commensurate resources allocated to confront them. However, if not addressed in time, these threats could also seriously damage a state's stability and security.

The Asia-Pacific countries must therefore not ignore NTS issues even as there is a renewed interest in traditional and familiar security concerns such as the threat posed by a nuclear-armed North Korea or the maritime assertiveness of a fast-rising China. Doing so would not only come at the expense of vulnerable peoples throughout the region, but would also undermine the foundations upon which future peace, stability and progress must rest.

Session 1: Climate Change, Environmental Security and Natural Disasters

The considerable environmental challenges confronting Southeast Asia in the face of climate change are widely reported. The Climate Change, Environmental Security and Natural Disasters research project of the MacArthur Asia Security Initiative developed and improved knowledge on the complex non-traditional security (NTS) issues related to climate change impacts. This session outlined the context, approach and findings of the research project, and explored two key themes in the work: approaches to gender issues in climate change debates, and the conceptualisation of climate change as a cause of migration.

Rethinking Climate Security from an NTS Perspective

The MacArthur Asia Security Initiative's Climate Change, Environmental Security and Natural Disasters research project undertook three years of research exploring climate security in the Asia-Pacific region, and in doing so explored the plight of some of the people and countries that are most vulnerable to the impacts of climate change. Taking an NTS approach, the project offered an alternative understanding of climate security that goes beyond that found in more traditional security literature, in which climate change is generally presented only as a threat multiplier. The first year of the project focused on social resilience as a security strategy, exploring how human insecurities and human security responses could be conceptualised in the context of NTS, while the second and third years focused on food security and climate change-induced migration respectively.

Given that it is no longer feasible to rely on mitigation strategies alone in addressing climate change, a key human security imperative is to reduce vulnerability and build social resilience by strengthening the ability of communities to cope with and adapt to significant external stresses and disturbances. The research undertaken under this project has confirmed that adaptive capacity is low in many parts of the Asia-Pacific region. Further, the barriers and limits to, costs of, and effectiveness of, adaptation strategies are not yet well understood. There is, therefore, a need for governments, civil society, the private sector and research institutions to generate better understandings of adaptation in order to reduce human insecurities and the potential for climate-related instability.

The research generated several key findings in relation to the principles that should inform climate security policy. Regional climate security frameworks need to be people-centred, and to focus on identifying who the climate insecure are and what climate insecurity means to them. Policy frameworks and actions also need to be formulated through engagement with local communities, and be responsive to their specific vulnerabilities and security needs. Bottom-up strategies and institutions that are inclusive, transparent and accountable are required. Equity concerns should be considered at the local and national levels, including those relating to gender difference, the geography of urban and rural communities, and the impact of poverty on adaptation and resilience choices. Climate security strategies that do not consider such principles risk undermining rather than enhancing social resilience, and exacerbating poverty and vulnerability.

In relation to climate security policy, current knowledge-development programmes tend to assume positive covariance in adaptation choices within affected communities. The project's research on local communities has revealed that individuals and households may pursue adaptation choices idiosyncratically, even within a locality in which climate change impacts are experienced similarly. Knowledge development therefore requires more reliable and compatible primary data to challenge existing assumptions.

The project's research on policy platforms has indicated that regional climate security arrangements are not always able to function as partnerships in innovation, often remaining disaggregated and disconnected. This results in regional efforts on climate security being characterised by duplication and overlap in addition to policy incoherence and fragmentation. Finally, the research has highlighted that governments need to place greater priority on finding agreement on regional

priorities for managing climate change insecurities, and on identifying national and regional lead agencies and local partners that can develop and manage protection and adaptation frameworks.

The Gender and Climate Debate: More of the Same, or New Ways of Thinking and Doing?

Gender typically had low visibility in early international climate change policy and practice, and although it is growing in prominence, current debates often continue to utilise outdated gender rhetoric from the 1990s. There were three key reasons for limited gender visibility in initial international climate agreements: the transboundary nature of climate issues, the urgency and immediacy of coalition-building around the US, and the focus on the technical aspects of climate change ahead of social issues. At the 2005 UN Climate Change Conference in Montreal, a 'gender agenda' discourse emerged. However advocates highlighted that the approach reflected problematic assumptions related to storylines that had long been central to the gender and climate change debate.

Key ongoing storylines, such as that of Women, Environment and Development (WED), take as their starting point the notion that vulnerable people, particularly women, are most at risk from climate change impacts. They also advocate that women are powerful agents of change, and that their full participation is critical to adaptation and mitigation policies and programmes. However, several problematic and universalist assumptions often shape how these storylines are applied to policy and development strategies. For example, the environment is added to the list of women's caring roles (for which they are not paid), and many of the assumptions do not match the ground realities or the nuances arising from the intersection of class, ethnicity and age. Furthermore, men are often rendered absent in gender and climate analysis, with many assumptions privileging women's knowledge of the environment from a position of subordinate obligation and power configurations.

The concept of vulnerability unpacks these assumptions. Vulnerability is defined here not as a fixed characteristic but as being indicative of historical practices that are dynamic and fluid. Therefore, instead of addressing gender issues (as they relate to climate) based on fixed roles and simplifications, the norms and practices that make people vulnerable to climate change impacts must be further investigated.

Case studies in Cambodia and Vietnam demonstrate that men and women may respond to environmental challenges simultaneously, separately, jointly and/or differently, and that gender roles and identities are dynamic rather than fixed. In Cambodia, farmers are adapting to rice shortfalls resulting from changes in weather with additional labour primarily in gender-specific roles, with male farmers adapting by cutting trees and clearing firewood, and women clearing bush in plantations, planting maize and making rice wine. Despite this split into seemingly traditional roles, wives are challenging local cultural and gender norms by urging their husbands to trade by selling trees. In Vietnam, fishing communities are adapting to the disappearance of fishing resources due to rising sea levels. Women, boys and girls collect seafood from government-controlled mudflats for household consumption to supplement food supplies. As fish resources become scarcer and tenurial rights tighten, women face increasingly less access to this supply.

In terms of policy implications, it should first be considered that the centred feminine subject of the current climate debate does not match gendered realities on the ground. It is, therefore, more useful to address the drivers of vulnerability. Furthermore, policies must focus on the practices that materialise the marginalisation, difference and insecurities of vulnerable groups including women, instead of the creation of programmes that rely on women's participation in climate change adaptation at the expense of the exclusion of men.

Contextualising Climate as a Cause of Migration in Southeast Asia

Throughout history, humans have sought progress by adapting to, exploiting and taking advantage of new environments and places. Humankind's ability to do so has reached a new level in recent centuries as a result of advancements in various fields, and this progress has opened up new capacities to respond to escalating anthropogenic and natural environmental challenges. As climatic changes amplify in the 21st century, the implications of the related environmental threats for social systems, communities and individuals will be multifarious and lead to a range of social responses. One such response, seen during past instances of environmental change, will be population movements. Given the climate vulnerabilities in many areas of Southeast Asia, it is salient to rigorously question the ways in which climate change might affect regional migration dynamics.

Environmental challenges facing the region include shifting precipitation patterns, increased instances of drought and floods, reduced water availability, and the increased frequency and power of storms, all of which lead to varying degrees of vulnerability. The scale of vulnerability depends upon the degree to which a system is susceptible and unable to cope with the adverse consequences of climate change. The most acute climate impacts will be faced by developing countries, which often have high vulnerability, low adaptive capacity and livelihoods closely tied to natural resources. At the individual level, human ingenuity in adapting to climate change is evident; therefore, it would be remiss to talk about developing countries being completely unable to cope. However, evidence suggests that climatic and environmental changes can in some cases contribute strongly to decisions to migrate.

Migration as a result of climate change has been the subject of dire predictions, with some political leaders and academics foreseeing population movements on an unprecedented scale and anticipating significant implications for receiving communities. The assumptions that lead to these predictions should be questioned and potential scenarios should be evaluated on a contextualised and case-by-case basis. It should also be considered that migration is not undertaken lightly, nor does it typically result from relatively direct causal pathways.

A nuanced approach to analysing climate change and migration would take into consideration both natural and social contexts. Natural contexts include climatic changes, propensity for storms, forest cover, watershed characteristics, rainfall variability and coastline proximity, while social contexts include anthropogenic environmental changes, infrastructure characteristics, adaptive capacities and adaptive choices. These factors contribute to vulnerability calculations to varying degrees, and by extension may lead to the possibility of migration.

Moreover, the population movements that do stem, at least in part, from climate change will occur within the larger regional migration pattern. Urbanisation is occurring on an unprecedented scale in Southeast Asia, and megacities and smaller urban areas are expected to grow significantly in coming decades. The push-and-pull factors associated with urbanisation trends are playing a key role in defining migratory patterns in the region. However, linear analyses of climate change-induced migration within the context of urbanisation are not adequate given the complex interplay of these factors, and given that choices are fundamentally made at the individual and household level.

In conclusion, climate change will continue to be a relevant causal factor underpinning migration in Southeast Asia, but it will in most cases be only one among a range of factors compelling people to migrate. The ways in which migration takes place will vary with individual cases, as will the attendant security implications. Contemporary trends and future projections suggest that cities will be the primary destinations, creating a host of challenges as well as opportunities.

Discussion

Highlighting the plight of women in climate-change policy planning – while at the same time avoiding the exclusion of men – presents a challenge that could only be effectively addressed by taking a multidimensional approach that does not take as its starting point the notion that women are the primary agents of change. Instead, the different drivers of vulnerability must be taken into account, and social and institutional practices should be analysed and addressed. From an advocacy standpoint, there have been initiatives related to the environment from women's organisations, but the environment has not yet become a mainstream issue within feminist movements. It would be useful for these actors to question the conditions that allow for women to act as agents. Furthermore, they should avoid counter-productive strategies that focus on women being given representation in policies and programmes yet reflect assumptions of fixed gender roles.

In the international climate regime, the idea that the global North is being 'threatened' by climatic changes in the global South should be discussed as such a discourse has significant implications. When adaptation is on the negotiating agenda in forums such as the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), developing countries often argue that there is a loss of focus on who is affected most. Even within Asian regional forums and climate security literature, there are poor methodological approaches that begin with erroneous assumptions about vulnerability and movements. For example, there is a drive to find vulnerability hot spots and broad trends, but this does not reflect the reality that adaptation choices are idiosyncratic. The methodology behind traditional climate security approaches is also often based on information that is flawed, such as projected climate-change migration numbers.

Analyses of people movements in response to climate change require consideration of a combination of push-and-pull factors. The outcomes of such analyses will vary given that it is difficult to assert that climate change is more than just one part of the decision to migrate. There will be cases in which environmental change is the defining factor in decisions to move, particularly in areas such as the Pacific small island states; but throughout Southeast Asia, it is likely that climate will represent only part of a complex milieu of forces compelling population movements. It will be a significant challenge to delineate the factors that play formative roles in these complex cases, particularly with urbanisation trends thrown into the mix, and this has implications for policies that seek to address connections between climate change and migration.

Although there will be some movement across borders, much of Asia's population movement will be domestic. This could to a certain extent ease the management of potential social and economic stressors in receiving areas. However, communities will still find themselves in unplanned living situations. The best approach is for institutions, particularly those in urban areas, to plan and prepare for the potential migrants, taking both a top-down and bottom-up approach. Funding for adaptation generated through both public and private channels should be directed towards improving the capacity of institutions to deal with multiple stressors.

Strong legal frameworks and structures will be required to address climate adaptation. These are being conceptualised by researchers and developed at regional and international climate change policy forums, an example being the Cancun Adaptation Framework outlined in paragraph 14(f) of the Cancun Agreements. There is currently no platform specifically addressing climate-related migration. Stakeholders developing policy frameworks for dealing with migration in response to climate change would need to ensure that the frameworks are not fragmented and incoherent, particularly at the regional level. Those most vulnerable to climate change impacts must be placed at the centre of such frameworks, and a nuanced and contextualised understanding of vulnerabilities must be incorporated into them.

Session 2: Energy and Human Security

With the growing demand for energy resources to sustain economic development amid limited sources of supply, energy security has emerged as a high priority for many countries. However, what is often not given enough attention are the wider non-traditional security (NTS) implications at the subregional, national and local level. The Energy and Human Security research project of the MacArthur Asia Security Initiative examined the varying perspectives and debates in the energy security discourse in Asia under two research themes: nuclear power and energy security in Asia, and managing energy vulnerabilities in East Asia.

Nuclear Power and Energy Security in Asia: Critical Debates

During the Cold War, much of the world was preoccupied with the military use of nuclear weapons while giving comparatively less attention to the civilian use of nuclear power to address energy security concerns. However, in light of the rising cost of fossil fuels, and despite the Chernobyl nuclear power plant disaster and the Three Mile Island accident, there has been growing interest in nuclear power as a means of ensuring energy security. Earlier this year, the Fukushima accident rekindled the debate around the development of nuclear technology for civilian purposes. This debate has proven to be particularly salient for the future of energy strategies in Asia.

The research project undertaken by the Energy and Human Security Programme explored the state of the debate on nuclear energy and evaluated the arguments. The debates seem to be strongly focused on the economic and financial dimensions of nuclear energy projects. In particular, policymakers continue to discuss such projects in terms of economic costs and benefits. The programme has strived to go beyond these areas to explore the issue from a broader perspective that includes environmental, security and social considerations.

The primary research finding was that the issues raised by nuclear energy are far from simple. At times, both supporters and opponents use the same data to justify contrasting positions, and this is particularly evident in the various assessments of the economic costs of nuclear power projects. For instance, the data on nuclear incidents might be presented as evidence of the relative safety of nuclear power, or as proof of its inherent danger.

Another significant finding of the research project relates to the actual and potential roles of civil society in the debates on nuclear power and energy security. The researchers involved in the project have examined the extent to which civil society organisations (CSOs) have been able to transform the energy policymaking landscape so that stakeholders affected by a state's policies are recognised and provided with avenues for involvement. The research has shown CSOs playing a significant role, due to three reasons. First, CSOs share several fundamental features despite their diversity: the provision of basic needs not forthcoming from the state, the protection of human rights, and involvement in advocacy for institutional reforms to improve governance. Concerns related to nuclear energy, such as the health of nuclear plant workers, safety and environmental pollution, would fall under these features. Second, CSOs could serve as credible alternative actors with the capacity to propose viable policy ideas and frameworks. Research in Southeast Asia has demonstrated that, despite what is commonly believed, not all CSOs are against the use of nuclear energy. In the case of Indonesia, nuclear proponents count among their members former civil servants with the advantage of prior (energy) policymaking experience and insights. The existence of multiple perspectives on nuclear energy within civil society itself means that there is access to a comprehensive understanding of nuclear energy within the public sphere, leading to a more substantive quality of debate from civil societies. Third, CSOs in Southeast Asia have demonstrated their ability to be more organised and strategic in intra- and inter-state relations with counterpart institutions.

The last point also highlights the importance of cooperation across different levels of governance and different sectors of government. Such cooperation allows for a more comprehensive approach towards addressing key nuclear energy issues such as the risk of accidents and the question of nuclear proliferation. Global dialogue could be particularly helpful here. It could, for instance, facilitate efforts to enhance international standards and norms on the use of nuclear energy. The researchers however noted that there are serious doubts as to whether a strong, collective international effort is plausible in light of the diverse and sometimes conflicting national interests at play – such dynamics have been evident in international negotiations on other socioeconomic concerns and global public goods, such as the environment. Regional cooperation may thus be a more effective means of bolstering inter-state cooperation and mutual understanding on nuclear energy, as regional neighbours have common traits and a basis of understanding to begin with.

In sum, the complexity of both nuclear power and energy security calls for looking at these from an expansive perspective. What must be acknowledged is that while international cooperation in energy matters seems necessary, every country faces a different demographic, economic, political, security and sociocultural context. Thus, no single energy mix applies to every country's needs. What is more, the question of whether or not to pursue nuclear energy projects is not simply one of practicality or cost-effectiveness, but one that also concerns issues of safety, morality and quality of life.

Managing Energy Vulnerabilities in East Asia

The research on managing energy vulnerabilities in East Asia recognised that there are multiple dimensions to the debates on energy security both in Asia and elsewhere. Yet, the dominant strand in the debates has narrowly focused on the factors related to the demand for energy resources, and thus the potential for not only intensified competition, but also increased geopolitical challenges. This also means that the issue of energy supply and transportation is often seen through the prism of naval capabilities. These assumptions lend themselves to more critical analyses that focus more directly on energy vulnerabilities. The research findings suggest that rising demand for energy need not mean zero-sum games and that efficiency of energy consumption might prove to be as or more important than securing access to more resources.

Looking at the vulnerability aspect of energy security could be particularly useful in the context of East Asia as most countries in the region are net energy importers. Furthermore, East Asian countries have only limited levels of political and economic integration, and hence a limited capacity to collectively address the problems of energy supply. This led to much discussion among project participants on the prospects of enhancing regional cooperation in East Asia. Specifically, the research project explored energy vulnerabilities in relation to energy pricing mechanisms, oil and gas issues, maritime threats to energy transportation, and infrastructure projects (such as pipelines).

In sum, the research findings suggested that while the traditional perspective on energy security – ensuring the security of energy supply – is not necessarily wrong, there is both room and need for questioning some of the assumptions underlying such a view. It was argued that the traditional approach, with its focus on competition for energy resources, would only be able to make limited contributions to easing existing tensions surrounding energy trade across nation-state boundaries. It is thus important to look at how countries and societies in East Asia have managed to pursue cooperation.

Enhancing Regional Cooperation in Fighting Piracy and Sea Robbery

One research stream under the theme of managing energy vulnerabilities in East Asia looked at ways of ensuring efficiency and safety in transporting energy resources. The safety of maritime trading routes is crucial to global energy security and has in recent years received

substantial attention from governments and business circles. Addressing the problem of piracy and armed robbery is one aspect of ensuring safety along such routes.

The end of the Cold War saw a surge in cases of piracy and armed robbery against ships in various parts of the globe, but most prominently in Africa and Southeast Asia. While piracy remains most serious off the eastern coast of Africa, it is Southeast Asia that has become the theatre of relatively strong regional and multilateral efforts to tackle the issue. This can be explained by the fact that, unlike in East Africa, regional governments currently have the political will and potential capacity to address this issue.

One of the most prominent multilateral initiatives to address the threat of piracy and sea robbery has been the establishment of the Regional Cooperation Agreement on Combating Piracy and Armed Robbery against Ships in Asia (ReCAAP) in 2004. Most maritime East and Southeast Asian countries are parties to the ReCAAP, as are a small number of other states that are particularly concerned about the safety of maritime routes (Denmark, Netherlands, Norway). In accordance with the agreement, an information sharing centre was launched in 2006. The centre is the first intergovernmental anti-piracy effort in the region.

The ReCAAP's three main pillars are information sharing, capacity building and cooperative agreements. Under the ReCAAP, the struggle against maritime threats must follow the principles of respect for sovereignty, transparency and effectiveness. The ReCAAP would help to bridge gaps in operational activities by leveraging different institutional strengths, to enhance cooperative measures in areas of mutual interest through providing a conduit for communications, and to shorten learning curves through the sharing of best practices. The ReCAAP has reportedly been able to demonstrate these capabilities in the case of several incidents of piracy in the Asian region. Indeed, the piracy and sea robbery situation seems to have improved. However, it is difficult to tell what part of the improvement is due to the ReCAAP.

While the ReCAAP is an impressive effort to establish multilateral cooperation in matters of maritime safety, it nevertheless faces various challenges. The main problems include limited resources, and problems reconciling the views of the various stakeholders, given that they have different interests and perceptions when it comes to maritime trade and security. That said, such a regional collaborative effort has nevertheless been an important step in enhancing maritime security. Moreover, given calls to increase trade among East Asian countries, it would be in the interest of states to further enhance the capabilities of the ReCAAP for their own security.

Energy Outlook of East Asia and Challenges for Sustainable Development

East Asia's demand for energy in all forms is rapidly growing and it is already one of the world's most important markets for energy. While the general characteristic of East Asia is that its demand for energy exceeds its potential supply of energy resources, the region is far from unified in needs and policies, and different countries play different roles in the energy market. For instance, Japan and Korea import virtually all of their fossil fuels. Southeast Asia as a whole is a net exporter of natural gas, yet this is likely to change soon as the demand for this commodity is growing rapidly in that region. China has moved from being one of the leading exporters of coal to becoming a net importer. Meanwhile, Indonesia has become a major coal exporter.

The earthquake and the ensuing tsunami that affected Japan in March 2011 was one of the worst disasters of its kind. It not only caused significant damage to Japan's infrastructure, but when it resulted in the Fukushima accident, it also significantly altered the energy outlook for Japan and the wider region.

Following Fukushima, the public in Japan and elsewhere expressed serious concerns about the safety of nuclear power plants. These concerns led to reviews of existing plants and nuclear projects under development, and in

the case of Japan, they resulted in the gradual halt of nuclear plants' operations. It is clear that this will lead to a significant increase in the demand for fossil fuels, and oil in particular. Japan had experienced problems ensuring adequate energy supply during the oil crises of the late 1970s. In response, Japan had implemented an ambitious energy conservation programme, which, together with nuclear energy and the diversification of suppliers, had helped it to achieve oil security. With the closing down of nuclear plants, Tokyo might again find it difficult to meet its current and future energy demands.

Carbon dioxide emissions in East Asia are likely to increase in the foreseeable future, especially with China's industrial rise and its use of fossil fuels. Japan's experience in energy conservation could be useful here, and indeed, in 2000, China and Japan established the Japan-China Energy Conservation Forum, which is becoming a model for international cooperation in the field. From the supply side, however, nuclear power is, in general, seen as a major option for mitigating emissions. From this perspective, the Fukushima accident might have serious negative implications for efforts to deal with the rising level of emissions.

The uncertain future of the nuclear power industry and rising oil prices might mean the increasing significance of natural gas as an energy resource in the region. Nevertheless, it is likely that fossil fuels will continue to dominate regional energy markets in coming years. Against this background, the smart and efficient use of hydrocarbons together with the adoption of new technologies would be key to sustainable development and at least partial mitigation of emissions.

Discussion

While not specifically addressing human security, the goal of the research on nuclear energy has been to present diverse perspectives and arguments. The focus was not on any specific argument or theoretical perspective on the issue, but rather a broadening of the discourse. The debates on nuclear energy should take into account the possible negative geopolitical consequences of the spread of the technology, such as the concern that it could facilitate nuclear weapons proliferation.

The use of nuclear energy is not simply a technical issue. It also presents a moral dilemma, as it involves forcing future generations to guard the by-product of a technology they may not approve of or use. The issue of nuclear waste is one such example. Given the moral dimension of nuclear energy, there have been instances – such as in Indonesia – where religious leaders have been directly involved in the debates on nuclear power projects. There is a need for civil society to be even more engaged in these debates. Their involvement would bring the moral and human security dimensions into the discussion.

While there has been a global push towards the use of alternative energy resources, there is still a strong reliance on traditional sources of energy. On the one hand, energy experts attribute it to the high costs of renewable energy sources, vis-à-vis cheaper fossil fuels such as coal. On the other hand, it could be suggested that the continued reliance on traditional energy resources stems from a lack of emphasis on issues of safety and the long-term sustainability of nuclear energy. Such has been the case in Japan. The country is looking into offshore oil exploration to make up for its reduced supply of nuclear energy after the Fukushima disaster.

The reliance on fossil fuels makes it even more imperative that NTS concerns related to their use are highlighted. Aside from the challenge of carbon emissions, issues such as environmental pollution and worker safety remain a feature of many coal mines and offshore rigs. For instance, the numerous coal mine explosions in China and the 2010 Gulf of Mexico disaster have implications for generations to come. Moreover, while energy demand continues to increase in the name of economic development, there are still many communities that are energy poor. It is therefore necessary to address issues of energy poverty as a means of enhancing the human development of marginalised communities, an aspect of energy security not often addressed by conventional models of development.

Session 3: Multilevel Approaches to Conflict Management and Resolution

Internal conflicts pose a major challenge to human security in many Southeast Asian countries. To achieve a sustainable peace, it is necessary to address the root causes of the conflicts. This requires multiple levels of cooperation at the local, national, regional and global levels, as well as efforts to engage all stakeholders. To identify these stakeholders, particularly the key actors involved in a particular conflict, people-centred approaches are essential. In examining the avenues for conflict resolution, the research project on Internal and Cross-border Conflict focused on three key themes, which address the mechanics of the effort towards a sustainable peace in Asia: the Responsibility to Protect (RtoP) in Asia; security sector governance (SSG) and conflict management; and peace negotiations.

The Responsibility to Protect in Asia: Issues and Challenges

The RtoP is a set of principles based on the idea that sovereignty is a responsibility, not a privilege. Following a 2001 report by the International Commission on State Sovereignty and Intervention, and the inclusion of the RtoP in the 2005 World Summit Outcome Document, UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon introduced in 2009 a three-pillar strategy to further diffuse and implement the RtoP. Pillar one addresses the protection responsibilities of the state; pillar two, international assistance and capacity building; and pillar three, timely and decisive response.

One of the key difficulties in pursuing the RtoP in Asia arises from a narrow understanding of the third pillar as sanctioning military intervention. However, the implementation of pillar three includes other options, including the use of 'smart power' interventions and preventive diplomacy. While many Asian states contribute significantly to UN peace operations globally, examining these contributions and the RtoP more generally within an Asian context remains a challenge in policy circles.

In Asia, and in particular Southeast Asia, many states face many small but violently simmering internal conflicts, and these internal conflicts are notably framed as either ethnic-based, religious-based or a combination of both under the rubric of identity politics. The protection of civilians is therefore of paramount concern, and the RtoP norm potentially of great assistance. However, given the prevalence in the region of the notion of non-interference in the domestic affairs of another state, countries vary in their attitudes towards the RtoP.

Over the last two and a half years, the Centre for Non-Traditional Security (NTS) Studies at the S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS) has carried out research on the RtoP, mapping the different understandings of the emerging principle and identifying the general trends in its development within Asia. The research findings have provided some indication of the opportunities and challenges that could arise from the further development of the RtoP norm.

A key finding was that many in the region remain unaware of the RtoP; it remains an elite concept. Consequently, there is a pressing need to promote the RtoP to all stakeholders engaged in internal and cross-border conflicts, and to advance its implementation within the region. In addition, it is important to recognise that, within countries, overseas representatives and domestic officials differ in their opinions of the RtoP. As a result of the reluctance to fully embrace the RtoP and the existence of divergent understandings within countries, there is no state that is clearly identifiable as a champion of the norm. Therefore, promotion of the RtoP in the region falls to non-state actors. A further RtoP challenge is in its application, as the definition and scope of mass atrocities, notably what constitutes a crime against humanity, remains contested.

These constraints mean that it is important for track two organisations and civil society to focus on capacity building and awareness-raising through identifying current institutions and policies that complement the RtoP. While remaining reliant on the global RtoP network for support, non-state actors supportive of the RtoP need

to coordinate among themselves as well as provide a solid information network on conflicts in the region. Through such a network, a preventive early warning mechanism can emerge. Such a mechanism could also pinpoint conflicts that are of concern to the region.

The emergence of national and regional mechanisms, notably in Southeast Asia, provides potential added capacity to promote and work towards the protection of civilians. The ASEAN Intergovernmental Commission on Human Rights (AICHR) and the ASEAN Commission on the Promotion and Protection of the Rights of Women and Children (ACWC) are institutions through which awareness of these issues could be raised. The most notable institution is the AICHR, which has the ability to gather thematic reports on human rights issues from all stakeholders. While the RtoP in Asia is contested at present, there remain multiple avenues for building capacity, raising awareness and providing the necessary means to protect civilians within the three-pillar strategy.

Security Sector Governance and Conflict Management in Southeast Asia

Under this research theme, the relationship between SSG and conflict management was examined using five Southeast Asian cases which vary in political and social contexts. The five countries included three liberal democracies (Indonesia, Thailand and the Philippines), one illiberal democracy (Malaysia) and one non-democracy (Vietnam).

The research was premised on four assumptions; first, that peace and security in Southeast Asia is largely defined by how intra-state conflicts are managed; second, that ASEAN countries are committed to the transition towards democracy and that this commitment would expose existing cleavages within ASEAN societies; third, that the escalation of societal tensions into armed conflict is related to the state of SSG in a country; and fourth, that heavy-handed handling of social tensions could escalate a situation, and lead to armed conflict.

The security sector comprises institutions responsible for the protection of the state and its constituent communities. It includes the security forces themselves, such as the armed forces, the police and intelligence agencies, as well as those other institutions that create, implement and oversee internal and external security policy.

Good SSG is generally defined in terms of the presence and effectiveness of institutional mechanisms that ensure that the security sector is inclusive in its decision-making; impartial, coherent, efficient and effective in the performance of its mandated functions, and not corrupt; responsive to public demands and concerns; and accountable to the public it is supposed to serve. A well-governed security sector ensures that the incidence of human rights abuses committed by security forces in the name of national security is reduced. In societies where conflict conditions exist, this would go far towards mitigating the factors that created the conflict in the first place. It also provides mechanisms for ensuring that the conflict does not escalate because of actions undertaken by security forces or because of social injustices resulting from political actors' use of the security forces.

An interesting finding from the research was that democracy in itself does not guarantee good SSG. Among the five cases, Vietnam and Malaysia had been more effective in implementing SSG than the three liberal democracies. For instance, in the recent case of poor SSG, the Maguindanao massacre in the Philippines, the militia commanded by one local political clan committed mass killings, using weapons provided by the military.

However, the transparent nature of the democratic system provides societies with the right to scrutinise the security sector, which generates the pressure to reform. Well-designed SSG reform, which could be introduced in the form of military reform, is conducive to the de-escalation of social conflicts. The transition of Indonesia in the late 1990s illustrated this point. However, in non-liberal democracies, the imperative for reform is not strong because SSG is not submitted to societal scrutiny.

The research also showed that SSG and conflict management are fundamentally connected. The individual country cases illustrate that further in-depth study of the relationship between SSG and conflict management needs to be undertaken. It is also worth examining whether SSG can be directed from the regional level given the level of integration in Southeast Asia.

Ceasefires sans Peace Process in Myanmar: The Shan State Army, 1989–2011

Tensions between the central government and the ethnic nationalities in Myanmar existed prior to the country's independence in 1948 and largely continue today. In the history of the negotiations between the central government and the ethnic nationalities, there have been previous attempts at peace talks. However, several problems prevent the peace processes from producing meaningful results.

First, the government has framed its approach to resolving the ethnic conflicts in military rather than political terms. The ceasefire agreements signed in the 1990s were military or business agreements rather than peace treaties. Business interests have been, and continue to be, an important factor in shaping how a peace process evolves in the country. In Myanmar, many small armed groups do not have independent political agendas and are largely driven by money through such avenues as the narcotics business. Likewise, the operations of government troops in the ethnic areas are also sometimes motivated by financial considerations. An example of this is the skirmishes between government troops and the Kachin Independence Army (KIA) in the areas along the Manmaw-Kai Htik-Nam Hkam road. This area connects Kachin State, Shan State and Yunnan province in China, where there is a high level of cross-border trade.

Second, the government strategy to address ethnic tensions has been fragmented, relying on individual negotiations with different armed groups rather than a comprehensive strategy to achieve national reconciliation. This approach is at odds with the demand of some ethnic groups for a peace process at the national level. A national peace treaty that balances the demands of different ethnic groups would be more desirable.

Third, the distrust between the government and the ethnic communities continues to be an obstacle. Trust-building is thus an essential prerequisite for a national peace process. The government has made a few steps in the right direction. For instance, the law on labour unions was formulated with the help of the International Labour Organization; censorship was repealed; the construction of Myitsone Dam was halted after widespread protests; political prisoners were released; and the National League for Democracy (which was disbanded in 2010 during the election) was allowed to re-register. Despite these encouraging developments, there is still cause for concern. For instance, government troops are still active in ethnic areas; and human rights abuses are widespread in ethnic states, particularly the border areas. These problems could offset the government's efforts to reach out to ethnic groups.

The most urgent need in Myanmar is for a general ceasefire and the withdrawal of government troops from the ethnic states. There have been positive signs. The central government has indicated its willingness to engage in political negotiation with the ethnic groups at the national level, an unprecedented move. High-level government officials have also had high-profile meetings with representatives of several ethnic armed groups.

For a national peace process to succeed, the various ethnic nationalities have to be allowed to engage with each other prior to the start of any negotiation. As these ethnic nationalities have diverse claims and demands, it is necessary for them to reach a preliminary understanding among themselves. It is also crucial that a fixed date is provided for any peace talks, one that would allow the ethnic nationalities time to specify their agenda for the negotiation. Such a move would demonstrate the sincerity of the government.

Foreign actors could contribute to the peace process by providing technical support for both the government and the ethnic groups. As Myanmar was under military rule for decades, the current civilian government needs support to build institutional capacity through knowledge sharing and training for a successful transition to civilian rule and eventually sustainable peace in the country.

Discussion

The discussion recognised that human security would be vital for successful conflict prevention, management and resolution. One avenue for achieving human security is through the operationalisation of the RtoP norm. In line with the spirit of the RtoP, SSG identifies the necessity of understanding security governance structures and processes, and of devising strategies to reform them in ways that strengthen a state's ability to protect its people from not only mass atrocities but also other human rights abuses. Human security also constitutes a key dimension of a sustainable resolution of the protracted ethnic conflicts in Myanmar; the claims of the ethnic nationalities in Myanmar centre on autonomy and equal access to development and resources, aspects essential to their human security.

The primary emphasis of the RtoP discourse in the region is on prevention, as ASEAN member states still hold traditional understandings of sovereignty. There is thus a need to promote greater understanding and awareness of the RtoP norm. To effectively diffuse the principle, it would be important to adjust the message to suit different audiences. For instance, the language of sovereignty and intervention would sound distant to people at the grassroots level. Instead, the provision of protection should be emphasised.

Civilian protection has also become a key aspect of conflict management, but there still exist many problems in achieving this goal. The protection of civilians could be advanced through various means. Diffusion of people-centred norms and governance reform are conducive for promoting the idea of civilian protection. Government troops and armed groups could be provided with human rights training so as to reduce incidence of abuses. Indigenous means of self-protection should be encouraged in cases where state protection is absent. In Myanmar, different villages exchange information with each other on the status of approaching armed combatants, so as to ensure safe retreat and hiding.

The conduct of a country's armed forces is not only a concern in Myanmar. The SSG research stream's study of three liberal democracies found that their institutions remain weak and thus unable to oversee their security forces, illustrating that democracy and good security governance do not necessarily go hand-in-hand. In view of the poor record of security governance in some states, civilian gun ownership was proposed as a means of self-protection. Civilian gun ownership would however likely intensify rather than alleviate human insecurity where institutions are weak and no proper regulation exists. If institutional capacity is not strengthened, the presence of non-state armed groups such as militia will remain.

While building the capacity of institutions remains necessary in the long term, it is important to involve all relevant stakeholders in negotiations to provide conditions conducive for peace. For example, business interests have always been a factor in the negotiations between the central government of Myanmar and the country's ethnic nationalities (business interests range from raw material extraction to narcotics production). In addition to business people, the negotiations also involve various stakeholders that include ceasefire groups, and military commanders. With regard to the political negotiations, there have been some positive signs. For instance, while there have been ceasefires over the years, they had not been achieved through genuine political processes. They had been instituted without addressing fundamental differences between the government and the ethnic nationalities. Thus, when the government agreed to grant equal status to the ethnic nationalities in political negotiations, one of their long-sought after goals, this was seen as a first for the government in terms of trying to resolve ethnic issues through political means.


Carolina


Ramesh Thakur


Dewi Fortuna
Anwar


Tin Maung
Maung Than


Nicholas Thomas


Tin Maung


80


Chung Chong
Wook

Speakers and moderators of the MacArthur Asia Security Initiative Dissemination Meeting 2011:

Seated (from left to right): *Assoc. Prof. Bernadette Resurreccion, Prof. Dewi Fortuna Anwar, Mr Kensuke Kanekiyo, Assoc. Prof. Ralf Emmers, Amb. Barry Desker, Prof. Ramesh Thakur, Assoc. Prof. Mely Caballero-Anthony, Dr Tin Maung Maung Than, Prof. Carolina Hernandez, Prof. Lorraine Elliott.*

Back row (from left to right): *Mr Herman Kraft, Prof. Zha Daojiong, Prof. Chung Chong-Wook, Dr Ian Storey, Prof. William Tow, Dr J. Jackson Ewing, Ms Samara Yawnghwe, Dr Alistair D.B. Cook.*

The Asia Security Initiative: Broadening the Security Discourse

The Asia Security Initiative project involved three research projects: Climate Change, Environmental Security and Natural Disasters; Energy and Human Security; and Internal and Cross-border Conflict. The overall objective of the Centre for Non-Traditional Security (NTS) Studies at the S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS) is to broaden the concept of security and provide a people-centred approach to current and emerging policy challenges. It was the need to recalibrate the security debate that was the driving force behind the establishment of the NTS programme at RSIS in 1997/1998.

Unlike in many Western circles, in which the concept of security has been challenged and the notion of NTS has found a foothold among scholars, there was initially less enthusiasm for such changes in Asia. Given this background, the RSIS Centre for NTS Studies has right from its inception attempted to do something unique. The Centre sought to go beyond cataloguing the various NTS issues. Instead, it has attempted to actually understand why such issues have become security issues and why they warrant attention in securitised discourses and policymaking. The research teams at the Centre therefore analysed security based on the vulnerabilities of different stakeholders and, in so doing, the security agenda was not only widened but also deepened to identify and include a range of often marginalised key stakeholders. To further an understanding of challenges faced by vulnerable groups, more empirically based research is essential. This charge has guided the research methodologies of those involved in the Centre's projects.

The other important objective of the MacArthur Asia Security Initiative was to broaden the communities of individuals and institutions involved in shaping security architectures. The NTS cluster within the MacArthur Asia Security Initiative has been able to create and leverage on a web of networks, including the Consortium of Non-Traditional Security Studies in Asia (NTS-Asia) for which the Centre serves as the Secretariat. It has also engaged actively in collaboration with various institutions and actors across regions. Indeed the concept of NTS is no longer a fad but its use has become more common in policy circles. Notably in the region, in ASEAN ministerial meetings as well as in meetings with East Asian partners, the use of the phrase has become more commonplace. Further, the NTS agenda, whether in the form of humanitarian assistance and disaster relief, is now found in many of the regional frameworks. NTS is therefore no longer a cottage industry but something that has significant connections to policies. The projects undertaken under the MacArthur Asia Security Initiative have been successful not just academically, but also in informing policies; and the collaborations among participating institutions will continue.

Programme

MacArthur Dissemination Meeting on Non-Traditional Security and Regional Security Cooperation

28–29 November 2011
Marina Mandarin Hotel, Singapore

28 November 2011 (Monday)
Meeting on Non-Traditional Security

08:30 **Registration**

09:15 **Welcome Remarks**
Ambassador Berry Desker
Dean, S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS),
Nanyang Technological University,
Singapore

09:20 **Introductory Remarks**
Associate Professor Mely Caballero-Anthony
Head, Centre for Non-Traditional Security (NTS) Studies,
S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS),
Nanyang Technological University,
Singapore
and
Director of External Relations,
Political Security Community Department,
ASEAN Secretariat,
Jakarta,
Indonesia

09:35 **Keynote Address: Non-Traditional Security – Three Frames of Analysis**
Professor Ramesh Thakur
Former Senior Vice-Rector, United Nations University;
Former Assistant Secretary-General, United Nations; and
Director, Centre for Nuclear Nonproliferation and Disarmament,
Asia-Pacific College of Diplomacy,
The Australian National University,
Australia

10:15 **Session 1: Climate Change, Environmental Security and Natural Disasters**

Moderator:

Professor Carolina Hernandez,
Professor Emeritus in Political Science,
University of the Philippines (Diliman);
Founding President and Chair of the Board of Directors, Institute for Strategic and Development Studies, Inc. (ISDS Philippines); and
ASEAN Co-Chair of the Council for Security Cooperation in the Asia Pacific (CSCAP) Steering Committee,
Diliman, Quezon City,
Philippines

Speakers:

Rethinking Climate Security from a Non-Traditional Security Perspective
Professor Lorraine Elliott
Department of International Relations,
School of International, Political and Strategic Studies,
College of Asia and the Pacific,
Australian National University, Canberra,
Australia
and
Senior Fellow and
Advisor to the Climate Change, Environmental Security and Natural Disasters Programme,
Centre for Non-Traditional Security (NTS) Studies,
S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS),
Nanyang Technological University,
Singapore

10.35 **The Gender and Climate Debate: More of the Same or New Ways of Thinking and Doing?**
Associate Professor Bernadette P. Resurreccion
Gender and Development Studies,
School of Environment, Resources and Development,
Asian Institute of Technology,
Thailand

10.55 **Contextualising Climate as a Cause of Migration in Southeast Asia**
Dr J. Jackson Ewing
Research Fellow and
Lead of the Climate Change, Environmental Security and Natural Disasters Programme, and the Food Security Programme,
Centre for Non-Traditional Security (NTS) Studies,
S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS),
Nanyang Technological University,
Singapore

11:15 **Q & A**

13:00 **Session 2: Energy and Human Security**

Moderator:

Dr Elspeth Thomson
Senior Fellow,
Energy Research Institute,
National University of Singapore,
Singapore

Speakers:

13:00 **Nuclear Power and Energy Security in Asia: Critical Debates**
Dr Rajesh Basrur
Senior Fellow,
S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS),
Nanyang Technological University,
Singapore

and

Mr Collin Koh
Associate Research Fellow,
S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS),
Nanyang Technological University,
Singapore

13:15 **East Asian Energy Vulnerabilities**
Professor Zha Daojiong
School of International Studies,
Peking University,
China
and
Visiting Senior Fellow and
Advisor to the Energy and Human Security Programme,
Centre for Non-Traditional Security (NTS) Studies,
S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS),
Nanyang Technological University,
Singapore

13:30 **Enhancing Regional Cooperation in Fighting Piracy and Robbery against Ships in Asia**
Ms Lee Yin Mui
Assistant Director (Research),
Information Sharing Centre (ISC),
Regional Cooperation Agreement on Combating Piracy and Armed Robbery against Ships in Asia (ReCAAP),
Singapore

13:45 **Energy Outlook of East Asia and Challenges for Sustainable Development**
Mr Kensuke Kanekiyo
Former Managing Director and
Research Advisor,
The Institute of Energy Economics, Japan (IEEJ),
Japan

14:00 **Q & A**

15:00 **Session 3: Multilevel Approaches to Conflict Management**

Moderator:

Professor Dewi Fortuna Anwar
Deputy Secretary for Politics to the Vice President,
Secretariat of the Vice President of the Republic of Indonesia,
Indonesia

Speakers:

15:00 **Responsibility to Protect in Asia: Issues and Challenges**
Dr Alistair D.B. Cook
Research Fellow and
Lead of the Internal and Cross-Border Conflict Programme,
Centre for Non-Traditional Security (NTS) Studies,
S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS),
Nanyang Technological University,
Singapore

15:20 **ASEAN Human Rights Commission and RtoP**
Mr Herman J. Kraft
Lecturer,
University of Philippines,
Diliman,
Philippines

15:40 **Ceasefires sans Peace Process in Myanmar: The Shan State Army, 1989–2011**
Dr Tin Maung Maung Than
Senior Fellow,
Institute of Southeast Asian Studies (ISEAS),
Singapore

and

Ms Samara Yawnghwe
Southeast Asian Studies Programme,
Chulalongkorn University,
Thailand

16:00 **Q & A**

16:45 **Concluding Remarks for Meeting on Non-traditional Security**
Associate Professor Mely Caballero-Anthony
Head, Centre for Non-Traditional Security (NTS) Studies,
S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS),
Nanyang Technological University,
Singapore
and
Director of External Relations,
Political Security Community Department,
ASEAN Secretariat,
Jakarta,
Indonesia

Note: Day 2 of this Dissemination Meeting focused on Regional Security Cooperation, and this is covered in a separate report.

List of Speakers and Moderators

(in alphabetical order according to last names)

1. **Professor Dewi Fortuna Anwar**
   Deputy Secretary for Politics to the Vice President,
   Secretariat of the Vice President of the
   Republic of Indonesia,
   Jl. Kebon Sirih No. 14,
   Jakarta 10110, Indonesia
   Telephone: +62 21 384 6737
   Fax: +62 21 344 6670
   Email: dfanwar@yahoo.com; dfanwar@gmail.com

2. **Dr Rajesh Basrur**
   Senior Fellow,
   S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS),
   Block S4, Level B4, Nanyang Avenue,
   Nanyang Technological University,
   Singapore 639798
   Telephone: +65 6513 7608
   Email: israjesh@ntu.edu.sg

3. **Associate Professor Mely Caballero-Anthony**
   Head, Centre for Non-Traditional Security
   (NTS) Studies,
   S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS),
   Nanyang Technological University,
   Singapore
   and
   Director of External Relations,
   Political Security Community Department,
   ASEAN Secretariat,
   Jakarta,
   Indonesia
   Block S4, Level B4, Nanyang Avenue
   Nanyang Technological University
   Singapore 639798
   Telephone: +65 6790 5886
   Email: ismcanthony@ntu.edu.sg

4. **Dr Alistair D.B. Cook**
   Research Fellow and
   Lead of the Internal and Cross-border
   Conflict Programme,
   Centre for Non-Traditional Security (NTS) Studies,
   Block S4, Level B4, Nanyang Avenue,
   Nanyang Technological University,
   Singapore 639798
   Telephone: +65 6790 4010
   Email: isdbcook@ntu.edu.sg

5. **Distinguished Professor Chung Chong-Wook**
   Dong-A University,
   840 Hadan2-dong, Saha-gu,
   Busan 604-714,
   Korea
   Telephone: +82 51 200 6442 (ext. 3)
   Fax: +82 51 200 6445
   Email: chongwook@gmail.com

6. **Ambassador Barry Desker**
   Dean,
   S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS),
   Block S4, Level B4, Nanyang Avenue,
   Nanyang Technological University,
   Singapore 639798
   Telephone: +65 6790 6907
   Email: isbdesker@ntu.edu.sg

7. **Professor Lorraine Elliott**
   Department of International Relations,
   School of International, Political and
   Strategic Studies,
   College of Asia and the Pacific,
   Australian National University, Canberra,
   Australia
   and
   Senior Fellow and
   Advisor to the Climate Change, Environmental
   Security and Natural Disasters Programme,
   Centre for Non-Traditional Security (NTS) Studies,
   S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS),
   Nanyang Technological University,
   Canberra ACT 0200,
   Australia
   Telephone: +61 2 6125 0589
   Fax: +61 2 6125 8010
   Email: lorraine.elliott@anu.edu.au

8. **Associate Professor Ralf Emmers**
   Head, Centre for Multilateralism Studies (CMS),
   S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS),
   Block S4, Level B4, Nanyang Avenue,

Nanyang Technological University,
Singapore 639798
Telephone: +65 790 4340
Email: isremmers@ntu.edu.sg

9. Dr J. Jackson Ewing
Research Fellow and
Lead of the Climate Change, Environmental Security and Natural Disasters Programme, and the Food Security Programme,
Centre for Non-Traditional Security (NTS) Studies,
S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS),
Block S4, Level B4, Nanyang Avenue,
Nanyang Technological University,
Singapore 639798
Telephone: +65 6592 2531
Email: isjjewing@ntu.edu.sg

10. Professor Carolina Hernandez
Professor Emeritus in Political Science at the University of the Philippines (Diliman);
Founding President and Chair of the Board of Directors in the Institute for Strategic and Development Studies, Inc. (ISDS Philippines); and
ASEAN Co-Chair of the Council for Security Cooperation in the Asia Pacific (CSCAP) Steering Committee
40-E Maalalahanin Street,
Teachers Village East,
Diliman, Quezon City,
1101 Philippines
Telephone: +63 2 929 0889
Email: carolghernandez@gmail.com ;
carol_g_hernandez@yahoo.com

11. Mr Kensuke Kanekiyo
Former Managing Director and Research Advisor,
Institute of Energy Economics, Japan,
Inui Bldg., Kachidoki,
10th, 11th Floor 13-1, Kachidoki 1-chome,
Chuo-ku, Tokyo,
104-0054 Japan
Email: kanekiyo@tky.ieej.or.jp

12. Mr Collin Koh
Associate Research Fellow,
S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS),
Block S4, Level B4, Nanyang Avenue,
Nanyang Technological University,
Singapore 639798
Telephone: +65 6790 6626
Email: iscollinkoh@ntu.edu.sg

13. Mr Herman Kraft
Lecturer,
Department of Political Science,
University of the Philippines,
Diliman, Quezon City 1101
Email: hskraft@gmail.com

14. Ms Lee Yin Mui
Assistant Director (Research),
Information Sharing Centre (ISC),
Regional Cooperation Agreement on Combating Piracy and Armed Robbery against Ships in Asia (ReCAAP),
Alexandra Road, NOL Building,
#11-02, Singapore 119962
Telephone: +65 6376 3091
Fax: +65 6376 3066
Email: yin_mui_lee@recaap.org

15. Associate Professor Bernadette Resurreccion
Gender and Development Studies,
School of Environment, Resources and Development,
Asian Institute of Technology,
Thailand
Km 42 Klong Luang, Pathumthani
Thailand 12120
Telephone: +66 2 524 5781
Fax: +66 2 524 6166
Email: babette@ait.ac.th

16. Dr Ian Storey
Senior Fellow,
Institute of Southeast Asian Studies (ISEAS),
30 Heng Mui Keng Terrace,
Pasir Panjang,
Singapore 119614
Telephone: +65 6778 0955
Fax: +65 6778 1735
Email: ijstorey@iseas.edu.sg

17. Associate Professor Tan See Seng
Head, Institute of Defence and Strategic Studies,
S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS),
Nanyang Technological University,
Block S4, Level B4, Nanyang Avenue,
Singapore 639798
Telephone: +65 790 4277
Email: issstan@ntu.edu.sg

18. Professor Ramesh Thakur
Former Senior Vice-Rector,
United Nations University;
Former Assistant Secretary-General of the United Nations; and
Director, Centre for Nuclear Nonproliferation and Disarmament,
Asia-Pacific College of Diplomacy,
The Australian National University,
Australia
Hedley Bull Centre Building 130,
Canberra ACT 0200,
Australia
Telephone: +61 2 6125 0912
Email: ramesh.thakur@anu.edu.au

19. Dr Tin Maung Maung Than
Senior Fellow,
Institute of Southeast Asian Studies (ISEAS),
30 Heng Mui Keng Terrace,
Pasir Panjang, Singapore 119614
Telephone: +65 6778 0955
Fax: +65 6778 1735
Email: tin@iseas.edu.sg

20. Associate Professor Nicholas Thomas
Associate Head,
Department of Asian and International Studies,
City University of Hong Kong,
Hong Kong SAR
Telephone: +852 3442 5301
Fax: +852 2788 8092
Email: ndthomas@cityu.edu.hk

21. Dr Elspeth Thomson
Senior Fellow,
Energy Research Institute (ESI),
National University of Singapore,
29 Heng Mui Keng Terrace,
Block A, #10-01,
Singapore 119620
Telephone: +65 6516 7080
Fax: +65 6775 1831
Email: esiebt@nus.edu.sg

22. Professor William Tow
Department of International Relations,
School of International, Political and Strategic Studies,
College of Asia and the Pacific,
The Australian National University,
Canberra ACT 0200
Australia
Telephone: +61 2 6125 8550
Fax: +61 2 6125 8010
Email: william.tow@anu.edu.au

23. Ms Samara Yawnghwe
Southeast Asian Studies Programme,
Chulalongkorn University,
254 Phayathai Road, Pathumwan,
Bangkok,
Thailand 10330
Telephone: +662 215 0871 3
Fax: +662 215 4804
Email: samara.yawnghwe@gmail.com

24. Professor Zha Daojiong
School of International Studies,
Peking University,
China
and
Visiting Senior Fellow and
Advisor to the Energy and Human Security Programme,
Centre for Non-Traditional Security (NTS) Studies,
S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS),
Nanyang Technological University,
Singapore
5 Yiheyuan Road,
Beijing 100871,
China
Telephone: +86 10 6275 4853
Fax: +86 10 6275 1639
Email: zhadaojiong@pku.edu.cn

List of Local and Overseas Participants

(in alphabetical order according to last names)

25. Mr S.H. Ang
Director,
Ang Sin Hock Associates Pte Ltd,
135 Cashew Rd,
#04-121,
Singapore 670135
Telephone: +65 9090 1953
Email: ashsociates@hotmail.com

26. Mr Endy Bayuni
Chief Editor,
The Jakarta Post,
Jalan Palmerah Barat 142-143,
Jakarta 10270,
Indonesia
Telephone: +62 21 530 0478
Fax: +62 21 535 0050
Email: endy@thejakartapost.com

27. Ms Pia Bruce
Executive Director,
National Committee for UNIFEM, Singapore,
2 Nassim Road,
Singapore 258370
Telephone: +65 9825 8659
Email: pia.bruce@unifem.org.sg

28. Dr Pavin Chachavalpongpun
Fellow, Regional Strategic and Political Studies (RSPS),
Lead Researcher for Political and Strategic Affairs,
ASEAN Studies Centre (ASC),
Institute of Southeast Asian Studies,
30 Heng Mui Keng Terrace,
Pasir Panjang,
Singapore 119614
Telephone: +65 6870 4522
Fax: +65 6775 6264
Email: pavin@iseas.edu.sg

29. Assistant Professor Chong Ja Ian
Department of Political Science,
Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences,
National University of Singapore,
AS1, #04-10, 11 Arts Link,
Singapore 117570
Telephone: +65 6516 5092
Email: polcji@nus.edu.sg

30. Dr Suba Chandran
Director,
Institute of Peace & Conflict Studies,
B 7/3 Lower Ground Floor, Safdarjung Enclave,
New Delhi 110029
India
Telephone: +91 11 4100 1900
Fax: +91 11 4165 2560
Email: subachandran@gmail.com

31. Ambassador Mary Seet Cheng
Ministry of Foreign Affairs,
Tanglin,
Singapore 248163
Telephone: +65 6379 8509
Fax: +65 6379 8228
Email: mary_seet-cheng@mfa.gov.sg

32. Ms Belinda Chng
Policy Adviser,
Policy Support Unit, APEC Secretariat,
35 Heng Mui Keng Terrace,
Singapore 119616
Telephone: +65 6891 9405
Fax: +65 6891 9419
Email: bchk@apec.org

33.Dr Raul Cordenillo
Head, Inter-Regional Democracy Resource Centre,
External Relations and Governance Support,
International IDEA,
Strömsborg SE-103 34 Stockholm,
Sweden
Telephone: +46 8 698 3700/75
Fax: +46 8 20 2422
Email: r.cordenillo@idea.int

34.Mr Prem Koman Damodaran
Communications and Partnership Manager
International Development Research Centre (IDRC),
22 Cross Street,
#02-55 South Bridge Court,
Singapore 048421
Telephone: +65 6594 3709
Email: pkoman@idrc.org.sg

35.Dr Kerstin Duell
Research Consultant to the Vice-Dean,
Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy,
Department of Political Science,
Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences,
National University of Singapore,
AS1, #04-10, 11 Arts Link,
Singapore 117570
Email: kerstin@nus.edu.sg

36.Ms Karen Francisco
Research Officer,
International Development Research Centre (IDRC),
22 Cross Street,
#02-55 South Bridge Court,
Singapore 048421
Telephone: +65 6594 3703
Email: kfrancisco@idrc.org.sg

37.Mr Dominic Goh
Director,
International Economics Directorate (IE),
Ministry of Foreign Affairs,
Tanglin,
Singapore 248163
Telephone: +65 6379 8550
Email: DOMINIC_GOH@MFA.GOV.SG

38.Mr Rahul Gupta
Director,
Noble Imports and Exports,
346, Pasir Panjang Rd,
Singapore
Telephone: +65 9035 7185
Email: rahulgupta3091@gmail.com

39.Professor Han Feng
Deputy Director,
Institute of Asia-Pacific Studies (IAPS),
Chinese Academy of Social Sciences,
3 Zhangzizhong Lu, Beijing 100007,
China
Telephone: +86 10 6403 9039
Fax: +86 10 6406 3041
Email: hanfeng@cass.org.cn

40.Mr Agung Hardjono
Deputy III,
President's Delivery Unit for Development
Monitoring and Oversight,
Jl. Veteran III/2,
Jakarta 10110,
Indonesia
Fax: +62 21 231 4147
Email: agung.hardjono@ukp.go.id

41.Ms Clara Joewono
Vice-Chair, Board of Directors and
Co-Founder of the Centre for Strategic and
International Studies (CSIS),
The Jakarta Post Building 3rd Floor,
Jl. Palmerah Barat 142-143,
Jakarta 10270,
Indonesia
Telephone: +62 21 5365 4601
Email: clara_j@csis.or.id

42.Mrs Septania H. Kadir
Program Coordinator,
ASEAN Foundation,
Jl. Sam Ratulangi No.2, Menteng,
Jakarta Pusat 10350,
Indonesia
Telephone: +62 21 3192 4833
Fax: +62 21 3192 6078
Email: nia@aseanfoundation.org

43.Mr Berthold Kastel
Founder,
Competitive Edge International (CEI),
118B Jalan Membina,
#26-125,
Singapore 162188
Telephone: +65 8533 2584
Email: berthold.kastel@me.com

44.Professor Koh Kheng Lian
Emeritus Professor,
Faculty of Law, National University of Singapore,
and
Director, Asia-Pacific Centre for Environmental Law,
469G Bukit Timah Road,
Eu Tong Sen Building,
Singapore 259776
Telephone: +65 6516 6246
Fax: +65 6872 1937/ +65 6779 0979
Email: lawkohkl@nus.edu.sg

45.Mr Andy Khong
Blk 297, #04-477 Punggol Central,
Singapore 820297
Telephone: +65 9022 8183
Email: mycandidate@hotmail.com

46.Ms Trina Liang-Lin
President, Executive Committee,
National Committee for UNIFEM, Singapore,
2 Nassim Road,
Singapore 258370
Telephone: +65 6238 6763
Email: trina.liang@unifem.org.sg

47.Ms Vivian Claire Liew
Founding Director,
PhilanthropyWorks,
Singapore
Telephone: +65 9388 3147
Email: vivianclaire@philanthropyworks.asia

48.Mr Lim Tian Kuay
Deputy Director,
National Environment Agency,
Environment Building,
40 Scotts Road,
#11-00,
Singapore 228231
Telephone: +65 9299 7438
Email: lim_tian_kuay@nea.gov.sg

49.Mr Keven Matthews
Military Attaché,
US Embassy in Singapore,
27 Napier Road,
Singapore 258508
Telephone: +65 6476 9331
Email: MatthewsKW@state.gov

50.Mr Benoit Mayer
PhD Candidate,
Faculty of Law,
National University of Singapore,
27 Prince George's Park,
Blk 13, #10-40,
Singapore 118425
Telephone: +65 9891 4648
Email: bmayer@nus.edu.sg

51.Dr Yayan Mulyana
Assistant Special Staff of the President for International Relations,
Gedung Sekretariat Negara Sayap Timur,
Jl. Veteran III No. 9,
Jakarta 10110,
Indonesia
Telephone: +62 21 351 0203 (Ext. 203)
Fax: +62 21 231 4142
Email: yyn_mulyana@yahoo.com

52.Major-General Muniruzzaman
President,
Bangladesh Institute of Peace and Security Studies,
House No. 405,
Road No. 06 DOHS Baridhara,
Dhaka,
Bangladesh
Telephone: +880 2 884 9092
Email: muniruzzaman@gmail.com

53.Ms Ng Swee Leng
Public Affairs Officer,
High Commission of Canada,
One George Street, #11-01,
Singapore 049145
Telephone: +65 6854 5852
Fax: +65 6854 5912
Email: swee-leng.ng@international.gc.ca

54.Mr Nguyen Hung Son
Deputy Director General,
Institute for Foreign Policy and Strategic Studies,
The Diplomatic Academy of Vietnam,
Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Vietnam,
69 Chua Lang, Dong Da, Hanoi
Vietnam
Telephone: +84 4 3835 9247
Email: tuanmai60@yahoo.com ;
tuanmai60@gmail.com

55.Ms Naida Pasion
Member Service Director, Asia,
Save the Children,
3rd Floor, Strathmore Building,
Tanglin International Center,
352 Tanglin Road,
Singapore 247671
Telephone: +65 6511 3160 (Ext. 154)
Email: naida.pasion@savethechildren.org

56.Mr Canesio Predo
Research Officer,
Environment and Economy Program for Southeast Asia (EEPSEA),
International Development Research Centre (IDRC),
22 Cross Street,
#02-55 South Bridge Court,
Singapore 048421
Telephone: +65 6594 3734
Email: cpredo@idrc.org.sg

57.Dr Amina Z. Rasul Bernardo
President,
Philippine Center for Islam and Democracy (PCID),
NCPAG Annex Building (one-storey),
R. P. De Guzman Street,
University of the Philippines (UP-Campus),
Diliman, Quezon City,
Philippines
Telephone: +63 2 426 9972
Fax: +63 2 426 5886
Email: aminarasul@gmail.com

58.Ms Melodie Sahraie
Centre for International Sustainable Development Law (CISDL),
Blk 13, #10-40,
27 Prince George's Park,
Singapore 118425
Telephone: +65 9891 7637
Email: melodie.sahraie@mail.mcgill.ca

59.Professor Louise Shelley
Director of the Terrorism, Transnational Crime and Corruption Center (TraCCC) and
University Professor,
School of Public Policy,
George Mason University,
3351 Fairfax Drive,
MS3B1, Rm. 712,
Arlington, VA 22201,
USA
Telephone: +703 993 9749
Fax: +703 993 8193
Email: lshelley@gmu.edu

60.Dr Song Jiyoung
Lecturer,
Department of Political Science,
Visiting Research Fellow, Asia Research Institute (ARI),
National University of Singapore,
NUS Bukit Timah Campus,
469A Tower Block, #10-01,
Bukit Timah Road,
Singapore 259770
Telephone: +65 6516 3810
Fax: +65 6779 1428
Email: arisjy@nus.edu.sg

61.Dr Sun Ru
Deputy Director,
Institute of World Political Studies; and
Associate Research Professor,
Institute of American Studies
China Institutes of Contemporary International Relations (CICIR),
A-2 Wanshousi, Haidian District,
Beijing 100081,
China
Telephone: +86 10 6841 8640
Email: sunru99@yahoo.com

62.Mr Tan Kwan Chong
Engineer,
Risk Assessment and Horizon Scanning (RAHS) Experimentation Centre,
5 Maxwell Road #12-00 Tower Block,
MND Complex,
Singapore 069110
Telephone: +65 6325 8414
Email: tkwancho@dsta.gov.sg

63.Mr Michael P. Totten
Senior Adviser,
Conservation International,
1E Cluny Road,
Singapore 259601
Telephone: +65 9753 5640
Email: mtotten@conservation.org

64.Ms Tomoko Suzuki
Senior Program Officer,
Japan Center for International Exchange (JCIE),
4-9-17 Minami Azabu,
Minato-ku, Tokyo,
Japan 106-0047
Telephone: +81 3 3446 7781
Fax: +81 3 3443 7580
Email: tsuzuki@jcie.or.jp

65. Professor James Tang
Dean, School of Social Sciences,
Professor of Political Science,
Singapore Management University,
81 Victoria Street,
Singapore 188065
Telephone: +65 6828 1929
Email: jamestang@smu.edu.sg

66. Dr Tang Siew Mun
Director (Foreign Policy and Security Studies),
Institute of Strategic and International Studies,
1, Persiaran Sultan Salahuddin,
P. O. Box 12424,
50778 Kuala Lumpur,
Malaysia
Telephone: +603 2693 4991
Fax: +603 2693 9375
Email: tang@isis.org.my

67. Ms Dayangku Norasyikin Pengiran Tejuddin
PhD Candidate,
Malaysia National Defense University,
Suite B-9-2 Armed Forces Residency,
Jalan U-Thant, No. 44 Jalan 1/76,
Off Jalan Kampung Pandan,
55100 Kuala Lumpur,
Malaysia
Email: dayangku23@live.com

68. Dr Agung Wicaksono
Assistant to the Head,
President's Delivery Unit for Development
Monitoring and Oversight (UKP4),
Jl. Veteran III/2,
Jakarta 10110
Fax: +62 21 231 4147
Email: agung.wicaksono@ukp.go.id

69. Mr Yang Yi
Director,
Office of International Exchanges,
China Institute of International Studies (CIIS),
No. 3, Toutiao Taijichang,
Beijing,
China 100005
Telephone: +86 10 851 19550
Fax: +86 10 6512 3744
Email: yangyi@ciis.org.cn

70. Ms Yao Lixia
PhD Candidate,
S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS),
Nanyang Technological University,
Block S4, Level B4, Nanyang Avenue,
Singapore 639798
Email: YAOL0007@e.ntu.edu.sg

71. Dr Yeo Lay Hwee
Director,
European Union Centre,
11 Slim Barracks Rise, #06-01 Executive Centre,
NTU@one-north campus,
Singapore 138664
Telephone: +65 6513 2006
Fax: +65 6774 1445
Email: eucylh@nus.edu.sg

72. Ms Erin Zimmerman
Research Scholar / PhD Student,
Indo-Pacific Governance Research Centre,
School of History and Politics,
Level 4 Napier Building,
University of Adelaide
Adelaide 5005, Australia
Telephone: +61 8 8313 5612
Fax: +61 8 8313 3443
Email: erin.zimmerman@adelaide.edu.au

RSIS

(in alphabetical sequence according to last names)

Faculty

73.Dr Alan Chong
Associate Professor
S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS),
Block S4, Level B4, Nanyang Avenue,
Nanyang Technological University
Singapore 639798
Telephone: +65 6514 1906
Email: iscschong@ntu.edu.sg

74.Mr Kwa Chong Guan
Head of External Programmes,
S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS),
Block S4, Level B4, Nanyang Avenue,
Nanyang Technological University,
Singapore 639798
Telephone: +65 6790 6975
Email: iscgkwa@ntu.edu.sg

75.Mr Mushahid Ali
Senior Fellow,
S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS),
Block S4, Level B4, Nanyang Avenue,
Nanyang Technological University,
Singapore 639798
Telephone: +65 6790 6836
Email: ismali@ntu.edu.sg

76.Mr Tan Seng Chye
Senior Fellow,
S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS),
Block S4, Level B4, Nanyang Avenue,
Nanyang Technological University,
Singapore 639798
Telephone: +65 6790 4009
Email: issctan@ntu.edu.sg

RSIS CENTRE FOR MULTILATERALISM STUDIES (CMS)
Website: **www.rsis.edu.sg/cms**

Faculty

77.Associate Professor Pradumna B. Rana
Centre for Multilateralism Studies (CMS),
S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS),
Nanyang Technological University,
Blk S4, Level B4, Nanyang Avenue,
Singapore 639798
Telephone: +65 6592 1821
Email: prana@ntu.edu.sg

78.Assistant Professor Bhubhindar Singh
Deputy Head, Centre for Multilateralism Studies (CMS),
S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS),
Nanyang Technological University,
Blk S4, Level B4, Nanyang Avenue,
Singapore 639798
Telephone: +65 6790 6845
Email: isbhubhindar@ntu.edu.sg

Research and Operations Staff

79.Mr Benjamin Ho
Associate Research Fellow,
Centre for Multilateralism Studies (CMS),
S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS),
Nanyang Technological University,
Blk S4, Level B4, Nanyang Avenue,
Singapore 639798
Telephone: +65 6592 2536
Email: isteho@ntu.edu.sg

80.Ms Alica Kizekova
Visiting Associate Fellow,
Centre for Multilateralism Studies (CMS),
S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS),
Nanyang Technological University,
Blk S4, Level B4, Nanyang Avenue,
Singapore 639798
Email: isalica@ntu.edu.sg

81.Ms Joann Saw
Centre Manager,
Centre for Multilateralism Studies (CMS),
S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS),
Nanyang Technological University,
Blk S4, Level B4, Nanyang Avenue,
Singapore 639798
Telephone: +65 6513 8299
Email: ismcsaw@ntu.edu.sg

RSIS CENTRE FOR NTS STUDIES
Website: **www.rsis.edu.sg/nts; Secretariat of the Consortium of Non-Traditional Security Studies in Asia: www.rsis-ntsasia.org**

Staff

82.Ms Regina Arokiasamy
Secretary to the Head,
Centre for Non-Traditional Security (NTS) Studies,
S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS),
Block S4, Level B4, Nanyang Avenue,
Nanyang Technological University,
Singapore 639798
Telephone: +65 6790 6053
Email: isregina@ntu.edu.sg

83.Mr Zbigniew Dumienski
Research Analyst,
Centre for Non-Traditional Security (NTS) Studies,
S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS),
Block S4, Level B4, Nanyang Avenue,
Nanyang Technological University,
Singapore 639798
Telephone: +65 6513 2035
Email: iszdumineski@ntu.edu.sg

84.Ms Lina Gong
Research Analyst,
Centre for Non-Traditional Security (NTS) Studies,
S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS),
Block S4, Level B4, Nanyang Avenue,
Nanyang Technological University,
Singapore 639798
Telephone: +65 6592 1817
Email: islinagong@ntu.edu.sg

85.Mr Pau Khan Khup Hangzo
Associate Research Fellow,
Centre for Non-Traditional Security (NTS) Studies,
S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS),
Block S4, Level B4, Nanyang Avenue,
Nanyang Technological University,
Singapore 639798
Telephone: +65 6513 2035
E-mail: iskkpau@ntu.edu.sg

86.Ms Sofiah Jamil
Associate Research Fellow,
Centre for Non-Traditional Security (NTS) Studies,
S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS),
Block S4, Level B4, Nanyang Avenue,
Nanyang Technological University,
Singapore 639798
Telephone: +65 6513 2037
Email: issofiah@ntu.edu.sg

87.Mr Yang Razali Kassim
Senior Fellow,
Centre for Non-Traditional Security (NTS) Studies,
S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS),
Block S4, Level B4, Nanyang Avenue,
Nanyang Technological University,
Singapore 639798
Telephone: +65 6790 6817
Email: isyangrazali@ntu.edu.sg

88.Ms Cheryl Lim
Programme Manager,
Centre for Non-Traditional Security (NTS) Studies,
S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS),
Block S4, Level B4, Nanyang Avenue,
Nanyang Technological University,
Singapore 639798
Telephone: +65 6592 7521
Email: ischeryllim@ntu.edu.sg

89.Ms Josephine Ng
Senior Administrative Officer,
Centre for Non-Traditional Security (NTS) Studies,
S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS),
Block S4, Level B4, Nanyang Avenue,
Nanyang Technological University,
Singapore 639798
Telephone: +65 790 5889
Email: islyng@ntu.edu.sg

90.Ms Ong Suet Yen
Copyeditor,
Centre for Non-Traditional Security (NTS) Studies,
S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS),
Block S4, Level B4, Nanyang Avenue,
Nanyang Technological University,
Singapore 639798
Telephone: +65 6316 8785
Email: issyong@ntu.edu.sg

91.Mr Steven Poh
Multimedia Webmaster,
Centre for Non-Traditional Security (NTS) Studies,
S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS),
Block S4, Level B4, Nanyang Avenue,
Nanyang Technological University
Singapore 639798
Telephone: +65 6592 7522
Email: isbcpoh@ntu.edu.sg

92.Ms Sally Trethewie
Senior Analyst,
Centre for Non-Traditional Security (NTS) Studies,
S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS),
Block S4, Level B4, Nanyang Avenue,
Nanyang Technological University,
Singapore 639798
Telephone: +65 6316 8782
Email: issallytrethewie@ntu.edu.sg

About the RSIS Centre for Non-Traditional Security (NTS) Studies

The **RSIS Centre for Non-Traditional Security (NTS) Studies** conducts research and produces policy-relevant analyses aimed at furthering awareness and building capacity to address NTS issues and challenges in the Asia-Pacific region and beyond.

To fulfil this mission, the Centre aims to:

- Advance the understanding of NTS issues and challenges in the Asia-Pacific by highlighting gaps in knowledge and policy, and identifying best practices among state and non-state actors in responding to these challenges.
- Provide a platform for scholars and policymakers within and outside Asia to discuss and analyse NTS issues in the region.
- Network with institutions and organisations worldwide to exchange information, insights and experiences in the area of NTS.
- Engage policymakers on the importance of NTS in guiding political responses to NTS emergencies and develop strategies to mitigate the risks to state and human security.
- Contribute to building the institutional capacity of governments, and regional and international organisations to respond to NTS challenges.

Our Research

The key programmes at the **RSIS Centre for NTS Studies** include:

1) Internal and Cross-Border Conflict Programme
   - Dynamics of Internal Conflicts
   - Multi-level and Multilateral Approaches to Internal Conflict
   - Responsibility to Protect (RtoP) in Asia
   - Peacebuilding

2) Climate Change, Environmental Security and Natural Disasters Programme
   - Mitigation and Adaptation Policy Studies
   - The Politics and Diplomacy of Climate Change

3) Energy and Human Security Programme
   - Security and Safety of Energy Infrastructure
   - Stability of Energy Markets
   - Energy Sustainability
   - Nuclear Energy and Security

4) Food Security Programme
   - Regional Cooperation
   - Food Security Indicators
   - Food Production and Human Security

5) Health and Human Security Programme
   - Health and Human Security
   - Global Health Governance
   - Pandemic Preparedness and Global Response Networks

The first three programmes received a boost from the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation when the RSIS Centre for NTS Studies was selected as one of three core institutions leading the MacArthur Asia Security Initiative in 2009.*

Our Output

Policy Relevant Publications

The **RSIS Centre for NTS Studies** produces a range of output such as research reports, books, monographs, policy briefs and conference proceedings.

Training

Based in RSIS, which has an excellent record of post-graduate teaching, an international faculty, and an extensive network of policy institutes worldwide, the Centre is well-placed to develop robust research capabilities, conduct training courses and facilitate advanced education on NTS. These are aimed at, but not limited to, academics, analysts, policymakers and non-governmental organisations (NGOs).

Networking and Outreach

The Centre serves as a networking hub for researchers, policy analysts, policymakers, NGOs and media from across Asia and farther afield interested in NTS issues and challenges.

The **RSIS Centre for NTS Studies** is also the Secretariat of the Consortium of Non-Traditional Security Studies in Asia (NTS-Asia), which brings together 20 research institutes and think tanks from across Asia, and strives to develop the process of networking, consolidate existing research on NTS-related issues, and mainstream NTS studies in Asia.

More information on our Centre is available at www.rsis.edu.sg/nts

** The Asia Security Initiative was launched by the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation in January 2009, through which approximately US$68 million in grants will be made to policy research institutions over seven years to help raise the effectiveness of international cooperation in preventing conflict and promoting peace and security in Asia.*

About the S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS), Nanyang Technological University

The S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS) was inaugurated on 1 January 2007 as an autonomous School within the Nanyang Technological University (NTU), upgraded from its previous incarnation as the Institute of Defence and Strategic Studies (IDSS), which was established in 1996.

The School exists to develop a community of scholars and policy analysts at the forefront of Asia-Pacific security studies and international affairs. Its three core functions are research, graduate teaching and networking activities in the Asia-Pacific region. It produces cutting-edge security related research in Asia-Pacific Security, Conflict and Non-Traditional Security, International Political Economy, and Country and Area Studies.

The School's activities are aimed at assisting policymakers to develop comprehensive approaches to strategic thinking on issues related to security and stability in the Asia-Pacific and their implications for Singapore.

For more information about RSIS, please visit www.rsis.edu.sg

CENTRE FOR
NON-TRADITIONAL
SECURITY STUDIES

S. RAJARATNAM SCHOOL
OF INTERNATIONAL STUDIES
A Graduate School of Nanyang Technological University

Centre for Non-Traditional Security (NTS) Studies
S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies
Nanyang Technological University, South Spine, Blk S4, Level B4
Nanyang Avenue, Singapore 639798
Tel. (65) 6790 6982 • Fax. (65) 6898 4060 • Email. NTS_Centre@ntu.edu.sg

www.rsis.edu.sg/nts • www.rsis-ntsasia.org • www.asicluster3.com