

1st Tokyo-Seminar on Common Security Challenges **“Future Cooperation among Defense Authorities in the Region”**

Wednesday, 18 March 2009
Keio Plaza Hotel (Tokyo)



This First Tokyo Seminar on Common Security Challenges was held after a meeting, which was also the first, among senior defense officials of Japan and ASEAN countries the day before. The Ministry of Defense of Japan organized this seminar with two objectives. First, it seeks to reassure Japan's commitment to strengthen regional stability. Second, it aims to provide a forum for open discussion on future regional security. The seminar comprised two sessions. The first session discussed ways to promote regional cooperation on common security challenges, whereas the second session focused its discussion on efforts of the defense authorities for the promotion of regional cooperation.

During the sessions, peacekeeping, peace-building, disaster relief, terrorism, and global economic/financial crisis were raised as common security issues in the Asia-Pacific. To address these issues, the discussion underscored the following points: (1) no one country can effectively cope with these issues alone, and cooperation among defense establishments is necessary; (2) capacity-building of those countries which are willing to deal with common security challenges but have only limited capability is necessary; (3) shaping habits of cooperation through joint training and other cooperation during peacetime is necessary; and (4) cooperation among major powers is important in promoting effective regional cooperation. The panelists also discussed regional frameworks for security dialogue and concrete actions.

With more than a hundred participants, the First Tokyo Seminar on Common Security Challenges drew to a successful close with fruitful discussion. The participants supported that this seminar be held next year. This report summarizes the discussion of the seminar. The Ministry of Defense received the cooperation of Research Institute for Peace and Security and Dr. Tamotsu Fukuda of International Christian University in preparation for this report.

0945 【Opening】

0945~1145 【Session I】 (p.1~)

“Common Security Challenges in the Region and Ways to Promote Regional Cooperation”

Chair : **Dr. Masashi NISHIHARA**

President, Research Institute for Peace and Security, Japan

Speakers : **Mr. Kohei MASUDA**

Vice-Minister of Defense, Japan

Mr. Antonio C. SANTOS, Jr.

Undersecretary for Defense Affairs, Department of National Defense,
Philippines

Mr. Jusuf WANANDI

Vice Chair, Board of Trustees of CSIS Foundation, Centre for Strategic
and International Studies, Indonesia

Tan Sri Mohamed JAWHAR Hassan

Chairman and CEO, Institute of Strategic and International Studies,
Malaysia

Discussant : **Dr. Seiichiro TAKAGI**

Professor, Aoyama Gakuin University, Japan

1145~1245 Break

1245~1300 Remarks by H.E. Mr. Nobuo KISHI (p.15)

Parliamentary Secretary for Defense, Japan

1300~1500 【Session II】 (p.16~)

“Efforts of the Defense Authorities for the Promotion of Regional Cooperation”

Chair : **Dr. Masashi NISHIHARA**

President, Research Institute for Peace and Security, Japan

Speakers : **Ambassador Barry DESKER**

Dean, S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies, Nanyang
Technological University, Singapore

Dr. Thitinan PONGSUDHIRAK

Director, Institute of Security and International Studies, Chulalongkorn
University, Thailand

Mr. Yasushi AKASHI

Chairman, Japan Center for Conflict Prevention

Major General Koichi ISOBE

Vice Commanding General (International), Central Readiness Force,
Ground Self-Defense Force, Japan

Discussant: **Mr. Masahiro AKIYAMA**

Chairman, Ocean Policy and Research Foundation, Japan

1500~1515 【Closing Session】 (p.29~)

Chair's Concluding Remarks

Dr. Masashi NISHIHARA

President, Research Institute for Peace and Security, Japan

Biographical Information of the Chair/Panelists (p.31~)

Reference Material (p.34~)

Session 1 “Common Security Challenges in the Region and Ways to Promote Regional Cooperation”



Summary of the Presentation

Mr. Kohei Masuda (Vice-Minister of Defense, Japan)



As one of the organizers of this seminar, I would like to express my sincere gratitude for your participation. Through years of security exchanges in the Asia-Pacific region, we are now in a transitional period from dialogue and confidence building to more concrete forms of cooperation. Moreover, upon the transition from the Defense Agency to the Ministry of Defense in 2007, the missions of the Self-Defense Forces (SDF) were reviewed and international peace cooperation activities were stipulated as a primary mission. SDF is now reorganizing itself to fit to this important mission. Amidst such developments, the Ministry of Defense of Japan organized this seminar with an aim to contribute to promoting a more active role of the Ministry and SDF in such activities as international peace cooperation activities and facilitating dialogue and cooperation in this region through discussion of defense authorities and experts from ASEAN countries and Japan. Also, the Ministry of Defense held a new senior defense officials meeting with ASEAN nations

yesterday aiming to cultivate a close person-to-person relationship with them through candid and informal discussion. With the endorsement of participants, we would continue to have this meeting next year.

From a global perspective, there are similarities or commonalities in security challenges across the regions of the world. In the realm of defense and military, there are security challenges that emanate from traditional inter-state relations, such as territorial disputes and problems arising from structural differences among nations. In addition to these, the so-called non-traditional issues like international terrorism, piracy, regional conflicts, disasters, narcotics, pandemics and climate change are emerging as security challenges. Broadly speaking, measures against traditional challenges are defense, and non-traditional security challenges are addressed through operations for the maintenance of law and order or what may be called as international policing activities by armed forces. Measures against traditional challenges are taken mainly by individual states with the view to defend themselves. On the other hand, since non-traditional challenges are transnational, it is not necessarily important to think in state-centric terms. Rather, it is recognized as necessary to meet such challenges through international cooperation beyond each nation's efforts. In addition to national defense, it is conceivable that the armed forces and the military are increasingly expected to play such a role of international policing activities.

In Asia, I think it is ASEAN that has been actively making efforts to address these non-traditional security challenges. ASEAN has been at the core of political-security dialogue in the Asia-Pacific, such as the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF). As far as I know, efforts have been made in recent years to establish the ASEAN Political-Security Community by 2015, and the ASEAN Defense Ministers' Meeting (ADMM) has been held since 2006. Conversely, in Northeast Asia, traditional challenges such as the Korean Peninsula issue still endure, and it is still somewhat difficult to advance cooperation even on non-traditional security challenges. From this, we can say that ASEAN's various attempts are advanced ones in the region.

It is important to bolster ASEAN's own efforts and promote open cooperation in the region. To achieve this, I would like to give a few thoughts and suggestions on what should be done. First is the respect for each country's character and promotion of dialogue. Given the magnitude of non-traditional challenges and potential lack of resources, ASEAN countries and other key players in the region have no choice but to cooperate. External players need to take into consideration the sensitivities felt by the people of receiving countries. Confidence building through dialogue is the key to overcome such sensitivities. The defense authorities should also work toward laying the groundwork for future cooperation. Second, it is essential to set concrete targets for cooperation through dialogue by identifying common security challenges and sharing recognition on what kind of cooperation is possible for each challenge. Third, it is necessary to

further facilitate joint training and personnel exchanges. It is valuable to build each country's capabilities through joint training and share experiences through exchange of personnel including trainees and students. The fourth suggestion is constructive commitment by external partners. There is a growing commitment of extra-ASEAN powers like Australia, China and India, let alone Japan. A refreshed US interest in the region under new administration is a welcoming development. These countries must make concerted and constructive efforts for enhancing stability and resilience of ASEAN rather than compete for influence over them. Lastly, the ARF should be a model for open cooperation as the only region-wide forum for security dialogue by both diplomatic and defense authorities. The great advantage of the ARF is the participation of all major countries in the region. The ARF should develop itself as a more relevant and effective security framework by promoting practical cooperation particularly in the area of non-traditional security where participating states could have common interests.

Main Points:

- The Ministry of Defense of Japan and the SDF hope that this seminar contributes to promoting a more active role of the Ministry and SDF in such activities as international peacekeeping operations and facilitating dialogue and cooperation in the region.
- In addition to national defense, the armed forces and the military are increasingly expected to play the role of international policing activities through international cooperation. ASEAN's various attempts are advanced ones in the region.
- In order to bolster ASEAN's own efforts and promote open cooperation in the region, the following points are suggested:
 - (1) Respect for each country's character and enhancing dialogue;
 - (2) Setting concrete targets for cooperation;
 - (3) Facilitating joint training and personnel exchanges;
 - (4) Constructive commitment of external players; and
 - (5) Promotion of concrete cooperation in the field of non-traditional security through the ARF.

Mr. Antonio C. Santos, Jr. (Under Secretary for Defense Affairs, Department of National Defense, Philippines)



In the Asia-Pacific region, besides rivalry between big powers there are non-traditional security challenges like international terrorism, piracy, large-scale disasters that can affect regional stability. These challenges can be divided into the following broad categories: (1) terrorism, (2) nationalism, (3) economic and resource issues, (4) territorial issues, (5) internal instability, (6) arms issues, (7) bilateral tensions, and (8) non-traditional issues and concerns. The seriousness of these challenges depends on the perception of how they affect countries' national interests. This is influenced by the immediacy of the challenge, geographic proximity, the infectious dimension of the issue, the magnitude of the issue, the collectivity or the chain-effect before the impact. There are also other factors that determine the commonality of security issues. Value factors include the proximity of the danger, the nature of the threat, the economic state, sentimental attachment and the support of security partners. There are also cost factors such as economic costs, the risk of enlarged conflict, the cost of protracted conflict, adverse international reaction, and the cost of public opposition.

While each sub-region of Northeast Asia, Southeast Asia, and South Asia faces its own security issues, common traditional security challenges in the Asia-Pacific include international terrorism (both Islamic and non-Islamic), maritime security, tension in the Taiwan Strait, India-Pakistan tension, nuclear proliferation in South Asia, North Korea's nuclear issue, and the tension in the Korean Peninsula. Common non-traditional security challenges are global warming, climate change, environmental degradation, spread of pandemic diseases, competition over energy supplies, large-scale disasters, and global economic crisis. Given the scale and complexity of these challenges, no single state has the capacity to effectively address them. These issues can be addressed by international and regional cooperation through bilateral and multilateral arrangements.

In Southeast Asia, mechanisms for cooperation have already been in existence and those should be the bases for expanding cooperation and building partnerships. One example is the well-known cooperation against piracy in the Straits of Malacca. And at ASEAN Defense Ministers' Meeting (ADMM) in 2009, bearing in mind the ASEAN Agreement on Disaster Management and Emergency Response and Standard Operating Procedures (SOP), Defense Ministers signed the Concept Paper on the Use of ASEAN Military Assets and Capacities in Humanitarian Assistance and Disaster Relief. The ADMM also declared to promote more

cooperation among ASEAN defense establishments in disaster management in enhancing operational effectiveness so as to minimize victims and losses in natural and manmade disasters. There will be a voluntary demonstration of ARF's response on disaster relief to be held in May 2009 in the Philippines, and it may be utilized for promotion of cooperation. Meanwhile, the Philippines, in cooperation with the U.S. and Australian governments, is in the process of establishing "Coast Watch South," a mechanism in order to enhance maritime security in the border area with Indonesia and Malaysia. And, we also have the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) and the International Maritime Organization (IMO) for the rule of law at sea; the IMO and regional frameworks for fighting against piracy and armed robbery at sea; the Global Maritime Partnership and Coast Guard Forums for capacity building; the United Nations Security Council Resolution 1540 and the Proliferation Security Initiative (PSI) for suppression of terrorism and proliferation of weapons of mass destruction; the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Maritime Navigation (SUA); the Global Maritime Cargo Security; International Ship and Port Facility Security Code (ISPS) and so on.

Mechanisms and protocols in responding to common security challenges in the region seem to be adequate. However, there is a need to further enhance individual capabilities and interoperability of defense forces to address both traditional and non-traditional security challenges. Confronted by the current global economic crisis, the biggest challenge is providing resources for developing capabilities and deploying such capabilities.

Main Points:

- While the seriousness of security challenges varies from one country to another depending on each country's perception of the extent to which they affect its national security, common traditional security challenges in the Asia-Pacific include international terrorism, maritime security, the tension in the Taiwan Strait, the India-Pakistan tension, nuclear proliferation in South Asia, North Korea's nuclear issue, and the tension in the Korean Peninsula. Common non-traditional security challenges are global warming, climate change, environmental degradation, spread of pandemic diseases, competition over energy supplies, large-scale disasters, and global economic crisis.
- Regional cooperation is essential to effectively address common security challenges. Through ADMM, ARF and other mechanisms, a cooperative framework for coping with non-traditional security challenges including disaster relief and maritime security is emerging.
- While we have various mechanisms, there is a need to further enhance individual capabilities and interoperability of defense forces in the region to cooperatively address

both traditional and non-traditional security challenges. The biggest challenge is providing resources for it.

Mr. Jusuf Wanandi (Vice Chair, Board of Trustees of CSIS Foundation, Centre for Strategic and International Studies, Indonesia)



As an introduction to common security challenges, we need to exchange more on the strategic environment in East Asia. While there are many new security challenges in East Asia, the current, new security challenge that has overridden everything else, not only to the East Asian region but also globally, is the financial and economic crisis. Dennis Blair, the top intelligence assistant to the president of the U.S., said in the testimony before Congress that this is the dominant issue of security across the globe and it affects every issue we are facing. While the global financial and economic crisis is not an immediate issue for defense authorities, it is wise to pay attention to after effects, side effects and impacts of this crisis for the security of the world and the region. Because of this crisis, there could be poverty, unemployment, civil strife, even wars and regime changes, especially in developing countries.

Secondly, the balance of power of big countries is still very important in our part of the world, and it is necessary to strengthen relationships between them by establishing regional institutions where big powers can cooperate to deal with challenges. The ARF has been an important forum for confidence building and it is necessary to develop it not only in the talking part but also in the doing part. But, for traditional security challenges, we have to have a kind of institution which can deal with them, and the United States must be a part of it as the most important military power.

Thirdly, as food security or energy security shows, not only traditional issues but also every aspect of life are included in the “security,” and that’s why comprehensive security has been aspired by both ASEAN and Japan. Because all the regional countries participate in this forum, the ARF is an ideal venue to promote cooperation to address non-traditional security challenges. For the ARF to remain relevant in the future, it can discuss confidence building measures but it should also be action-oriented. In order to have such action-oriented cooperation, Co-Chair should come from non-ASEAN countries to have full participation of all countries, a full secretariat has to be established, and the participation of Ministry of Defense including Minister himself should be secured. The issue of natural disasters is the first issue and an example of important action-oriented cooperation at the ARF and the participation of defense

authorities is very important in such activities. In order to promote the ARF toward action-oriented cooperation, support of Japan is very important. If such development of the ARF is realized, non-traditional security challenges like peace-keeping, transnational crime, terrorism, climate change and energy security can be much more effectively addressed through better cooperation.

Main Points:

- Although the global financial and economic crisis is not an immediate issue for defense authorities, it is wise to pay attention to it as it can affect peace and stability of the region.
- It is necessary to establish a regional framework where big powers can discuss traditional security challenges.
- For the ARF to remain relevant in the future, it has to be a more action-oriented forum to cope with non-traditional security challenges.

Tan Sri Mohamed Jawhar Hassan (Chairman and CEO, Institute of Strategic and International Studies, Malaysia)



With the birth of the Obama administration in the US and improved relations between Tokyo and Beijing as well as Taipei and Beijing, the prospects for regional cooperation to manage common security challenges have improved perceptibly in recent months. The most compelling reason for security to be seen as common and for it to be addressed cooperatively in the region, however, has been the dramatic increase in economic integration and interdependence among the states in East Asia and the Asia-Pacific. China, Japan, the United States, South Korea, Taiwan and the ASEAN states are each others' largest trading partners. Economic security of the countries of the region has become intertwined and indivisible like never before, and it is becoming increasingly suicidal and mutually devastating for states to go to war. Regional countries should think more and more in terms of working with one another rather than against one another.

Marked differences in security cultures, doctrines and interests among Asia-Pacific countries make it difficult to generate common interests on threats of military nature. Conversely, non-military/non-traditional challenges to security such as public health, humanitarian assistance, and climate change lend themselves to be perceived as common security threats most easily because they know no borders. Regional cooperation to address common security challenges has thus the greatest potential in the field of non-military security.

The primary common security challenges in the region include: (1) non-military security challenges; (2) threats to peace and stability arising from factors such as major power rivalry, territorial disputes, the Korean issue and cross-Taiwan Strait relations; (3) cross-border militant and terrorist organizations; and (4) nuclear weapons and their proliferation.

There are two general suggestions on promoting regional cooperation on common security issues. First, while common security challenges benefit from cooperation among states, we must never forget that each national effort is the most important. The best contribution regional cooperation can make is to help each nation enhance its capacity available to tackle problems. Second, regional cooperation processes should not be pushed beyond their levels of competency. While maximum effort should be made to enhance the effectiveness of regional cooperation mechanisms, all regional cooperation devices are compromises imposed by the prevailing strategic forces at work in the region. Expecting these processes to deliver beyond their level of competency would be a waste of time.

Based on these two principles, there are several specific suggestions. First, special focus should be given to increasing national capacity. Often the problems are greatest in countries that are least equipped to meet non-traditional security challenges due to lack of capacity. Capacity building can take the form of providing financial resources and material assets, training and knowledge transfer to strengthen legal structures and skills on intelligence and information gathering. Second, as non-traditional security challenges require diverse non-military expertise like medicine and environment, it is necessary to fully engage professionals in the relevant fields within the security framework like the ARF to better address these problems. Third, exclusive security arrangements should not be strengthened. While the existing defense treaties and alliances perform important functions to reassure states and in that regard they should be retained, exclusive security arrangements shouldn't be enhanced as these tend to generate distrust, tension and hostility. Fourth, while we minimize existing exclusive military arrangements, we should expand inclusive military engagements especially joint military exercises which bring everyone together. Fifth, since unresolved historical issues are at the heart of distrust, suspicion and residual hostility among countries in Northeast Asia, these issues must be solved. Sixth, as China has begun to be more transparent with regard to its military, this positive development should be further encouraged. Seventh, the ARF should promote a code of conduct to govern maritime issues and conflicting maritime claims in Northeast Asia, similar to the one between China and ASEAN in Southeast Asia. Eighth, regional countries must take a balanced effort on the proliferation of nuclear weapons. While emphasis tends to be given to prevention of nuclear proliferation to non-nuclear states, more emphasis should be given to disarming nuclear weapon states. Lastly, while the threat of international terrorism and piracy

have receded greatly, thanks to national and regional efforts, countries in the region should remain vigilant on these issues and continue building capacity to effectively confront these threats.

Main Points:

- Regional cooperation to address common security challenges has the greatest potential in the field of non-military security.
- The key to effective cooperation in coping with common security challenges is building national capacity. What is needed the most in the region is cooperation for capacity building through the provision of resources and training and the transfer of knowledge.
- The following points are recommended: Engaging professionals of related non-military fields in the regional processes, not enhancing exclusive security arrangements, promoting open joint military exercises, resolving historical issues, increasing the transparency of armed forces, promoting a code of conduct to govern maritime issues in Northeast Asia, and making a balanced effort on the non-proliferation and disarmament of nuclear weapons.

Discussant: Dr. Seichiro Takagi (Professor, Aoyama Gakuin University, Japan)



I would like to raise three questions. First relates to difficulty of institutional arrangement. Non-traditional security issues vary greatly. Not all countries in the region address these issues in a similar manner. In some countries, defense establishments address these issues, whereas in others police or non-defense agencies deal with them. In many cases, civil society organizations are also involved in dealing with non-traditional security issues. Even within one country, several agencies are involved. It is very difficult to coordinate activities of different agencies in various countries. How can regional countries approach the difficulty and complexity of coordinating a myriad of different agencies from different countries?

The second difficulty in promoting regional cooperation is the persistent nature of nationalism. Nationalistic sentiments can hinder effective cooperation. The earthquake in China's Sichuan Province is a case in point. Although Japan's offer to send SDF cargo planes to transport relief materials to Sichuan was accepted by the Chinese government, this agreement had to be cancelled quickly due to the consideration of nationalistic anti-Japanese sentiments felt by the Chinese people. The Myanmar cyclone is another example, in which Myanmar's unwillingness to accept international relief efforts hindered international disaster relief

operations. Regional countries have to find the way to overcome this issue.

Third, a more difficult issue relates to the treatment of Taiwan. Although being well aware of the complexity of the issue, as non-traditional security challenges are common to all I have to ask how regional cooperation can be effective if it excludes Taiwan which has a significant size of economy and population. This is in no way to be understood as supporting Taiwanese independence, but I am only advocating creative approaches to work out a way to include Taiwan in regional cooperation, like the recent action taken by the World Health Organization (WHO) to apply the International Health Regulation (IHR) to Taiwan directly.

Questions and Answers

1) Comments from the Panelists on the Points made by the Discussant

Wanandi: On the difficulty of coordination, although it cannot cover all the areas of cooperation, Foreign Ministry should be the coordinator and play the central part in coordinating responses at first. On nationalism, regionalism is a good instrument to curb nationalist sentiments. ASEAN is a good example of this. On the issue of Taiwan, regional countries do not have a large role to play because it is an issue of China-Taiwan relations. Countries can only state that peaceful cross-Strait relations contribute to the stability and welfare of the region.

Masuda: I would like to touch upon the question on the earthquake in Sichuan Province, as a person directly involved. We believed a military-to-military understanding on SDF's sending transport aircraft to the province was reached between Japan and China. However, there were difficulties in public relations or the way we perceive our relations with the media, and this development was made open at the early stage, provoking various discussions among Chinese people. We feel we have to take into full account the way to promote our public relations. Also, I would like to comment on non-traditional issues from a different angle. Last week Japan dispatched two Maritime SDF ships to off-Somalia to tackle piracy in the area. By this, there would be areas where military ships from Japan, China, and South Korea are present together and acting side-by-side. If there could be some kind of cooperation among them, and when that information reaches each country, how the public in each country perceive it would be very important. As this illustrates, cooperative relationship in tackling non-traditional security challenges might contribute to efforts to cope with traditional challenges.

2) China

Q: The rise of China is the most significant phenomenon in this century. How should China engage in regional cooperation? Has the rise of China affected in any way the perception of Southeast Asian countries on how to engage China in regional cooperation?

Jawhar: Other than bilateral and China-ASEAN processes, China now participates in many Track I like the ARF and Track II multilateral security processes like the CSCAP. Initially the process was difficult because China was not used to discussing openly at multilateral fora and sometimes they just read out their papers and stuck to their positions. But China has growingly become comfortable in regional engagement and has become a very responsible player in regional processes. China has taken initiatives in various issues at the ARF and become able to engage multilaterally better than some other countries. China is now a responsible stakeholder in the region.

Wanandi: China's participation is very much appreciated. Honestly speaking, there are worrisome movements from China, but, at least we can directly talk on those with China through regional arrangements now. In the last twelve to thirteen years various topics including security issues were discussed in the dialogue between the ASEAN and China and, questions like China's defense expenditures, defense doctrines and defense postures were raised. Institutional frameworks enable such dialogue. Such confidence building mechanisms should be established between regional big powers in the future. For this reason I think an overarching Summit would be necessary where the big powers including the U.S. come together and discuss challenges including military issues.

Q: On the issue of the South China Sea, China and ASEAN claimants agreed on the Declaration on the Conduct of Parties in the South China Sea. Why did Southeast Asian countries come to agreement on this declaration without having China withdraw its naval presence from the Spratly Islands?

Santos: Because China is a big country physically and financially, we (ASEAN countries) have to engage China. The Philippine government recently passed a law on Philippine baselines, which is consistent with UNCLOS. The Philippines didn't include Scarborough Shoal, which is along the boundary of our Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ), and Kalayaan Island Group, which is part of the whole Spratly Island Group, into Philippine's main baselines, but considered these as "regime of islands." Because UNCLOS is a mechanism to settle disputes, we came up with

this baseline law so that our domestic laws will be compliant to UNCLOS. Regarding the presence of Chinese submarines, the Philippines does not have the capacity to detect them in its area. Without evidence, the Philippines cannot protest. However, through political and security dialogues, the Philippines and China have built confidence and now both countries can ask questions each other candidly. What is important is respecting each other.

3) The impact of the global economic crisis

Q: Considering the meaning of the oil crisis in 1973, I agree on the opinion that the present global economic crisis is a security challenge. Also, history shows that economic crisis can change political and security decisions greatly. Two years after the Great Depression in 1929 occurred the Manchurian Incident and then Germany and Italy tried to rise following that. After the oil crisis in the 1970s, maybe thinking the era of the U.S. had ended, the Soviet Union took a military invasion. The occupation of the U.S. embassy in Iran also occurred. These are examples that economic crises brought acts of folly in political and security terms. In 2009 Asia, what effects would the current global economic crisis have on regional security? There are two possible dangers. First, China might face difficulty in maintaining self-control on the use of growing military capacity in the wake of the economic crisis. If China's economic growth stagnates, which could lead to worsening domestic grievances and growing criticism toward the Chinese government, China may feel compelled to take a hard-line policy against outer world and to take aggressive acts in the East China Sea and the South China Sea. Second, as a result of the economic crisis, there might be a possibility of terrorism using weapons of mass destruction.

Wanandi: The present economic crisis is expected to last for several years, and since we are late in getting the results of countermeasures, resolutions of the problem might be more delayed. Differences in their approach among developed countries could delay the resolution, and as a consequence developing countries might collapse. Much closer cooperation is necessary to prevent the worst scenario from realizing. There are six Asian countries (Australia, China, India, Indonesia, Japan and South Korea) in the G-20, but they have not cooperated closely to the extent they should in changing rules or hammering out necessary stimulus packages to get the regional economy back on track for development. Now, the 120 billion dollars emergency fund of the Chiang Mai Initiative of ASEAN+3 (APT) has been multilateralized and it is expected that an additional fund for future stimulus packages in the region would be agreed in the APT summit the next month in Thailand. Changing rules of the IMF and the World Bank for coping with the crisis is a mid-term task, and much closer cooperation is required for that.

On terrorism, although it is still a threat and we have to remain vigilant, we have taken

various domestic measures and the threat of terrorism has declined significantly in the region.

Jawhar: Although our export markets in the U.S. and Europe were not damaged during the last economic crisis, the situation is different this time. The world economy has been more globalized. The economies of Southeast Asia will recover when the U.S. and other big economies come out of the recession. But, until then, we have to make efforts through implementing stimulus packages, improving efficiency, developing domestic markets, and so on.

Although the current economic crisis is a big concern in Southeast Asia, a larger problem is still the issue of nation-building. Nation-building is a very important issue in countries like Myanmar/Burma, Thailand, the Philippines and Malaysia. Countries in Southeast Asia are also undergoing political transformation. While Indonesia has been more successful in democratic transformation, other countries are experiencing difficulties. Problems related to nation-building still preoccupy the mind of Southeast Asian countries.

With respect to China, as all countries have increased military spending until the economic crisis, it is not possible to stop China's military expenditure. What is most important is to build trust, engage, improve transparency, and reduce the cause of frictions. It is important to look at China's military expenditure and capability in a wide perspective. For example, Japan has high quality naval capacity equivalent to China. Japan has no nuclear capability but it has the ability to develop it quickly if it wishes to do so. The alliance with the U.S. is also Japan's advantage. The Chinese naval capability is lower than India's. Although China's military budget continues to increase, the sum of China's military expenditure in the last ten years in absolute amount would equal to the military expenditure of one country in one year. There are some countries in the region that have traditional or historical problems with China, but they must adjust to situations and make things less hostile and confrontational as far as possible.

4) Terrorism

Q: The threat of maritime terrorism in the Malacca Straits is serious, but the issue of sovereignty is hindering effective multilateral cooperation. Understanding the linkage between terrorism and piracy is critical.

Santos: Abu Sayyaf with links to Jemaah Islamiyah is still a threat in the Philippines, and southern Philippines is very porous. But, with cooperation of the US and Australia, the Philippines is improving national capacities by, for example, installing radars to watch ships movements in the border regions. Developing national capacity is very important in addressing

terrorism, which makes bilateral and multilateral cooperation possible.

Summary of Session 1

Major points raised during the session include the followings:

- Common security challenges include both traditional and non-traditional issues, but the latter is the area in which cooperation is more likely. To effectively manage issues that transcend national boundaries, regional and international cooperation are required.
- Seeking for cooperation to cope with non-traditional security challenges will also contribute to improvement of inter-state relations.
- While defense establishments and armed forces may not play a primary role in managing the current global financial crisis, it is a serious security challenge that requires them to be cautious about the side effects of the crisis, such as domestic instability and inter-state tensions.
- Capacity-building of individual countries is as much important as regional cooperation in coping with common security challenges. Measures such as joint training and personnel exchanges can contribute to enhancing national capacity-building.
- The ARF should seek to deal with non-traditional security challenges in a more action-oriented way. Non-ASEAN countries like Japan can play an important part in developing the ARF toward that direction.
- On traditional security challenges, regional frameworks that enable dialogues between major powers are also necessary.

Remarks by H.E. Mr. Nobuo Kishi (Parliamentary Secretary for Defense, Japan)



The role of regional multilateral fora is changing from holding dialogues and discussion to implementing concrete cooperation such as military training and the drafting of strategic guidelines for international disaster relief. Time has come for defense and military establishments in the region to positively commit themselves to regional peace and stability. Cooperation with other countries is significant in order to solve various security issues. This Tokyo Seminar has three characteristics and values. First, while arguments on security have focused on global issues such as terrorism in recent years, this seminar focuses on this region. Second, it is hosted by a defense authority. A number of international and regional conferences have already been held, but defense authorities rarely hosted one. Third, it is widely open to the public in order to enhance public interest in security issues. The Ministry of Defense of Japan hopes that this seminar serves to the effort for improving security environment and promoting regional dialogues and cooperation.

Session 2 “Efforts of the Defense Authorities for the Promotion of Regional Cooperation”



Summary of the Presentation

Ambassador Barry Desker (Dean, S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore)



The key component of regional security architecture today is the US. As China becomes more powerful and increasingly influential in regional and global institutions, the management of US-China relations should be the critical concern for US security policy-makers. The challenge will be to do this while reassuring Japan that its security interests are not undermined. The US has been upgrading its defense relations with key allies in the region. Washington has also resumed aspects of its military assistance program to Indonesia. Significantly, since 2005, the Japanese armed forces have engaged American, Singaporean, and Thai forces in military maneuvers in Thailand, Cobra Gold. The significance of such strategic development is two-fold. First, it reflects Japan’s increasing desire to be a ‘normal’ state. Second, it suggests that while bilateral alliances such as the US-Japan treaty relationship will remain a primary instrument of US security policy, there is a progressive multilateralization of US-led security cooperation in Asia.

What are the emerging trends in the development of regional defense and security

cooperation? Although the East Asian Summit (EAS) and the East Asian Community (EAC) provide opportunities for informal confidence building and discussions on broad strategic issues that concern the region, neither have the defense component. A potentially significant defense-related development is the proposal of the ASEAN Defense Ministers' Meeting-Plus (ADMM-Plus) process as an integral part of the ADMM which would be inclusive of ASEAN's dialogue partners. The ADMM-Plus provides a framework for confidence building and should facilitate the handling of emerging traditional and non-traditional security issues such as maritime security, terrorism, peacekeeping, humanitarian assistance and disaster relief. ASEAN regards the ADMM-Plus as a means of engaging the major powers and facilitating constructive and cooperative norms of behavior.

The ADMM-Plus process would be even more significant if a synergistic relationship could be developed between the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) forum and the ARF. A new security architecture which is inclusive and representative as well as having the capacity to shape regional security and economic environment could then be nurtured. This could be done through back-to-back meetings of APEC and the ARF at the summit level. At the moment, the ARF is primarily a Foreign Ministers' forum. What is needed is a substantive defense component beyond the level of senior officials at ADMM-Plus. If APEC meets in an ASEAN country once every three years, ARF summits could be held at the same time. Because there is no need for APEC to replicate the workings of the ARF, APEC should be a primary economic forum. Regional security architecture issues taken up during the ADMM-Plus meetings would have the attention of heads of government during ARF summit meetings.

The primary obstacle to effective regional cooperation is the presence of competing visions of regionalism. If defense authorities are to play a useful role in overcoming such obstacle, there is a need to coalesce around a common vision, which is inclusive, strengthens cooperative relationships, and reduces the risk of arms races. Traditional and non-traditional security challenges provide the basis for concrete measures designed to build mutual confidence amongst defense institutions in the region. There is a need for one institution where all these issues are discussed at the summit level.

Main Points:

- While bilateral alliances will remain a primary instrument of US security policy, there is a progressive multilateralization of US-led security cooperation in Asia.
- The ADMM-Plus provides a framework for confidence building and would facilitate the handling of emerging traditional and non-traditional security issues, such as maritime security, terrorism, peacekeeping operations, and humanitarian assistance and disaster relief.

- Holding back-to-back meetings of APEC and the ARF at the summit level would be useful. Regional security architecture issues taken up during the ADMM-Plus meetings would have the attention of heads of government during ARF summit meetings.
- The primary obstacle to effective regional cooperation is the presence of competing visions of regionalism. There is a need to coalesce around a common vision, which is inclusive, strengthens cooperative relationships, and reduces the risk of arms races.

Dr. Thitinan Pongsudhirak (Director, Institute of Security and International Studies, Chulalongkorn University, Thailand)



The critical issue today is how to collectively handle, manage and resolve security challenges that are transnational and regional in nature. These challenges include terrorism, piracy, large-scale disasters, energy security, food security, environmental security, pandemics, migration, human and drug trafficking, and other forms of transnational crime. Chief among regional responses to these challenges is the ARF. But this forum has been constrained by its inability to move much beyond confidence-building measures.

Regional security dialogue has been given a new impetus and moment by the launch of the ASEAN Defense Ministers' Meeting (ADMM). Almost at the outset of the ADMM's formation, the concept of ADMM-Plus was broached, which involves extra-ASEAN states. While it is still nascent and inchoate, the ADMM-Plus offers a qualitatively new platform for regional cooperation on defense and security issues beyond ASEAN's capacity. The dilemma of ADMM-Plus is that in order to avoid the ARF's path, the ADMM-Plus must ensure that its inclusiveness and openness are confined to the regional states on common regional challenges and are issue-driven. If ADMM-Plus ends up as another vehicle of the so-called "open regionalism," it risks dilution and may end up like ARF and APEC, unable to stake out a clear and achievable agenda due to contending and unworkable preferences of the myriad membership.

The ADMM-Plus may have to confine itself to such functional issue-areas as disaster relief and maritime security, which are rooted in ASEAN but require extra-ASEAN cooperation for solutions. As a host of non-traditional security challenges are global or extra-regional (meaning beyond ASEAN Plus Three) in nature, the ADMM may have to prioritize its common security challenges in going forward with the ADMM-Plus.

The recent 14th ASEAN Summit held in February 2009 was significant. It was the first for

ASEAN under its much-vaunted Charter, which envisions an integrated ASEAN community by 2015. In view of its latest summit, ASEAN may now be poised to proceed in two broad and problematic directions, internal and external. Within ASEAN, the Charter retains the congenital “non-interference” principle while calling for human rights and fundamental freedoms. Such an inherent contradiction, as manifested in gross divergences in regime types from outright military dictatorship to thriving democratic rule, makes the Charter fundamentally challenged unless these democratization gaps among members are increasingly bridged towards the highest common denominator. The ASEAN Charter conceived of a democratizing ASEAN. The ASEAN members either have to open up their political landscapes on their own or irreparably erode the document on which their credibility and future viability now rest.

Externally, frustration from outside have come to the fore. As ASEAN in the driver’s seat has meant going nowhere, ASEAN’s partners have come up with alternatives in a fast-changing global landscape. They include Australia’s proposed Asia-Pacific Community, Indonesia’s call for regionalization around G-20, Shangri-la Dialogue and China-Japan-South Korea trilateral summit. This is why the ADMM-Plus concept should be given more attention and commitment.

Main Points:

- The ADMM-Plus offers a qualitatively new platform for regional cooperation on defense and security issues beyond ASEAN’s capacity. The ADMM’s dilemma is that the ADMM-Plus may follow the ARF’s path, suffering from contending and unworkable preferences of the myriad membership. To avoid this, openness must be subsumed under regional priorities that require regional inclusiveness.
- In order for ASEAN to create its Community by 2015, democratization gaps among members must be bridged towards the highest common denominator. The ASEAN Charter conceives of democratizing ASEAN. The credibility of ASEAN rests with the process of internal political developments that are in line with charter provisions.
- Externally, ASEAN’s partners are frustrated by ASEAN in the driver’s seat and have come up with alternatives. This is why the ADMM-Plus concept should be given more attention and commitment.

Mr. Yasushi Akashi (Chairman, Japan Center for Conflict Prevention)



The UN Charter can be looked at from the perspective of universalism versus regionalism. In the process of drafting the UN Charter, universalism won, but regionalism has been retained in Chapter VIII as a subsystem under the Security Council. Almost as an afterthought in San Francisco, Article 51 referring to inherent right of individual and collective self-defense was inserted. As the Cold War started and the UN became unable to function as envisaged, more and more resort was made to Article 51. The end of the Cold War in the late 1980s and early 1990s brought about the shift of focus of world attention back to the UN as an embodiment of universal security. But after initial successes of peacekeeping, the UN faced unexpected difficulties in Somalia, Rwanda and former Yugoslavia, compelling the US to withdraw into unilateralism. Now with the advent of the Obama administration, regionalism may gain new prominence. It is not the choice of one against another, but we have to have an appropriate mix of global, regional, bilateral and national efforts.

Asian countries, while accepting UN membership as important, have seemingly not been completely comfortable with the direction in which UN proceeds. In East Asia, two major UN peacekeeping operations have taken place (Cambodia and East Timor) and there are smaller monitoring missions in Nepal and Kashmir; however, in some other conflicts in this area, there is no UN role in such places as Sri Lanka, Aceh, and Mindanao. This picture of Asia makes a sharp contrast to, for instance, Africa, where a number of major UN peacekeeping and peace-building efforts continue.

Several new global and regional non-traditional threats have emerged, calling for regional coordination of action and civil-military cooperation in areas like post-conflict peace-building. At the end of peacekeeping operations, we need a prolonged period of peace-building to make sure there is no recurrence of old conflict. Post-conflict peace-building necessitates active participation of the military elements in areas such as disarmament, demobilization and reintegration (DDR), demining operation, and disposal of unexploded ordnance. Police and some military presence are required in the subsequent period of establishment of law and order and humanitarian assistance. Then comes a period of sustained governance. Other non-traditional security issues that sometimes require military presence include natural disasters, terrorism, nuclear proliferation, and many types of transnational crime. In all these efforts, coordination between military, police and civil authorities is becoming more and more vital.

ASEAN is a sub-regional organization. In order to fill the void of non-ASEAN East

Asian countries, we have today ASEAN+3, +6, etc. It has been pointed out that though existing large regional bodies such as APEC and ARF have important functions to fulfill, they suffer from their large membership and diversity of nations in performing specific security purposes. It may be necessary to have some intermediate structures. The ADMM-Plus might present significant new contribution to help resolve some of the new regional and global threats. But such new proposals have to be very carefully delineated and attentively nurtured. We also should avoid over-ambitious approaches. Any new institutions should be tailored in such a way that they will meet specific needs and requirements and that their capabilities are carefully balanced with tasks.

Main Points:

- We have to have an appropriate mix of global, regional, bilateral and national efforts.
- Post-conflict peace-building necessitates active participation of the military elements in areas such as DDR, demining operation, disposal of unexploded ordnance, the maintenance of law and humanitarian assistance.
- Existing large regional bodies suffer from their large membership in performing specific security purposes. New intermediate institutions should be carefully delineated and attentively nurtured as well as meet specific needs. Their capabilities should be balanced with tasks.

Major General Koichi Isobe (Vice Commanding General (International), Central Readiness Force, Ground Self-Defense Force, Japan)



To contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security, Japan Self-Defense Forces (SDF) engage in international peace cooperation activities. Such activities are categorized into three types: United Nations peacekeeping operations, international disaster relief operations, and activities based on special measures laws such as humanitarian and reconstruction activities in Iraq.

International disaster relief operations conducted by the SDF may take different forms according to factors such as the type of disaster, degree of damage, and requests of governments of affected countries or international organizations. The GSDF maintains a standby posture that allows CRF and Regional Armies to deploy international disaster relief units such as medical treatment, helicopter transport, and water supply. In conjunction with the GSDF, the MSDF's Self-Defense Fleet and ASDF's Air Support Command maintain sea and air lift capability for

overseas deployment of GSDF unit. Since 2005, the SDF has conducted three major international disaster relief operations in Indonesian Sumatra Island and the Indian Ocean in 2005, Pakistan in 2005, and in central Java Island, Indonesia in 2006. Through these activities, the SDF learned two lessons: the importance of rapid deployment and close cooperation with civilian partners. GSDF's experience of humanitarian reconstruction assistance in Iraq suggests that the formation of coordinating mechanism with local community is critical for the faster and simpler implementation of reconstruction projects. We believe this experience can be applied to future international disaster relief operations.

Since its establishment in 2007, the Central Readiness Force (CRF) has developed and strengthened partnerships with relevant organizations based on the I³ concept. The first "I" stands for initiative. Because many actors play various roles, coordination of operations and activities is complex. Taking an initiative is critical to accomplish missions. The second "I" stands for innovative. The SDF must be innovative because every operation is unique. The third "I" is for interactive. Being interactive is very important for civil-military cooperation.

To be interactive, the CRF maintains regular contacts with civilian organizations with potential partnership, such as United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), United Nations University (UNU), Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA), and International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC). Maintaining relationship with these civilian organizations will make it easier to coordinate with one another in the field. The CRF actively participates in workshops to improve capabilities, to acquire information related to civil-military cooperation, and to strengthen relations with various civilian organizations. Because relationships with foreign countries, especially foreign forces, are similarly important, the CRF holds dialogues with foreign partners. For education and training, CRF members have participated in multinational exercises and seminars such as Cobra Gold. Finally, CRF has its International Peace Cooperation Activities Training Unit. This unit engages in education and research on international peace operations and educates troops which will be deployed overseas. The unit invites lecturers from international organizations and NGOs.

Main Points:

- GSDF maintains a standby posture that allows CRF and Regional Armies to deploy international disaster relief units in a timely manner.
- Through international disaster relief activities and humanitarian reconstruction assistance, the SDF learned two lessons: the importance of rapid deployment and close cooperation with civilian partners.
- To better cope with domestic and overseas operations, the CRF has developed and

strengthened partnerships with relevant organizations based on the I³ concept, which stands for Initiative, Innovative and Interactive. To be interactive, the CRF maintains regular contacts with civilian organizations and foreign partners.

Discussant: Mr. Masahiro Akiyama (Chairman, Ocean Policy Research Foundation, Japan)



Some ten years ago we saw a lot of multilateral security cooperation in Europe, but impressively there are multi-layered international arrangements relating to security of this region in recent years. The ideas of the ADMM-Plus and the combination of APEC and ARF are interesting, but it is necessary to further discuss issues of the membership and the subject matters that these fora take up. We should also further discuss the idea, as raised by Professor Thitinan, of a forum that is open but regionally-inclusive.

Since regional institutions have not dealt with issues related to peacekeeping and peace-building, they should give more emphasis on these issues in the future.

It is important to exchange views at the summit level on a regular basis for the promotion of regional cooperation. Discussion at the summit level is necessary on conventional security challenges like the Korean Peninsula, the Taiwan Strait, maritime issues, military build-up, and non-traditional security challenges.

It is not so easy for the military forces in the region to conduct joint operations, but the ARF and other regional dialogue fora should deepen discussion toward that end.

Asian countries have a stake in good trilateral relations of the US, China and Japan. It is also instrumental to discuss the mentioned trilateral relations for regional security cooperation.

The CRF should make more effort in public relations so that Southeast Asian countries have a better understanding of its functions.

A question to General Major Isobe: What is the relationship between CRF partnership and international disaster relief operations?

Questions and Answers

1) Comments from the Panelists on the Questions raised by Discussant Mr. Akiyama

Isobe: We, the SDF, have a basic recognition that overseas operations, be it peacekeeping operations or disaster relief operations, cannot be accomplished by ourselves. We need

cooperation and coordination with various relevant organizations on site. Cooperation and coordination on a regular basis through CRF partnership is very important for partnership-building.

Since I omitted the explanation of CRF missions and the procedures of sending SDF missions to overseas in my presentation earlier, I would like to explain a little more in detail. The CRF is a new headquarters established three years ago, and the headquarters is responsible for sending GSDF contingents overseas. The main bodies of the standby forces are located in Regional Armies, and the CRF commander will conduct operations overseas with those standby forces provided by the Regional Armies. Our five Regional Armies maintain the standby forces on a six-month rotational basis. When disasters occur overseas and the governments of affected countries make a request, the Army Commanding Generals provide the CRF Commander with their contingents, and the CRF dispatches troops overseas. The MSDF and ASDF maintain a highly ready force posture for transport. Depending on the type and scale of disasters, we may form a joint task force headquarters or set up a joint coordination cell at the site if necessary.

2) Peacekeeping and Peace-building

Q: How do Singapore and Thailand prepare their armed forces for peacekeeping and peace-building operations? For example, are there any programs for training armed forces on the legal aspects of use of force, language, and so forth?

Thitinan: The Thai military has long been involved in dozens of peacekeeping operations since the Korean War. Thailand is going to send a battalion to Darfur in June. Thailand has a peacekeeping center, headed by a Major General. Peacekeeping has been a distinct military operation within the Thai armed forces and has become a source of dignity, pride, prestige and income for Thai military officials. Peacekeeping, as opposed to peace-building and peace-making, can be integrated into Thailand's overall foreign policy position. Peacekeeping in East Timor, which was considered a successful operation, was headed by a Thai lieutenant general.

Desker: Singapore is relatively a new comer to the provision of military contingents to peacekeeping operations. Its participation began in East Timor, but since then there has been greater involvement of Singaporean forces in peacekeeping operations. However, the Singaporean armed forces have played a more significant role in humanitarian assistance and disaster relief operations. The Singaporean armed forces are now being trained to effectively respond at short notice to such incidents which might arise in the region.

Akashi: I'm a longstanding partisan of more regional training programs for peacekeeping and peace-building. As early as 1992 when I headed the UNTAC, I felt that joint participation in training activities not only increase capacity and efficiency of peacekeepers, but enhance mutual confidence among participants. I have advocated that countries in the region, including Japan, China and South Korea, to join these training exercises. Having a unit for international cooperation, I'd like to see Japan moving one step further to improve the capability of Asian countries in peacekeeping operations. In the area of peace-building, Hiroshima University, in cooperation with the Japanese Foreign Ministry, Defense Ministry, and several civil society organizations, has embarked on regional training programs on future peace-builders.

Question to General Major Isobe: What is the status of Japan's UN standby arrangements for peacekeeping? In a report that came out in 2002, the International Peace Cooperation Advisor Group suggested that Japan should participate in the UN system of standby arrangements for peacekeeping. Has the Japanese government made its decision to participate in the UN standby arrangements?

Isobe: The Japanese government has not decided to participate in this arrangement of UN standby forces, but the Ministry of Defense is discussing what kind of cooperation is possible for such arrangements. At present the SDF has units for activities like peacekeeping operations on a six-month rotational basis and can send engineer corps, aviation squadrons, and medical support teams overseas within a few months or so.

One of the advantages of participating in UN peacekeeping operations is that they contribute to confidence building among regional armed forces. For example, in Cambodia the GSDF worked side by side with the Chinese army engineer corps; in East Timor the GSDF worked closely with the South Korean engineer corps. Mutual respect was also nurtured between the Japanese SDF and Chinese and Korean armed forces by working together.

Q: How did differences in the capabilities of national armed forces and the lack of interoperability affect peacekeeping operations in Cambodia?

Akashi: With regard to police contingents, Singapore had an outstanding police contingent which exercised good leadership. I, as head of the UNTAC, had more difficulty in maintaining the high quality of the police forces than armed forces. With regard to armed forces, although all Asian countries, including ASEAN countries, had efficient armed forces, there were cultural differences in the way of thinking and operation among troops coming from different countries,

especially between the commanders and between the commander and the troops. To settle differences, sometimes I had to intervene between the commander and the troops.

There were some troops with questionable quality from non-Asian countries, but these countries were undergoing the process of tremendous social transformation with the breakup of the communist political system. When a country is in trouble within itself, the performance of its troops participating in the UN peacekeeping operations needs improvement. These countries also had more victims. But, since then the UN has improved its performance, and the UN Department for Peacekeeping Operations has also been strengthened. The UN peacekeeping operations have evolved from a simple, traditional type of peacekeeping to the second generation which is multi-dimensional involving a lot of civilian organizations and expertise. Operations in Congo and southern Lebanon required higher military capabilities than usual, and the rules of engagement have changed as well. This evolution of UN peacekeeping operations poses a challenge to any Asian countries. I personally feel that Japan has been a bit too over-cautious and reluctant to undertake difficult and complex operations even under the auspices of the UN. Even there is no UN blessing, the Japanese government should think of cases in which SDF can participate in operations if it is in the larger interest of the countries concerned, not limited to Japan.

Desker: Singapore has a longer tradition of providing police forces than armed forces in peacekeeping operations. What should be emphasized here is that with the beginning of the ADMM process, what we're likely to see is increased cooperation among ASEAN countries on learning from best practices in peacekeeping operations, just as there will be a move towards learning from best practices in maritime security and humanitarian disaster relief operations.

Akashi: On this point of best practices, while it is vital to learn from past experiences, as Major General Isobe has already pointed out, each situation is unique, and we have to always be innovative. Learning too much from one operation is as bad as learning too little. From my experience in former Yugoslavia, we were determined not to make the same mistake as in Somalia, with the UN venturing too much into an aggressive type of action. Our common motto was "not to cross the Mogadishu line." We were determined to keep to traditional principles of peacekeeping. But the situation in Yugoslavia was in the midst of a civil war, so we had to devise cooperation with NATO. While learning as much as possible from past experiences, peacekeepers should always be aware of new elements in each situation.

3) Disaster Relief

Q: How can this region cooperate to cope with natural disasters? In the case of peacekeeping operations, the UN has its Security Council. It passes resolutions and asks member countries to send troops. But on disaster relief, there is no such organization; countries have to work together in a coalition type. How do regional countries participate in disaster relief operations?

Akashi: There is an UN office in charge of emergency and humanitarian assistance, called the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA). The OCHA has a branch in Geneva and also a small office in Kobe. The OCHA collects information about emerging natural disasters and appeal for international assistance from countries that are prepared to offer such assistance. But, I'm not aware of any regional organization for information sharing and coordination of activities vis-à-vis natural disasters.

Isobe: As written in the reference prepared for today's seminar, for regional cooperation to deal with large-scale disasters, Japan holds the Tokyo Defense Forum (TDF) and Multinational Cooperation Program in the Asia Pacific (MCAP), sponsored by the Ministry of Defense of Japan and GSDF. The Ministry invites high-ranking regional military officers for training and sharing information and experiences. Since the SDF have learnt a lot of lessons from responding to natural disasters, we are prepared to share such information and experience with Asian countries upon request. We can also share relevant information online via a US Pacific Command-sponsored network, called the Asia-Pacific Advanced Network (APAN).

Thitinan: National preparedness for natural disasters varies across the region. On the one hand, there are countries like Japan which have an advanced, comprehensive natural disaster-response program. Other countries, on the other hand, do not have the same level of readiness as Japan. When it comes to regional response, the ADMM recognizes the difficulty of how to coordinate the actions of regional countries. Even if there is an agreement, for example, there must be a standby agreement for quick action. After Cyclone Nargis in Myanmar, ASEAN Secretary-General Surin Pitsuwan proposed that ASEAN should maintain a food stockpile. Yet, this is just the beginning, and they have not had sufficient discussion to move forward. Until the "how" question is resolved, each country has to rely on national responses based on national readiness at different levels.

Desker: After the 2004 tsunami, Indonesia had immediate willingness to accept international participation, including the deployment of the armed forces units. In Cyclone Nargis, the

government of Myanmar was concerned that the presence of foreign military forces within the country could be interpreted as the lack of political will on the Myanmar government side to respond to it. There were a number of ASEAN countries which had contingents on standby but were waiting for the agreement from the government of Myanmar. This instance highlights a problem within ASEAN, with emphasis on self-determination, non-interference and respect for sovereignty. These principles have led governments in the region to be constrained in criticizing or even acting when there is a disaster in neighboring countries unless there is the agreement of that state. This trend has been inscribed into the ASEAN Charter, and the flexibility that existed earlier does not now exist.

Akiyama: Japan has various human resources for natural disasters. The dispatch of these resources should be based on the request of affected countries or international organizations.

4) The role of India in the region

Q: What effects will India's growing influence have on regional security?

Desker: India's regional and global influence will increase. India's Look East policy has resulted in an increase in interaction with Southeast Asian countries. However, India still has some issues. In terms of power projection, India is focused on its relations with its neighbors while it is interested in playing a global role in international institutions. It should be noted that for both India and Japan, as one rises as a global power, the responsibility of that country that it has to the region and the world also increases. That also means that the country must be prepared to address domestic communities regarding its role in the international community.

Summary of Session 2

Main views raised during Session 2 are as follows:

- In addition to peacekeeping operations, there are cases in which the active role of defense authorities and armed forces is critically important in post-conflict peace-building, especially in areas of DDR, demining operation, disposal of unexploded ordnance, humanitarian assistance, and the maintenance of law and order and good governance. In disaster relief and terrorism, the role of defense is also expected. In all of these activities, cooperation between the military, the police and civil society is vital.
- Differences in the capability of regional countries to pursue peacekeeping operations could affect the efficiency and the safety of peacekeepers. As UN peacekeeping operations have become more complex, it is important to build or improve capabilities of regional countries

through such cooperation as joint training.

- While it is important to learn from the past experience in peacekeeping operations, it is also important for peacekeepers to keep in mind that each situation is unique and different. Peacekeeping forces should always expect new elements and be flexible in response.
- The national preparedness for disasters varies across the region. It is instrumental to share experience on this issue among defense establishments.
- The ADMM-Plus has the potential of providing a useful venue for handling non-traditional security issues. On the other hand, it runs the risk of becoming like the ARF, which is unable to take actions due to its too large membership.
- By holding back-to-back meetings of the APEC and the ARF, ARF summits should be held on a regular basis.
- New intermediate institutions (e.g. ADMM-Plus) should be carefully delineated and attentively nurtured. They should be tailored in such a way to meet specific needs and requirements and their capabilities are carefully balanced with tasks.

Closing Session: Chair's Concluding Remarks

Dr. Masashi Nishihara (President, Research Institute for Peace and Security, Japan)



In summary, some of the important points made at this seminar include:

- (1) Non-traditional security challenges require multilateral cooperation;
- (2) Armed forces could have a role to play in those issues that necessitate immediate response and those whose aftereffects could expand and worsen rapidly, such as large-scale disasters and peacekeeping operations;
- (3) While non-traditional security challenges include peacekeeping and peace-building, disaster relief, terrorism, piracy, and transnational crime, all of these issues do not necessarily require regional defense/military cooperation. Affected countries will respond to disasters by themselves if they are able to do so, but when foreign military forces are to assist them, they should do so to help the efforts of the affected countries;
- (4) Sovereignty and national pride are still important in the region, and they could be obstacles to regional cooperation among armed forces;
- (5) Some kind of legal basis and the willingness and capability for cooperation are necessary for regional armed forces to work together multilaterally;

- (6) Shaping habits of cooperation through multilateral joint training would be constructive in responding to emergent situations. Countries should foster the culture of accepting international assistance; and
- (7) Regional frameworks such as the APEC, ARF, ADMM and ADMM-Plus have great potential in advancing cooperation among defense authorities. However, we should avoid becoming over-ambitious about these frameworks and attentively nurture them.

Biographical Information of the Chair/Panelists

Chair

Masashi NISHIHARA (Japan) is President of the Research Institute for Peace and Security (2006-). Receiving Ph.D. in political science from the University of Michigan, he taught at Kyoto Sangyo University and National Defense Academy and served as President of the Academy for six years. Among others, he was a member former Prime Minister KOIZUMI's Task Force on External Relations (2001-04) and a member of the Weapons of Mass Destruction Commission, chaired by Hans Blix of Sweden (2004-06).

Panelists (in the order of presentation)

Kohei MASUDA (Japan) is Vice-Minister of Defense, Japan (2007-). After graduating from Tokyo University, he joined Japan Defense Agency and served as Deputy Director-General, Bureau of Defense Policy; Director, Office for Promoting Assistance to the Reconstruction of Iraq, Cabinet Secretariat; Director, Office of Civilian Assistance to the Reconstruction of Iraq, Cabinet Office; Director-General for Joint Operations, IT & Facilities; Director-General, Bureau of Personnel & Education.

Antonio C. SANTOS, Jr. (Philippines) is Undersecretary for Defense Affairs, Department of National Defense (DND), Philippines. He graduated from the Technological Institute of the Philippines. During his military career of more than 35 years, he served at several Staff and Command positions in the Armed Forces of the Philippines including Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations in the General Headquarters. After retirement from the military service at Major General rank in 2000, he joined the DND and served as Undersecretary for Operations and Undersecretary for Plans, Policy and Special Concerns.

Jusuf WANANDI (Indonesia) is Co-founder and Vice Chair, Board of Trustees of CSIS Foundation, Center for Strategic and International Studies, Indonesia. He is also chairman of the Indonesian National Committee for Pacific Economic Cooperation Council (INCPEC) and co-chair of CSCAP (Council for Security Cooperation in the Asia-Pacific) Indonesia, and concurrently the member of the Steering Committee of CSCAP. He is also president director of *the Jakarta Post*, national English daily. He taught at University of Indonesia and served as secretary of the Indonesian Supreme Advisory Council and as four-term representative in the People's Consultative Assembly.

Mohamed JAWHAR (Malaysia) is Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Institute of Strategic and International Studies, Malaysia (2006-). Before joining ISIS Malaysia as Deputy Director-General in 1990, he served with the government as Director-General, Department of National Unity; Under-Secretary, Ministry of Home Affairs; Director (Analysis) Research Division, Prime Minister's Department; and Principal Assistant Secretary, National Security Council. He also served as Counselor in the Malaysian Embassies in Indonesia and Thailand.

Seiichiro TAKAGI (Japan) is Professor, Aoyama Gakuin University, Japan. He taught at Saitama University and National Graduate Institute for Policy Studies and served as Director of the Second Research Department of the National Institute for Defense Studies. He specializes in international politics, Chinese studies, international relations in the Asia-Pacific region and security issues. He received Ph.D. in politics from Stanford University.

Barry DESKER (Singapore) is Dean, S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies, Nanyang Technological University (NTU), Singapore, and Director, Institute of Defence and Strategic Studies, NTU. He served in the foreign service as Deputy Permanent Representative to the United Nations and Singapore's Ambassador to Indonesia. He was appointed as Chief Executive Officer of the Singapore Trade Development Board. He is concurrently Vice-Chairman of Singapore Business Federation and the Chairman of Singapore Technologies Marine. He studied at the University of Singapore, University of London and Cornell University.

Thitinan PONGSUDHIRAK (Thailand) is Director of the Institute of Security and International Studies (ISIS) and Associate Professor of International Political Economy at the Faculty of Political Science, Chulalongkorn University. He has authored a host of articles, books and book chapters on Thailand's politics, political economy, foreign policy, and the role of the media in democratization, as well as ASEAN and East Asian security and economic cooperation. He holds Ph.D. from London School of Economics.

Yasushi AKASHI (Japan) is Chairman of the Japan Center for Conflict Prevention. He received M.A. from University of Virginia and later studied at the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy. He became the first Japanese citizen to join the United Nations Secretariat in 1957 and served as Ambassador at the Permanent Mission of Japan to the UN, Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs, Special Representative of Secretary-General for Cambodia and later for the Former Yugoslavia, Under-Secretary-General for Humanitarian

Affairs. Concurrently, he is Representative of the Government of Japan on Peace-Building, Rehabilitation and Reconstruction in Sri Lanka and Visiting Professor at Ritsumeikan University and Akita International University.

Koichi ISOBE (Japan) is Vice Commanding General (International), Central Readiness Force, Ground Self-Defense Force (GSDF), Japan. He is Major General. After graduating from National Defense Academy, he joined GSDF and served as Commander, 9th Aviation Unit; Chief, Exercise Section, Ground Staff Office (GSO); Senior Research and Development Officer, Ground Research and Development Command; Director, Policy and Programs Division, GSO; Vice Chief of Staff, Eastern Army.

Masahiro AKIYAMA (Japan) is Chairman, Ocean Policy and Research Foundation (2001-). Upon graduation from Tokyo University, he joined the Ministry of Finance and took charge of budgetary planning and banking administration. He was transferred to the Japan Defense Agency (JDA) and served as Vice-Minister of Defense and at other senior positions. After retirement from JDA, he was a visiting fellow in Harvard University. He is concurrently Professor, Graduate School of Social Design Studies, Rikkyo University.

Reference Material

Large-scale Disasters

Maritime Security

International Peace Cooperation

Terrorism

The Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) and Their Delivery Means

(This reference was distributed at the 1st Tokyo-Seminar on Common Security Challenges.)

Large-scale Disasters

Asia is extremely prone to natural disasters such as earthquakes, typhoons, floods, volcanoes, droughts, and wildfires. Examples of large-scale natural disasters include the earthquake off Sumatra and the subsequent tsunami in the Indian Ocean in December 2004, earthquakes in Pakistan in October 2005, the earthquake in Central Java Island in June 2006, the large-scale cyclone that hit Myanmar in May 2008, and the earthquake in Sichuan Province of China in May 2008.

Japan's Efforts

- International disaster-relief operations

Disaster-relief operations are conducted by the Japan Disaster Relief Team (JDR), which is composed of rescue teams, medical teams, expert teams, and the Self-Defense Forces. They are dispatched individually or in cooperation with other teams based on the scale of the disaster and the degree of damage. GSDF maintains its readiness for international disaster relief operations by possessing Central Readiness Force and regional units, so that they are capable of providing medical, transport, and water supply services in a self-sustained manner. The MSDF and the ASDF maintain their readiness to dispatch fleet and air-support units respectively to transport supplies to units participating in international disaster relief operations. SDF undertook international disaster-relief operations in, among others, Indonesia, India, Pakistan, Thailand and Iran.

- Tokyo Defense Forum¹
- Multinational Cooperation Program in the Asia Pacific (MCAP)²
- Grant Aid for Disaster Prevention and Reconstruction
- Creation of Japan-Indonesia Joint Committee on Disaster Reduction (2005)
- Establishment of the Asian Disaster Reduction Center (ADRC) (1998)³

Regional Efforts

- ARF
 - Inter-sessional Meeting (ISM) on Disaster Relief
 - Adoption of the "ARF General Guidelines for Disaster Relief Cooperation" (2007)
 - Desktop exercise on disaster relief (co-chaired by Australia and Indonesia, May 2008)
 - Field exercise (Voluntary Demonstration of Response) (to be held in May 2009)
 - Consideration of the ARF Standby Arrangement
 - Development of the ARF Strategic Guidance for Humanitarian Assistance and Disaster Relief
 - National Contact Points for Disaster Relief Cooperation
- ASEAN
 - Establishment of the ASEAN Committee on Disaster Management (ACDM) (2003)
 - Conclusion of the ASEAN Agreement on Disaster Management and Emergency Response (AADMER) (2005)
 - Standard Operating Procedure for Regional Standby Arrangements and Coordination of Joint Disaster Relief and Emergency Response Operations (SASOP)
 - ASEAN Regional Disaster Emergency Response Simulation Exercises (ARDEX)
 - ASEAN Humanitarian Assistance and Disaster Management Coordination Center (AHA Center)
- Multilateral joint exercises (e.g., Cobra Gold)
- Establishment of the Tsunami and Multihazard Early Warning System in Southeast Asia (Asian Disaster Preparedness Center: ADPC)

Common Agenda in the Region

- Coordination and information sharing between affecting countries and assisting countries/organizations
- Consolidation of institutions and procedures for emergency response
- Capacity-building, enhancement of interoperability
- Establishing regional mutual assistance and coordination mechanism (e.g., hotline)

¹ In an effort to respond to large-scale disasters, TDF stresses the importance of disaster relief cooperation. For TDF, see <http://www.mod.go.jp/e/d_policy/t_d_forum/index.html>.

² In August 2006, under the theme of "Importance of military-civilian collaboration in the event of large-scale disasters and their ideal relations to be built in peacetime," participants held a training session.

³ The ADRC works to build disaster resilient communities and to establish networks among countries through many programs including personnel exchanges in the field. It has 27 member countries, including Japan, China, the ROK, and ten ASEAN countries. For more details, see the ADRC website <<http://www.adrc.asia>>.

Maritime Security

While threats to maritime security are manifold such as armed conflict, accidents, and marine pollution, one of the greatest threats in the Southeast Asian waters is crimes at sea, such as piracy and smuggling and trafficking in arms, drugs and persons.

Japan's Efforts

In order to strategically examine the maintenance of maritime order and preservation of safe sea transportation lines, the Ministry of Defense has established a section for maritime policy in its Bureau of Defense Policy. As countermeasures against piracy in Southeast Asia area, Japan Coast Guard sends ships and aircrafts to the area. In addition to carrying out patrols on high seas, JCG conducts combined exercise, enhances information exchange and improves cooperation and collaboration with the relevant organizations, in order to develop their law enforcement capability.

- Regional Cooperation Agreement on Combating Piracy and Armed Robbery against Ships in Asia (ReCAAP)⁴
- Grant aid to regional coast guard agencies (provision of patrol vessels, improvement of port facilities security)
- Helping establishing regional coast guard agencies (Philippines, Indonesia, Malaysia)
- Enhancing partnerships between/among coast guard agencies (holding of seminars and meetings, including Regional Conference on Combating Piracy and Armed Robbery against Ships, Asian Cooperation Conference on Combating Piracy and Armed Robbery against Ships, Heads of Asian Coast Guard Agencies Meeting, Asia Anti-Piracy Challenges, Maritime Drug Law Enforcement Seminar (MADLES))
- Enhancing law enforcement capability of regional coast guard agencies (e.g., training junior officers)
- Co-chair of the ARF Inter-session Meeting (ISM) on Maritime Security

Regional Efforts

1) Regional Fora

- ARF ISM on Maritime Security (1st meeting was co-chaired by Japan, Indonesia and New Zealand)
- APEC Maritime security is given emphasis under STAR (Secure Trade in the APEC Region) initiative
- North Pacific Coast Guard Forum (Japan, China, ROK, Canada, Russia, US), Western Pacific Naval Symposium (WPNS) etc.

2) Bilateral and Multilateral Maritime Security Cooperation

- Coordinated patrols between and among the Indonesian, Malaysian, Singaporean, and Thai Naval Forces (INDOSIN, MALINDO, MASLINDO, the Malacca Straits Patrol (MSP) Agreement)
- Aerial patrol "Eyes in the Sky" among Indonesia, Malaysia, Singapore, and Thailand
- Joint naval exercises with user states
 - United States (CARAT (Cooperation Afloat Readiness and Training))⁵
 - India (Singapore-India Maritime Bilateral Exercise: SIMBEX, Indonesia-India coordinated patrol: INDINDO)
- Multilateral joint exercises (Pacific Reach, Search and Rescue Exercise (SAREX), Multilateral Joint Marine Exercises, Joint Exercise to Fight Piracy, Five Power Defence Arrangements⁶)

Common Agenda in the Region

- Capacity building and training of officials of regional navies and coast guard agencies in order to address crimes at sea such as piracy
- Enhancement of partnerships and coordination between coast guard agencies and maritime defense forces (regional efforts may encounter problems in coordination since relevant agencies to address piracy and other crimes at sea are not necessarily the same)
- Enhancement of partnerships between/among relevant law enforcement agencies both within and between regional countries

⁴ ReCAAP, which was proposed by Japan, was concluded in November 2004. The Information Sharing Center was established in Singapore in November 2006. The 14 member countries are Japan, China, ROK, India, Bangladesh, Sri Lanka, and eight ASEAN countries except Indonesia and Malaysia. Indonesia and Malaysia participate as observers.

⁵ CARAT is an annual series of bilateral maritime training exercise between the United States and Brunei, Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore, and Thailand.

⁶ Malaysia, Singapore, Australia, New Zealand, and the United Kingdom

International Peace Cooperation

In East Asia and particularly Southeast Asia, international peace cooperation has been conducted in, for instance, Cambodia (United Nations Transitional Authority in Cambodia (UNTAC: February 1992 – September 1993)) and East Timor. In East Timor, international operations such as the United Nations Transitional Administration in East Timor (UNTAET: October 1999–May 2002) and the United Nations Mission of Support in East Timor (UNMISSET: May 2002–May 2005) have been conducted, and the United Nations Integrated Mission in Timor-Leste (UNMIT) is still in operation (from August 2006).

Japan's Efforts

- Participation in peacekeeping operations such as UNTAC and UNTAET/UNMISSET
- In January 2007, international peace cooperation activities were stipulated as one of the primary missions of the Self-Defense Forces (SDF).
- Establishment of the International Peace Cooperation Activities Training Unit (March 2007) and Central Readiness Regiment (March 2008) under the GSDF Central Readiness Force
- Preparations for the establishment of the International Peace Cooperation Center (tentative name)
- International peace cooperation exercises by the SDF and other related efforts
- Drafting of a “Best Practices Reference Paper for Peace-Building” (at the 7th Sub-Committee of the Forum for Defense Authorities in the Asia-Pacific Region (Tokyo Defense Forum: TDF))⁷
- Multinational Cooperation Program in the Asia Pacific (MCAP)⁸
- Seminars and symposia on peace-building (e.g., Tokyo Peacebuilders Symposium)
- Launching of the Pilot Program for Human Resource Development in Asia for Peacebuilding (2007)

Regional Efforts

- ARF
 - ARF Inter-sessional Meeting (ISM) on Peacekeeping (1996-1997)
 - Meetings and seminars at the ARF (e.g., Peacekeeping Experts' Meeting, Peacekeeping Seminar)
 - Creation of ARF Contact Points for Peacekeeping
 - Development of an Almanac of Peace Operations Training Activities
- Peacekeeping training exercises (e.g. Cobra Gold, Cambodian Peace Support Operations, South Asia Peacekeeping Operation Command Post Exercise, Khaan Quest)
- Peace operations training under US Global Peace Operations Initiative (GPOI) (Peace training centers are located in Indonesia, Malaysia, Thailand, etc.)⁹
- ASEAN
 - Following points are agreed in areas of peacekeeping and post-conflict peace-building.
 - Utilization of national peacekeeping centers
 - Adoption of a common standard operating procedures (SOP)
 - Establishment of regional arrangements for the maintenance of peace and stability

Common Agenda in the Region

- Holding of a joint peacekeeping exercise
- Joint training and capacity-building measures (e.g. language training)
- Development of an integrated mission concept, involving planning, training, operation, etc.
- Fostering cooperation among national peacekeeping centers
- Development of a peace-building and nation-building program
- Improvement in interoperability (guidelines, standard operating procedures, etc)
- Fostering information sharing and coordination of activities in the field
- Civil-military relations (enhancement of cooperation and collaboration between militaries and civil society organizations)

⁷ The Tokyo Defense Forum has been annually held by the MOD since 1996. For the Seventh Sub-Committee in February 2008 and the Best Practices Reference Paper, see <http://www.jda-trdi.go.jp/j/defense/dialogue/tdf/pdf/7th_sub_summary_e.pdf>.

⁸ In August 2008, MCAP held a seminar on peacekeeping.

⁹ The United States sees the Malaysian Peacekeeping Training Center as a “Center of Excellence” for peacekeeping training in Southeast Asia. For US GPOI, see <<http://www.state.gov/t/pm/ppa/gpoi/c20212.htm>>.

Terrorism

Indonesia experienced a series of terrorist attacks from 2002 to 2005. Jemaah Islamiyah, an Islamic terrorist organization, is strongly suspected of carrying out these bombings. Thanks to steady progress on national and regional counter-terrorism measures, there have been no large-scale terrorist attacks reported since 2006. Nevertheless, terrorism continues to threaten national political stability in the Philippines and the southern part of Thailand. Terrorism remains to pose greatest threat to peace and security in the region.

Japan's Efforts

The 9.11 attacks on the US led to the enactment of the Anti-Terrorism Special Measures Law and the succeeding law, the Replenishment Support Special Measures Law, was enacted in January 2008. On the basis of these laws, the MSDF has been conducting replenishment activities in the Indian Ocean. Japan places high priority on capacity-building assistance to developing countries. Japan implements capacity-building assistance utilizing Official Development Assistance (ODA), especially in the Southeast Asian region. Specifically, Japan has accepted trainees, dispatched experts, provided relevant equipment, and held seminars in the following areas: (1) immigration control, (2) aviation security, (3) port and maritime security, (4) customs cooperation, (5) export control, (6) law enforcement cooperation, (7) combating terrorist financing, (8) counter-chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear (CBRN) terrorism, and (9) international counter-terrorism conventions and protocols.¹⁰

- Introduction of a new assistance scheme, the Grant Aid for Cooperation on Counter-Terrorism and Security Enhancement (2006: USD 62million, 2007: USD 65million). To the ASEAN countries, it has begun to apply the Japan ASEAN Integration Fund (JAIF) (USD 68million) established in March 2006.
- Provision of technical assistance and relevant equipment
- Hosting of the ASEAN-Japan Counter Terrorism Dialogue
- Hosting of various seminars and meetings

Regional Efforts

Regional countries, especially law enforcement agencies, are promoting cooperation with emphasis on information sharing and capacity building.

- Establishment of counter-terrorism centers (Southeast Asia Regional Centre for Counter-Terrorism (SEARCCT), Jakarta Center for Law Enforcement Cooperation (JCLEC))
- Joint statements and conclusion of treaties (ASEAN Convention on Counter Terrorism (ACCT))
- Cooperation with extra-regional countries, especially the United States and Australia
 - US: economic and military assistance, International Military Education and Training (IMET), joint military exercises (Balikatan (US-Philippines), Cobra Gold (US, Thailand, Singapore, Indonesia and Japan))
 - Australia: economic and military assistance, joint military exercises between Australia's Special Forces and Indonesia's Special Forces, *Kopassus*.
- Cooperation between and among ASEAN countries (information sharing between/among law enforcement agencies, holding of relevant seminars)
- Cooperation through regional fora
 - ARF (ARF Inter-sessional Meeting on Counter-Terrorism and Transnational Crime, various joint statements against terrorism)
 - APEC (various measures with the aim to secure the region's economic, trade, investment, and financial systems: Establishment of Counter-Terrorism Task Force (CTTF), STAR (Secure Trade in the APEC Region) initiative)
- Asia/Pacific Group on Money Laundering (APG)

Common Agenda in the Region

- Addressing gaps in counter-terrorism capacity among regional countries
- Strengthening border security and immigration control
- Strengthening partnerships between defense and law enforcement agencies
- Balancing between tightening domestic political stability and protection of human rights

¹⁰ MOFA, *Diplomatic Bluebook 2006*, p. 138.

The Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) and Their Delivery Means

Japan's Efforts

Japan seeks a peaceful resolution to North Korea's nuclear and missile problems and denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula through Six-Party Talks. Recognizing that cooperation in Asian region is indispensable for enhancing the non-proliferation of WMD, Japan has actively implemented outreach activities to encourage other countries with the aim of promoting understanding and strengthening efforts toward non-proliferation, including the Proliferation Security Initiative (PSI) (e.g. Asian Senior-level Talks on Non-Proliferation (ASTOP) and Asian Seminar on Export Control). Japan hosted the PSI Maritime Interdiction Exercises in the sea off Sagami Bay in October 2004 (Team Samurai 04) and in Izu-Oshima Eastern Sea in October 2007 (Pacific Shield 2007). Japan has been providing information and knowledge gained through past training to the national defense authorities of Asian countries to promote understanding toward PSI.¹¹

Regional Efforts

While almost all the countries in the region are parties to international non-proliferation treaties such as the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), the Biological Weapons Convention (BWC), and the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC), the number of participating countries in the relevant global export control regimes is small (see the table below). Generally, one of the reasons that ASEAN countries are non-committal to these regimes derives from their concern that the regimes could well restrict the technology transfer for peaceful purposes.¹² Japan, Singapore, Brunei, Cambodia and the Philippines declared for PSI, and Japan and Singapore have hosted PSI Interdiction Exercises.

At a broader regional level, the ARF and APEC also address the issue of WMD proliferation, but their efforts are not legally binding. The only legally binding arrangement is the Treaty on Southeast Asia Nuclear Weapon-Free Zone (SEANWFZ). All the ten ASEAN countries acceded to the treaty, but none of the nuclear weapon states, including India and Pakistan, has yet signed it (see the table below).

Country	AG	HCOC	MTCR	NSG	ZAC	SEANWFZ
Japan	x	x	x	x	x	
China				x	x	
ROK	x	x	x	x	x	
DPRK						
Brunei						x
Cambodia		x				x
Indonesia						x
Laos						x
Malaysia						x
Myanmar						x
Philippines		x				x
Singapore						x
Thailand						x
Vietnam						x

Notes: AG: Australia Group, HCOC: Hague Code of Conduct against Ballistic Missile Proliferation, MTCR: Missile Technology Control Regime, NSG: Nuclear Suppliers Group, ZAC: Zangger Committee, SEANWFZ: Treaty on Southeast Asia Nuclear Weapon-Free Zone.

Common Agenda in the Region

- Strengthening partnerships between relevant national and international agencies on interdiction exercises such as the PSI (comprehensive approach that incorporates defense, diplomacy, law enforcement and export control)
- More participation in global export control regimes
- Weak export control systems
- Non-proliferation as a policy agenda is not given high priority (differences among regional countries as to the threat that WMD proliferation poses to their national security)

¹¹ MOD, *Defense of Japan 2008 and 2005*; MOFA, *Disarmament and Non-Proliferation: Japan's Efforts*, March 2007.

¹² Indonesia, Laos, Malaysia, and Vietnam are vocal on this point. See their submitted reports to the UN Security Council 1540 Committee. <<http://disarmament2.un.org/Committee1540/report.html>>.