



Council for Security Cooperation in the Asia-Pacific

9<sup>th</sup> General Conference

Prioritizing Mutual Trust and Win-Win Cooperation

Beijing, December 2-4, 2013

REPORT

CSCAP CHINA

Part I  
INTRODUCTION

The 9<sup>th</sup> General Conference of the Council for Security Cooperation in the Asia-Pacific (CSCAP) was convened in Beijing, China, from 2 to 4 December 2013. It is the first time the CSCAP General Conference was held in China. CSCAP China served as the host committee. CSCAP China received generous financial and technical assistances from various CSCAP member committees, especially from CSCAP Australia, CSCAP New Zealand, CSCAP Indonesia, the CSCAP Secretariat, and China Institute of International Studies (CIIS) in making the Conference a big success.

The 9<sup>th</sup> General Conference has drawn great attention from the Asia-Pacific region with more than 300 participants. In addition to representatives from CSCAP Member Committees, many policymakers, security experts and scholars, members of the diplomatic corps in Beijing, as well as regional and local journalists were present at the Conference and made their contribution to the meeting. A large group of young scholars participated in the Conference, and among them the most notable participants were from the Pacific Forum Young Leaders Program. The Vice Foreign Minister of China, H.E. Mr. Liu Zhenmin delivered a luncheon speech on the “Evolving Security Situation in Asia and the Role of China”, and Lieutenant General Ren Haiquan, Vice President of the Academy of Military Science of China, talked on China’s national defense policy in the dinner speech.

Whiling drafting the conference agenda, CSCAP China conducted wide consultations with colleagues from other CSCAP Member Committees. The agenda put the priority on achieving mutual trust and win-win cooperation in the face of a broad ranging security challenges in the region. The organizers, with the help of all CSCAP Member Committees, managed to invite the participation of distinguished role-players who shared their minds in high-quality and substantive presentations and thus created open, frank and friendly discussions and exchange of views during the six-session conference.

Part II  
HIGHLIGHTS AND DEBATES

---

**Tuesday, December 3, 2013**

---

**Opening Remarks**

**Ambassador MA Zhengang, Chair, CSCAP China**

**Ambassador Leela K. Ponappa, CSCAP Co-Chair**

---

The conference was opened by Ambassador Ma Zhengang, Chair of the host CSCAP Committee. On behalf of CSCAP China, Ambassador Ma welcomed all participants to the conference. He stressed the importance of the 9<sup>th</sup> General Conference since it was conducted at a time when the Asia-Pacific region as well as the world was undergoing great changes. He also expressed his hope that, through very frank and friendly discussions, mutual understanding and some consensus could be reached and cooperation and friendship promoted. Although CSCAP is not a government institute, through our efforts made in Track II, we can influence governments to work together for a peaceful and prosperous Asia Pacific region.

Ambassador Leela K Ponappa, CSCAP Co-Chair, in her opening remarks, expressed her pleasure to have the 9<sup>th</sup> General Conference held in Beijing, and extended her gratitude to CSCAP China for hosting this event and for its effective organizing efforts. She also thanked all members from 19 countries and CSCAP Secretariat who have supported the conference in ways of providing financial assistance and sponsorship, shared expertise and advice and assistance in searching role players.

Ambassador Leela K Ponappa mentioned that it will be twenty years since the adoption of the CSCAP Charter. So this conference is also an anniversary celebration. CSCAP has reached this milestone thanks to the initiative persistence and commitment of the leaders of its founding institutions, some of whom are present here today. Their foresight and dedication to development of a structured process for regional confidence-building and security cooperation with the objective of identifying and forwarding policy recommendations to intergovernmental bodies in the region should be lauded. Over the past twenty years, CSCAP has sought to engage the Track I in the region as well as to reach out to the wider body of interested public opinion on specific aspects of the security environment, and measures for cooperation.

CSCAP work takes place through the papers and discussions of its study groups, through the memos produced by the study groups, and forwarded to the ARF on a wide variety of issues, through interactions with governments at the national level, by member committees and with the ARF at its ISMs and in its ISGs; also through periodic publications including the annual CSCAP Regional Security Outlook.

CSCAP also works through the general conference held once every two years.

CSCAP will thus enter its third decade in a regional environment rich in potentials, but fraught with great tension and some risks. The region's security concerns include geopolitical disputes over territories and waters, threats of the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, natural disasters, drug-trafficking, cyber security concerns, transit borders, and threat of terrorism. The attacks in Bali, New York, Mumbai and most recently in Beijing stoutly demonstrate that we have a common interest. The ravages of natural disasters have caused so much death and destruction that calls not just for our sympathy and prayers and condolences, but also for concerted action in disaster management. As the security issues facing Asia Pacific expand in scope, there have been growing expectations of the regional security architecture to be able to deal with them. The ARF was established in 1994 as the security arm of ASEAN. While the region's security situation has changed since then, the ARF too has changed and grown in scope, and other regional security entities have also been created, notably the ADMM+ and the EAS. Since the 8<sup>th</sup> CSCAP General Conference in Hanoi in 2011, these bodies have been joined by the EAMF, the Expanded ASEAN Maritime Forum, which was first convened in October, 2012. Amidst this dual expansion of the issues and the institutions, we are confident that the continued and enhanced efforts of CSCAP can make a meaningful contribution to the process of security cooperation in this region by providing Track II inputs which the Track I might not be easily able to address for reasons of operational pressures or sensitivities.

In conclusion Ambassador Leela K Ponappa expressed her hope that the 9<sup>th</sup> CSCAP General Conference would be another step in this direction and she looked forward to substantive presentations and discussions in the conference.

---

**Session One**

**Building A New Type of Major-Country Relations for the Benefit of the  
Asia-Pacific Region**

**Chair: Professor Jim Rolfe, Acting Director and Director of Program, Centre for  
Strategic Studies, New Zealand**

---

**Mr. Cai Wei**

**Deputy Director General, Department of North American and Oceanian Affairs,  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs, China**

---

Mr. Cai Wei began his presentation by introducing the historic meeting between Chinese President Xi Jinping and American President Barack Obama in 2013. The most important outcome of the meeting is that the two countries reached a strategic and constructive agreement on the building of a new model of major-country relationship. He explained the essential features of this model which include “no conflict, no confrontation, mutual respect and win-win cooperation”. Mr. Cai further specified the essential features that no conflict and no confrontation should be the

baseline. China and the United States should recognize that it is unimaginable for the two countries to have a war or conflicts. The past tragedy in the major countries' relationship shall not be repeated again in the future and the two countries shall live in peace and collaboration no matter what happens. Mutual respect should be the basic guiding principle. The fundamental national interest and concerns of the other side should be respected. Between China and the United States, there are great differences in their political and social system, history, culture and tradition, and the two countries are also in different development stages. However, their consensus should be increased by thinking and expanding common ground and hearing and learning from each other. Win-win cooperation should be the common objective for the relationship among major countries. Both countries should discard zero-sum concepts in pursuing one's national interests and development.

Mr. Cai continued his presentation by talking about how to put a new model of the major countries' relationship into reality. Facts have shown repeatedly that development for emerging countries is the great blessing that significantly enlarges the rooms of development and makes it possible for the developed countries to strive and grow. Developed countries should see the rise of the emerging countries as great historic opportunities and take emerging countries as equal partners, respect and welcome them into the global governance. Differences between the U.S. and China will not disappear overnight, or disappear over one visit, or just because we want to build a new model relationship. The key lies in truly respect of the other side's core interests and major concerns, managing their differences through constructive dialogue and consultation. The two countries, to have a sound new type relationship, should take concrete actions in their cooperation. China and the U.S. should maintain and strengthen their cooperation and coordination on regional and global issues.

Finally Mr. Cai pointed out that Asia Pacific is a region where China and the U.S. have the greatest converging interests and most frequent interactions. Therefore the region provides an ideal testing ground for building the new type of relationship between China and the U.S. China welcomes the constructive role of the US in this region and stands ready to engage in more positive interaction with U.S. in their concerted contribution to peace, stability and prosperity in the Asia- Pacific region.

---

**Mr. Michael Shiffer**  
**Senior Adviser and Counselor,**  
**U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee**

---

Mr. Michael Shiffer presented his views on the topic by saying that the term "new power relationship" is a wonderful aspiration that the two countries can work together to build a mutual cooperative, prosperous and secure regional and global order. But the question remains: how to add content and turn this notion into a viable strategic concept? A lot of work lies before us in defining what this new type of major power relationship is all about. Mr. Shiffer highlighted characteristics and pathways of a new

power relationship. He offered, first of all, that a new type of major power relationship needs to recognize that old zero-sum concepts simply no longer work, given the realities of the 21<sup>st</sup> century. Secondly, to make a non-zero world a reality, major powers need to align to create appropriate, legitimate multi-lateral institutions and mechanisms to legitimately arbitrate and resolve their legitimate interests. A rules-based order with a common operating system governed by and embedded in norms and institutions and rules with major powers responsible for supplying public goods for the region and the globe perhaps starts to get somewhere along the road to what a new type of major power relationship might look like.

Mr. Shiffer went further to talk about four possible pathways forward. He said the first pathway is words and deeds need to match, especially in the early days of the project. To offer rhetoric about a new type of relationship while at the same time pursuing old types of policy and action is counterproductive. The second valuable pathway Mr. Shiffer suggested is to build a new type of major-country relationship in an evolutionary way on existing mechanisms. The U.S. and China have the strategic security dialogue at the SNED that allows the two countries to address some of the most sensitive issues in the bilateral relationship. For the region, we have the emergence of an open and inclusive problem-solving architecture including the ARF, the ADMM and TPP. The third pathway is to make sure we have durable and usable crisis management mechanisms in place to help us navigate the current of uncertainty, especially in the military to military sphere. Lastly, all of us must and be willing to shed old and outdated conceptual categories and try to put ourselves in the minds of the other. If we remain persistently in one's own mindsets and approaches, it will be very difficult to establish a new type relationship.

---

**Professor Jusuf Wanandi**  
**Vice Chair, Board of trustees, Centre for Strategic and International Studies**  
**(CSIS) Foundation, Indonesia**

---

Professor Jusuf Wanandi highlighted his perspectives on the strategic development in the Asia-Pacific region. East Asia economically will become the most important part of the globe due to the rise of East Asian economies via China. China is becoming a big power who aims at a peaceful rise and would like to leave behind the cold-war confrontation between the big powers. That will depend on two things mainly: One is the relationship between the two big powers which constitutes critical part of the development of a peaceful Asia-Pacific region in the future; and second is the dynamics as well as the importance of regional economic and security institutions. It is not yet there, but it is developing very fast. Both China and the United States should understand that for TPP and RCEP to be able to merge is very critical for the region because only then it has its impact for the region dramatically. However, there is a long way to go. In the security field, China is to propose a community of interests, and China's neighborhood plays very important role in building such a community of interest. In this respect, Professor Wanandi thought that efforts should be made

concerning the solution, or to have a meeting of minds, as well as some institutions and regulations of the South China Sea. Right now there are more discussions among Asian countries on more cooperation in the implementation of the Declaration of Cooperation (DOC). At the same time, the formulation of the Code of Conduct (COC) now is being done together by Asian countries and China. China's increased assertiveness on the SCS issue over the past two years and more have made the ASEAN countries feel worried. But China's new policies concerning its neighborhood and the policy implementation is the best time because of this China-ASEAN relationship is so important.

Professor Wanandi shared his views on regional powers. He talked about his worry of the U.S. for its in-depth political divide although the survival of the American political system is always there. China, as shown in its latest third Plenary Session, is preparing herself through reforms to have more development in the future, and a successful China will be for the good of the region. Since it is difficult to make predictions on China, people in the region have to rely on institutions to establish cooperation through discussions and dialogues. ASEAN alone cannot do this. We need all the big powers' involvement. Professor Wanandi expressed his hope that Japan and its leadership will restore the country's economic development and strength because the region needs her. However, the statements of Prime Minister Shinzo Abe and his willingness to entertain the revisionist ideas of World War II make the Southeast Asian countries worried because this part of the region feels safe with the statements of Murayama and Kono and reshaping that again is a mistake. Professor Wanandi hoped that Japan will see that and he thought that is why the regional institution plays a very important part in maintaining the dynamics of the region. Professor Wanandi concluded his remarks by hoping that the United States will be part of this region, yet the United States has to take care of herself before she can fulfill her expected role in this part of the world.

---

**Mr. John Guinn**

**Assistant Secretary, Strategic and Intelligence Branch of the Department of  
Foreign Affairs and Trade, Australia**

---

Mr. John Quinn started his presentation by saying that all the countries in the region including Australia have a huge stake in the region's prosperity and stability. The regional security depends on major power relationships. In addition to US-China relationship clearly being the critical driver, there are also other important relationships. Japan is a critical player, and the China-Japan-ROK relationship, though very complex, is really critical to the future. India, a rising power, is playing more of a role in East Asia which is a welcome development, and Southeast Asia is a remarkable success story and has become a major player. Clearly the challenge for us is how to manage these multi-faceted bilateral relationships which are clearly characterized by strong common interests and interdependencies but also competitive elements. The imperative is to focus on the shared interests, the interdependencies and

the need for deft and enlightened leadership on the part of the major powers, as well as proactive diplomacy, on importance of crisis management and transparency.

Mr. John Quinn underlined in particular the role played by the middle and smaller countries in regional security since we cannot just rely on major powers to get the job done. It is important that middle and other powers have the opportunity and the responsibility to seek to influence constructively in global and regional developments. The middle and smaller countries need to be engaging with the major powers and make their views known because they have a huge stake in how the major countries conduct their bilateral relationships. Efforts are often made through coalitions, regional institutions and multilateral institutions. Major powers need to be listening to the middle and smaller powers who have to speak up respectively and constructively.

Mr. John Quinn acknowledged it as good news that US-China relationship is the major driver in the region, and both sides invest heavily in that relationship. They engage in some sixty bilateral dialogues on major economic and strategic issues, in particular dealing with hard issues. The U.S. and China now have a cyber dialogue and it is hoped the two countries will move to the direction of an agreement on confidence-building. This relationship has proved remarkably resilient and constructive over many years, again driven by economic interdependence and strong incentive to work together for the common interests. The United States will remain the global superpower for the foreseeable future. Its alliances and partnerships in the region have underlined strategic stability. Although it has significant fiscal and economic challenges, the US capacity for renewal should never be underestimated. The U.S. has a huge stake in this region so it stays on in the region which Mr. John Quinn thought is a good development. Similarly we all want to benefit from China's continuing rise, and we are firmly committed to engage China and talk to China on all the big issues because China is a fundamentally important player.

In conclusion, Mr. John Quinn touched on important role of regional architecture in managing new major powers' relations in the region. On a rules-based structure it is really important that major powers engage in these processes. He mentioned important structures like the East Asia Summit, and thought that EAS is a key institution having the major powers around the table with the U.S. and Russia joining fairly recently. EAS has the right agenda, and it has the potential not only to address political and security issues but also helps deepen regional financial and economic integration. ARF does very important work in areas of cyber and space security and has critical engagement with major powers. ADMM Plus is really vital to make major players stay engaged in these processes. The middle and smaller powers need to be urging major powers to engage seriously in these processes on the basis of a rules-structured regional architecture.

During the question and answer time, a question was raised concerning the possibility of forming a league in East Asia led by other major countries in case when there is no



confidence over new type of major country relationship. Professor Wanandi said that China and the United States are working on the building of a new type of relations with both improvement and setbacks. The middle and smaller countries also have a supporting role to play and, through regional institutions, their role will be more effective. Mr. John Quinn thinks that there are more major powers emerging in the world. Any issue comes up, such as environmental issue and economic integration, we need to be talking as middle powers. Middle powers need to be more active diplomatically, and they have particular responsibility to engage the major powers in a multi-polar world. Mr. Michael Shiffer thought that in a non-zero-sum regional or global order, middle powers and small powers are not subjects of great powers in great-power games. They have an important role to play in determining regional norms and rules as well as institutions. Middle powers play important part in supplying public goods even if they are not able to play simultaneously across every dimension of the game. Mr. Cai Wei said that China and the U.S. are working on building their bilateral relations while they welcome more cooperation, interaction and inputs from all middle and small powers. And the two countries are willing to engage with more middle and small powers in the building of new model of relationship.

On the question of different approaches of China and the United States in dealing with international relations, Mr. Cai Wei thought that China and US are so different in history, tradition, culture and political systems that it is only natural that China emphasizes mutual respect in order to avoid the historical lessons. So long as we appreciate there is a big difference between the two countries, we can find a way to manage or resolve those differences or potential conflicts. The most important is to understand and to respect the other side and don't let the differences disturb the picture of cooperation and collaboration. China and the United States are in the process of building a new type of relations which is not equal to G2. To build this relationship of win-win cooperation, more inputs from all countries, and different voices and advices from friends of middle and small countries are most welcomed.

Mr. Michael Shiffer elaborated his remarks on crisis management and mechanisms. Given the scale of redistribution and diffusion of power in the region over the past decades, China and the United States, and also other powers, are rubbing up against each other with increased frequency primarily in military security sphere. This leads to possibilities of incidents, accidents, miscalculation, and misunderstanding which should be managed given the huge strategic implications. The leadership from both the U.S. and China would feel confident that mechanisms would provide communication and would contain crisis. Over the past several years, some of the mechanisms are already there for various militaries in the region, so the leaders in the region feel confident that they can contain and control unintended incidents.

Mr. John Quinn, in answering the question on Indo-Pacific, emphasized that it is an emerging strategic concept which focuses very much on economic integration

dimension and strategic sea lines and other communication links. The Indo-Pacific arc runs from South Asia through Southeast Asia to East Asia including the U.S. as a major regional player. Australia, as an Indian Ocean and Pacific nation, is interested in broader issues in Indian Ocean cooperation like in particular fishing and environmental cooperation.

---

**Session Two**

**Fulfilling the Promise of Regional Security Architecture**

**Chair: Ms. Clara Dyah Vidyarani Jeowono, Vice Chair,**

**Board of Director of CSIS Foundation, CSIS Indonesia**

---

**Professor Tsutomu Kikuchi**

**Adjunct Fellow, Japan Institute of International Affairs, Japan**

---

Professor Tsutomu Kikuchi focused his presentation on current situation in regional security architecture in the Asia-Pacific region. He thought that over the past fifteen or twenty years, a variety of overlapping economic and security institutions have been established in the region. The proliferation of these overlapping regional institutions defects the strategies taken by the countries to respond to increased insecurity and uncertainty. The Asia-Pacific region is confronted with changes and challenges, such as increased economic interdependence intertwined with economic competition; the future relations of big powers remain uncertain and unpredictable because of their deep mutual distrust. In the face of regional changes and challenges, Asian countries are engaged in complicated and competitive institutional building to response to uncertain and unpredictable situation in the regions, and at the same time to balance both the established and rising powers. Professor Kikuchi assumed the institutional convergence will not take place in the foreseeable future. Asia-Pacific region will continue to have a variety of overlapping regional institutions, because the Asian countries wish to have multiple choices instead of making any commitment to a single institution. The conclusion of many bilateral free trade arrangements is on the rise. Through regional institutions, Asian countries can cooperate in some areas. Yet institutional outlook of these regional institutions will continue to be modest. The possibility for Asia to develop strong and effective regional institutions will be small given the fact of uncertain landscape in Asia. However TPP is an exception. TPP, if agreed between the U.S. and Japan on highest standards, will have a huge impact on regional political securities. Although the regional institutions in Asia continue to be weak and not producing tangible results, yet, instead of being talk shop, they are playing quite important role, especially playing a role of moderators in inter-state tension and conflicts.

Professor Kikuchi continued to focus on ASEAN by saying that the institutions in Asia cannot go beyond ASEAN at least for the moment because of important role ASEAN is playing in the current institutional structure of Asia. ASEAN political and security community will be strengthened and enhanced by adopting more rules and norms. A strengthened ASEAN leads to enhanced regional institutional-building in

Asia. The East Asia Summit formula (EAS) and its linkage with ADMM Plus and ARF should be strengthened. In conclusion Professor Kikuchi said that regional institutions need to be strengthened to address economic and security issues, but in the foreseeable future network of alliances are critically important bedrock for regional peace and stabilities.

---

**Commandore Uday Bhaskar (Ret.)**  
**Visiting Fellow, National Maritime Foundation, India**

---

Commandore Uday Bhaskar (Ret.) begins his presentation by talking about his experiences with turbulent CSCAP meetings in the earlier days and thought that this can serve as an indication of how far we have come in terms of creating the feeling of community and family. Then Commandore Uday Bhaskar touched on the concept of security. He thought the big shift is that the region is no longer exclusive as it was during the Cold War and it is no longer uni-dimensional. We have to recognize: security is indivisible and is inclusive in nature; and today in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, regions are no longer exclusive.

Commandore Uday Bhaskar turned to focus on regional security architecture. He thought that the multiplicity is one of the features for regional security architecture. If there is a need to have an approach to security, the ASEAN Regional Forum is a way. ARF was formed after CSCAP in 1994. Since then there are follow-up mechanisms like the East Asia Summit in 2005, ADMM plus in 2006 and the Six-Party Talks in 2003 dealing with contentious WMD related issues. Now there is the Expanded ASEAN Maritime Forum. The review of the Regional Security Architecture, a progress achieved by one of many CSCAP study groups, would be a very valuable starting point. CSCAP makes contributions, firstly by being able to contribute to discourse, and secondly by picking up specific issues and making them more manageable. Since RSA is one of the areas where CSCAP has had some limited success with an objective review, then more follow-up investments are needed.

Commandore Uday Bhaskar proposed deliberations on another issue, Humanitarian Assistance and Disaster Relief (HADR), on this area the Expanded ASEAN Maritime Forum should focus. HADR and other related apolitical issues should be discussed as the first stepping stone.

---

**Tan Sri Mohamed Jawhar Hassan**  
**Chairman, Institute of Strategic and International Studies, Malaysia**

---

Tan Sri Mohamed Jawhar Hassan focused his perspectives, through the presentation, on regional security arrangements. Firstly the bilateral arrangements are the most important for the management of security in the Asia Pacific region. The bilateral relations, especially in the ASEAN, are very successful especially in the Southeast Asia region between various neighbors. Through bilateral arrangements for security,

there are neither avoidance of issues nor potential conflicts. By working together, lots of things have been settled instead of going to the ICJ. Secondly, the formation of ASEAN in 1967 was a game changer for the region, because ASEAN focuses on common security, cooperative security and mutually shared interests. ASEAN works beyond narrow security and conventional security bounds, and extends into political and economic fields on building common prosperity in this region. ASEAN is also a game changer in another sense by triggering more Asia-Pacific mechanisms for regional security cooperation, such as ARF, ASEAN+3, ADMM, and ADMM plus. Despite of all the limitations, ASEAN has fulfilled its promises well beyond its founders' wide imagination.

ASEAN, through ecosystem, has enabled member countries to be strengthened and empowered those smaller countries to engage with larger actors in the international affairs. This is a very important contribution of the ASEAN. Hard efforts must be made for an ASEAN community by the year 2050. Although ASEAN's link with ARF is concerned weak, it is the most necessary link in the security architecture in the region.

Tan Sri Mohamed Jawhar Hassan talked on the military alliance in the region. He thought the US presence and its strategic partnership in the region have been useful and beneficial especially for the parties concerned. However, for the region as a whole, the military alliance has counter-productive effect, because it is inherently conflictual in nature and it is dividing the region.

Finally Tan Sri Mohamed Jawhar Hassan came to interdependence. He thought in the region the geopolitics has not kept up with the geo-economics because the geo-economics bring and pull the countries together while geopolitics is still taking us apart. Many of us are still in the old mode, and have not come to the fact of more interdependence, with shared economic interests and prosperity, and shared security interests. Priority must be given to the management of territorial disputes, not necessarily the settlement of them. So both the COC the DOC are very important. And the exclusive and antagonistic alliances should be transformed slowly into more inclusive alliances by engaging more countries in the region.

---

**Dr. Victor Sumsky**  
**Director, ASEAN Centre in MGIMO University, Russia**

---

Dr. Victor Sumsky highlighted in his presentation Russia's East Asian Security Initiative as a successful exercise for constructing a new regime of security architecture. During the East Asia Summit in Brunei, Russia came forward with a proposal to start a discussion on framework principles of regional security architecture in East Asia, emphasizing that this is a starting point which may eventually in the distant future lead to a conclusion of a regional treaty on security in East Asia. The proposal covers well-known principles and perspectives of sovereignty,

peaceful solution of disputes, not use of force or threaten to use force in international relations, security based on mutual equality and not on blocks, and security should not be achieved at the expense of a certain partner.

Dr. Victor Sumsky pointed out that a popular opinion is to think that growing economic interdependence will solve security problems, and will automatically lead to more stability and peace; another view is that traditional security issues will never again become as important as in the Cold War era, and new non-traditional security issues are coming to be prominent and become primary concerns. That is the reason for the setting-up of ARF in 1994; finally some people holding less euphoric views think that with the end of bi-polar competition and the melting of the Cold-War ice, there comes the reemergence of smaller conflicts. Dr. Victor Sumsky held the view that traditional security issues are never going away as long as the international relations are there. One of the major paradox today is more interdependence, more globalization, and stronger nationalism in the region. The region can be driven by economic successes, it also can be driven by lack of economic successes. Traditional security issues are back as major regional theme. Classic international laws should be used as tools to confront traditional security issues and to solve problems of peace and war. However, now in the early 21<sup>st</sup> century the international laws have been watered down by interventionism in the world. In conclusion, Dr. Victor Sumsky said that going back to the basics of international laws is the intention for Russia to put forward the East Asia Security Initiative and the proposal serves as an example and exercises in preventive diplomacy.

During the Q & A time, questions and observations are raised concerning bilateral arrangements, impacts on ASEAN centrality by Russian proposed framework principles, ASEAN's leading role in the building of regional architecture and on security model. Tan Sri Mohamed Jawhar Hassan said the bilateral arrangements for managing conflicts between neighbors have been most effective and productive in providing security to the countries in the region, although it is not perfect and it does not provide all the public goods, since there are continuing problems. If conflicts cannot be resolved, there is also another avenue to go, that is the ICJ. This is the evidence of maturity of bilateral cooperation where both sides can agree to the ICJ and accept the outcome. The same does not apply to other regions, certainly not to Northeast Asia which has all the historical wounds which have not been properly addressed and the rising nationalism. As for military alliances, they are performing as negative security insurance. They may meet the narrow security needs of the parties concerned, but they may not yield public goods for the region as a whole. And what is the worst is that military alliances may lead to the establishment by the other side of military alliances. So we should work for the inclusiveness, and to include as many as possible other countries in expanding military alliance.

Dr. Victor Sumsky elaborated that all the principles are based on the Bali principles as well as the UN Charter, from the experiences of constructing the collective security system in Europe, and also from the principles of indivisible security. Dr. Victor Sumsky did not think all the principles in Russia's initiative infringe upon ASEAN centrality. ASEAN is facing incredible tough tasks, but ASEAN is doing pretty well in terms of regional integration. Asian countries should have their integration in their own way.

Dr. Tsutomu Kikuchi pointed out that the major powers' relations is getting tense, and this relationship will continue to be competitive and confrontational while at the same time there are cooperation among major powers. ASEAN leaders will face a fundamental task of managing their relations with major powers. Association of small or medium sized countries can play important and constructive role in the fussy situation among big powers. ASEAN has to overcome difficulties and keep its important independent role in the newly emerging competitive security environment in Asia. Touching on the US-centered security network, Dr. Kikuchi thought that the bilateral alliance centered on the United States can provide security public goods almost to all the nations. Because of changing relations among the countries as well as the economic relations, additional layers of framework are needed to further address pressing issues and efforts should be made to further develop region-wide institutional arrangement. However, the role of regional institution would be important but limited. In the future, regional architecture in Asia Pacific will be multi-layered with the US-based alliances as bedrocks. Without the US-centered security network as bedrocks, Asia cannot enjoy any economic growth in the coming decades. In the foreseeable future, no big and strong regional or sub-regional institutions will be formed in the region which can address security and economic issues.

Commodore Uday Bhaskar responded to some of the observations by touching on legitimate arbitration which leads, first of all, to consensus about the nature of interests, and secondly depends on degree of faith or trust in the external body. As for a security model, he thought it has to be equitable, sustainable, and harmonious. The European model can be used as a reference, and Asia needs to develop its own security mechanism. Asia is still at the early stage to find its own regional architecture consensus as ASEAN and ARF are the first attempt to be consolidated. ASEAN-led regional security architecture can be the first model.

---

**Luncheon Speech**  
**H.E. Mr. Liu Zhenmin**  
**Vice Foreign Minister, China**

---

H.E. Mr. Liu Zhenmin, Vice Foreign Minister of China, graced the conference by delivering a luncheon speech on the "Evolving Security Situation in Asia and the Role of China". The following is the summary of the speech.

Asia has largely maintained peace and stability for decades after the Cold War. This has served as a solid basis for Asia to focus on economic development.

Asia is seeing new progress in regional cooperation. However, Asia is still faced with many security challenges. Legacies of the Second World War and the Cold War, and territorial and maritime disputes continue to affect Asian security. There are also growing non-traditional security challenges, such as natural disasters, transnational crimes, cyber security, energy and food security. In addition, there are still attempts in our region to seek absolute security through strengthening military alliances. The trust deficit between some countries remains large. Only with openness, inclusiveness, mutual respect and cooperation can countries achieve security and development, and create a harmonious environment for regional security.

H.E. Mr. Liu said that China does not believe in the old security concept based on zero-sum game, military hegemony and power politics. China put forward a concept of New Approach to Security in the 1990s, which are based on mutual trust, mutual benefit, equality and collaboration. This can be called the 3C security approach, namely comprehensive security, cooperative security and common security.

To maintain and promote security in Asia, we should promote regional economic integration as the foundation for Asian security; keep good relations among major countries, make good use of existing regional mechanisms; and foster new security architecture.

China still sees itself as a developing country. For many years to come, the issue at the very top of China's policy agenda remains achieving its own development. Our focus will be on implementing the program of reform, opening-up and development drawn up at the recent 3rd Plenum of the 18th CPC Central Committee, to build a moderately prosperous society for 1.3 billion Chinese people.

China has achieved development under the current international order. To keep the order stable, and renew and reform it gradually serves China's interests as well as those of other stakeholders in the region.

To describe China's neighboring policy, President Xi Jinping used four phrases: closeness, sincerity, sharing in prosperity, and accepting differences, or inclusiveness. He reiterated that China remains committed to developing friendship and partnerships with its neighbors. China's development will bring more benefit to our neighbors.

This year, China proposed many new proposals on cooperation projects with our neighbors, such as the Silk Road Economic Belt, the 21st Century Maritime Silk Road, the establishment of an Asia Infrastructure Investment Bank, the China-ASEAN community of common destiny, the 2+7 cooperation framework to enhance China ASEAN strategic partnership, etc.

China is firmly committed to building a new type of major country relationship. Naturally, such a new type of relationship will not be plain sailing. We owe it to ourselves and to the region to avoid the historical trap of major power conflict.

China will continue to firmly support ASEAN community building and ASEAN centrality in regional cooperation. China is the first outside country to sign the Treaty of Amity and Cooperation in Southeast Asia, and the first major country to establish a strategic partnership with ASEAN. China will continue to properly handle disputes over territory and maritime rights and interests. China and ASEAN countries are making joint efforts to implement the DOC comprehensively and effectively and will push forward COC discussions in a positive and prudent manner.

H.E. Mr. Liu said that China stands for shelving disputes and seeking joint development. China has reached initial understanding on joint development with some countries. On issues of territorial sovereignty and maritime interests, China does not believe in provoking others. Nor would we allow provocation against China's principles and bottom line.

On the issue of Diaoyu Islands, China's activities in the area is the legitimate exercise of its jurisdiction on these islands and should not be seen as an attempt to change the status quo. China's establishment of the Air Defense Identification Zone in the East China Sea is consistent with international law and international practice. More than 20 countries including the United States and Japan have established their own ADIZs since the 1950s. As for the issue of aviation safety in the overlapping areas, China and Japan can and should strengthen dialogue and communication to ensure aviation safety and avoid accidents. China hopes that relevant countries will not read too much and not overreact to China's ADIZ in the East China Sea.

China will continue to work for the solution of hotspot issues in Asia. China will firmly push forward the denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula. We sincerely hope that the relevant parties will move in the same direction and make effort to resume the Six Party Talks to bring the issue back to the track of negotiations.

In conclusion, H.E. Mr. Liu expressed his hope that CSCAP, as an influential think tank on security in the Asia-Pacific, will continue to approach security issues in Asia with open and creative thinking, and provide more ideas and support to regional security cooperation.

After his remarks, H.E. Mr. Liu answered questions from the audience. On the issue of building a new security architecture, H.E. Mr. Liu responded that although we have ARF with ASEAN centrality, ARF still remains a forum. Asia is short of a security architecture which is inclusive and supported by all parties. In the future, the role of ARF need to be further strengthened, and all parties should make good use of this



platform, increase trust and reduce differences. For the time being, the main functions for ARF are to increase mutual trust and conduct preventive diplomacy while the diversity of Asian countries, as well as the interests of other major countries in Asia should be taken into consideration. H.E. Mr. Liu believed that a gradual process should be taken to build an Asian security architecture, and work can be started at sub-regional level, and gradually put in place a security architecture that covered all the Asian region.

On international and regional order, H.E. Mr. Liu responded that the overall international situation has not seen any fundamental change since the establishment of U.N., and the collective security system, the trading system, and the financial system established on the basis of the U.N. are still valid. Of course, the existing international order can no longer satisfy the needs of the 193 UN members. However we cannot deny the existing international order, we can only reform it gradually. China is supportive of the UN reform, and believes that the reform should be advanced on the basis of equality and sovereignty. The result of the reform should better reflect the reality of the international situation.

On the issue of absolute security, H.E. Mr. Liu responded that some countries still want to achieve absolute security, and military alliances remain a reality in Asia. Some countries both outside and inside of this region still give supports to military alliance. However, China believes that military alliance is outdated and will not suit the new type of state relations. As early as the 1990s, China proposed a new security concept, and since then China has been working to advance the concept. We believe it is important for major countries to shape a new model of relationship, and Asian countries need to build a state-to-state relationship based on equality, mutual support, and win-win cooperation. China has confidence in the future of Asia, and is confident in the maintenance of peace and stability in Asia.

---

### **Session Three**

#### **Overcoming Current Obstacles for Peace and Stability in Northeast Asia**

**Chair: Major General QIAN Lihua, Vice Chair, CSCAP China**

---

**Mr. Jong Chol Nam, Institute for Disarmament and Peace**

**Democratic People's Republic of Korea**

---

Mr. Jong Chol Nam focused his presentation on the issue on the Korean peninsula. He argued since the end of the cold war there are many important changes in world politics, which affect the strategic importance of the region in the Northeast Asia. He reviewed the situation after the Cold War, and held the view that the strengthened US, Japan, and South Korea military relations accelerated the move to form the triangular military alliance. It will be a great danger to the security balance in the region of the Northeast Asia. On the other hand there is an increase of danger of nuclear war on the Korean peninsula. There isn't a mechanism to stop the military conflicts in any case. The DPRK has to pursue self-defense. He went on with the ways to overcome the

current fragile situation in the region. Firstly, US should put an immediate stop to joint military exercises. Secondly, it is important to abolish the UN command, which would prove the US willingness to withdraw its hostile policy to DPRK. Thirdly, the nuclear crisis on the Korean Peninsula has to be solved on the basis of the principle of simultaneous actions. And finally, the joint declarations between the North and the South should be implemented.

---

**Mr. Ralph A. Cossa**  
**President, Pacific Forum CSIS, USA**

---

Mr. Ralph. A. Cossa talked mainly on three subjects, the North Korean nuclear weapons program, North Korea's hostile attitude towards South Korea and the current trust deficit, the territorial disputes which were not being managed well at the present time in Northeast Asia and Southeast Asia, and history issues which kept coming up. On territorial disputes, he held that the main problem today is refusal to seek outside mediation. There are vehicles in existence. If people are that convinced that their claims are legitimate, they can go to the International Court of Justice like they can go to other outside mediators. On the case of China-Japan territorial disputes, they may learn from the model of Russia and Japan. A current bargain is possible if Japan would acknowledge that the islands are disputed from a Chinese perspective and China would acknowledge that the islands are currently under Japan's administrative control and act accordingly. On history issues, Mr. Ralph Cossa held that Prime Minister Abe should play the history card, which is the history of Japan at the second half of the twenties century. China and South Korea need to acknowledge that Japan has played as a lead goose in the 1980s and 1990s, making the economic miracles for both China and Korea possible.

On North Korea and its nuclear weapons program, Mr. Ralph Cossa explained the need to take a fresh approach to what's happening. There are very few problems in the world that the U.S. is not capable of handling without using nuclear weapons. And the only reason nuclear weapons come to play on the Korean Peninsula is because the DPRK had threaten to use them. On the need for a peace treaty, Mr. Cossa said the US is committed to that in 1989 when the U.S. established with China and the ROK the Six Party Talks. The DPRK walked away from those agreements because it refused to sign an agreement with the ROK. The problem is the DPRK's refusal to acknowledge the existence and legitimacy of the government in South Korea. Any time if the two want to sit down developing a peace mechanism, they will find the United States and China fully prepared to support that but again the ball here was in the DPRK's court.

---

**Professor Takagi Seiichiro**  
**Senior Associate Fellow of the Japan Institute of International Affairs, Japan**

---

Professor Takagi Seiichiro elaborated his perspectives concerning the settlement of history problems among Asian countries. He said that the tendency of whatever one

side claims to be true should be accepted, and whatever settlement one side demand should be accepted by the other” should be overcome by seeking truth from facts. Study of history is a serious matter, and it’s not a game to be played among politicians or among people of the countries. We should study history to take lessons from the past, to understand how our society has evolved and how it is likely to develop in the future. However, nowadays people of Japan, China and Korea are influenced by commercialized newspapers and television and increasingly by internet communication. It is a very unproductive way to handle history. We should avoid over-reliance on symbolism and focus on substance. When Japanese political leader visited the Yasukuni Shrine, people get upset, but in fact, the politicians are not praying for the revival of Japanese militarism or trying to create an atmosphere and planning to make Japan into strong and militarized nation. We should distinguished symbolism from reality. Subjective scholarly research is the best way to handle history issues rather than put it in the political realm. A serious attitude on history issues would produce maybe not the total agreement in history but more productive atmosphere with regard to history.

---

**Professor Jaewoo Choo, Department of Chinese Language, Kyung Hee  
University, Republic of Korea**

---

Prof. Jaewoo Choo presented his views on the new type of great power relations between the U.S. and China, as well as regional security architecture. The fundamental challenge to regional security lies in the relationship between the U.S. and China, since they have different perspectives, outlooks, and perceptions on how the security architecture should be built in this region. The U.S. and China are both looking ahead but taking different approaches. The seed of distrust of China and the U.S. lies in the following aspects: China has a historical phobia of encirclement. In contemporary terms, the US alliance-building in Southeast Asia, USSR’s expansion in Vietnam, Mongolia, and Afghanistan, US unsuccessful expedition into Central Asia and its strategic rebalancing strategy with allies are all causes of distrust. China is concerned that America constrains or even upsets China's rise. The intentions of US rebalancing strategy remain unclear. The U.S. is concerned about China’s long-term zero-sum game thinking; China’s mercantilist policies, China’s one-Party political system, China, no longer a developing country, will assume a more hegemonic, assertive and active approach, and PLA weapons modernization targeting at America. The U.S. and China has no common denominator on regional architecture. China wants common development, harmonious world, peace and development, cooperation, multilateralism, open regionalism, respect diversity, ASEAN-centered regional order, inclusive membership and common interest and new security concept. The U.S. wants preservation of primacy, value-based order, democracy, freedom, market economy, bilateral alliance, alliance based regionalism, shared values, commitment and international law, allies-centered regional order, exclusive membership, and US leadership. To conclude, China and the US will find it difficult to build a ground where they can converge, unless the seed of distrust is completely exhumed. For the

time being, “Common interest,” would not be the answer, since interests out of the boundary estrange them. Regional states are compelled to choose side. It is a big obstacle for peace and stability in the region.

---

**Professor Georgy Toloraya**  
**Head of Regional Projects Department, Russkiy mir Foundation**  
**Russia**

---

Professor Georgy Toloraya presented his views on security and cooperation of Russia and Northeast Asia. He stated that this is a stable but very tense region, and challenges include territorial conflicts, historical tensions, differences in economic development, military alliances, as well as non-traditional threats. Possible solutions may include bilateral diplomacy, multilateral security groups (Six-Party Talks), avoidance of division lines, track II and humanitarian exchanges, network diplomacy, and energy and logistic bridges. He suggested that the Six-Party Talks should be restarted without preconditions. Work must be done for the improvement of Korea-Japan and China-Japan relations, hostile propaganda must be checked up, and multilateral projects promoted. He then offered some proposals for a new security system in Korea. Since strictly bilateral agreements on Korea do not work, a durable peace regime should be a multilateral construction - both Koreas, China, USA, Japan and Russia. A set of bilateral treaties on security arrangements on the Korean Peninsula among all participants of the multilateral diplomatic process should be signed. Each country signs legally-binding agreements with the five other members. Unified understanding of the peace regime and verification mechanisms should be achieved. Basic principles of bilateral relations, implementation of the UN Charter principles in Korea, and military-political arrangements including armament sphere, should be adhered to. The vital part lies in nuclear armament, missiles and other WMD issues, as well as strategic conventional arms, creation of verification regimes. This security system will give possibility to control the implementation of agreements by all other participants.

---

**Dr. Ganbat Damba, Director of Institute for Strategic Studies of Mongolia**

---

Dr. Ganbat Damba talked about Mongolian foreign policy in Northeast Asia, especially the initiative of Ulan Bator Dialogue on the Northeast Asia Security. The goals of the initiative are to continue to downgrade mistrust through negotiations, and to make efforts aimed at reaching a long-term goal of regional peace and setting up mechanism of dialogue in Northeast Asia. The dialogues will be conducted with a combination of “Track I” officials and unofficial “Track II” academia. Topics to be discussed might include regional economic cooperation, military transparency, environmental issues, non-traditional security threats, and regional stability. Principles which should be abided by include respecting the opinions of other parties, conducting full and thorough discussions, and holding meetings at both official and unofficial levels. The dialogue should be held on the basis of trust. At the initial stage,

parties to the dialogue should include the six countries in Northeast Asia. The participation of other countries and entities should be discussed in an open and transparent way step by step.

---

### Question and Answer Session

---

On the issue of relations between China, Japan and South Korea, Mr. Cossa responded that there is a need for great cooperation among the three countries, and dialogue is absolutely necessary. There is no way to pursue a good neighbor policy if the leaders would not sit and discuss. What really required is for the three leaders to sit down and talk with one another, and the US could provide good offices. Prof. Jong responded that President Pak has a trust policy, and the core idea behind is sincerity. One should match words with actions and use actions to prove it. Dr. Takagi Seiichiro responded that, on the operation level, cooperation between Japan and Korea is very good. The problem is on the political side and maybe public opinions too. This is why political leadership is important. Both Japan and Korea are allies of the United States, so it is natural for them to have better communication and have productive cooperation.

On the efficacy and usefulness of the current sanction regimes against the DPRK, Prof. Toloraya maintained that sanctions are in failure. Some other engagement ways should be found rather than sanction and isolation against the DPRK. Mr. Cossa responded that sanctions are useful, but if countries sign up for sanctions and do not enforce them, they become useless. Sanctions fail to work because the DPRK continues to get the technology and the equipment required to develop nuclear weapons. It would be impossible for the US to lift the sanctions, since it seems like to reward the North Korea who has carried out uncooperative actions.

A Chinese scholar expressed the worries of Japan's future political development and pointed out that the Chinese and Korean government's request is very simple: the Japanese Prime Minister should refrain from visiting the Yasukuni Shrine in his official capacity. However this very fundamental request had been kept being challenged and being ignored by the Japanese government. How could Japan's neighboring countries really feel at ease about Japan's future direction of possible militarism.

One participant raised a question regarding military alliances in the Asia-Pacific region. He believed that military alliance is a negative factor in maintaining peace and stability in the Asia-Pacific region. All of the US military alliances, including US-Japan, US-South Korea, US-Philippines, were formed during the Cold War. After more than twenty years, the US should loosen these alliances. However, on the contrary, these alliances have been strengthened and consolidated. Mr. Cossa responded that U.S. military alliances are positive forces for stability in the region.

The alliances provide a foundation upon which multilateral cooperation could be built. He expressed his worries about the consequences of the lack of military alliances. If the military alliance would be taken away, a couple of moral nuclear weapon states in East Asia might emerge, which would not contribute to the security in the region .

---

**Session Four**

**Building A Secure and Open Cyberspace through Cooperation**

**Chair: Mr. Ron Huisken, Associate Professor, Strategic and Defense Studies  
Centre, Australian National University, Australia**

---

**Dr. Xu Longdi**

**China Institute of International Studies**

---

Dr. Xu Longdi shared his views on China's policies and practices on Internet development and cyber security. From the very beginning of its development, China's Internet has been closely linked to the Chinese economy, and is programmed and integrated into its macro-economic development blueprints. In addition to lending full policy support to Internet development, China also invests heavily on building Internet infrastructures. The construction and improvement of Internet infrastructure facilitates the spread and application of Internet. The Chinese Government actively promotes the R&D of next-generation Internet (NGI). China practices a policy of managing cyber affairs in line with law, adhering to the principles of scientific and effective management in its Internet governance. He then went on with the challenges facing China's cyber security. China has been a major victim of cyber attacks, which have been increasing dramatically in recent years and fully demonstrated China's weaknesses in the realm of cyber security. Although China has made due progress in its information and communication technologies (ICTs), yet as a late comer to this field, China still lags far behind other developed countries in a lot of areas.

China has the largest number of netizens in the world, many of them are just green hands in access to ICTs, often without any awareness or sense of cyber security. China is suffering from various cyber attacks in the real world as well as in cyberspace. At present, a Chinese way of doing cyber security is in the making. It further promotes international and bilateral cyber cooperation. The international community is called on for making rules for cyberspace. In this process, all countries are indispensable. As the Stuxnet worm against the Iranian nuclear facilities demonstrated, cyber tools and weapons could lead to catastrophic scenarios. Building technical capabilities and narrowing digital gaps are underway. Although the West, particularly the United States, is keen on accusing China of the cyber attacks it suffered, today the two countries share common interests in the face of common cyber security threats.

---

**Mr. B.J. Srinath**

**Senior Scientist, Department of Electronics and Information Technology, India**

---

Mr. B.J.Srinath gave his views on cyber security saying that cyber security is a highly complex issue. First, the trans-boundary nature of cyberspace security makes arbitration very difficult. Second, state behavior in cyberspace is becoming extremely important and the role of non-state actors also important. The key issues are cyber crime, cyber terrorism, critical infrastructure protection, cyber warfare, and the large issue of ownership of Internet. The implications are that the norms of behavior are becoming very important. The recent trends are that most countries have begun to adopt national strategies, which are mixed with several things, for instance, building of the infrastructure, law enforcement, legal framework, and international cooperation, etc. The setup of NATO center of excellence is an effort to define terms in cyber space, and a good start. The difficulties are that there are no common agreements on concepts or definition. Then the critical question is how to manage cyber security. Should the content of cyber space be controlled? and how? He then introduced India's cyber policies. India has recently come out with a very ambitious cyber security policy which involves coordination among multiple agencies, and also appointment of a cyber security coordinator. He also talked about the development of a large number of cyber security experts in the country over the next few years. What are needed to be done? The dialogue is very important. It is taking place but fragmented. We should also take lessons from other fields. The question of definition of concept is important. Whatever we develop, it should have a wider acceptance, and perhaps the UN should be involved in this respect.

---

**Dr. Amirudin Abdul Wahab**  
**Chief Executive Officer, CyberSecurity of Malaysia**

---

Dr. Amirudin Abdul Wahab stated that Malaysia recognizes the uprising cyber security threats and the potential to disrupt our society. Therefore, to build a safer cyber space is very important. Hence there are demands on domestic and international levels to protect our open cyber space, and it could be achieved through international cooperation. The cyber crimes have increased with complexities. We are facing threats posed by international crime organizations, using the Internet for illegal drugs, human trafficking, financial fraud, money laundering, etc. These crimes are across borders and transnational. Malaysia also acknowledges cyber aggression conducted by nation states, and states sponsored non-state actors. It is believed that such activities are committed with diverse political and economic motives, in order to achieve dominance in cyber space. The recent Edward Snowden issue shows that such spying activities have posed risks to national sovereignty. If it is not managed properly by global community, it would heighten the tension of cyber security among the nations. The exploitation of Internet has also created digital hacktivism. Such acts could be seen as WMD in cyber space. If a nation is attacked, the damage could spread to other countries. Cyber security cooperation among nations is of vital importance to addressing cyber crimes in the region. Such cooperation may include cooperation on programs in cyber security among member states, platforms for

information exchange, and knowledge-sharing opportunities, and possible engagement with other platforms, such as ARF.

---

**Ms. Elaine Korzak,  
Cyber Security Fellow, CISAC, Stanford University, USA**

---

Ms. Elaine Korzak focused her presentation on the significance of rules and norms for building a security open cyber space through cooperation. There is consensus on the need of norms on cyber space, but the challenge is to agree on the exact type and content of those norms. When it comes to international legal regimes, there is a big debate going on whether we should keep the existing international legal frameworks or we should come up with new norms, or whether it should be a mix of both. By reviewing UN resolutions and reports of groups of governmental experts, she pointed out the applicability of existing legal frameworks. Then she recommended that the future group of experts should not back track on the commitments they made in their report.

The next step should include the application of particular norms to figure out how this would translate into cyber space. And Ms. Korzak recommended to start with the relatively easy area of agreement and then to figure out real tough and controversial issues. Track II discussions might be very helpful as a vehicle to move this discussion forward, and a correct way to start Track II conversations is to broaden up expert groups to have a truly equitable geographical distribution. She then pointed out the danger of fragmentation. Although it is very helpful to stimulate discussions on regional level, we should be careful not to end up with regional regimes, norms, and ideas that in the end may be counter-productive and even contradictory.

---

**Mr. Kwa Chong Guan  
Senior Fellow, S.Rajaratnam School of International Studies, Singapore**

---

Mr. Kwa Chong Guan focused his presentation on whether people should have absolute access to information through internet and on whether we should have regulations. He stated that the growth complexity impact of the Internet on our lives today challenges the call for the independence of cyber space. There are three layers/domains of cyber space that needed some form of government or intergovernmental influence over the way that internet is governed. First is the physical infrastructure foundation of the cyber space. Second is the logic components which compose the infrastructure and the network. Third is the content through which information flowed through the internet.

---

**Dinner Speech  
Lieutenant General REN Haiquan  
Vice President of the Chinese Academy of Military Science**

---



Lieutenant General REN Haiquan made a dinner speech on China's national defense policy. The summary of the speech are as follows:

Today's world is undergoing complex and profound changes. The Asia Pacific has become the most dynamic region with greatest potential. The biggest concern for China is stability and development in this region. China has been committed to a defensive national defense policy as follows: China upholds national sovereignty, security, territorial integrity, and protects China's peace and development. China wants to build a strong national defense force and a strong military, which is consistent with China's national status and meets the needs of China's national security and developments interests. China has been actively implementing a proactive defensive military strategy and committed to a self-defensive nuclear strategy. And finally, China works hard to uphold world and regional peace and stability.

China's defensive national defense policy has the following features: Firstly, It is self-defensive in nature. China's defensive national defense policy is based on resisting aggressions, and protecting the motherland and the peaceful work of the people. Secondly, we have an active defense policy, by which we mean that we adhere to the principle featuring of defensive operations, and striking the enemy only after the enemy has started the attack. We have been very prudent in the use of force, and we will not be the first to create an incident. And lastly, it is a peaceful national defense policy. We attach great importance to curbing crisis and wars together with other countries to create a good environment for common development.

The more we promote China's reform, the more consistent we will be in practicing the defensive national defense policy. China needs a peaceful and stable environment to deepen reform in a comprehensive manner. The successful experiences and practices of reform both home and abroad told us that national security and social stability are actually the preconditions for the smooth reform and development. To comprehensively deepening reform will not be possible without the support and cooperation of the Asia-Pacific countries and it will not be possible without a good internal and external security environment. Military expansion does not serve the national strategy of China's peaceful development, thus it will never become an option of China's national defense policy.

In deepening China's defense and military reform, China also aims to improve the military institution organization and structure, improve the relevant policies and systems, and raise the capabilities of the military to discharge its missions and tasks in order to provide a better support for the implementation of the defensive national defense policy.

In expanding its opening up, China will seek to have better security cooperation with Asia-Pacific countries so as to bring more benefit to the neighbors. In other words, China's opening wider to the outside world does not go against China's practice of the defensive national defense policy. The two things actually reinforce each other. We will be more proactive in our participation in regional security cooperation, and we will be more actively undertaking responsibilities as a major country by providing more public common goods for the Asia-Pacific region and the international community.

---

### **Question and Answer Session**

---

On China's Air Defense Identification Zone (ADIZ), Gen. Ren responded that the ADIZ is defensive in nature, and it is not to expand China's territorial airspace. It is not a unique thing practiced by China. There is not a unified international model for the ADIZ implementation. As to whether we would establish ADIZs in other territorial seas, it will be determined by our judgment of the international situation, as well as the needs of China's national security. The flight of the civil aircraft will be very safe in the future in the ADIZ. We hope that the civilian aircrafts of other countries could give early warnings report in advance as Chinese aircrafts did in other ADIZs.

On China's policy of non-first-use of nuclear weapons, Gen. Ren responded that the policy had never been changed. In the future, the first users of nuclear weapons will be punished by history. Now that the U.S. is pursuing a strategy of rebalancing in Asia, we should neither take it too seriously nor too lightly. Despite the rebalancing policy, the U.S. will not go against the will of the international community and become first user of nuclear weapons. If any country dares to use nuclear weapons against China, China will be able to counterattack, and we will be able to punish that kind of act. Although we do not have so many nuclear weapons, they are enough to counter and punish those first users.

On the role of the newly formed Chinese National Security Council, Gen. Ren responded that the Council is to support our security interests by integrating all the security forces surrounding the security matters. The Council assumes top strategic positions, since it involves not only the defense or military departments, but all departments related to security. It is connected somewhat with the Central Military Commission, but not the same. To ensure national security, we not only need the support of the armed forces, but also the support of the Foreign Ministry, of intelligence, economic, cultural and other related departments. The National Security Council will have a larger scope than the Central Military Commission.

On the issue of China's policy to counter terrorism, Gen. Ren responded that our position is that we are firmly opposed to terrorism, whether it takes place in other parts of the world or in China. Terrorism represents the common enemy of mankind. The first thing for us to do in fighting terrorism is to remove the soil for its creation. We need to attack terrorism from all perspective, including political, social, economical, ethnic, cultural, and religious perspectives. In fighting against terrorism, we have to rely on the people. We also have to enhance the development of the terrorism fighting professionals, including intelligence, military, and assistance missions. Last but not least, we have only a single standard to judge terrorism. We do not practice double standards.

On the issue of the Korean Peninsula, Gen. Ren responded that China has a consistent policy concerning the DPRK nuclear issue. China is committed to the denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula. China is committed to the peace and stability of the Korean Peninsula, because that is crucial to the peoples and countries in Northeast Asia, or even to Asia as a whole. All the disputes need to be solved through peaceful negotiations. Currently the most effective way is through the Six Party Talks. In the past, there were some possibilities emerged for the settlement of the issue. However, it is regrettable that, later on, the ruling Party of the U.S. changed policy towards the DPRK. So the most important thing is to honor one's words.

On the issue of Diaoyu Islands, Gen. Ren said that the least thing we want is lack of sincerity. Some leaders of some countries are actually losing the tradition of resolving disputes through diplomatic means. They do not recognize there are disputes, which close the door for diplomatic talks. The only way left is to compare muscle strength. Anybody, especially the leaders of a country, need to give top priority to upholding world peace and their national interests, rather than pursuing the goal of winning more votes, or working longer in their official positions.

---

**Wednesday, December 4, 2013**

---

**Session Five**

**Water Security: Dealing with Common Challenges**

**Chair: HRH Sirivudh Norodom, Founder and Chairman  
Cambodian Institute for Cooperation and Peace, Cambodia**

---

**Prof. Zhou Shichun**

**Secretary General, Ecosystem Study Commission for International Rivers  
(ESCIR), China**

---

Prof. Zhou noted that China is now facing a severe challenge along with further industrialization and urbanization, as well as global climate change. Flood, drought, pollution and soil erosion are still the predominate problems in China. China's water policy is to make a balance of exploitation and protection, economy and environment, innovation of environment-friendly technologies, and to enhance international cooperation. Following the update of China's hydropower development in the

Lancang River, Prof. Zhou introduced some experiences for hydropower development, such as coordinating hydropower development with social economic development, emphasizing ecological and environmental protection throughout the hydropower development, and balancing the interests of different stakeholders. He emphasized that as an upstream country, China has been adhering to the sustainable development strategy, paying equal attention to development and conservation, and taking account of the interests of both China and downstream countries in exploiting the hydropower resources at the Lancang River.

Moving on to the water situation in the Mekong River, Prof. Zhou noted that the Mekong River is one of the last large river on Earth not dammed for most of its length. The Mekong River Basin is rich in water resources with only 15% available water resources being exploited currently, and water pollution generally has not reached an alarming level. He then pointed out the challenges including the lack of water service provision, flood and drought management, a comprehensive basin development plan and insufficient infrastructure on the basin.

Prof. Zhou finally pointed out that China attaches importance to the cooperation between the upstream and the downstream countries. The hydrological data in wet season in the Lancang River is shared with the downstream since 2002, and is also shared in dry season in case of extreme draught. Under the agreement between China and India, the Tibet Hydrological Bureau provides, from 1st June to 15th October, hydrological data and information to India since 2002. China has navigation cooperation with Myanmar, Lao PDR and Thailand. Capacity-building and technical exchanges are also underway between the upstream and downstream countries.

---

**Dr. Nguyen Nam Duong**  
**Deputy Director General, Institute for Foreign Policy and Strategic Studies,**  
**Diplomatic Academy of Vietnam**

---

Dr. Nguyen Nam Duong emphasized that water security is a common challenge and has never become more imperative as it is today due to the reasons Prof. Zhou has mentioned. He added that over-damming is a very worrying trend in some of the Asian countries, especially on trans-boundary rivers. The downstream countries are always in a very disadvantage position in the sharing of water.

Dr. Nguyen Nam Duong then suggested that in order to deal with these challenges, water security issues need to be mainstreamed into the sustainable development plan at the national level. At the regional level, he noted that it's time to focus on water security issues in the regional architecture. There needs to be a very comprehensive and holistic view on the management of water instead of dealing with water separately. He further suggested that water issue should be discussed in all the three pillars of the ASEAN community, especially in the ASEAN political and security community, and

also in the ASEAN economic community. With regard to the ASEAN Regional Forum, he noted that ARF is now transforming from confidence-building measures to preventive diplomacy. Hence, water security issues could also be discussed as CBMs , and as a PD area.

---

**Mr. Mark Brindal**  
**Adelaide University, Former Minister for Water Resources in the South**  
**Australian Government, Australia**

---

Echoing two previous speakers about the importance of water, Mr. Mark Brindal noted that no more issues are important than water. The security on earth first depends on whether we have enough food and water. This is not a battle between sovereign states. It is a battle between us and nature, and nature always wins. The only way mankind should do is to compromise with nature. In this respect, Mr. Brindal gives a warning of the declining water availability in the region.

Mr. Mark Brindal emphasized the importance of China because it controls the head waters of most rivers in the region. He pointed out that China is a superpower in term of water. It has a vital role to play in the protection of humanity. There is an opportunity for China to cooperate with the downstream states by building dams in an environmental friendly manner to achieve stability, lasting peace and prosperity in the region.

---

**Dr. Arvind Gupta**  
**Director-General, Institute of Defense Studies and Analyses,**  
**New Delhi, India**

---

Dr. Arvind Gupta began his presentation by introducing the water situation in India where there has been a rapid decline in per capita water availability and unevenly distribution. In 2012, the Indian Government promoted national water policy which seeks to a holistic and integrated approach to water management.

Dr. Gupta then touched upon the cooperation between India and its upstream and downstream countries. India has been dealing with trans-boundary rivers for years. As an upstream country, India has treaties with Pakistan and Bangladesh, and these treaties do take account of the interests of the downstream countries. Meanwhile, as a downstream country, India has some agreements with China, Nepal and Bhutan. He noted that the data-sharing provided by China is useful, but the cooperation is still limited. There are two main concerns, one is lack of information about the damming in the Yarlung Zangbo River, and the other is the problem of water diversion. For conclusion, he noted that although these treaties are comprehensive, some new elements, especially the climate change factor needs to be brought into the treaties. Policy is fine but implementation is problematic. Wider cooperation and dialogue

among countries are crucial concerning the trans-boundary rivers.

During the question and answer time, participants highlighted the importance of cooperation in terms of water resources. Questions were raised including China's joining of the Mekong River Commission, China's engagement with downstream countries, in particular in terms of water-sharing and information of the damming. Also there is a question concerns possible cyber attacks threatening the infrastructure including hydropower station and irrigation system.

In response Prof. Zhou noted that although China has not yet joined the MRC, there are no difficulties for China and MRC to carry out cooperation and exchanges regarding the information-sharing and capacity-building. China in recent years has very good connection and cooperation with MRC on capacity-buildings, water resource development, hydro environmental protection, and ICEA cooperation. Mr. Mark Brindal pointed out that the political attitude of China not to get itself involved in MRC is to avoid the rules of the team because it is not part of the team. He urges all river basins, including Myanmar which is also not a member, to be MRC members so as to accept responsibility rather than choosing them.

Regarding the cyber-attacks against the infrastructure, all panelists attach great importance to the safety of infrastructure, especially the safety of dam system. One panelist emphasized that security of hydropower dam should be treated as seriously as the nuclear power plant. The threat to the constructions mainly comes from terrorists. He further noted that governments need to review the construction of dams comprehensively not only in terms of the water security but also in terms of the physical security.

---

### **Session Six**

#### **Enhancing a Peaceful and Cooperative Maritime Environment in the Region**

**Chair: Ambassador Barry Desker,  
Dean, S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies, Singapore**

---

**Dr. Rizal Sukma**

**Executive Director, Centre for Strategic and  
International Studies, Indonesia**

---

Dr. Sukma began his presentation by pointing out three of the worrying trends in the region. Firstly the changing nature and changing value of the sea in East Asia. Due to the changing nature of the power relations in the region, especially among the major powers, at least for the last three or four years, East Asia maritime domain has received a lot of tensions, thus increasing the strategic significance of the area. He said that the return of the traditional concern of the sea might diminish what we have tried to accomplish about how to cooperate to advance the notions of maritime domain as the original public goods. Secondly due to the increasing risks of conflict,

accident, incident, miscalculations, and in particular the major powers' rivalry, the unresolved territorial disputes in East Asia are becoming more and more difficult to resolve. Thirdly although we have many non-traditional maritime issues to deal with, we are now forced to think more about how to address traditional security challenges. He noted that in the area of maritime space, the opportunity for cooperation in non-traditional security issues is much greater than in other areas.

Dr. Sukma then made some suggestions with regards to the above-mentioned worrying trends. He does not think ASEAN can do much to help resolve the East China Sea dispute. However, he noted that it is in the South China Sea that ASEAN does have a lot of expectation. The process at the moment is really on track. Especially with political changes in China and also with the Brunei's chairmanship of ASEAN, there are more opportunities for both sides to move forward. And he pointed out that the Suzhou meeting is a good starting point.

Dr. Sukma further noted that the priority should be put on the Code of Conduct in order to avoid miscalculations and incidents at sea. At the same time, what is the most important for ASEAN and China is to avoid letting the disputes overshadow the overall ASEAN-China relation. He pointed out that while balancing the importance of traditional challenges in maritime domain, we should not forget the non-traditional security challenges, because traditional issue is basically problematic while non-traditional maritime challenges can be profiled as opportunity and cooperation.

---

**Dr. James Manicom**

**Research Fellow, Centre for International Governance Innovation, Canada**

---

Dr. James Manicom's presentation focused on how to cultivate a cooperative and harmonious maritime environment. In this regard, he mentioned the following three ways:

The first way concerns formal arbitration, binding arbitration and third party intervention. He noted that the loss of arbitration could result in strategic as well as political cost at home. He added that arbitration may not actually solve anything. One of the interesting features in the last two years' Asian maritime disputes is that every claimant has confidently asserted their claims and presented supporting evidences. It gives the opportunity for the Track II to engage and discuss which evidence might be relevant in the court of law.

The second way is to build political will in order to settle disputes through negotiations, just as Australia and East Timor did in their dispute. Given the example of negotiations among the former Soviet Union, Cuba and the United States during the Cuban missile crisis, he emphasized the importance of empathy-building which means to put oneself in the shoes of its rivals.

The third way is to negotiate a new status quo in both the East China Sea and the South China Sea. Dr. Manicom noted that any sustainable status quo involves having some kind of ways to manage possible escalation of tensions between countries. Furthermore, he attached importance to hot lines and confidence-building measures between countries which have disputes, and said that CSCAP can play a role in this regards.

---

**Mr. Gi Hoon Hong**  
**Professor of Marine Science and Policy, Korea Institute of Ocean Science and**  
**Technology, Republic of Korea**

---

Prof. Gi Hoon Hong presented some perspectives concerning prioritizing mutual trust and achieving win-win cooperation in the field of marine environment. Firstly to join and implement global marine environmental protection treaties, for example, the London Protocol which is on the Prevention of Marine Pollution by Dumping of Wastes and Other Matter. He noted that Asia Pacific is not very well managed in terms of environment. It is urgent for CSCAP members to join the London Protocol, because no voices from Southeast Asian countries are heard in global arena. Secondly to establish the Asia-Pacific ESPOO Convention for the prevention of industrial accidents. Taking the accident of Fukushima Nuclear Power Plant as an example, he suggested establishing a practical international regime on industrial accidents prevention and on assistance supply to deal with aftermaths of large-scale accidents potentially causing extraterritorial marine pollution.

---

**Professor Paul Sinclair, Regional Security Fellow,**  
**Centre for Strategic Studies, New Zealand**

---

In his presentation, Prof. Paul Sinclair made some proposals on enhancing regional maritime cooperation.

**1. CUES** He first mentioned about CUES which aims to offer a safety measure for facilitating communication among Naval and public ships, submarines and aircrafts. Last year's WPNS decided to wait for formal adoption of CUES at the meeting in China next year. The further development of CUES would be significant in building cooperation in the maritime environment. He appreciated the process of the decision made by ADMM+ expert working group on maritime security to exploit some technical aspect of CUES.

**2. Pan-Regional Coast Guard Forum** Prof. Paul Sinclair then noted that, should CUES be formally adopted, one consideration is to extend it to coast guard operations. The idea is to establish a Pan-Regional Coast Guard Forum. Given the fact that Southeast Asia does not have an equivalent forum as the North Pacific Coast Guard Forum, Pan-Regional Coast Guard Forum can provide region-wide framework to



build confidence through professional level of interaction and regular dialogue between coast guards.

**3. Regional Maritime Domain Awareness** He noted that the establishment of international fusion centre in Singapore is an important step for promoting collective awareness of trans-boundary maritime security threats.

**4. ReCAAP** It provides information-sharing and confidence-building arrangements through inter-governmental cooperation against maritime piracy and armed robbery. Prof. Paul Sinclair then touched upon challenges facing ReCAAP, that is the need for further institutionalized mechanism and a wide mandate to include all transnational crimes into its framework.

**5. Bilateral Hot Lines** Prof. Paul Sinclair attached importance to bilateral hot lines in incident prevention and mitigation, including at the operation level between navies and between coast guards. He noted that the agreement to set up a hot line between China and Vietnam on resolving fishing incident in the disputed South China Sea waters is a welcoming progress this year.

**6. Search and Rescue Cooperation** Prof. Paul Sinclair pointed out that recent developments in the South Pacific have provided a useful experience in achieving a harmonized regional approach at this point. A non-binding regional arrangement that facilitates preparations through major SAR emergencies in the South China Sea would be a significant and very practical confidence-building measure.

**7. Security of Submarine Cables** Finally, Prof. Sinclair highlighted the importance of the submarine cables, saying they are the backbones of international telecommunication network. However, little attention has been paid to ensuring its security, he noted. He emphasized that there is an urgent need for a convention to protect the security of submarine cables.

During the question and answer time, panelists were asked whether the Track 1.5 or Track II processes could play a bigger role in dealing with sensitive issues in the region, and how these processes could tackle difficult questions as well as explore outside-the-box solutions to regional problems. One panellist noted that Track 1.5 or Track II can actually help the government officials explore how UNCLOS and other international laws are actually relevant to the disputes in the South China Sea. Also, Track II can provide the input on the content of the COC. However, Track II must have close access to government channels, otherwise, no matter how good the recommendations are, it would not be able to go through the decision-making process, he noted.

Another question was raised about renouncing the use of force in certain maritime context. In response, Dr. Sukma noted that with regard to the South China Sea, the

first principle of the DOC is no use of force. That is why until now even though we have ups and downs, none of the claimants actually have used force to solve the disputes. General Qian Lihua then expounded China's position at the request of the questioner. He said that China is the one victimized by use of force. Our position is that we will never attack others unless we are attacked. China will never fire the first shot. He pointed out that anyone who understands China and understands China's defence policy should know the basic principle of China.

In response to a question on the concept of arbitration, on when applying arbitration you need a unilateral action or an action after consensus of agreement by all parties concerned, Prof. Paul Sinclair is not so convinced about the wisdom of unilateral approaches to arbitration. Dr. James Manicom showed his disagreement by noting that there is no need always seeking a common legal action. A unilateral action is not a problem as long as it has legitimacy.

### **Conclusion**

In the closing session, Prof. Nguyen Thai Yen Huong delivered her conclusion remarks on behalf of CSCAP Co-Chairs. She noted that the 9<sup>th</sup> General Conference has concluded with significant achievements under the theme of mutual trust and win-win cooperation. This conference has provided fresh thinking and perspective on the emerging security challenges and the regional architecture in the Asia-Pacific. Above all, it provided the format for building trust and enhancing cooperation in this region. The speeches presented by China's Vice Foreign Minister and Vice President of the Chinese Academy of Military Science were very comprehensive and fruitful. She pointed out that the security dialogue at the second track is essential for the region, as there has existed many significant and hot spot issues that require dialogue and other confidence-building measures. The 9<sup>th</sup> General Conference in Beijing is a great event which has promoted the good spirit of CSCAP from a wider setting to a wider audience. She then expressed her gratitude and appreciation to CSCAP China, China Institute of International Studies, CSCAP Secretariat and each member committee especially Australia, New Zealand and Indonesia, for their substantive and financial support in the organizations of the conference. The appreciations also go to all participants and the volunteers. Finally, she hopes the results of the conference will not only be useful for CSCAP activity but also for the regional cooperation in the coming future.

Ambassador Leela K Ponappa added by saying that what was really gratifying in terms of this conference was there were so many suggestions with the aim of making CSCAP recommendations pragmatic and practical. She further noted that this conference and the works of CSCAP for the past twenty years have demonstrated that track two can play a role, although it may not be evident immediately, but it keeps the discourse going.

