

Council for Security Cooperation in the Asia-Pacific

11th
GENERAL
CONFERENCE



Ensuring a Peaceful Evolution of Regional Security Order in the Asia-Pacific

REPORT

14-15 December 2017
Chiang Mai, Thailand

CSCAP Thailand

Part I

INTRODUCTION

The 11th General Conference of the Council for Security Cooperation in the Asia-Pacific (CSCAP) was convened in Chiang Mai, Thailand from 14-15 December 2017. It was the first time that the CSCAP General Conference was held in Thailand. The Institute of Security and International Studies (ISIS Thailand) and Devawongse Varopakarn Institute of Foreign Affairs co-hosted the conference with financial and technical assistance, together with that from the Asia Foundation and the CSCAP Steering Committee.

The Conference has attracted the policymakers, academics media, members of diplomatic corps to the City of Chiang Mai.

The Opening remarks from the CSCAP Thailand's Chair, Dr. Suchit Bunbongkarn, reflected the complexity of security threats in the Asia-Pacific, while setting the objective of the conference towards constructive conclusion and policy recommendations. Keynote speech was delivered by H.E. Kasit Piromya, Former Minister of Foreign Affairs Thailand. The Asia Regional Director of the Center of Humanitarian Dialogue, Dr. Michael Vatikiotis, delivered dinner speech. The CSCAP Thailand's Deputy Chair and Former Deputy Permanent Secretary for Foreign Affairs, Dr. Chitriya Pinthong, gave the Closing Remarks.

The theme of the 11th CSCAP Conference "Ensuring a Peaceful Evolution of Regional Security Order in the Asia-Pacific" was structured to allow experts and foreign service officers to exchange insights and experience on the following topics:

1. Changing Great-Power Dynamics in the Asia-Pacific: Meanings and Consequences
2. Beyond 50: ASEAN Centrality and Regional Architecture-Building
3. Addressing Maritime Security Challenges: Ways Forward
4. Terrorism and Extremism: Management, Mitigation, Prevention
5. Non-Traditional Security Threats: Human Trafficking, Transnational Crime and Human Security
6. Wrap-Up Roundtable: How to Save the Asia Pacific from itself!

Part II

HIGHLIGHTS AND DEBATES

Thursday, 14 December 2017

WELCOME REMARKS

Dr. Thitinan Pongsudhirak

Director of Institute of Security and International Studies (ISIS Thailand)

Dr. Thitinan welcomed the participants to Chiang Mai, a northern province situated at the heart of mainland Southeast Asia. He asked participants to join him to observe a moment of silence in the memory of Dr. Surin Pitsuwan who passed away on Nov 30, 2017. He was the Former ASEAN Secretary General and Thailand Foreign Minister whose contributions had led to the advancement of ASEAN and interest of the Thai people in this regional organization. The country has suffered a great loss as Dr. Surin could have had a strong leadership role at the global stage. Dr. Thitinan expressed his sincere gratitude for the supports from the Devawongse Varopakarn Institute of Foreign Affairs, the Asia Foundation and the CSCAP secretariat for the organizing of the 11th CSCAP General Conference. He conducted the conference proceedings which received much anticipated media attention expecting that the CSCAP would provide important dialogue mechanism for a diplomatic break-through regarding current security crises in the region.

WELCOME REMARKS

Mr. Krit Tanawanit

Vice Governor of Chiang Mai Province

Mr. Krit pointed out that Chiang Mai was an attractive venue for seminar and conference due to its excellent facilities and accommodations, cultural heritage charms and hospitality of people. Long history of Chiang Mai City dated back over 700 years when it was the capital of Lanna Kingdom. Nowadays it is a popular city with much to visits including temples in Lanna style architectural structures. Relating to the title of the 11th CSCAP conference, Mr. Krit agreed that security and stability were among Chiang Mai great concerns, especially related to the highland opium poppy cultivation and trade. The Royal Projects initiated by the late King have offered alternatives to the local people's traditional livelihoods including the growing of coffee and certain vegetables unique to the cooler climate of the North. These royal

projects have decreased the intensity of the problems of drugs and human trafficking. Chiang Mai Province continues to support these projects to help address suppressing security issues in the region.

WELCOME REMARKS

Ambassador Yoshiji Nogami

CSCAP Co-chair

Countries in the Asia-Pacific are surrounded by several security issues that have to be dealt with including maritime security challenges in the Northeast Asia and South China Sea, the spreads of terrorism, problems associated with rising population. Ambassador Nogami recognized the past contributions made by the Track Two diplomatic channel such as CSCAP, and expected meaningful discussions among the participants of this conference to help address these security challenges.

WELCOME REMARKS

Dr. Suriya Chindawongse

The Devawongse Varopakarn Institute of Foreign Affairs

The Conference represents CSCAP diversity and breadth with a number of countries participating from different time zones. Dr. Suriya stressed the significance of CSCAP where ideas have complemented and influenced that of the Track One such as the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF) to inform policy decision-makers. The vision of CSCAP, and its contributions have since been conducive to producing a much more transparent and clearer picture of the whole security landscape and to realize potential areas of challenges in the region. Dr. Suriya urged participants to recognize the pace and breadth of change happening in the region and highlighted the level of uncertainty and dynamics of security situations while calling for an on-going search for the equilibrium of peace and security in the Asia Pacific. Hopeful thoughts for the ideas generated at this CSCAP would be reflected in the institutions of the Track One to complement the good initiatives that have been established.

OPENING REMARKS

Dr. Suchit Bunbongkarn

The CSCAP Thailand's Chair and CSCAP Co-Chair

Dr. Suchit started his remarks by welcoming participants and providing a background of CSCAP being a platform for a meeting of experts, academics, government and foreign service officers and researchers in the area of international and regional security to exchange ideas vital to the traditional and non-traditional

security issues in the region. He further expressed his hope for the conference to provide recommendations to various government bodies on the current crises. His remarks highlighted profound changes in the global and regional security landscape over the past two decades. Issues ranked high in the priority list of policymakers include the rise of China as a full-fledged military superpower, the uncertainty of the United States' security roles in the Asia-Pacific region, the security conflicts and uncertainty in the Korean Peninsula, lack of the cordiality of the relationship among some countries in the Asia Pacific, the maritime disputes in the South China Sea, and the questionable ASEAN's centrality in addressing these challenges. Non-traditional security threats have emerged to post greater concerns especially human trafficking, spread of terrorism and extremism, and a number of transnational crimes. Among a number of multilateral channels being established to address the whole range of issues, CSCAP has taken up some of these concerns as presented in the agenda of this Conference. He expressed his hope for the CSCAP's Track Two mechanism to provide constructive conclusion and policy recommendations for these security challenges.

KEYNOTE ADDRESS

H.E. Kasit Piromya

Former Minister of Foreign Affairs Thailand

H.E. Kasit Piromya started his speech by echoing the concerns raised earlier by previous speakers. He stressed three key elements to address current security challenges; 1) China, 2) Intelligence, and 3) The United Nations.

China: On the point of the emerging China into the international scene, H.E. Kasit Piromya traced the changing tone of China's foreign relations over the past decades. China was friendly with positive gestures and actions, resulting in a conducive environment for it to grow and to participate in the globalization and embracing the market economy. Such emerging China was deemed as a positive element of the world at large. With the advent of the 21st century, the world tends to see the 'Emerging China' as an erupting China to the global political and economic landscape. The pursuit of its policy objectives in an assertive and aggressive manner need to be discussed and call for collective actions by the global leaders especially those in the Indo-Pacific region.

Further elaborated on the concerns over China, H.E. Kasit shared his view that not only China has become more nationalistic world power, China has also exported its one-party system of development model – challenging the multi-party open-society one. Chinese leaders have been seen influencing various leaders particularly in Southeast Asia on the view that emulating the Chinese model would lead to peace, stability

and economic development. Having said that, he tended to disagree that such practice would be conducive to development. He argued by presenting the case of Japan post-war development as well as South Korea and Taiwan over the past 50 years towards a full-fledged open democratic society as lessons drawn and alternative to the Chinese model. The practice of Chinese leadership, colluding with some leaders in the region, deems to be detrimental to the relationships among countries in the region as the leadership of the authoritarian one would be catering to the interests of a few and disadvantages of the people at large, hence, affecting the model of ASEAN centrality and people at the center of all ASEAN activities. Collective leadership to face with Chinese challenges and dominance must be based on the democratic foundation.

Intelligence: All the cross-border crimes including terrorist activities and violence need a much more enhanced intelligence networks that connect all the intelligence agencies of countries around the world and in the Asia-Pacific in particular. The deployment of the new technology i.e. satellite intelligence communication and drones, as well as the joint border patrol can become an urgent necessity which needs a lot of cooperative activities and coordination in order to suppress cross-border crimes.

He suggested that there is a need to revive *the roles of the United Nations* which have been inactive over the past eight years along with that of the US Presidency. Particular focuses should be on the peacekeeping operations and the enhancement of the world's prosperity and progress. Collective plans such as the master plans on migration, on displaced-persons/refugees, and the one on controlling the border diseases could be impactful, as well as the master plans on the prevention and suppression of the human trafficking and endangered species. In such context, the strong leadership of the United Nations could play the role for the drafting of such plans, especially the application of the comprehensive plan of actions for the case of the Vietnamese boats people to the Rohingya crisis.

H.E. Kasit continued to discuss the role of the UN on the pressing issue in *the Korean Peninsula*. Recent statement from the US Secretary of the State confirmed the direction for peace. He did not see the logic of imposing sanction and then proposed for the neutrality of the Korean Peninsula and the Nuclear Free Zone for the whole peninsula to be guaranteed by the UN peacekeeping force. Direct negotiations between North and South Korea, under the auspices of the UN, should be considered. This includes the inspection by the IAEA that gears toward dismantling of the facility and the development of ballistic missiles on the part of North Korea. He continued to suggest more contributions of the uniformed personnel to be recruited from the forces of the US, Russia, China, Indonesia, Australia and Thailand in securing peace in the region.

On the *management of the South China Sea* following the verdicts of the International Court of Arbitration which ruled out the Nine-Dash Line's territorial claim by China, H.E. Kasit asked the international community to consider the resource management in the South China Sea being a common issue of the region – suggesting that the amount of up to 20% of income generated from the resources in the South China Sea become a revolving fund for the humanitarian undertakings for people around the world. He also mentioned the important role that the UN could play in *the management of major rivers* of the Indo-Pacific region due to the tributary connectivity and downstream effects.

Given the structure and nature of governments in Southeast Asia and the Asia Pacific region, H.E. Kasit was hoping to see a more open and democratic atmosphere and denounced the authoritarian regime as there would be no future for the people at large. Such self-defeating political structure could yield benefits only in the short term, or medium term at most, but not in the long term. He strongly believed that the openness could provide a better way to address diverse political structures in this region in order to ensure effective communication and cooperation.

SESSION ONE

**CHANGING GREAT-POWER DYNAMICS IN THE ASIA PACIFIC:
MEANINGS AND CONSEQUENCES**

Chair: Dr. Thitinan Pongsudhirak, ISIS Thailand

Mr. Richard Smith

Co-Chair, Australia CSCAP

Mr. Smith started his presentation by conceptualizing the term ‘power’ which characterizes a strategic weight of the country in relations to others. Factors affecting the strength of power include the size of economy, population, momentum and connection. These are important elements used to determine the degree of power of a country. Mr. Smith suggested that the United States is still considered the most influential power; however, it is among many rising powers with economic weight and national leadership especially in the Asia Pacific region. National leadership and domestic policy under the previous US presidency and the current administration under President Donald Trump have sent a strong message regarding the dynamic of great powers. Mr. Smith highlighted that the US has been stepping back in terms of economic activities and its roles in the global political arena. With such conditions, the economic weight and negotiation approach of China have allowed the momentum of power to swing to its favor. The nuclear armed Russia has recaptured its influences in the Middle East while China has been showcasing its military agenda and economic might. These situations have shaped global politics especially in the Asia-Pacific.

With such perspective, Mr. Smith suggested that change and uncertainty would govern dynamics of engagement among partners in the region. The governments would likely be more cautious about their actions and engagement in such context. Particularly the Australian government would continue to keep its interests in the region. He further opined that the containment policy of the Cold War type is not advisable. Nor would it be in anyway desired in addressing the rise of China as a global power. Balancing power and fostering ties with partners in the region is therefore recommended, along with the open-market system and the attitude towards openness and political engagement. He stressed the role of the United Nations in ensuring a 'rule-based' global security governance and international relations. Liberal principles remain important, but no longer a generic model for the rule-based order. He commented that the rules deem not to fit the changing context. He then raised two questions to the floor: whether there was benefits

in the discussion on the ‘rule-based global order’ and what China meant by ‘rules’ and how they were made.

Dr. Wu Xinbo

Director, Center for American Studies

Dean, Institute of International Studies

Fudan University

Dr. Wu defined the shift in powers to derive from the accelerated changing in power structure and strategic adjustment by players. He did not foresee an overturn or evolution in the global politics. This was because economic logics is the main factor and all players were trading/investment partners in most of the development and economic cooperation. In terms of the geopolitics in the Asia-Pacific, the China-U.S. relations have set the regional agenda. Much of the discussion have been to promote regional economic cooperation and the security concerning North Korea. Dr. Wu commented that the U.S. and China had to collaborate and work together to shape the global governance. He further elaborated on the point concerning global governance; global players have concerns about the way China plays its game. He suggested that China’s strategic approach was to maintain stable and secured political environment in order to safeguard its interests.

Professor Satoru Mori

Professor of Faculty of Law

Hosei University

Professor Mori discussed three main agenda concerning how to make sense of the U.S. position, what the prioritized and disregarded areas were and what implication this may have, and international trade and North Korean crisis. On the U.S. position, based on the Trump’s administration of putting America First, an agenda was set on issues most important to its interests, including homeland defense/counter terrorism, Afghanistan, North Korea nuclear proliferation, redistribution of trade benefits and deficits. Countries needed to come up with initiatives to get the U.S. onboard for other areas outside its prioritized agenda. Professor Mori opined that such opportunity provided a platform for regional leaders such as Japan and Australia to set agenda. On the pressing agenda such as North Korea he suggested that the world needed a long-term effort to handle the situation of nuclear weapon state. There were risks emerging regarding the direction of strategic engagement - either the sanctions, military engagement or dialogues. Miscalculation of risks could create illusions that North Korea could influence/affect actions on the part of Japan and

South Korea, hence ignited the regional security dynamics. It was therefore important to handle the situation with great caution. There needed to be a clear and effective communication though this had proved to be difficult.

Mr. John Brandon

Senior Director, International Relations Programs

Associate Director, Washington D.C.

The Asia Foundation

Mr. Brandon shared his views regarding the current security landscape that there would be years of rhetoric, miscalculation and confusion or even contradictions as the US was struggling with internal issues of leadership. Messages from the U.S. suggest that in order for it to be strategic abroad, it has to be stronger at home first. Currently there are issues with the lack of cohesion and ineffective communication and various messages from the leaders. He said that the Trans-Pacific Partnership was a miscalculation and the trade deficit issue still kept the President occupied. These issues may have marginalized the U.S. position and there is various interpretation in terms of its influences to countries in the region. For certain, there is dualism which creates inconsistency in the US political objectives. The US analysis of China's One-Belt-One-Road initiative reveals concerns over their economic impact or even if their implementation is possible. Mr. Brandon highlighted the US political dynamic and its check-balance system to deal with domestic political situation. He concluded that the U.S. still thrived but was not as strong a global player as before.

Professor Georgy Toloraya

Director of Asian Strategy Center

Institute of Economy of the Russian Academy of Science

Professor Toloraya shared his observation that there has been a shift in geopolitical landscape following current dynamic of political and security engagement which see more role of India, BRICs, and SCO on the part of Eurasia. Russia considers it to be a review of the Pacific that not only centralizes on China but also accounts for the political dynamics and engagement with other countries in Southeast Asia. After the U.S. withdrew from TPP, other countries came to realize this dynamics as well as interests of individual countries and their convergence. He further discussed the architecture of global governance that the Western world set the rules while smaller countries are rule takers. On the Korean Peninsula; Professor

Toloraya pointed out that it was considered a real conflict among Great Powers which could result in the interference of South Korea government. Russia proposed a collective mechanism for security cooperation to address this issue.

Questions & Answers of Session I

Questions to the panel were about the assertive roles of China and what strategy should be appropriate in such context as well as the roles of the U.S. and Russia in relations to smaller countries. Comments from the EU representative regarding the rule-based global security governance suggested that the effectiveness of existing rules should be more important than the entity that set the rules, while exception to the rules should not be tolerated. The panel suggested that universal rules should be respected especially human rights and related values, though not much were mentioned in the panel. Cooperation was needed that allowed for balancing acts between countries involved in the rule-setting, which had to account for interests of other countries. This included the UNCLOS and the compliance to other international rules. The model should allow other countries to contribute to the rule-setting activities.

The panelists discussed that rules would need to evolve. The relevant institutions had to make ways for emerging powers. Negotiations and coordination needed to accommodate rules compliance. Economic interests had to be addressed when considering TPP or other regional cooperation. It was in China's interest to comply with the established but fair and effective rules. China believed that 'Rights has the Might' which had implication on the factor affecting direction of change in the rule. The panel highlighted that capacity of China would be one of the key factors. Although the roles of economy, geopolitics and technologies have given more room of engagement by the public, the benefits were not well-perceived on the moral authority that comes with democracy.

SESSION TWO

BEYOND 50: ASEAN CENTRALITY AND REGIONAL ARCHITECTURE-BUILDING

Chair: Tan Sri Rastam Mohd Isa, Chairman and Chief Executive,
Institute of Strategic and International Studies (ISIS) Malaysia

Dr. Suriya Chindawongse

Director-General

Department of ASEAN Affairs

Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Thailand

Dr. Suriya's presentation focused on the key factors driving ASEAN regional cooperation. ASEAN aims at being a normative organization, despite its nature of a political organization with strong interests in pursuing interest-based and power-based order. When ASEAN was established; there was a general consensus among ASEAN member countries and how ASEAN positioned itself among global players. The principles suggest it being 'friend to all, enemy to none' without posing threat to others. He said that the situations had now changed, however. There are new expectations with what ASEAN is to achieve, despite the complexity that each ASEAN member has. Dr. Suriya further highlighted the advancement of technology such as IoTs and profits generated from data management, and how it could affect the security landscape. Despite better connection, the world needs safeguarding system to protect human security. Technology should be viewed as a nexus to analyze how it affects power relations. Such type of 'space' alters the way power is created, understood and managed, which created various perceptions. In the case of positive sum game, there would be win-win scenarios in the event of cooperation, Dr. Suriya opined that ASEAN would be allowed to take central and neutral role. For zero sum game scenario, there would be some gains and some losses, ASEAN would then be forced to take side. For negative sum game, this would be a lose-lose scenario, though this is uncharted. Dr. Suriya proposed some recommendations to ASEAN suggesting it would need to get their acts together to implement and enforce the rules, policies, and initiatives that it has issued. ASEAN should engage more on the initiatives with mutual interests, while welcoming new ideas that could be developed to be mutual benefits especially regarding the maritime issues. In order to effectively manage the curve space issues, ASEAN should embrace sub-regional initiatives accounting for small voices which could be combined into a sub-regional collective

dialogue such as the Indo-Pacific one. Moreover, it should consider strengthening the infrastructure for security cooperation in the region.

Dr. Pranee Thiparat

Former Director

Institute of Security and International Studies

Dr. Pranee elaborated on the concept of ASEAN centrality that it was meant to be for external focus i.e. a driving force for cooperation with external partners. The pace of cooperation in the past 20 years saw its focus on the economic and security cooperation maturing into ARF, ASEM, ASEAN Plus 3, ADMM+ as well as ASEAN grouping of small powers. ASEAN centrality processes also allowed for regional comprehensive economic cooperation (RCEP). However, she viewed that ASEAN lacked behind in fulfilling its role as a contributing element to the content of those cooperation it helped to form. Dr. Pranee shared her observation that there were limitation and challenges in ASEAN centrality. This included the inability to present itself as a unified position as witnessed in its failure at the latest ADMM to deliver a common statement concerning security issues.

Professor Tsutomu Kikuchi

Professor at Department of International Politics

Aoyama Gakuin University

Professor Kikuchi pointed out the critical role of ASEAN to ensure that Asia must run by rules and not by power. That was to ensure rule-based regional order by means of being a mediator for security issues and debates. Currently, there is a strong competition between U.S. and China that affects creativity and cooperation. In his analysis, Professor Kikuchi commented that ASEAN is too much occupied with seeing its future through the lens of the U.S.-China relations and confrontation. He then suggested the ASEAN's future scenarios would be centered on the U.S.- China relations with the U.S. hegemony, but not a Cold-War-type confrontation. The world could see the era of the rest of Asia where agenda is shaped by the consensus forged by groups of pivotal countries and institutions other than that of the U.S. and China. And for that, Japan would continue to give support and engage with the rest of Asia. Prof. Kikuchi further stressed that ASEAN shared norms have been committed in the ASEAN Charter as important foundation for the security cooperation in Southeast Asia. This should be enforced by ASEAN and ASEAN-related regional institutions.

Mr. Andrey Lyamin

Deputy Director, Department of Asia-Pacific Cooperation

Russian Foreign Ministry

Mr. Lyamin suggested that the security situation has been a challenge with regards to the Korean Peninsula, Transnational crimes, and Non-traditional security threats. Strategic equilibrium is needed to ensure parties working together to arrive at a suitable security governance model that could be developed further into a regional security structure. He provided some recommendations on such direction starting with debate on the principle issues, developing generally accepted guidelines and consensus on terms and definitions to avoid definitional debates, minimizing deficits of trust and confidence, creating mechanism to ensure regional security, as well as considering alternative groupings. Mr. Lyamin further recommended that the multilateral institutions needed to be respected. It would be the primary role of ASEAN to lead and foster networks of multilateral institutions in the region.

Mr. Carl W. Baker

Executive Director

Pacific Forum CSIS

Mr. Baker talked about what ASEAN could do to make itself useful in the current security context. The role of ASEAN is in the various emerging frameworks which should be used to promote 'good governance' and protect venerable members. He said that the Charter gave the legal personality to ASEAN, along with the protocol for dispute resolutions, though not yet to be activated, and the code of conducts which were to be implemented. There are security-oriented initiatives inherited through the ASEAN institutions. These include the monitoring systems for economic surveillance and coordination centers for haze and natural disaster warning. He suggested that the progress should be made to establish and ensure implementation and enforcement of these norms. Mechanism should be created to manage dispute resolutions. Mr. Baker recommended the next step to consider, which was to empower the ASEAN Secretariat following the global governance model aiming at taking a leadership role on various mechanisms installed.

Questions & Answers of Session II

The floor asked the panel on how to ensure ASEAN centrality given the assertive role of China in the region, and how ASEAN could reconcile its interests internally and act more collectively. The panel made a remark that ASEAN Centrality was the response to external threats and opportunities. Although it was a traditional concept, it should not go beyond what has been consented by all members of ASEAN of the cooperation. Existing ASEAN platforms have been effective in the past by allowing its partners to voice out their constructive arguments. The panelist discussed that due to diversity among ASEAN member countries, it was vital to get consensus as it would anchor commitment and ensure long-term implementation. This would also limit the chance that the members question motives of the cooperation. To address the point on diversity, panelist highlighted that it is important to change the narratives of agenda in the cooperation to account for cultural standards and norms as key elements of the partnership.

SESSION THREE

ADDRESSING MARITIME SECURITY CHALLENGES: WAYS FORWARD

Chair: Ambassador Pou Sothirak

Executive Director, Cambodian Institute for Cooperation and Peace (CICP)

Admiral Arun Prakash, (Ret.)

Former Chief of Naval Staff of India

Admiral Arun highlighted the wealth of resources in the Pacific and Indian oceans which created geopolitical conflicts drawing in national interests that fueled maritime security concerns. Recent ADMM+ meeting called for responsive military responses and collective dialogue for effective handling of the maritime challenges. He shared his observation on the maritime security issues. On the U.S. retreat, Admiral Arun stated that the national agenda focusing on putting American First affected the geopolitical landscapes. There are concerns about military hegemony causing the naval races among countries in the region affecting regional security. He opined that the continued strategic role of the U.S. in this region was therefore of paramount importance. Safety of shipmen passing through Malacca straight was of a great concern. Unstable maritime security may lead to the denial of a safe shipping passage. He stressed that an individual country reaction was not effective and considered as dangerous. Nuclear weapon proliferation would fuel arm and naval races further and jeopardize existing security cooperation. Admiral

Arun further urged the global community to recognize the importance of cooperation for development and humanitarian crises. Environment and climate change issues need to be addressed collectively. He concluded by calling for maritime security and mechanisms to address non-traditional security challenges in the maritime zone. Complementary naval forces may be needed to ensure freedom of navigation and safe sea passage.

Capt. Martin A. Sebastian

Center Head / Senior Fellow

Center for Maritime Security and Diplomacy (MSD) Maritime Institute of Malaysia (MIMA)

Captain Sebastian stressed the nature of maritime insecurity and its linkages with land security. Currently there is no effective communication among institutions to provide the comprehensive view of the security challenges. Apart from fostering partnership, he proposed the balance between soft security and hard security that accounts for sustainable development and environment. He suggested the role of civil servants in dealing with organized crimes and militancy, including the enforcement of Anti-money laundering and Terrorist Financing Act to freeze and confiscate assets.

Dr. Nguyen Vu Tung

President

Diplomatic Academy of Vietnam (DAV)

Dr. Nguyen Vu Tung shared his views that the lack of maritime security was instigated by China's in compliance to the UNCLOS ruling, rising nationalism, and ineffectiveness of the governments in the region in addressing the challenges internally and externally. There are some limitations and constraints on the existing conflict resolution frameworks which have resulted in the lack of effective implementation. Crisis management approach would be considered the most appropriate way to reduce and manage such tensions. He suggested that a linkage between US-China relations could provide a channel for effective management. Addressing through the lens of International laws and orders, a regional institution like ASEAN could play a significant role in facilitating the crisis management. He predicted that the probability was high toward tensions as countries were already at the confrontational stage. However, opportunities still exist in developing initiatives calling for confidence building measures. Dr. Nguyen Vu Tung further suggested that the bilateral discussion between China and Vietnam could

provide another effective alternative. However, it was not discussed much in the previous panels. Networks of experts and policy-makers could play a supportive role of moderators/facilitators.

Dr. Huong Le Thu

Visiting Fellow, The Strategic and Defence Studies Center

Australian National University

Dr. Hhong Le Thu shared her research findings and analysis from several white papers on the dynamic of rule-based orders focusing on the use of coercion i.e. the threats of war to force others to take a certain action in the context of maritime disputes. She suggested that maritime security and territorial disputes continue to be a theater to showcase power relations. Coercion works when there is a gap created by an inequality that gives an opportunity for one party to leverage. Uncertainty and anxiety have helped fuel such coercion leading to the naval races. This erosive level of trusts among parties could lead to the breakdown of security cooperation. The policy recommendations included developing a monitoring mechanism that could provide more information to all parties in order to reduce the level of uncertainty, anxiety, and reducing the gap, hence, lower the probability of the use of coercive measures.

Reliable monitoring mechanisms for a maritime zone would require partnerships between state and non-state actors i.e. the tech-companies to encourage transparency with the availability of data. This could be done by engaging in the public-private partnership for the development of platforms for data gathering/collection as well as the creation of a surveillance system. This could pave ways toward creating the fourth dimension of order i.e. the information-oriented order that is coupled with power/interest-centered orders.

Questions & Answers of Session III

A Thai former ambassador commented on the initiatives and programs that Thailand has been involved in addressing maritime insecurity in the region. This included the expansion of the joint patrols and anti-piracy operations. He questioned the effectiveness of these activities in the current crises. The panel echoed a similar concern because of the capacity of China holding the largest navy, but had yet to communicate clearly its strategic direction on the matters. The panel voiced out their concerns over how effective governments could be in addressing security threats under existing and new security cooperation mechanisms.

Another factor to consider is the political commitment to determine how the rules could be enforced or manipulated. Constructive approaches would be needed to address the challenges once taking into account

the level of commitment. One panelist also clarified China's interpretation of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) terms to aid the public understanding of why China engaged in the territorial claim in South China Sea and construction of artificial islands. Such interpretation convinced China to extend its territorial claims from the 'artificial islands' transformed by exploiting seabed and converting 'rocks', which is the ambiguous term whose rights and definition are not clearly specified under UNCLOS.

The floor further questioned the incentive of the US in ratifying the UNCLOS, while others asked about the possible outcome from the bilateral engagement as well as the contribution from scientific and technological advancement. The panel suggested that elements to consider for any initiative are the level of impact and sustainability especially on the environment. They recommended the platforms and opportunities for the disputed parties to engage in dialogues and discussions that are considered more communicative and educational. Open discussions are needed for effective conflict resolutions. Research-based, knowledge-based and information-based approaches are needed to address the challenges.

SESSION FOUR

TERRORISM AND EXTREMISM: MANAGEMENT, MITIGATION, PREVENTION

Chair: Dr. Eva Pejsova

Senior Analyst, CSCAP EU

Mr. Don Pathan

Associate,

Asia Conflict and Security (ACAS) Consulting Ltd. (Hong Kong)

Mr. Pathan started his talk with the clarification on the definition of terrorism and insurgency noting the difficulty of drawing the line on what terrorism was, which depended on who asks the question and in what context. He further elaborated on the evidence of terrorist incidents in the context of Southeast Asia dating back to the 1980s. Some were even state-organized initiatives. He stressed the importance of the local context and urged to consider the moral arguments before classifying or labelling any incident to be an act of terrorism. Extremism needs to be understood in the local context. This argument could explain why the Islamic groups in Southeast Asia do not join the jihadist movement that engages in religion-

motivated terrorism. Mr. Pathan expressed his observation that labelling insurgencies as terrorists provide an excuse for the government to deny negotiation with them.

Mr. Pathan gave a further explanation on the rise of religion extremism/insurgencies especially the Buddhist extremism as witnessed in Myanmar. He pointed out that creating a structured platform on such topic would be difficult due to high security risk associated with such activity, while recommending a platform for reconciliation be facilitated by external party like Thailand. He suggested the initiatives that open up cultural spaces where the minority and local people could express themselves, allowing a recognition of the indigenous groups. Recommendations include internationalizing tools and mechanisms that provide education for the understanding of worldview and the degree of civility to these insurgencies.

Mr. Andrey Lyamin

Deputy Director, Department of Asia-Pacific Cooperation

Russian Foreign Ministry

Mr. Lyamin shared his views that the rise of terrorist threats spreading to various locations around the world including Southeast Asia is perceived as a common mechanism for growing the terrorist networks and demonstrating the power of their caliphate. It could be observed in 3 aspects: physical movement, spread of ideologies, and financial movement. He suggested a multilateral channel to address the rise of such challenges. Existing mechanisms including intelligence and operational exercises have provided preventive mechanism against the attack on member states of the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation (SCO).

Mr. Lyamin pointed out that the implementation of, and compliance with, existing counterterrorism instruments and norms are essential. These counterterrorism instruments include sanction measures linking with global governance and political tools for terrorism prevention, including the adoption of the legal instruments essential to the financing of the terrorist acts. He further shared his view that the key instrument to counter-terrorism is the anti-money laundering measures. Intersectional meetings on the communication and information technology also discussed their contribution on the issues. Such agenda ranks high on the APEC, ASEM and other regional institutions including the CSCAP. These platforms encourage productive interactions and allow significant contributions from experts and academics to provide insights to the governments.

Mr. Khin Maung Lynn

Joint Secretary 1

Myanmar Institute of Strategic and International Studies

Mr. Khin Maung Lynn informed the floor that Myanmar joined the CSCAP in 2016, and recognized its foreign relations have helped the country countering both traditional and non-traditional security threats. He stressed the role of social media being both the sources of intelligence and tools for public manipulation. Southeast Asia has recently become the target for the recruitment of terrorist groups. In Myanmar, there are evidence of historical development related to extremism and insurgencies since around 1950s with various motives ranging from separation to religious extremism. More recent incidents include the terrorist attacks in Rakhin state. The Joint Secretary referred to the complicated relationship with Bangladesh in the past, which has created difficulty especially in the management of border issue. He urged for the initiatives that enhance the relationship with Bangladesh and regulate the flow of people crossing the border. These include raising concerns to the international community to seek humanitarian assistance. In terms of communication, Mr. Khin Maung Lynn shared his observation that ASEAN would need a stronger sense of community and trust in order to fight terrorism. In addition, there is a need for effective mechanism and collaborative approach, as well as professionalism and a strong political will. He further emphasized that the media needs to play a more constructive role in the processes to address security treats by adopting a positive and open-minded attitude in defining root causes and providing recommendations. He urged the community to stop the practice of scapegoating in fighting against terrorists. Military operation is not enough in addressing it, and therefore should be considered implementing financial and economic measures that would limit terrorists' activities.

Mr. Praveen Swami

National Editor for Strategic and International Affairs,

The Indian Express

Mr. Swami's talk focused on how the future of terror, small wars and insurgencies would reshape Asia. Tracing the historical development, these conflicts and beliefs existed before the concept of modern states. Narratives of such incidents have fueled political and economic strategies around the world. When the modern state was conceptualized in Asia, its authority and the foundation of state system was, and still is, weaker than perceived by many especially the Western world. Mr. Swami reckoned that given such context, the small wars and insurgencies would continue to have several transnational consequences.

Drawing lessons from his work in Kashmir, he suggested that insurgencies could be diminished with a large and long-term military commitment. The impact of this strategy would be difficult to realize in the case of Afghanistan, however. The country is ten times the size of Kashmir, hence limitation in terms of resources committed to such cause in the case of Afghanistan is understandable. He commented that India, or even China, does not have resources to make the Kashmir model widely replicable.

Mr. Swami continued to discuss how much countries should be concerned about these insurgencies to avoid falling into the anaemic state. Governments in the past had pre-empted strategies by incorporating the insurgencies into the establishment. He also pointed out demographic trends in many Asian states having a large number of young men suggesting a long period of conflicts ahead. He noted that the processes of state building in Asia is far from complete, and hence urged the relevant parties to identify their shared interests for mutual agreements and constructive efforts toward more peaceful state-building process. He raised the question related to resources to protect state system and the mechanism to guard fragile states.

Dr. Aries A. Arugay

Department of Political Science,

University of the Philippines

Presentation by Dr. Arugay attempted to shade lights on the Marawi siege, a five-month-long armed conflict in the city of Marawi on the island of Mindanao between the Philippine government security forces and militants affiliated with ISIL, including the Maute and Abu Sayyaf Salafi jihadist groups. Dr. Arugay highlighted some facts about the city Marawi which has the largest urban Muslim population in the country. Marawi crisis showcased the confusion between foreign-domestic politics, as well as political and economic policy objectives. With the resulting Martial law declared in Mindanao extended throughout the year 2018, Dr. Arugay commented that the Philippines would be a country whose Southern territory saw the liberty and safety of the people being compromised. Political scientists also cast doubts on the use of federalism model on the Muslim region.

Dr. Arugay shared his observation that the result of the general election meant that the people foresee terrorism as the key national agenda. However, the pursuit of military approach has generated social and economic impact that needed to be addressed. His discussion further revealed that the Armed Forces of the Philippines suffered from the ill-equipped military operation fighting against the IS military using traditional approaches and equipment/tools. They were not used to fight or train in a non-traditional context of urban battles. Dr. Arugay provided some recommendations regarding the rebuilding and

rehabilitation of Marawi which would require comprehensive resources especially the civilian institutions which needed to be empowered. He further called for multilateral supports, the review of critical roles of media to counter the violence and radical movements, and the initiatives to limit youth being recruited and radicalized into insurgencies. In addition, he also called for the development of regional strategic communication plan. It should take into account the critical review of Marawi crisis in order to make it an effective plan. And that counterterrorism measures need to address the grief and historical grievances.

Question and Answer of Session IV

The floor asked questions concerning current counterterrorism measures, especially those influential to the value system and how to make it operational in the region. The panel responded with the example of trilateral cooperation in the context of Marawi, which was considered a responsive action rather than a pre-empting one. In seeking supports from the U.S. in countering terrorism at home, the President of the Philippines has strategically toned down his level of aggressiveness toward the United States. Recognizing that terrorism is a global problem, the panel urged the United Nations to play a greater role in devising more effective countering measures.

Dinner speech: The Challenges to Regional Security in the Asia Pacific

Dr. Michael Vatikiotis

Asia Regional Director

The Center for Humanitarian Dialogue

Dr. Vatikiotis began by expressing his gratitude for the CSCAP Convenors and organisers as well as the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Thailand, while recognizing the contribution of the late Dr. Surin Pitsuwan on overcoming the obstacles to collective regional action and his enthusiastic willingness to look for creative solutions to regional problems. His speech focused on the key challenges to managing regional security. He introduced his new book called “Blood and Silk: Power and Conflict in Modern Southeast Asia” which explored the protracted violent conflicts that linger on the margins while Asia appears to be at peace. He pointed that such conflicts have afflicted the borders and attracted unwanted external interference. These conflicts are less about sizable numbers of battle deaths: the violence is low intensity, but it displaces hundreds of thousands of people, disrupts lives and interrupts education - from the Southern Philippines, to Myanmar’s Shan and Kachin states to the neighboring Bangladesh. He commented on the escalating tensions in East Asia with North Korea’s ability to launch intercontinental

nuclear weapons in the near future, which could spark a wider conflagration in the region and a slide towards nuclear confrontation.

Dr. Vatikiotis pointed out the decay of multilateralism and how it has impacted the effectiveness of the existing regional security architecture. When functions well, the channel could help generate trust and confidence to better manage bilateral disputes. There is no better example of this than ASEAN itself, which has for half a century kept the peace in Southeast Asia, and perhaps the wider region, by sustaining a burdensome but necessary rhythm of annual meetings that bring regional leaders together to help alleviate suspicion and generate goodwill. He highlighted the contribution of ASEAN for helping the region recover from the polarisation of the Cold War. The overlapping dialogue partnerships centered on Southeast Asia made it hard for bigger powers to impose their wills and divide the region. ASEAN centrality has corralled larger powers into multilateral frameworks that help build trust and, to a degree, manage tensions.

Dr. Vatikiotis commented that the equilibrium started to change at the end of the first decade of the 21st century with crisis in the South China Sea. This has pressured smaller states to align with major powers while having competing visions of development and security. He updated that while the United States is a waning power in Asia, China has clearly indicated the contours of its more active engagement with the region. In an important speech he gave this past week in Beijing Foreign Minister Wang Yi spoke of playing a more constructive role in the stability of the world by “actively exploring the Chinese way of helping find solutions to hot issues.” Wang Yi outlined these characteristics in terms of three principles: 1) not interfering in the internal affairs and opposing and imposing force on others; 2) upholding the principles of fairness and objectivity; and 3) adhere to political solutions and oppose the use of force.

Because he questioned how the new “active” dynamic translates into reality, it is vital to engage intensively with China to help inform policymakers and generate ideas that may be of mutual benefit. He urged the community to reinforce existing track one multilateral engagements with the more creative use of informal space for dialogue, while emulating ASEAN centrality at the informal level as it has started to fray at the official level.

He echoed a common concern on an imbalance of power, whereby everyone is forced to align towards a single geo-political polarity, and suggested that restoring balance in the formal sphere would need visionary leadership and persuasive diplomacy. Neither of which is evident at this point in time. It is therefore very important to generate trust and confidence using ideas developed from informal dialogues, and therefore the congenial habit of multilateral engagement must be preserved. He shared his experiences on preventing incidents in the South China Sea with the aim of providing a discreet platform for dialogue

among relevant governments in the region to build trust and confidence, and conceptualize effective mechanisms to prevent incidents in the Spratly Islands of the South China Sea.

Dr. Vatikiotis was positive that those meetings had cultivated a high degree of trust and confidence, which in turn generated useful ideas on how to maintain peace and security in this contested maritime area. He highlighted a set of “Common Operating Principles” specifically designed for maritime law enforcement agencies operating in the area. He recommended to convene relevant people in an informal setting where hard official positions and delicate sensitivities about sovereignty could be laid aside, and direct the focus on practical cooperation and the facilitation of tangible confidence building measures – as oppose to more research and unrealistic aspiration. The key was to keep it practical and to involve the practitioners i.e. those who encounter one another in the disputed area. He stressed that in an era of diminishing multilateral space, the informal realm of dialogue, carefully facilitated and productive, is an important, even essential reinforcement of official tracks.

On the second part of his talk, Dr. Vatikiotis argued that the major security challenge lies in the social and cultural sphere as across the Asian region great religions co-exist in close proximity creating tensions. He pointed out a divide has opened up between the Muslim and Buddhist communities, though the proximate cause is the eruption of communal conflict in Myanmar’s Rakhine state. Spoken with his insights, the increasing conservative practices over the past two decades have fueled suspicions and generated a sense of threat on both sides of the religious divide in the broader regional context. This perception of threatened sacred space has been exploited in turn by politicians who have mobilized religious nationalist platforms that preach hatred on social media platforms where more people have access to. He argued that the threat to security stems from the possibility of communal violence spreading beyond the confines of Rakhine State.

Yet, unlike the case in the multilateral sphere of traditional security, the tools of dialogue are less effective and the space for civilized discourse is shrinking. The point about religious belief is orthodoxy, which does not lend itself to compromise. Governments find it hard to regulate people’s beliefs, while political actors continue to exploit them to win votes. To address these challenges, he suggested to start by looking within the communities. Buddhists and Muslims, as well as other faiths, need to reflect within their communities on the dangers of polarization that lie ahead. The task would not be easy as neither the Muslim nor Buddhist faith are easily moderated since they lack coherent leadership. Given such context, the moderate views are easily hijacked by extremists - reflecting a growing insecurity in society fueled by political uncertainty and alarming economic inequality.

Dr. Vatikiotis suggested the possibility of Muslim and Buddhist leaders reaching a consensus on the need to preserve traditional customs and laws that reinforce tolerance. On this starting point, the ASEAN Foundation has been quietly conducting informal dialogue on religious tolerance. The initiative could usefully be amplified and empowered, and its outcomes elevated to the official and leadership level as a matter of concern for regional security. Bold leadership is needed to stem the tide of bigotry and prejudice that can easily undermine the stability that is the lynchpin of Asia's security and prosperity.

Failing to do so could result in the kind of sectarian conflict that besets the Middle East. He argued that the insecurity and the failure to deliver effective governance is what effectively gave birth to the siege of Marawi in Muslim Mindanao. This together with the Rakhine State Crisis in Myanmar should be a wake-up call for the region. He urged the need to establish a mechanism for mobilizing more effective coordination and cooperation.

He further argued that while the mechanisms of non-interference may cordon off potentially divisive issues, it would not help the region address the nuclearisation of the Korean peninsula, or meet the challenge of spreading sectarian tensions in the wake of the Rakhine State Crisis. Nor would it help foster closer cooperation and coordination to protect the environment in maritime areas. This is because the security challenges we face today are no longer delimited by boundaries. Hence, pressure to consider intervention as a tool for managing regional security is building. He pointed out that successful regional management of common problems and challenges always involves trade-offs, and that the principle of non-interference does not mean that states couldn't help each other in times of need.

In the face of the more complex challenges to regional security, it would be useful to consider a more flexible, less dogmatic approach to regional coordination and cooperation, one that:

- allows security forces to establish ad-hoc joint task forces to address violent extremism,
- enables the mobilization of humanitarian agencies and regional resources to address human and natural disasters,
- empowers leaders to use their good offices to mitigate conflict, which the ASEAN Charter allows for and China is increasingly recognizing as a plank of its foreign policy,
- recognizes the tools of dialogue and facilitation in informal space as a means of reducing tensions and resolving disputes, which ASEAN leaders recognized when they established the ASEAN Institute for Peace and Reconciliation.

For the smaller states of this region, this flexible approach to engagement and the use of creative diplomacy will ensure that they can continue to manage regional security without the fear of external intervention by larger powers.

Dr. Vatikiotis concluded that such approaches might prevent another Marawi, where more than 1,000 civilians and soldiers were killed and more than 300,000 people displaced; it might ensure that when huge numbers of people are displaced, as in Myanmar's Rakhine State, their needs could be addressed more speedily and effectively; and it might provide a platform for solving complex and protracted conflicts, both internally and externally.

SESSION FIVE

**NON-TRADITIONAL SECURITY THREATS: HUMAN TRAFFICKING,
TRANSNATIONAL CRIME AND HUMAN SECURITY**

Chair: Ambassador Ong Keng Yong

Executive Deputy Chairman, S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS)

Co-Chair, CSCAP Singapore

Dr. Sunait Chutintaranond

Dean of Graduate School

Chulalongkorn University

Dr. Sunait talked about the significance and historical development of Sangkha Institution (the institution of the Buddhist monkhood) in Myanmar, which has contributed to both the religion/spiritual and political functions of the country. The significance of this institution was unfold in the recent crises between the Buddhist majority and the Muslim Rohingya especially in the Rakhine state where insurgencies and violence heightened. The discovery of the Rohingya crisis since the transition to democracy has posed a serious human rights violation, non-traditional security challenges and hostility fostered by the Army. Dr. Sunait pointed out the findings from the UN report which informed that Myanmar's security forces have been an active force and instrument of Rohingya abuse and improper treatment.

Dr. Sunait offered the historical accounts and analyses that focus on the role of Sangkha of Myanmar Buddhism and the Burmese Army in causing the ethno-cultural conflicts described as non-traditional security crisis. He shared his observation that the historical legacy of the Burmese Sangkha Institution has been built upon its strong political functions; from developing a position against the British in the colonial era, to fighting against suppressive military junta. With the political transition in 2010, there was 'no place' for the Theravarna Buddhism inside the Western-driven Burma. Nationalism movements and anti-Muslim sentiment have become the platform and venue devised to preserve the position and significance

role of the Sangkha institute in modern Myanmar. The activist monks have developed the xenophobic sentiment with the Muslim and the Rohingya have become the scapegoat.

Dr. Sunait further elaborated on the role of the Burmese Army and its agenda on the Burmese Sangkha Institution. As the reform came with the diminishing role of the Army following the 2015 election, Myanmar generals devised new strategies to ensure its survival in the transition process by creating the confrontation between the traditional and new/contemporary forces. They attempted to keep their significant role by bringing back their political position, prestige and respect through the hostility against the Muslim and the Rohingya.

Professor Seo Hang Lee

President of Korea Institute for Maritime Strategy

Professor Lee provided the overview of the non-traditional security sources (NTS) in Asia. Dramatic change of global security environment in the post-Cold War has provided the background for the emergence of NTS that include the growth of non-state actors and a host of local as well as transnational threats. He called for a widened approach to account for the emergence of comprehensive security challenges that range from the spread of infectious diseases to natural disasters and environmental degradation, to irregular migration, to transnational crimes and terrorism, and to cyber-attacks. Because the NTS have their roots in the social, economic and cultural soil of different countries, the national solutions only are inadequate. Addressing such threats would be difficult and require a long process and comprehensiveness concerning the management, hence a regional and multi-stakeholder response would be needed.

Professor Lee focused on the newly-emerged 'cyber security' threats. Changes driven by cyber security threats, as refer to by the UNSG A. Guterres, arise primarily out of non-military sources, and are able to disrupt relations between states as well as the structures and systems of modern life. The consequences extended beyond the state to include individuals and societies. Cyber security is about the insecurity created through cyberspace. They include the technical and non-technical practices of making it (more) secure with the intention to protect the bioelectrical environment and data it contains and transports. With the spread of internet, advances in AI and robotics, and the availability of social media, information and individual comments have spread rapidly and shaped public opinion. Such abilities also threaten to legitimize false information.

Professor Lee stressed two important issues to be addressed under such context: protection of information and data (intellectual property, communications, and personal information), and reducing the risk of

disruption in the cyber environment as well as the critical infrastructures that depend upon it. He put more emphasis on the human attacks on the computer system and network and described the main characteristics of such cyber-attacks called hacking. Asymmetric vulnerabilities and attribution problem mean that the global information networks seem to make it much easier to attack the major power, while it is almost impossible to identify who are behind the perpetration. There is evidence of 'hacktivism', the combination of hacking and activism, whereby political activism calling for rights to information has challenged the self-proclaimed power of states to keep information on the ground of national security.

Cyber security become important concept in the cyber warfare. Professor Lee then presented the cases of cyber-war and cyber-conflict since the turn of the 21st century, highlighting the 2014 cases that include the ransomware attacks worldwide using cryptocurrency of 'Bitcoin'. He further stressed the growing concern on North Korean cyber threat whom he claimed to have developed cyber-operation programs attacking the machines and IT/ICT infrastructures of South Korea as asymmetric strategy to invade the South and the world. He suggested some desirable responses to cyber security which include enhancing capacity building to protect critical infrastructures of society in governance, research and development, and education. Regional cooperation is needed for information sharing about cyber threats including international norm-building for responsible use of peaceful cyberspace as stipulated in the Budapest Convention on Cybercrime.

Professor Pou Sovachana

Deputy Director

Cambodian Institute for Cooperation and Peace (CICP)

Professor Sovachana offered his views and recommendations from the perspective of a small state on transnational crime and terrorism highlighting the case of Marawi, on human security with the emphasis on prevention measures and empowerment, and on the effect of climate change on the Mekong River Basin. With respect to the Marawi siege, the 5-month long fights between the Philippines military forces and the Muslim insurgencies resulted in the scale of casualties and the abuse of human rights which have posted threats to human security in Southeast Asia. Professor Sovachana urged for the role of ASEAN in mitigating and managing the crisis suggesting that it should draw lessons from its response to the aftermath of Typhoon Haiyan in Nov 2013. Typhoon Haiyan highlighted the weakness of the role and structure of ASEAN to respond effectively to humanitarian crisis. It's an important wake-up call which suggests the need for a comprehensive institutional reform.

On the climate change agenda, Professor Sovachana highlighted increasing competition for water resources among countries in the region. Water scarcity have significantly affected the lives of local people and their sustainable livelihoods. He called for a new structure of global governance to address the scarcity of 'international public goods' that comes with environmental challenges. The building of hydropower dams on the Mekong river resulted in negative externalities that need to be managed. While safety nets and effective mechanisms need to be devised to reach the poor and most vulnerable. He commented that bilateral channel to address these issues has been improved; however, civil society is questioning its effectiveness and the enforceability of these measures.

Last but not least, Professor Sovachana called for institutionalized efforts to tackle transnational crimes, human trafficking and other cross-border security threats. He voiced out his concern regarding the management of these problems especially the role of ASEAN and the effectiveness of the cooperation to manage these security threats. He concluded by promoting common interests, norms and values, and asked ASEAN to evaluate its position on the ASEAN Ways.

Dr. Joe Burton

Research Fellow, NATO Cooperative Cyber Defense Center of Excellence

Dr. Burton talked about issues ranked high on the cyber security concern and discussed some cases and facts on the cybercrimes and malicious activities, which have seen growing more than 45% over the past years. He highlighted the dangers inherited in the cybercrimes and the growing scale of seriousness. One of the biggest controversies being the U.S. election hacking which highlighted the impact of cyber-attack on the national security that went beyond hacking the emails of politicians or local/national election boards. He stressed the political utility of such attack and the connection between cyber-attack and social media platform. Given such threat, the benefit of social media as a tool to promote good governance become questionable as its content could be corrupted/manipulated.

Dr. Burton shared his observation that despite the challenges, there has been some positive development in the area of cyber security. Recent collaboration between US-China on the cyber cooperation meant that substantive global cooperation is possible, while deterring and preventing measures should receive supports from global pool of resources. The role of the United Nations to facilitate such efforts should be stepped up. Dr. Burton stressed the needs to rejuvenate mechanisms at the UN level, though there is no consensus on the justification to use forces. He concluded by stressing that new law and regulation i.e. international regime/international convention should keep up with the advancement of technology/ICT, hence calling for independent bodies and universally adopted instruments to be implemented.

Question and Answer of Session V

The floor asked questions concerning the utilities of cyber security and the role of the market, challenges on the human and institutional capacity i.e. a gap to address drug trafficking and transnational crimes, and clarification on the financing of cyber security crimes. The panel responded that apart from tracking the cryptocurrency that might be used to fund cyber security crimes, there exist a bolt of illicit activities outside the online environment that need to be prohibited and regulated. Existing mechanisms such as the Inter-Pol have encountered problems of gathering evidence for use in official investigation. While non-state actors could be deterred from such activities through the right legal and institutional mechanisms, extra-judicial mechanisms for international collaboration are essential referring to the Budapest Convention on Cybercrime. North Korea has been eager to engage in hacking activities and take advantage from the cryptocurrency situation. Ethical hacking concept may have a positive contribution to raise awareness about cyber security that it encourages people to understand the technicality of hacking in order to develop measures to prevent it - referring to the annual 'Cyber Security Challenge' hosted by a university in New Zealand. The panel also touched on the questions about the transnational crimes especial drug trafficking, that it would be difficult to address with land-borders challenges. However, non-traditional security threats are considered low-hanging fruit, easier to manage than the official traditional one.

The following questions concerned human security dimension, especially on the Buddhist extremists and Muslim minorities. The panel suggested that there is limited information about the local context. Scholars have to rely on international analyses and perspectives including the wounded history featuring ethnic groups and racial discrimination. The findings concluded with the views of sectarian violence without much resistance from the majority, fueled by political shifts and historical legacy, and with the consequences spreading elsewhere. Domestic mechanism and instruments devised locally such as the 'interfaith model' may offer a solution.

Regarding the human security concerns in Asia Pacific, Professor Sovachana mentioned in his 2018 publication the mechanisms to address cyber security at the regional level. He claimed that ASEAN has not been active in addressing cyber security threats. He proposed the international code of conduct as a useful provision to the UN to facilitate negotiation between global cyber powers such as China and Russia. NATO has been working on many of the collective defenses, married with the mechanisms at the EU level. Some measures could be considered for implementation in the Asia-Pacific region.

SESSION SIX

WRAP-UP ROUNDTABLE: HOW TO SAVE THE ASIA PACIFIC FROM ITSELF!

Chair: Dr. Pranee Thiparat

Former Director, Institute of Security and International Studies

Faculty of Political Science, Chulalongkorn University

Mr. Kavi Chongkittavorn

Senior Fellow, Institute of Security and International Studies

Faculty of Political Science, Chulalongkorn University

Mr. Kavi Chongkittavorn stressed that China is the key to addressing security issues in the Asia Pacific and recommended to learn to engage with China. One way to start is to understand China's dream as it would set the mood for the regional one. Dreams of China have been to grow rich and strong. Income per capita of China has been on the rise with its tremendous growth and consumption level set for housing, cars and education. Similar to others, China also faces development challenges. There are domestic problems ranging from poverty, governance, and democracy included. The role of social media (Weibo) have been clear in that it has given more insights and empowered the ordinary people.

Mr. Chongkittavorn further shared his view of China in the regional perspectives. He commented that ASEAN has been assessing China on a day-to-day basis with a more realistic view, which is something different than it previously conducted. Rhetoric between ASEAN and China has not been conclusive in any certain direction. For one thing, ASEAN has yet to fully endorse the One-Belt-One-Road initiative of China. This is considered quite unusual because in the past ASEAN had accepted and endorsed China on its various initiatives. China understands that the relationship with ASEAN is a delicate one, and it has to approach ASEAN differently than the past. He commented further that the interests of China spread wide, and its mega projects and other overtures would be tested/assessed for the global partnerships. Mr. Chongkittavorn commented that China is conducting a form of 'constructive intervention' in international affairs, and warned the community of the impact of such policy. He further stressed that the Code of Conduct needs to be drafted and complete as it stipulates the rules of laws drafted by the conflicted parties in the South China Sea – not by the outsiders. He touched upon the issue of regional architecture stating that it would need a strong ASEAN working collectively on such matters.

Tan Sri Rastam Mohd Isa

Chairman and Chief Executive

Institute of Strategic and International Studies (ISIS) Malaysia

Tan Sri Rastam Mohd Isa began by recapping the mood and tone of the conference that saw the United States pursuing its own interests while China was erupting the global stage. He commented that the Asia Pacific's now facing with various traditional and non-traditional security challenges, while ASEAN has been under tremendous pressure to play its central role. He then provided his assessment of the regional performance. Tan Sri Rastam Mohd Isa shared his view that the region has done reasonably well with respect to the economic context. Growth is going in a healthy rate with rising middle class and mobile phone ownership as well as foreign investment and the market capitalization of large companies in the region - all provided positive indicators of prosperity. Purchasing Power Parity (PPP) of large economies in the world e.g. China, the United States, Japan and India also point to the same direction.

Projections until the year 2025 signal positive outlook for the region. He also suggested the region being the center for financial and innovation hubs especially IT/ICT industries - particularly China, Taipei, Singapore, Hong Kong, India, Japan, and Korea. Emerging countries have also made the list especially Vietnam and its start-ups in the IT sector. There are also growing number of transactions between countries in the intra-Asia Pacific region, with China continues to be the main trading partner. On the regional economic architecture; APEC would be looking at the revision of economic outlook in 2020. What is important is the emerging and constructed China-led initiatives.

On the regional cooperation and ASEAN Community, Tan Sri Rastam Mohd Isa discussed the basis of its regional cooperation and integration. He shared his views which was published on behalf of ASEAN-ISIS that there are five main challenges faced by ASEAN and the Asia Pacific alike. These challenges are related to the centrality and solidarity of ASEAN, the U.S. - China relations, changes and development in the global economic strategies and demographic change. Recommendations for ASEAN include deciding on the Secretariat architecture, synchronizing the visions and plans of action, demands for human rights and civil liberty, and issues of governance which needs to be sorted out. There are also issues with competition over water, food, and energy that need proper management. He stressed the needs to manage urban problems and issues related to ageing population and demographic change. Development gaps have to be reduced to minimize the intra gap and sentiment against certain racial and ethnic groups/identities.

Next he touched on the challenges of information and technology and its implication to intelligence and national security. Recommended strategies include adjusting to the situation, ensuring dialogues and cooperations with relevant parties, and reducing competition.

Professor Gaye Christoffersen

Professor of International Politics

Johns Hopkins University, SAIS, Nanjing Center, China

Professor Christoffersen showed a more positive attitude about the prospects of ASEAN institutional building, which is understood to be incremental and time consuming. She reckoned that there are needs for additional layers of cooperation to manage crisis to be institutionalized. These include the US-JP-CN trilateral mechanism and a Southeast Asia security regime. Professor Christoffersen further elaborated on the mentioning of trilateral relations witnessed under the Track II discussion. She commented that the trilateral dialogue has been an important mechanism for moving the discussion on Track II into Track I. The crisis over the disputed islands in the East China Sea is the evidence of trilateral crisis (between China, Japan, and the US) which lacks trilateral mechanism to address it. There were some ad hoc attempts from the scholars and policy analysts who initiated Track 1.5 to help mediate the tensions. Unfortunately, such trilateral meeting had never been institutionalized or transformed into an official recognition and enforcement. Professor Christoffersen continued to advocate for the trilateral mechanism as an alternative to the bipolar structure between US and China that has emerged in Southeast Asia.

Another missing area that has been discussed in the Track II for decades is the lack of framework to manage the security challenge in the Northeast Asia region. Over the past five years, there have been new additions to the existing security architecture - the China's One-Belt-One-Road, the Russia's Greater Eurasian Partnership, and the US's Rebalancing Strategy - now the Indo-Pacific Strategy. Professor Christoffersen described the Russia project to have encompassed China's One-Belt-One-Road initiative, and comes out of the domestic needs to construct the identities of the Eurasianism. Another purpose of Russia is to create the link between the Eurasia Economic Union and ASEAN-SCO (the Shanghai Cooperation Organization) Relations, as well as to reduce Russia's dependence on China and rebalance China in Central Asia.

Bandwagon initiatives of China were derived from the domestic needs in addressing over-production; however, the successful ones would have to meet the needs of Southeast Asia countries and to allow them to balance various outside powers. On the US rebalancing strategies, Professor Christoffersen expressed some pessimistic views concerning the economy given the withdrawal from the TPP, while remain to be hopeful on the military strategies. Although it is a work in progress, the US rebalancing strategies prove to have some impact. It is necessary for the US to pursue a Track 1.5 when handling the crisis in North

China Sea (the Senkaku/Diaoyu islands), and to ensure that the strategies fit well with ASEAN's regional strategies.

She concluded on the agenda of Northeast Asia security mechanism stating the contributions from the first working group under CSCAP with the analysis that the major powers might not want to get involved in such mechanism as much as the smaller countries. Therefore, should such working group be revived again, smaller countries and middle powers should make the initiative using middle-power diplomacy, with 2-3 countries co-chairing such as Australia. She commented that the Track 1 diplomacy would be complicated given the inconsistency of the United States, while Track II would offer more rooms for creativity. She then suggested using the channel of East Asia Summit to address the issues, with the trilateral model and Southeast Asia security framework on the sidelines meeting of the EAS.

Ambassador Ma Zhengang

Chairman, CSCAP China

Ambassador Ma Zhengang pointed out that there is no clear evidence of aggressiveness and hostility from China. With geographical significance of the Asia Pacific, any change in this region would affect everyone's interest. With such recognition, China stands ready to handle challenges in this region in order to realize common development and prosperity among all. One way to start is to promote mutual understanding among all countries. Ambassador Ma Zhengang warned not to engage or interfere in the internal affairs of other states, while recommending to unite the ideas for the common good and creating strategies to promote and anchor trust among countries in the region. He urged the community to recognize diversity and differences in the approach that countries pursue their policies. He then asked for a greater level of tolerance and inclusivity as no-one should be forced to have the same attitude.

Ambassador Ma Zhengang repeated the question raised earlier regarding the rule-based global order and asked who set those rules. While commenting further that China would not follow rules that are no longer suitable to the changing context, it is willing to work together to support economic development and prosperity. He stressed that China would ensure common understanding among people while promoting people's change as they are the foundation of all countries in the Asia Pacific. Ambassador Ma Zhengang reiterated earlier claims that The Asia-Pacific region is the homeland to all, including China. It is therefore China's duty to maintain peace and stability in the region.

As a new developing country, China is under two pressures: first the domestic pressure to reach its own development goals, and second the international pressure to enter and establish its position in the global stage. With respect to the first goal, Ambassador Ma pointed out that China has aimed for comprehensive

welfare society by the year 2020 and be the largest economy in the world in terms of (nominal) GDP. He denied the general claim that Chinese President Xi Jinping has been pursuing his vision of a China-led international order, and therefore challenged the existing global order. He argued further that China has never sought hegemony or practiced expansionist policy.

Question and Answer of Session VI

During the question and answer time, the floor asked for the implication on China's commitment and engagement in a certain security context and questioned the rhetoric and actions on China. Mr. Chongkittavorn opined that the messages from China have now been carefully analyzed and the tone of its messages to ASEAN would be less imperialistic. He commented that there are more than 120 proposals from China to ASEAN that have not been selected, partly due to the skeptical views and the needs to assess China's position. The regional bloc needs more substantive commitment and engagement among leaders. The panelist addressed further that the issue was not about the lack of engagement, but about the unclear position and message from China. Security landscape and cooperation has been disrupted by a series of spontaneous reactions among the parties concerned. It is important that China needs to determine and clarify its position for proper strategic engagement by the rest of the world.

Ambassador Ma confirmed Chinese position to support ASEAN in its economic and social development through various partnerships ranging from treaties, tax cuts and other investment schemes. While highlighting cultural relations and related initiatives, he argued that outsiders' view on China regarding nuclear issues are not accurate, and that it denied any hostile or aggressive behavior. To address questions on the Northeast Asia, the panel commented that Track II could provide effective platform to resolve issues not concluded in the six-party talks, while CSCAP should be attached to the high level East Asia Summit. Ambassador Ma suggested further that the U.S. should play a bigger role in promoting peaceful engagement in the Asia Pacific context.

Part III

CONCLUSION

In the closing session, Dr. Chitriya Pinthong, the CSCAP Thailand Deputy Chair and Former Deputy Permanent Secretary for Foreign Affairs, delivered her conclusion remarks. She highlighted the significance of the CSCAP General Conference, noting that it had provided a venue of engagement for all, on their various personal capacity, to exchange the views and facilitate dialogues among broad-based stakeholders on the security-related issues. The conference had touched upon many issues and provided descriptive analysis of the security challenges in the region. Some went beyond national boundaries namely terrorism, extremism, and wide-ranging non-traditional security threats. The role-players and participants addressed issues and expressed forward looking along with their critical assessment of the current situation, while making good recommendations to address these security issues.

Dr. Chitriya Pinthong recognized that some issues and discussions may have been sensitive, but they had been addressed at this critical juncture – with the aim to search for the common understanding, trust, and confident-building measures, as well as the common good of promoting regional peace and stability. Given the multidimensional security challenges in the Asia Pacific region and the level of uncertainty that causes rising tensions in some areas, the regional security situations are now precarious and more dynamic than ever. To manage security challenges and changes, ASEAN has been asked to take a central and more active role in shaping the regional architecture. Given the changing environment since its first established, Dr. Chitriya urged ASEAN to look at itself, reflect and draw lessons on its previous achievements and actions. She concluded by expressing her gratitude and appreciation to the ISIS Thailand, the Devawongse Varopakarn Institute of Foreign Affairs, and The Asia Foundation for the support. CSCAP Thailand also would like to thank all the keynote speakers, role-players, presenters and discussants for their excellent presentations and sharing of viewpoints at the conference as well as all participants for their active contributions.