

---

# Japan-East Asia Dialogue

**"A New Horizon of Regional Cooperation in East Asia -  
Overcoming the Age of Complex Risk"**

---

---

## Conference Papers

---

December 10, 2015

Tokyo, Japan

Co-Sponsored by

The Global Forum of Japan (GFJ)

The Japan Forum on International Relations (JFIR)

East Asian Institute, National University of Singapore (EAI)

International Relations Department, University of Indonesia

Supported by

The Japan Foundation Asia Center

# Table of Contents

1. Program.....	1
2. Biographies of the Panelists.....	3
3. Presentation Papers .....	9
<i>Session I : Complex Risks in East Asia: An Overview.....</i>	9
Mohd Kamarulnizam ABDULLAH .....	9
INADA Juichi .....	10
Tawatchai APIDECHKUL.....	17
CHOE Wongi.....	18
YONEYAMA Yoshiharu.....	19
TRAN Quang Minh .....	20
SAHASHI Ryo .....	22
Chandarith NEAK .....	24
<i>Session II : Complex Risk Management and Regional Cooperation in East Asia.....</i>	25
GUO Yanjun.....	25
Evi FITRIANI.....	26
SHIROYAMA Hideaki.....	27
YURA Suma Adnan .....	28
FUKUSHIMA Akiko .....	29
Marife BALLESTEROS.....	30
IIDA Keisuke.....	31
4. An Introduction to The Global Forum of Japan .....	32
5. An Introduction to The Japan Forum on International Relations.....	33
6. An Introduction to East Asian Institute, National University of Singapore.....	35
7. An Introduction to International Relations Department, University of Indonesia .....	36

# 1. Program

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Japan-East Asia Dialogue</b>  <b>日・東アジア対話</b>  <b>"A New Horizon of Regional Cooperation in East Asia : Overcoming the Age of Complex Risks"</b>  <b>「東アジア地域協力の新地平-複合リスクを如何に乗り越えるか-」</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">10 December, 2015 / 2015年12月10日          於 The Prince Park Tower Tokyo Hotel / ザ・プリンス パークタワー東京          Tokyo, Japan / 東京          Co-sponsored by / 共催          The Global Forum of Japan (GFJ) / グローバル・フォーラム          The Japan Forum on International Relations (JFIR) / 日本国際フォーラム          East Asian Institute, National University of Singapore (EAI) / シンガポール国立大学東アジア研究所          International Relations Department, University of Indonesia / インドネシア大学国際関係学部</p>
---

<b>Thursday, 10 December, 2015 / 2015年12月10日(木)</b> <b>The Prince Park Tower Tokyo Hotel "Convention Hall G" / ザ・プリンス パークタワー東京「コンベンション ホールG」</b>	
<b>オープニングセッション / Opening Session</b>	
<b>13:00-13:15</b>	
Opening Remarks (5min.) 開会挨拶 (5分間)	ITO Kenichi, Chairman, GFJ / President, JFIR 伊藤 憲一 グローバル・フォーラム代表世話人 / 日本国際フォーラム理事長
Opening Remarks (5min.) 開会挨拶 (5分間)	Hikmahanto JUVANA, Professor, University of Indonesia ヒクマハント ジュワナ インドネシア大学教授
<b>Session I / 本会 第 I</b>	
<b>13:15-15:20</b>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Complex Risks in East Asia: An Overview</b>  <b>「東アジアが直面する複合リスクの現状と課題」</b></p>
Co-Chairperson (10min.) 共同議長 (10分間)	ITO Go, Academic Governor, GFJ / Professor, Meiji University 伊藤 剛 グローバル・フォーラム有識者世話人 / 明治大学教授 LYE Liang Fook, Assistant Director, EAI (Singapore) ライ・リャン・フック シンガポール国立大学東アジア研究所所長補佐
Speaker A (7min.) 報告者A (7分間)	Mohd ABDULLAH, Dean, Ghazali Shafei Graduate School of Government, University Utara Malaysia (Malaysia) モハド・アブドラ マレーシアウタラ大学ガザリシェフエイ大学院院長
Speaker B (7min.) 報告者B (7分間)	INADA Juichi, Professor, Sensyu University 稲田 十一 専修大学教授
Speaker C (7min.) 報告者C (7分間)	Tawatchai APIDECHKUL, Assistant Professor, School of Health Sciences, Mae Fah Luang University (Thailand) タワチャイ・アピデチャウ メーフアールアン大学健康科学学院准教授
Speaker D (7min.) 報告者D (7分間)	CHOE Wongi, Associate Professor, Institute of Foreign Affairs and National Security, Korea National Diplomatic Academy (Korea) チョウ・ウォンジ 韓国国立外交院准教授
Speaker E (7min.) 報告者E (7分間)	YONEYAMA Yoshiharu, Deputy Director General, Human Development Department, Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA) 米山 芳春 国際協力機構 (JICA) 人間開発部次長
Speaker F (7min.) 報告者F (7分間)	TRAN Quang Minh, Director General, Institute of Northeast Asia Studies, Vietnam Academy of Social Sciences (Vietnam) トラン・カン・ミン ベトナム社会科学院北東アジア研究所所長
Speaker G (7min.) 報告者G (7分間)	SAHASHI Ryo, Associate Professor, Kanagawa University 佐橋 亮 神奈川大学准教授
Speaker H (7min.) 報告者H (7分間)	Chandarith NEAK, Head, Department of International Studies, Royal University of Phnom Penh (Cambodia) チャンダリ・ニク プノンペン王立大学国際研究学部長
Free Discussions (45min.) 自由討議 (45分間)	All Participants 出席者全員
Summarization by Co-chairperson (10min.) 共同議長総括 (10分間)	ITO Go, Academic Governor, GFJ / Professor, Meiji University 伊藤 剛 グローバル・フォーラム有識者世話人 / 明治大学教授 LYE Liang Fook, Assistant Director, EAI (Singapore) ライ・リャン・フック シンガポール国立大学東アジア研究所所長補佐

<b>15:20-15:30 Break</b>	
<b>Session II / 本会議 II</b>	
<b>15:30-17:30</b>	<b>Complex Risk Management and Regional Cooperation in East Asia 「東アジアに求められるリスクマネジメント型地域協力の増進」</b>
Co-Chairperson (10min.) 共同議長 (10分間)	SOEYA Yoshihide, Academic Member of GFJ / Professor, Keio University 添谷 芳秀 グローバル・フォーラム有識者メンバー / 慶應義塾大学教授  Yong CHANTHALANGSY, Director General, Institute of Foreign Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Laos) ヤン チャンサランジ 外務省外交問題研究所所長
Speaker A (7min.) 報告者A (7分間)	GUO Yanjun, Deputy Director, Institute of Asian Studies, China Foreign Affairs University (China) グオ・ヤンジュン 中国外交学院アジア研究所副所長
Speaker B (7min.) 報告者B (7分間)	Evi FITRIANI, Head, International Relations Department, Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, University of Indonesia (Indonesia) エヴィ・フィトリアニ インドネシア大学社会政治学部国際関係学科長
Speaker C (7min.) 報告者C (7分間)	SHIROYAMA Hideaki, Dean, Graduate School of Public Policy, The University of Tokyo 城山 英明 東京大学公共政策大学院院長
Speaker D (7min.) 報告者D (7分間)	YURA Suma Adnan, Head of Research Division, the Sultan Haji Hassanal Bolkiah Institute of Defense and Strategic Studies, Ministry of Defense (Brunei) ユラ・スマ・アドナン ブルネイ防衛省スルタン・ハジ・ハッサナル・ボルキア防衛戦略研究所調査長
Speaker E (7min.) 報告者E (7分間)	FUKUSHIMA Akiko, Professor, Aoyama Gakuin University 福島 安紀子 青山学院大学教授
Speaker F (7min.) 報告者F (7分間)	Marife BALLESTEROS, Acting Vice President, Philippine Institute for Development Studies (Philippines) マリフェ・バレステラス フィリピン開発問題研究所副理事長代行
Speaker G (7min.) 報告者G (7分間)	IIDA Keisuke, Professor, The University of Tokyo 飯田 敬輔 東京大学教授
Speaker H (7min.) 報告者H (7分間)	Zaw MIIN, Advisor, Myanmar Institute of Strategic and International Studies (Myanmar) ザウ・ミン ミャンマー戦略国際問題研究所主任研究員
Free Discussions (45min.) 自由討議 (45分間)	All Participants 出席者全員
Summarization by Co-Chairperson (10min.) 共同議長総括 (10分間)	SOEYA Yoshihide, Academic Member of GFJ / Professor, Keio University 添谷 芳秀 グローバル・フォーラム有識者メンバー / 慶應義塾大学教授  Yong CHANTHALANGSY, Director General, Institute of Foreign Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Laos) ヤン チャンサランジ 外務省外交問題研究所所長 (Laos)

[NOTE] 日本語・英語同時通訳付き / English-Japanese simultaneous interpretation will be provided

## 2. Biographies of the Panelists

### 【Foreign Panelists】

#### **Hikmahanto Juwana**

*Professor, University of Indonesia (Indonesia)*

Received LLM from Keio University, Japan (1992) and PhD from the University of Nottingham, UK (1997). Served as Consultant at the National Development Planning Board (2001 – 2002), Senior Legal Adviser to the Coordinating Minister for Economic Affairs (1999 -2001), Expert Council at the Ministry of Justice and Human Rights (2004- 2005) and Member of the Taxation Oversight Committee at the Ministry of Finance, (2010 - 2013). He is also Independent Commissioner of PT Aneka Tambang Tbk, Member of the Legal Experts Team at the Ministry of Defense, and Member of the Legal Committee at the Ministry of State-Owned Enterprises.

#### **LYE Liang Fook**

*Assistant Director, East Asian Institute, National University of Singapore (Singapore)*

He was part of a team that was commissioned by the Singapore government to complete a study on the Suzhou Industrial Park, a flagship project between China and Singapore to distil possible lessons of experience arising from this collaboration. He has also conducted research into the Sino-Singapore Tianjin Eco-city project, the second flagship project between China and Singapore. He attended the Hanban program for distinguished scholars in China studies in 2009. Besides the academia, he manages the Singapore Secretariat of the Network of East Asian Think Tanks (NEAT) and the Network of ASEAN-China Think Tanks (NACT), two Track II bodies that seeks to foster ASEAN plus Three cooperation and ASEAN plus One cooperation respectively.

#### **Mohd Kamarulnizam Abdullah**

*Dean, Ghazali Shafei Graduate School of Government,*

*University Utara Malaysia (Malaysia)*

Received MA from International Relations, the Australian National University (1992) and Ph.D. from Politics and International Relations, Lancaster University (1998). Served as Lecturer, University Kebangsaan Malaysia (1998-2004). Associate Professor, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia (2005-2012). He is also, Director, UUM Research Institute for Indonesia, Thailand, and Singapore University Utara Malaysia Profesor in International Studies.

#### **Tawatchai APIDECHKUL** *Assistant Professor, School of Health Sciences, Mae Fah Luang University (Thailand)*

Received Master of Science (Public Health), Major Epidemiology of Infectious Disease in 2000 and Doctor of Public Health (International Program) in 2007 in Mahidol University, Thailand. He also received Hubert H. Humphrey Fellow (Fulbright) and studied HIV/AIDS Policy and Prevention in Emory University, US (2013-2014). He served as Public health officer in Chiang Rai Public Health Office, Ministry of Public Health, Thailand (1996-2006), and Project Manager of “HIV-Orphan Project” supported by EDC (Education Development Center) in USA (2003-2206). He is also Chair of Master of Science (Public Health) International Program at the School of Health Science in Mae Fah Luang University, Thailand.

**CHOE Wongi**

*Associate Professor, Institute of Foreign Affairs and National Security,  
Korea National Diplomatic Academy (Korea)*

Received MA in International Relations, Seoul National University, Korea (1995) and Ph.D. in Political Science, University of Washington (2005). Served as Visiting Faculty, School of International and Area Studies and Department of Political Science, University of Oklahoma (2005), Associate professor, Department of Economy and International Trade, Korea National Diplomatic Academy, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Seoul, Korea (2006), Member of policy evaluation committee for green growth, Office of Prime Minister, Korea (2010), External advisor, Policy Planning and Coordination Division, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, Korea (2010) and Visiting Fellow, School of Global Environmental Sustainability Colorado State University (2011).

**Tran Quang Minh**

*Director General of the Institute of Northeast Asia Studies,  
Vietnam Academy of Social Sciences (Vietnam)*

Received MA in Economics of Development from the Australian National University, Australia (1994) and Ph.D. in World Economics and International Economic Relations from the Institute of World Economics and Politics (1999). Served as Researcher of Institute of Asian-Pacific Studies under the Vietnamese Academy of Social Sciences (VASS) (1984-1992), Head of Department of Japanese Economy of the Center for Japanese Studies under the VASS (1993 to 2004), Deputy Director-General of Institute for Northeast Asian Studies under the VASS (2005 to 2010), and Director-General of Institute for Northeast Asian Studies under the VASS (2011 to now).

**Chandarith NEAK** *Head, Department of International Studies, Royal University of Phnom Penh (Cambodia)*

Received MA in Political Science from Graduate School of International Cooperation Studies (GSICS), Kobe University, Japan and Ph.D. in Political Science from School of International, Political and Strategic Studies, Australian National University, Australia. Served as the Principal Founder and Curriculum Developer for International Studies. He is also the Director of Cambodia Maritime Silk Road Research Center at Program at Royal University of Phnom Penh.

**Yong CHANTHALANGSY** *Director General, Institute of Foreign Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Laos)*

He received a Diploma of Journalism in 1997 from the Ecole Supérieure de Journalisme de Paris (1973-1975), the Center de Formation des Journalistes de Paris (1975-1977), and the India Institute of Mass-Communication (1980-1981). He used to be an official interpreter for the Government of the Lao PDR from 1978-2008, and worked at the Lao New Agency for 20 years (1977-1997). He, a senior officer at the FCB of the ASEAN Secretariat in 1998-2002, worked as Director General of the Press Department and a spokesman of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in 2002 before he was assigned to be Ambassador Permanent Representative of the Lao PDR to UNOG and Ambassador of the Lao PDR to Switzerland, Greece, Turkey, Italy, Malta and Cyprus for five years (2009-2013). Recently, he has assumed a new position as Director General of the Institute of Foreign Affairs since 2014. He has other professional skills, for instance translation and interpretation, and can speak three foreign languages, such as English, Vietnamese and French.

**GUO Yanjun**

*Deputy Director & Associate Professor,  
Institute of Asian Studies, China Foreign Affairs University (China)*

He is an associate professor and deputy director of the institute of Asian Studies at China Foreign Affairs University. He also serves as a research fellow at the Innovation Center on National Territorial Sovereignty and Maritime Rights. As a member of the NEAT China (10 + 3) and NACT China (10 + 1), he has involved in a couple of track II activities in the past years. He specializes in the study of international rivers and transboundary water resources management, esp. the Lancang-Mekong river water management. He has published relevant writings and articles both at home and abroad on transboundary water resources management.

**EVI Fitriani**

*Head, International Relations Department,  
Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, University of Indonesia (Indonesia)*

She obtained her master degrees from Leeds University, UK, 1994, and from Ohio University, USA, in 1995. She completed her doctorate program in Political Science and International Relations at the Australian National University (ANU) in 2011. She is a co-founder of the University's Master Program of European Studies as well as the ASEAN Study Center of FISIP UI. Since 2012, she has been Indonesian Country Coordinator of the Network of East Asian Think Tanks (NEAT), a second track of the ASEAN Plus Three countries. She was trained in International Relations Studies in Indonesia, the UK, the US, and Australia, as well as in Japan, Sweden, the Netherlands, and Hungary.

**YURA Suma Adnan**

*Head of Research Division,  
Sultan Haji Hassanal Bolkiah Institute of Defense and Strategic Studies, Ministry of Defense (Brunei)*

She heads the Research Division at the Sultan Haji Hassanal Bolkiah Institute of Defense and Strategic Studies (SHHBIDSS), Ministry of Defense since November 2009. Her research interest covers Defense and Military Affairs and Regional Strategic and Security Studies in particular ASEAN and maritime security issues. Prior to her appointment in SHHBIDSS, she was enlisted as a Diplomatic Officer in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade in 1999. During her diplomatic career, she served in the ASEAN Department and the then Department of Multilateral Economics. She was also posted as the Second Secretary in the Embassy of Brunei Darussalam in Phnom Penh, Cambodia from 2004 – 2007.

**Marife BALLESTEROS**

*Acting Vice President and Senior Research Fellow,  
Philippine Institute for Development Studies (Philippines)*

Received her doctorate degree (PhD) in Social Sciences major in Development Economics at the Katholieke Universiteit Nijmegen, the Netherlands. She is a leading expert in the fields of housing, land policy and urban development. She has been involved in program assessments at the city, community and household levels and in several policy discussions in her areas of expertise. She also participated in studies on post disaster needs assessments and in policy discussions on building back better and improving community resilience.

**Zaw MIIN**

*Advisor, Myanmar Institute of Strategic and International Studies (Myanmar)*

Received B.Sc. from Yangon Arts and Science University, Advanced Diploma from the Institute of Foreign Languages, Yangon, DESS from University of Paris I Pantheon-Sorbonne, Paris, and Diplome de l'Institut from the International Institute for Public Administration, Paris. He worked at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs from 1974 to 1989, serving at the Ministry in Yangon and in Geneva, Switzerland. He worked for UNHCR from 1994 to 2007, in Myanmar, Iraq and Republic of Congo. Presently he is UNHCR Senior Advisor in Yangon and Advisor of the Myanmar Institute of Strategic and International Studies.

**【Japanese Panelists】****ITO Kenichi**

*Chairman, GFJ / President, JFIR*

Graduated from Hitotsubashi University and joined Ministry of Foreign Affairs in 1960. Studied at GSAS of Harvard University. Served in Japanese Embassies in Moscow, Manila and Washington and also as Director of First Southeast Asian Division until 1977. Since then he served as Tokyo Representative of CSIS (1980-1987) and Professor of international politics at Aoyama Gakuin University (1984-2006). He has been President of Japan Forum on International Relations (JFIR) since it was founded in 1987 and now concurrently serves as Chairman of Council on East Asian Community (CEAC). He is Professor Emeritus and holds Honorary Doctorate in International Relations.

**ITO Go**

*Academic Governor, GFJ / Professor, Meiji University*

Graduated from Sophia University. Received Ph.D. at the Josef Korbel School of International Studies, University of Denver in 1997. Served as Associate Professor at Meiji University in 1998, and assumed the current position in 2006. Also served as Visiting Professor at Beijing University, Academia Sinica (Taiwan), Bristol University(Britain), Australian National University, and Victoria University (Canada), Adjunct Professor (International Security) at Waseda University as well as Sophia University, and as Adjunct Researcher of the House of Councilors. Recipients of the Eisenhower Fellowships in 2005 and the Nakasone Yasuhiro Award in 2006. Concurrently serves as Superior Research Fellow, JFIR.

**INADA Juichi**

*Professor, Sensyu University*

He received his M.A. in international relations and graduated from doctoral course of the University of Tokyo (Japan). He has experiences of working & studying at several think-tanks such as the Nomura Research Institute (1980-81), the Japan Institute of International Affairs (1986-90). He was also a Research Fellow at the Center for International Affairs (CfIA) at Harvard University (1992-1994). He has his experiences of working at the World Bank twice. Once in 1996-97, he joined into some research works at the Policy Research Department (DEC/PRD). More recently in 2004-2005, he worked for LICUS (Low Income Countries under Stress) Unit (OPCS). He has a lot of experiences of involving into researches on fragile states, especially regarding the relationship between security and development, governance and institutional aspects of development.



**YONEYAMA Yoshiharu**

*Deputy Director General, Human Development Department,  
Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA)*

Graduated from Sophia University and joined JICA in 1988. In JICA, he served as Team Leader of Reproductive Health Team, Human Development Department from 2004 to 2006, Director of Planning Department, Southeast Asia 1 and Pacific Department from 2006 to 2009, Senior Representative of JICA Laos Office from 2010 to 2013 and as Deputy Director General and a Group Director for Health 1, Human Development Department from 2013 to 2015.

**SAHASHI Ryo**

*Associate Professor, Kanagawa University*

Received B.A. from International Christian University and Ph.D. from the Graduate Schools for Law and Politics at the University of Tokyo. He also studied at Department of Political Science, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. He has been Visiting Associate Professor, Walter H. Shorenstein Asia Pacific Research Center, Stanford University and Shigeru Yoshida Chair, Instituto Tecnológico Autónomo de México (ITAM). He also served adjunct Senior Research Fellow at Sasakawa Peace Foundation, Tokyo Foundation-German Marshall Fund of the United States Partnership Fellow, and Guest Researcher for First Special Committee Research Office, House of Councilors. He is also Research Fellow at the Japan Center for International Exchange

**SOEYA Yoshihide**

*Academic Member of GFJ / Professor, Keio University*

Graduated from Sophia University. Received Ph.D. from the University of Michigan in 1987. He previously served on the Council on Security and Defense Capabilities in the New Era (Prime Minister's Office), Council on Defense Facilities (MOD) and the Council on Industrial Structure (METI), and was a faculty fellow of the Research Institute of Economy, Trade and Industry (2000-04). Most recently, He served as Director of the Institute of East Asian Studies at Keio University (2007-2013) and Japan Scholar of the Woodrow Wilson Center, in Washington D.C. (2013 -2014). He is currently a Council member of the Japan Association of International Studies, Japan Association for Asian Studies, the International House of Japan, and the Asia Society in New York.

**SHIROYAMA Hideaki**

*Dean, Graduate School of Public Policy, The University of Tokyo*

Graduated from the University of Tokyo. Served as Visiting Fellow, Center for International Studies, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and Visiting Professor, Institut d'Etudes Politiques de Paris. He studies about international administration, science/ technology and public policy, and public policy process. He has been a member of various government advisory councils on higher education, nuclear safety, food safety, scenarios for climate mitigations, industrial policies and science technology policy. He is also Professor of Public Administration at the Graduate School of Public Policy and a Professor of the Graduate School of Law and Politics, the University of Tokyo.

**FUKUSHIMA Akiko***Professor, Aoyama Gakuin University*

Received M.A. from the Paul H. Nitze School of Advanced International Studies (SAIS), Johns Hopkins University and Ph.D. from Osaka University. Her carrier includes Adjunct Professor of the Law School at Keio University, Director of Policy Studies at the National Institute for Research Advancement (NIRA), Senior Fellow at the Japan Foundation and Visiting Professor to the University of British Columbia, Canada. She has served on the Japanese government committees including the Advisory Council on National Security and Defense Capabilities since 2014. She is also a Senior Fellow of the Tokyo Foundation since 2013.

**IIDA Keisuke***Professor, The University of Tokyo*

He is Professor in the Graduate Schools for Law and Politics at the University of Tokyo. He holds a Ph.D. from Harvard University and has formerly taught at Princeton University and Aoyama Gakuin University. His major publications include *Legalization and Japan: The Politics of WTO Dispute Settlement* (2006) and *International Monetary Cooperation among the United States, Japan, and Germany* (1999). His current research interests include the economy-security nexus in East Asia, the politics of trade, and the political economy of financial and currency crises.

(In order of appearance)

### 3. Presentation Papers

---

#### *Session I : Complex Risks in East Asia: An Overview*

---

**Mohd Kamarulnizam ABDULLAH**

**Dean, Ghazali Shafei Graduate School of Government,  
University Utara (Malaysia)**

#### **The Complex Risks of Ideological Contestation and Political Violence**

East Asia's economic growth has produced multiple forms of incongruous circumstances. The rapid growth accelerates the formation of modern, secularly-inclined and innovative society. East Asian has been the most vibrant economies in the world for the last decades. The dynamism of market economy, the increase standard of living and, the expansion of democratic governance are scores of the manifestations of this phenomenal Asian modernity. The inevitable challenge is, however, that progress and modernity do not necessarily create a liberal society based on rules of law. At the same time, the changing global landscape has also affected state and societal wellbeing. As such, the classical assumption that modernity would create an environment where personal ideological belief would largely be confined to one's private sphere appears to be deceiving. Global rise of political violence and terror movements began to articulate and propagate the antithesis of democratic values and principles. These movements want to inculcate their own values and ideological beliefs into one single norm through violent acts.

The multiple threats of terrorism seem to have gaining grounds. Norms, traditions, and practices of society have been subjected to ideological attacks. What's more is that modern terror movements justify their acts in the name of God though their actions were obviously did not reflect any one's religious teachings. These terror movements, nonetheless, are not confined to only one religion. In the East Asian context, the act of terrorism has gone beyond religious beliefs.

Terrorism poses complex risks to society and state in East Asia. Everybody can be a random target of terror attacks regardless of nationalities, educational background, religious belief, or ethnic identity. None could claim that they would be spared by terror attacks nowadays.

Understanding the crux of terrorism is only a part of the overall solutions to the phenomenon. It can be argued that one may not get a definite answer to the root causes of terrorism. Nor one could have a single approach to wipe out the threats. Henceforth, we need re-strategize our focus and priorities. Every level of the societal and state system needs to be synergized. A society must continuously build a strong bond from within. Youth must be protected from being exposed to the incongruent and extreme ideologies. Furthermore, state and society should build a mutual trust to help each other, to prevent the spread of radical ideologies. At the regional levels, concerted efforts have to be intensified to counter violent ideological influences. The 2001 ASEAN Declaration on Joint Action to Counter Terrorism can be a yardstick to strengthen multilateral cooperation in East Asia, in order to neutralize, inhibit and suppress terrorist threats in all forms and manifestations.

## Session 1. Complex Risks in East Asia: An Overview

### Perception of Risks and Social Safety Net in East Asia: Surveys in Indochina Countries



Juichi INADA  
Professor, Senshu University  
2015.12.10



1

---

#### ***1-1. Risks in life and social safety net: Surveys conducted in East Asia***

- The research project of Senshu University aimed to **explore the realities of “social capital”** in East Asia.
- The framework of the research was to base on the concept of social capital, which referred to **the norms of trust and reciprocity, and social networks that could enhance the welfare of the community/society.**
- **Local field studies** were undertaken in selected countries in East Asia (2010-2014).

## ***Countries & Areas Targeted in the Survey***

Research Area	Urban Vietnam	Rural Vietnam	Urban Vietnam	Rural Vietnam	Urban Cambodia	Rural Cambodia
Survey Period	October 2010	March 2011	January 2014	January 2014	October 2011	October 2011
Target City and Village	Nam Dinh province Nam Dinh city Vi Xuyen ward	Nam Dinh province Giao Thuy district Giao Tan commune	Nam Dinh province Quang Trung	Nam Dinh province Hai Hau	Siem Reap province Siem Reap district Sala Kamreauk commune	Prey Ven province Peam Ro district Babang commune Baban village
abbreviation	VnU	VgR	VqU	VhR	CaU	CaR
Sample Size	100 samples	100 samples	100 samples	100 samples	200 samples	200 samples

  

Research Area	Urban Laos	Rural Laos	Thailand	Thailand	Korea	Korea
Survey Period	January 2010	October 2011	December 2012	December 2012	August 2011	September 2012
Target City and Village	Vientiane Municipality Chanthaboury district Nongping village	Vientiane province Meuang Feuang district Nakang village	Nonthaburi province Bangkruai district Bang Kruai Municipal	Chonburi province Panasnikom district Phanat Nikhom Municipal	Busan City	South Gyeongsang Province Gimhae City
abbreviation	LU	LR	ThNU, ThNR	ThCU, ThCR	KB	KG
Sample Size	116 samples	116 samples	400 samples	400 samples	248 samples	200 samples

## ***1-2. Perception of Risks in Vietnam***

- The hardships/risks in the life include a lot of different types. Research Team presented **7 types of risks with 5 influence levels to the life**.
- Generally, **war (65%); disaster (43%); illness, injury (42%); and unemployment, no job, low income (30%)** which were the risks with the important level account for the highest percentage.
- The important level as threat to the life selected by most people was unemployment, no job and illness, injury: 38% and 31% respectively.
- Therefore, it is possible to categorize the hardships/risks into **3 groups that threatens the people's life** (based on both indicators of “very important” and “important” ).
- The “very important” group includes **war and disaster**, the second group includes **illness, injury and unemployment/no job, low income**; The third group concerns the **infrastructure (water shortage, transportation condition, road, traffic accident) and food shortage**.

## ***Vienam: Perceptions of risks in life (%, 200 samples)***

---

Kinds of risk	Not very important	Somewhat important	Important	Very important
Unemployment, little income	22	10	38	30
Illness, injury, etc.	15	12	31	42
Food shortage	47	13	21	19
Not having access to water	43	9	27	21
Poor means of transportation or road conditions, traffic accidents	38	23	21	18
Natural disasters (Wind and flood damage, draught, etc.)	44	3	10	43
War	26	0	8	65

---

### ***1-3. Perception of Risks in Cambodia***

- All the respondents perceived the risks listed as important or very important threats to their life, although two of the risks, i.e. not having access to water and poor means of transportation do not seem to be as important as the other risks.
- Younger respondents seemed to rate the risk of being unemployed or having little income higher than the older respondents. Older respondents were more likely to rate such risks as illness, food shortage, natural disasters and war, higher than the younger respondents. (see Table 11).
- The findings show that the majority of the people still regard the family and relatives as an important informal support system. This informal social safety net is still very strong, although this seems to be changing.

## ***Cambodia: Perceptions of risks in life (%, 400 samples)***

Kinds of risk	Not very importa nt	Somewh at importa nt	Importa nt	Very import ant
Unemployment, little income	0.0	2.5	19.5	77.5
Illness, injury, etc.	0.5	4.0	13.0	82.5
Food shortage	0.0	2.0	6.0	92
Not having access to water	6.5	19.5	32	42
Poor means of transportation or road conditions, traffic accidents	1.5	18.5	35	45
Natural disasters (Wind and flood damage, draught, etc.)	0.5	6.0	8.5	85
War	2.0	4.5	7.5	86

## ***1-4. Laos: Perceptions of risks in life (%, 232 samples)***

Kinds of risk	Not very important	Somewh at importa nt	Import ant	Very importan t
Unemployment, little income	22	10	38	30
Illness, injury	15	12	31	42
Food shortage	47	13	21	19
Not having access to water	43	9	27	21
Poor means of transportation or road conditions, traffic accidents	38	23	21	18
Natural disasters (Wind and flood damage, earthquake, etc.)	44	3	10	43
War	26		8	65

## **1-5. Timor Leste: Perceptions of risks in life (% , 255 samples)**

Kinds of risk	Cannot answer	Not very important	Somewh at importan t	Importa nt	Very important
Unemployment, little income	3.1	3.9	11.0	47.8	34.1
Illness, injury	1.6	7.1	7.1	40.8	43.5
Food shortage	2.8	2.0	2.8	30.7	61.9
Not having access to water	2.0	2.8	4.3	30.4	60.5
Poor means of transportation or road conditions, traffic accidents	2.0	1.6	5.5	45.7	45.3
Natural disasters (Wind and flood damage, earthquake, etc.)	2.0	5.1	11.8	44.9	36.2
War	7.1	15.7	10.6	39.4	27.2

## **2-1. Improvement of social safety net (SSN) in Southeast Asia**

- Most Southeast Asian countries have been trying to improve their social security systems in recent years. Their **increasing efforts to move toward “welfare states”** had been brought about by the economic reforms and democratization movement in the 1990s, **an awareness of the importance of social safety net** gained through lessons drawn from the Asian financial crisis in 1997, and the rapid shift toward becoming aging societies.
- The SSN serves **three purposes**. The first purpose is to **minimize damage in the event of its occurrence**. The second purpose is to **prepare the system in advance to compensate for the damage**. The third is **to offer a sense of safety** through the existence of SSN.



## ***continued***

- SSN can be defined widely as welfare policies, including **health insurance, unemployment insurance, and pension system etc.**
- On the other hand, SSN can be defined more narrowly as **support for the poor or low-income households.**
- In short, SSN is defined as **a social system or program that helps to diminish the risk of illness, unemployment, and poverty, and to offer protection from such risks.**
- **Table 1 shows the major types of SSN.** SSN is provided through **formal systems** such as government programs, and through **informal networks** such as mutual help systems of relatives and communities or assistance from NGOs such as religious groups.

## ***2-2. Major Types of SSN***

Sectors	Official SSN offered through governmental programs and/or systems		Informal SSN
	Social Insurance System	Other official programs	
Health	Health insurance	Provision of health service to the poor	Mutual aid from relatives and/or communities, aid from NGOs and religious groups
Labor/employment	Unemployment insurance, labor incident insurance	Introduction of jobs, vocational training, job creation through public works, local job creation program	Job creation in the agricultural sector
Income	Pension for the old, insurance for the old	Livelihood protection (public benefits), social benefits such as child benefits, food benefits, fuel benefits	Mutual aid from relatives and/or communities
Social welfare		Social service provision to handicapped persons, elderly, etc.	Mutual aid from relatives and/or communities, aid from NGOs and religious groups

(Source) JICA Institute, *Basic Survey on Social Safety Net: Toward establishment of SSN in developing countries*, 2003, Chapter 2, p.5.

## 2-3. Outline of SSN in Vietnam

Sectors	Official SSN offered through governmental programs and/or systems		Informal SSN
	Social Insurance System	Other official programs	
Health	No health insurance	Provision of health service to all people by the state	Mutual aid from relatives and/or communities, aid from NGOs and religious groups, are limited
Labor/employment	No unemployment insurance, no labor incident insurance	Large public sector, all farmers are members of the Farmers' Union, many semi-official unions such as Farmers' Union, Women's Union, Youth Union, etc.	Job absorption in agricultural sector, aid from relatives and communities (neighbors)
Income	Pension for the elderly (public servants and military personnel only), no insurance for the elderly	Several forms of public benefits for the poor, households with students, persons unable to work, etc.	Mutual aid from relatives, aid from communities, are included in the official benefits system (officially classified as "poor")
Social welfare		Several forms of public benefits for the poor, households with students, persons unable to work, etc.	Mutual aid from relatives and/or communities, aid from NGOs and religious groups, are limited

(Note) Drawn up by the author, based on Table 1.

## 3. Conclusions

- We should **monitor the progress of the SSN system in East Asian countries** and check if the official SSN system continues to be effective in a changing society that is experiencing rapid economic development.
- We have observed that **emerging middle income citizens** and/or rich households are beginning to **look for new or supplemental systems** for their pension, health care, etc.
- It would be beneficial for researchers in East Asian countries to have the opportunity to **exchange knowledge and experiences of effective SSN systems** in each country, and to come up with ideas for better SSN systems that are suitable for each society in the future.

**Tawatchai APIDECHKUL**  
**Assistant Professor, School of Health Sciences,**  
**Mae Fah Luang University (Thailand)**

**Social divers-development and a complex risk of emerging infectious diseases in East Asia**

East Asia has a rapid growth of economic ground and diversity of population relationships, lead to moving up to face a complex risk for emerging infectious diseases situation. New human pathogens have been reporting frequently and most of it directly impacts on both human life and economic including social system. Any given outbreak of new emerging disease has stimulated a capacity of humankind to respond with effectively control measures. However, we are still now standing on a point of surrounding by the interactions and diversities of socio-economic complex, which is leading to having new emerging diseases which more and more serious harm for human health.

A development of economic in a particular country is needed to use a large scale of environmental resources. Unlimited use together with failing of an effective management of use of resource stimulates a change of human environments. The change is on an exponential pattern and be enormous impacts in widely aspects. In a final stage of environmental change becomes an adjusting by environmental itself through out various disaster forms including flood, earthquake, typhoon, etc. By unavoidable, the final impacted persons are humankind in this world.

In the aspect of social diversity, in the 21th century, there are so many interactions happening among the people in our society with inaccurate expectation in the results. An interaction between persons, interaction between communities, and interaction between countries become sophisticated and complex societies. Resulting of the interactions would be a positive or a negative result. In appositve manner, human society can move forward to achieve a civilization community as in a new modern human definition. In the opposite way, conflicts between person and persons, community and communities, country and countries are often happening globally. A more complex of society, a more easily of emerging a new diseases, is suitable explanation by a health care professional view. Modern life and modern society are encountering a complex risk of emerging infection diseases especially in East Asia where are worsening inequalities development across and within many countries.

A continuous attention on sustainable environment and encouraging a positive interaction between people, community, and country would be the best way to protect the new severe emerging diseases in human society. To achieve this particular mission, we, East Asia Countries, have to collaborate both in science and social dimensions for a better and safer of life and society.

## **CHOE Wongi**

**Associate Professor, Institute of Foreign Affairs and National Security,  
Korea National Diplomatic Academy (Korea)**

### **Talking Points: Complex Risks in East Asia: A Korean Perspective**

Some of the complex risks in East Asia

Infectious Diseases: SARS epidemic (2003), Avian Flu (2005), Ebola(2014),MERS (2015)

Natural Disasters and Extreme Weather Events: Tsunami (2004), Floods in Thailand, Pakistan, India, etc.

Transnational Crimes: Piracy, Narcotics, Human Trafficking

Terrorism: Bali Bombing(2005), ISIS, etc.

Environmental Degradation: Haze in SE Asia, Yellow Sand in NE Asia, Transboundary pollutants, etc.

As the level of connectivity and interdependency rise at unprecedented rate in East Asia, our vulnerability to non-traditional and transnational security threats and risks also increase at a tremendously rapid pace. There is an acute and growing need for regional-level response and cooperation.

Regional cooperation in non-traditional security areas does not involve high political costs compared to traditional security threats while its benefits can be widely shared. Non-traditional security cooperation does not usually require hard political bargaining, rather it involves more of coordination of national policies, technical and administrative cooperation, information-sharing, resource-pooling, capacity-building, etc.

Regional cooperation in non-traditional security areas could provide new sources of building blocks for community building efforts in East Asia; it could be new areas of cooperation that corroborates existing cooperation resources.

## **YONEYAMA Yoshiharu**

**Deputy Director General, Human Development Department, Japan International  
Cooperation Agency (JICA)**

### **Concrete efforts and new perspective of regional cooperation against complex risks mainly focus on health and social protection**

1. Economic development, poverty reduction and reduction of traditional risks in East Asia in the MDGs era and contribution of Japanese ODA and JICA
2. JICA's Vision and Mission
  - Vision: Inclusive and Dynamic Development
  - Mission: Addressing global agenda, Reducing poverty through equitable growth, Improving governance, Achieving human security
3. JICA's efforts against risks and lesson learned
  - Peace building (Cambodia, East-Timor, Mindanao)
  - Combatting Malaria, Polio, HIV/AIDS, and SARS
  - Social protection program after Asia economic crisis, promotion of Universal Health Coverage (UHC) and comprehensive social protection program
4. JICA's efforts for promoting regional cooperation
  - Group training in Japan and Third Country Training Program (TCTP) (started from 1950 's)
    - Ex. Training courses of TB control in Japan, PHC and Disaster risk management courses in Thailand
  - Regional cooperation Project/Program (initiated from 2000 's)
    - Ex. Regional cooperation for the control of HIV/AIDS, Bird flu
    - AUN/SEED-Net (Southeast Asia Engineering Education Network),
    - Asia-Pacific Development Center on Disability
    - ASEAN Disaster Medical Assistance Network
5. A new perspective of regional cooperation against new complex risks
  - Holistic approach by utilizing the fruits of vertical approach
  - Mutual learning regionally, globally, and in the cross-sectoral way
  - New regional mechanism for risks (Financing, Human resources, etc.)
  - Creation and utilization of inovative technology through Public- Private Partnership (PPP)
  - Regional cooperation among governments, private sector, and catalytic role of ODA

**TRAN Quang Minh**  
**Director General, Institute of Northeast Asia Studies,**  
**Vietnam Academy of Social Sciences (Vietnam)**

**Potential Complex Risks of Regional Conflicts**

East Asia occupies an important position on the world geo-political map and is a dynamic development center of the world. This is an area of plentiful natural resources, lots of marine lines; at the same time, it is also a place where there have been rapid economic integrating processes, promoting the closely growing interdependence among nations.

However, the regional security environment in East Asia remains many potential risks because arm races tend to increase, disputes on territory and maritime sovereignty happen harshly, especially nationalism, extreme religious ideology, unilateralism and political attitudes towards relying on its own power tend to rise regardless of international law and prejudice to peace, security and human living environment. Followings are the two most potential risks.

*1. The situation on the Korean peninsular:*

After 70 years from the end of the Second World War, the Korean peninsular is still divided into two parts, North Korea and South Korea. In fact the two Koreas have been still in a situation of a paused war as a peace treaty has not yet been signed between the two sides. There have been a number of times tensions on the Korean peninsular became very high placing the two sides on situations of an ordinary war, if not to mention the serious danger of a nuclear war as North Korea possesses nuclear weapons. The most recently tension is in August 2015, when the two sides have been ready preparing for a war happened. It must be until the time when the two Koreas are united or have any measures to avoid such tensions, the risks of a war on the Korean peninsular is still remained.

*2. The heightened tensions in the East Sea/South China Sea*

Tensions are heightened in the East Sea, an area with important sea lanes for the world economy and surrounded by many economies. The rise of China accompanying with its declaration of the “U-shaped line” map occupying nearly 90% of the East Sea, and its hardly actions on the East Sea recently have been making the security and maritime safety in this area become worse. In the East Sea, China has from the beginning behaved unilaterally and hardly that is inconsistent with the method of

building a peaceful and stable region that the countries in the region are pursuing. These actions include the strengthening activities in the disputed areas, military exercises, arresting fishermen, forcing foreign firms to stop cooperating to explore and exploit on the sea... These make ASEAN countries begin to vigilance toward China's claims and actions on the East Sea. Along with an increasing tension, countries in the region have gradually realized the threat to their general security and particularly their maritime security. The unrest in the East Sea will certainly bear potential complex risks for the countries engaging operations in this sea area, especially ASEAN countries, Japan, South Korea, and China also.

*In short*, the common interests of the security in the region in general and maritime security in the East Sea in particular are being under threat. It is a challenge for the new structure of the region and the countries in East Asia at present and in the future. In our opinion, any dispute should be settled in the spirit of the rule of law, without any threat or use of force, and through peaceful and diplomatic means. Maintaining peace and stability in the region and the world is a premise for prosperity in the region and beyond.

However, the division of benefits and lack of strategic confidence between nations make East Asia having not yet come to an agreement, a mechanism or a collective security structure to effectively deal with emerging challenges. Therefore, promoting confidence building in East Asia is essential to achieve peace and prosperity in the region, which is a global center for growth today. As international affairs including regional security environment has been tremendously changing, it is timely for East Asian countries to discuss about the ways to build the confidence and consensus among the nations so as to avoid the complex risks of a new cold war in the whole region or limited hot wars in some certain areas. It is very necessary to set up a future vision together with solutions and appropriate steps to build friendship relations of mutual confidence through sustainable cooperation mechanisms in the new turbulent context of the region. Specifically, countries in the region should discuss to better understand the relationship between the national interest and the common interest of the regional community; responsibilities of each country, especially of the major powers in handling common problems, building an appropriate security – political and economic structures and promoting the role of small and medium-sized countries in the region.

## **SAHASHI Ryo**

**Associate Professor, Kanagawa University**

### **Disaster Relief and Risk Reduction in East Asia: the role of Japan-ASEAN cooperation and Japan-US alliance**

Asia Pacific is highly vulnerable to natural disasters. As a region connected by an ocean, located on the edge of several tectonic plates, and having a substantial population residing in low-lying coastal areas, Asia Pacific's geological conditions contribute to the large number of disasters it experiences and the severity of the damage they inflict on humanity—a situation likely to be aggravated by environmental disruption and climate change. To make matters worse, many countries in the region are undergoing a process of urbanization. When congested cities and towns are struck by disasters, huge impacts on human security result.

Another vulnerability in Asia Pacific comes from the weakness of governance and community structures. In many cases, local governments do not have enough capacity or governance ability to cope with catastrophes, while even central governments often cannot easily make expeditious decisions. Therefore, many actors, including foreign governments and militaries, international organizations, nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) working on humanitarian assistance, and various donors, must join the efforts of the affected country in response and recovery efforts. Ironically, however, the coordination cost for affected governments to manage such numerous external actors is very high.

The author has recently led and completed two projects on disaster relief and risk reduction in East Asia, focusing on Japan-ASEAN cooperation and on US-Japan alliance role, respectively. The proposal below are excerpts from two final reports.

#### **Japan-ASEAN Cooperation**

Firstly, Japan and ASEAN should review the functions of the AHA Centre in light of the experience with Typhoon Haiyan in terms of the provision of emergency stocks and coordination among governmental and nongovernmental actors.

Secondly, Japan and ASEAN should seek ways to make optimal use of their military assets because the natural disasters in Asia Pacific tend to involve quite a large number of people suffering from a loss of shelter, food, and clothing, and a loss of effective governance. Japan and ASEAN should discuss further efforts on military training for disaster management that involves civilian-sector representatives from international organizations and NGOs

Thirdly, Japan and ASEAN should explore ways to smooth the transition from disaster recovery to



development, since many of the most heavily affected areas are apt to be those that are less developed.

Fourthly, the Japanese government should assist ASEAN countries in developing more resilient infrastructure against disasters including typhoons, storm surges, earthquakes, tsunamis, volcanic eruptions, and landslides, and also seek the way to utilize the data from Japanese meteorological satellites and broadcasting networks.

### **Japan-US Alliance**

Firstly, to build the resilience, Japan and the United States, in consultation with other regional governments through existing multilateral frameworks, should develop regular joint HA/DR threat assessments that highlight existing and likely future vulnerabilities to major disasters. Also, defense aid programs should be focused on organization building, enhancing C3 infrastructure, and procuring multipurpose platforms such as transport helicopters and coastal patrol craft.

Secondly, to strengthen the response capacity of the region, the United States and Japan should develop a combined and joint CONPLAN series to cover a likely range of disaster events that could affect regional stability, and for that purpose, they should establish an HA/DR coordination and command center and joint doctrine, mobilizing both civilian and military capacity. In so doing, however, the United States and Japan must acknowledge and seek to alleviate regional concerns that such an approach might harken back to debates over the R2P doctrine, wherein military intervention might be justified on humanitarian grounds.

Thirdly, to make smooth recovery and development, financial assistance from foreign governments in the weeks and months following a disaster is crucial to supporting these on-the-ground efforts. Toward that end, the United States and Japan should work closely to sustaining recovery efforts in affected nations following devastating disaster incidents. NGOs and private-sector actors should play the central role in the recovery phase, while the U.S. military and JSDF may consider leaving a small advisory contingent in the affected nation during the recovery phase depending on security situations and demands from governments.

### **[Reference]**

Ryo Sahashi, 2015, "Disaster Relief and Risk Reduction in East Asia: the role of Japan-

ASEAN Partnership," in Mely Anthony and Chikako Ueki (eds.), *Navigating Change: Japan-ASEAN Strategic Partnership in East Asia*, Center for Strategic and International Studies (Indonesia) and Japan Center for International Exchange, 131-149.

\_\_\_\_\_, T. Fargo, and N. Yamaguchi, K. Koga and A. Szalwinski, 2015, *Special Report 52: Preparing for Future Disasters: Strategic Assistance and the U.S.-Japan Alliance*, Seattle, WA: National Bureau of Asian Research.

## **Chandarith NEAK**

**Head, Department of International Studies,  
Royal University of Phnom Penh (Cambodia)**

### **Functional Solution to a Complex Risk Problem?**

Complex phenomenon is one that has no linear structure. As a result, we often talk about natural disasters because they are often unpredictable and can have major consequences on society including second-order or even third-order effects. Not surprisingly, therefore, major and small countries alike, as well as regional supra-national organizations have sought out ways to manage the consequences of such disasters. This current paper will point out one possible pitfall of this approach. While the approach focuses on major events that can cause damages, it tends to clearly distinguish traditional from non-traditional security threat. As a result, the approach might miss the essence of a complex risk: the entanglement of traditional and non-traditional security risks. Both occur at the same time; and while we may wish to focus more on the easily agreeable cooperation in non-traditional security, we may find ourselves struggling to deal with the emergence of traditional security threat. As a case in point, the Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN) focus its cooperation on non-traditional security with dialogue partners outside Southeast Asia. It then often finds itself struggling to deal with the hot, emergent traditional security issue such as the South China Sea.

This paper offers a simple solution: we need to consciously connect cooperation in non-traditional security areas with that in traditional security area. We can start with the most technical and functional things like Humanitarian Assistance and Disaster Relief (HADR), which are potentially agreeable. And then, we can start building confidence and habit of cooperation which shall extend to the traditional arena. Complex risks need composite solution. This also means that the situation no longer exhibits binary outcome: either confrontation or cooperation. Rather, it is one situation where the outcome is unpredictable and would only occur gradually once it passes a certain threshold. This allows small countries like Cambodia to actively participate in the regional “controlled chaos” and to facilitate agreements. The establishment of the Declaration on the Code of Conduct (DOC) in the South China Sea in 2002 is an example.

---

## *Session II : Complex Risk Management and Regional Cooperation in East Asia*

---

**GUO Yanjun**

**Deputy Director, Institute of Asian Studies, China Foreign Affairs University (China)**

### **Multi-level Approach to manage East Asian Complex risks**

East Asia is undergoing profound changes in political, security, economic and social dimensions, in which a couple of risks are emerging. The task for the regional countries is to manage and settle these complex issues and risks in a peaceful manner, based upon mutual respect and a way of equal, comfort, gradual and comprehensive. Some issues are really competitive in nature, such as the territorial disputes, may lead to chaos or conflicts in the region. Why should we cooperate? Cooperation is one of the most cost-effective ways of solving problems.

There are at least three levels to deal with the regional complex risks. The first is to settle the disputes in bilateral level. For instance, China and ASEAN have agreed on a “dual track” approach on disputes in the South China Sea, and have made progress in the consultation and negotiation of the COC while fully implementing the DOC. China and Japan should also discuss to set up the risk management mechanism in East Sea.

The second is to maintain the peace in regional level. APT is an ideal framework to build the regional peace through pragmatic cooperation both in term of NTS cooperation and in terms of maritime cooperation. The leaders from the 13 countries this year reaffirmed APT as a driving force for enhanced peace, security and prosperity in the East Asian region, with the long-term goal of building an East Asia community. Towards this end, the leaders also emphasized the need to enhance efforts to address emerging challenges in the areas of traditional and non-traditional security.

The third is to build confidence and coordination in Asia- pacific level. EAS is an important framework for a broader coordination among Asia-pacific countries. ARF is another useful tool for regional NTS cooperation and as well as a good platform to facilitate preventive diplomacy in Asia-pacific.

To push forward the above multi-level cooperation, consensus should be reached. According to Jürgen Habermas, the most important philosopher in Germany, rational communication and mutual understanding is quite needed before getting consensus. It seems that the countries tend to persuade others to accept themselves’ ideas or claims without fully communication and mutual understanding. The consequence is that both sides do not accept each other’s policies. In this meaning, effective communication is highly needed. Communication is not only limited in the leaders and elites, but also include the ordinary people, who are the very important influencing actors for foreign policy making.

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Evi FITRIANI</b> <b>Head, International Relations Department,</b> <b>Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, University of Indonesia (Indonesia)</b></p>
--

**Risk Management and Regional Cooperation in East Asia:  
An Indonesian Perspective**

Economic development in East Asia in the last two decades have created a very dynamic region that is able to support current world's economic growth. However, the wealth and prosperity have also encouraged unprecedented geo-strategic changes which, in turn, create several flashing points in the region. Increasing tensions in the South and East China Sea are two example of flashing points that have not only involved regional countries but also attracted external major powers. As a result, security risk in both air and sea in East Asia has increased. This circumstance can treat regional stability as well as economic development in the region.

There is no regional country can handle the increasing security and economic risk alone. They have to cooperate and regional cooperation is perhaps the most feasible instrument to manage the risks. However, existing regional cooperative institutions such as Association of the Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), ASEAN Plus Three, and ASEAN Regional Forum have limitations due to fundamental differences among the participating countries and, most importantly, the absence of trust.

Nevertheless, regional cooperation have to be built and pursued more seriously if regional countries understand the risks of their self-centered attitudes. Neighboring countries need to understand that they will not feel secure until their neighbors are secured. Dialogue and a small investment in trust are the key. Indonesia have had many experiences in which dialogues could bridge differences and mitigate mistrusts, and cooperation is possible even though before conflict is solved. Regional cooperation in East Asia need to be reshaped as a platform to address common problems and to achieve common interests.

## SHIROYAMA Hideaki

Director, Policy Alternatives Research Institute, The University of Tokyo

### An Attempt for Integrated Risk Mapping and Governance Challenge in Asia

#### 1. The need for risk mapping - assessment

- \* Many risks we face today are multifaceted, complex and systemic in nature.
- \* “All hazards” approach.
- \* An attempt in Japan after East Japan Earthquake and potential need in Asia

#### 2. An Attempt: Risk Landscape in Japan

Mikuniya, K., Taniguchi, T., Shiroyama, H., Kishimoto, A., Hiruma, Y. and Matsuo, M. (2014), Risk Landscape in Japan (in Japanese) is available at [http://pari.u-tokyo.ac.jp/policy/WP14\\_13.html](http://pari.u-tokyo.ac.jp/policy/WP14_13.html)

- \* By conducting a web-based survey, we tried to visualize the relation and structure of identified risks in different fields (ex; societal, economic, geopolitical, environmental and technological) in Japanese context.
- \* Dimensions: Likelihood of occurrence/influence (影響可能性) + Impact (影響度)

#### 3. Difficulties of Complex Risk Governance

- \* Institutional infrastructure for the Identification of the whole picture of the risks in question and transparent decision making mechanism- but dilemma: integration or making sure diversity?
- \* Scenario analysis (based on security thinking) can be a help ←→ Reliance on PRA (probability risk assessment) as a filter in Severe Accident management based on engineering thinking
- \* But scenario in what scope?

#### 4. Institutional Issues

- \* Japan: National Resilience Initiative: Narrow scope - focusing on large scale natural disasters; selection of target scenarios not based on risk assessment; relationship between National Resilience Office (国土強靱化推進室), Deputy Chief Cabinet Secretary for Crisis Management (内閣危機管理監) and National Security Bureau (国家安全保障局) in Cabinet Secretariat
- \* Singapore: Institutionalized NSCS (National Security Coordination Secretariat) in PM office in 2004; RAHS (Risk Assessment and Horizon Scanning) System in 2007 - Think Centre, Solutions Centre (capacity building), Experimentation Centre)

#### 5. Needs for Regional Integrated Risk Governance in Asia: Ex. Nuclear Governance

- \* Use of nuclear in China, India and Korea
- \* Interests by emerging countries - Vietnam, Indonesia
- \* Possibility of transboundary impact
- \* Natural disaster/ Nuclear safety linkage, nuclear safety/ security linkage
- \* Competition for manufacturing capability (China, Korea and Japan/US)
- \* Where civilian fuel cycle will go?

## **YURA Suma Adnan**

**Head of Research Division, the Sultan Haji Hassanal Bolkiah Institute of Defense and Strategic Studies, Ministry of Defense (Brunei)**

### **Promoting Culture of Dialogue and Consultation in East Asia**

The management of complex risks and promotion of regional cooperation is vital and in fact, necessary for ensuring prosperity, peace and stability in the region. ASEAN has long recognised the importance of understanding and cooperation among Southeast Asian countries. The Treaty of Amity and Cooperation (1976) is a key political document to govern inter-state relationship and regional cooperation.

The habit of dialogue in the form of consultation has developed into a culture of cooperation in ASEAN. This culture is embedded in ASEAN's approach towards common goals, and throughout the process of building and strengthening its community. This has also been the preferred approach for many other countries in the region. Now there is stronger culture of cooperation in all areas, in the political and security area, in economics and trade, and in the socio-cultural area.

ASEAN's strategic weight in the region as a hub of dialogue and cooperation has also extended in the defence sector. Over the years, cooperation in defence has expanded and strengthened in both bilateral and multilateral level. Practical and constructive are a prominent feature of this mechanism. It includes a simple dialogue to joint trainings and also large-scale exercises such as the ADMM Plus HADR/Military Medicine Exercise conducted among member states and its Dialogue Partners in 2013.

Member countries are also working towards improving coordination, and the regional capacity to respond, thereby expanding the scope for closer and deeper cooperation. This encouraging trend bodes well for the future, especially in addressing the growing challenges in the region.

Promoting habits of cooperation, not only improve regional as well as individual capacity to respond to threats, but it can also contribute to managing disputes and conflicts peacefully. The conduct of relations and cooperation, of course, must be based on the universal and enduring principles of equality, mutual respect, mutual benefit and respect for international law.

As a region of countries with rich histories, many have disputes that continue to this day. Dispute resolution always calls for political will, but many times it may also require the wisdom of future generations. Nurturing investment in regional relations at all levels, most especially earlier at junior level must be an enduring initiative. This can help better promote promoting understanding, enhance trust and building confidence in the region while being mindful of the diversity in historical and cultural heritage.

**FUKUSHIMA Akiko**  
**Professor, Aoyama Gakuin University**

**Exploring Regional Cooperation on Complex Risks**  
**-- Human Security Perspectives --**

### **Challenges of Complex Risks**

Risks we face today are certainly becoming ever more complex. Yet their onset may not be limited to a single event but could involve synchronous onset of hazards as exemplified by the Great East Japan earthquake in March 2011, which entailed earthquake, tsunami and nuclear crisis. Occurrences/recurrences of risks have been rising. According to United Nations Office of Disaster Risk Reduction (UNISDR) during the period of 2000-2012 natural disasters caused 1.7 trillion USD damage, 2.9 billion people affected and 1.2 million killed. Their magnitudes and intensities are becoming more serious than ever.

Moreover risks are not limited to natural but also involve man-made or technological ones. The latter is well demonstrated by attacks to cyber space. We also have risks of terrorists' attacks as illustrated by massive exodus of refugees from Syria and its neighbors to Europe as well as by the attack of Islamic State (IS) to Paris in November 2015.

Risks may cause numerous damage to people, including loss of life, injury or other health impacts as well as cause damage or loss to property, infrastructure, livelihoods, and economic disruptions and environmental damage. National security and individual safety, dignity and liberties are at risk.

### **Human Security Policy Framework to Address Complex Risks**

In addressing these complex risks, we must take approach to prevent, mitigate onset of hazards and to respond if peril takes place. Thus our risk management ought to combine measures firstly to secure freedom from want such as poverty, food and other supplies, and information etc., secondly to secure freedom from fear such as national security, individual safety from natural and technological risks, and thirdly to secure freedom to live with dignity such as individual liberties.

These risks thus demand us to take comprehensive approach which human security can offer a framework for us to combine and integrate our measures. Mindful of impacts of risks, we ought to have both national and people-centered approaches.

### **A Suggestion for Regional Cooperation on risks**

Since risks do not respect national borders, regional cooperation is in order. Some man-made risks are predictable, while natural risks are not. Depending on predictability or uncertainties of risks, our approaches should vary. Thus we should prioritize our efforts to be effective in our risk management and be equipped with in depth knowledge and skills.

As a first step I recommend to take comprehensive human security approach as delineated in the preceding section. More concretely I suggest the organizers of the Dialogue to start a series of experts workshops to examine each risk ranging from natural to man-made and to set up a core group to synthesize respective jigsaw puzzle pieces together as a comprehensive risk management mechanism. The outcome ought be framed as a policy recommendation to the governments and the regional institutions in East Asia.

## **Marife BALLESTEROS**

**Acting Vice President,**

**Philippine Institute for Development Studies (Philippines)**

### **I. Why the need for risk-management response to complex risk at the regional level?**

A series of factors have contributed to complex risks that the Philippines currently faces and which has taken new significance to a large part of the economy. These factors are: (1) the scale and rapidity of urbanization posing threat to food security and the environment; (2) the continuing trend towards globalization of production and trade that opened Philippine SMEs to global crises e.g. financial risks and natural disasters; (3) the open-door policy and the promotion of people to people connectivity providing easier movement of people and access across borders; and (4) the widespread use of new information and communications technologies. All these events have offered tremendous opportunities for economic growth and innovation but at the same time have given rise to increasingly complex interdependencies and exposures to the country.

### **II. Philippines Exposure to Complex risks**

**Urbanization:** In the last decade (2000-2010) the Philippines has been growing at an annual rate of 1.86%. Population is expected to double in 30 years. Urbanization is also rising with close to 60% of population living in urban areas. Rapid urbanization and population growth has significantly increase the demand for urban settlement expansion. The need to feed growing population and to support urban development raise the need to manage conflicts in the utilization of natural resource within the country and to explore cooperation in common resource among countries.

**SMEs and global value chain:** Currently at least 28% of Philippine SMEs are integrated into the global value chain. These SMEs are experiencing consolidation, with multinational corporations (MNCs) and synergies are emerging from among different value chains. Integrating SMEs into GVCs brings benefits, but also faces challenges such as susceptibility of firms to external conditions (specifically those that impact on MNCs).

**People to people (PTP) connectivity:** PTP can be defined as the cross border movement of people from one country to another on a repeated basis either through education, training, tourism, etc. In particular, PTP for tourism has been significant for the Philippines. Philippine tourism, in the recent years has grown in leaps and bound. It has been a major source of growth and foreign exchange in many countries. This trend is foreseen to grow even more in the future, as ASEAN + 3 countries continue to undertake travel easing and visa facilitation. However, “regionalism” require the country to improve security to control flow of crime, human trafficking, increase infection risk, etc.

### **III. What concrete risk-management responses can be promoted for regional cooperation in East Asia?**

- Strengthen international laws and cooperation on resource management; in land or sea degradation and in conservation and preservation of biodiversity.
- Develop cooperative mechanisms among countries in the area of security management. Provide transparency and data sharing.
- Provide cover for supply chain; greater transparency in understanding risk drivers.



**IIDA Keisuke**  
**Professor, The University of Tokyo**

**The Possibility of Regional Cooperation in Risk Management in East Asia: An Institutional Perspective**

It is trite to say that we live in an age of risk society. We are surrounded by a wide range of risks, both as individuals and collectively. Risk management is a big business in modern society; Insurance companies and security companies are thriving everywhere, and many countries have also set up various institutional mechanisms to cope with these risks.

However, despite the proliferation of local-, national-, and global-level institutions for risk management in recent decades, one notable feature of today's international relations is the paucity of regional institutions for risk management, especially in East Asia. One reason for this institutional gap is the fact that externalities of these risks or sources of risks that give rise to the motivation to design international institutions, are either sub regional or global, and are not specifically limited to, or wide enough to include, the region of East Asia comprised of both Northeast Asia and Southeast Asia.

One major exception to the rule is the Chiang Mai Initiative Multilateralization (CMIM). It was created in 2000 as the Chiang Mai Initiative (CMI), a net of bilateral swap agreements (BSAs) among the central banks of the ASEAN+3 nations in the wake of the Asian Financial Crisis. Later it was multilateralized. Its purpose is to provide quick liquidity to countries in need, and by assuring investors of sufficient liquidity, it was designed to stave off the recurrence of currency crises in East Asia.

Fortunately or unfortunately, the effectiveness of this institution is yet to be tested, partly because of the large amounts of foreign reserves that the East Asian governments amassed after the Asian Financial Crisis and partly because the only country which needed liquidity during the global economic crisis in the wake of the Lehman shock—South Korea – turned to the Federal Reserve of the United States for help rather than the CMI.

There is potential for creating similar institutions for other kinds of risks. Prime candidates are early warning systems for tsunami, typhoons, and pandemics. Also, if nuclear accidents happen again in some parts of Asia, it would be ideal to have a coordinating mechanism for country responses. On the other hand, maritime and aerial accidents, which are a hot subject in the region, do not have region-wide externalities; therefore bilateral agreements and mechanisms will be more efficient and effective than regional institutions.

## 4. An Introduction to The Global Forum of Japan

In today's world, people's attention is focused not only around the ways and means to cope with the globalization, but also the rise of new states including People's Republic of China and the geopolitical evolution both inside and outside the former Soviet Union. Under these circumstances, in addition to traditional dialogue partners in Asia-Pacific region, it has become increasingly important for Japan to establish new channels of dialogue both in the first and the second tracks with countries which she has yet to hold regular meetings with, such as member countries of the Organization of the Black Sea Economic Cooperation (Russia, Turkey, Romania, etc.). On the basis of such understanding, The Global Forum of Japan (GFJ) aims to promote the exchange of views on commonly shared interests and issues in the field ranging from politics and security to economy, trade, finance, society and culture, and to help business leaders, Diet members and opinion leaders both in Japan and in their counterpart countries to discuss about the formulation of new orders in global and regional arenas.

### 【History】

The 1982 Versailles Summit was widely seen as having exposed rifts within the Western alliance. Accordingly, there were expressed concerns that the summit meetings were becoming more and more stylized rituals and that Western solidarity was at risk. Within this context, it was realized that to revitalize the summit meetings there must be free and unfettered exchanges of private-sector views to be transmitted directly to the heads of the participating states. Accordingly, Japanese former Foreign Minister OKITA Saburo, U.S. Trade Representative William BROCK, E.C. Commission Vice President Etienne DAVINGNON, and Canadian Trade Minister Edward LUMLEY, as representatives of the private-sector in their respective countries, took the initiative in founding The Quadrangular Forum in Washington in September 1982. Since then, the end of the Cold War and the altered nature of the economic summits themselves had made it necessary for The Quadrangular Forum to metamorphose into The Global Forum established by the American and Japanese components of The Quadrangular Forum at the World Convention in Washington in October 1991. In line with its objectives as stated above, The Global Forum was intended as a facilitator of global consensus on the many post-Cold War issues facing the international community and reached out to open its discussions not only to participants from the quadrangular countries but also to participants from other parts of the world. Over the years, the gravity of The Global Forum's activities gradually shifted from its American component (housed in The Center for Strategic and International Studies) to its Japanese component (housed in The Japan Forum on International Relations), and, after the American component ceased to be operative, the Board of Trustees of the Japanese component resolved, on February 7, 1996, that it would thereafter act as an independent body for organizing bilateral dialogues with Japan as a hub for all countries in the world, and amended its by-laws accordingly. At the same time, The Global Forum's Japanese component was reorganized into The Global Forum of Japan (GFJ) in line with the principle that the organization be self-governing, self-financing, and independent of any other organization.

### 【Organization】

The Global Forum of Japan (GFJ) is a private, non-profit, non-partisan, and independent membership organization in Japan to engage in and promote international exchanges on policy-oriented matters of bilateral, regional and global implications. While the secretariat is housed in The Japan Forum on International Relations, GFJ itself is independent of any other organizations, including The Japan Forum on International Relations. Originally established as the Japanese component of The Quadrangular Forum at the initiative of HATTORI Ichiro, OKITA Saburo, TAKEYAMA Yasuo, TOYODA Shoichiro in 1982, GFJ is currently headed by OKAWARA Yoshio as Advisor, ITO Kenichi as Chairman & President. The membership is composed of 10 Business Members including the two Governors, MOGI Yuzaburo and TOYODA Shoichiro; 18 Political Members including the four Governors, ASAO Keiichiro, KAKIZAWA Mito, KOIKE Yuriko, and TANIGAKI Sadakazu; and 86 Academic Members including the three Governors, ITO Go, SHIMADA Haruo and MUTSUSHIKA Shigeo.

### 【Activities】

Since the start of The Global Forum of Japan (GFJ) in 1982, GFJ has shifted its focus from the exchanges with the Quadrangular countries for the purpose of contributing to the Western Summit, to those with neighboring countries in the Asia-Pacific region including US, China, Korea, ASEAN countries, India and Australia European countries, Wider Black Sea Area, for the purposes of deepening mutual understanding and contributing to the formation of international order. GFJ has been active in collaboration with international exchange organizations in those countries in organizing policy-oriented intellectual exchanges called "Dialogue." In order to secure a substantial number of Japanese participants in the "Dialogue", GFJ in principle holds these "Dialogues" in Tokyo. A listing of topics of "Dialogues" and its overseas co-sponsors in past years given below.

Year	Month	Topic	Co-sponsor
2015	Dec.	Japan-East Asia Dialogue "A New Horizon of Regional Cooperation in East Asia : Overcoming the Age of Complex Risks"	East Asian Institute, National University of Singapore (EAI)
	Sep.	Japan-China Dialogue "Toward a Future-Oriented Relationship"	International Relations Department, University of Indonesia
	Jul.	The Second Japan-GUAM Dialogue "The Japan-GUAM Relationship in the Changing World"	China Institutes of Contemporary International Relations (CICIR) GUAM-Organization for Democracy and Economic Development
	Mar.	Central Asia + Japan Symposium	Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan, the University of Tokyo
	Feb.	The Japan-U.S. Dialogue "Alliance in a New Defense Guideline Era" Japan-East Asia Dialogue "What Should We Do toward Reliable International Relations in Asia?"	Institute for National Strategic Studies, National Defense University School of Public Affairs, Zhejiang University the Albert Del Rosario Institute for Strategic and International Studies
2014	Dec.	The Japan- Asia Pacific Dialogue "The Asia-Pacific in Global Power Transition: How Many Great Powers?"	Meiji University University of Western Sydney
	May	The Japan-China Dialogue "Prospect of Japan-China Relationship in the Changing World"	The Japan Forum on International Relations (JFIR) Institute of Japanese Studies, Chinese Academy of Social Sciences (CASS)
	Mar.	The Japan-U.S. Alliance in Changing International and Domestic Environments	Institute for National Strategic Studies, National Defense University
	Jan.	Toward Building Confidence Between Japan and China in 'New Domains'	The Japan Forum on International Relations (JFIR)
2013	Oct.	Toward the Making of Shared Values in Foreign Policy	Washington College International Studies Program Foundation of Research on Transformation of Malaysia
	Mar.	Future Prospect of the Japan-GUAM Partnership for Democracy and Economic Development	GUAM-Organization for Democracy and Economic Development
	Feb.	How to Develop Japan and Black Sea Area Cooperation	Organization of the Black Sea Economic Cooperation (BSEC)
	Jan.	Toward a Future-Oriented Japan-China Relationship	School of Environment, Beijing Normal University World Resources Institute College of Public Administration, Zhejiang University

## 5. An Introduction to The Japan Forum on International Relations

The Forum conducts a variety of activities hosting conferences, organizing research programs, and publishing research reports and policy recommendations, etc.

### [History]

The Japan Forum on International Relations, Inc. (JFIR or The Forum) was founded on March 12, 1987 in Tokyo on the private initiative of Dr. OKITA Saburo, Mr. HATTORI Ichiro, Prof. ITO Kenichi, and 60 other independent citizens from business, academic, political, and media circles of Japan, recognizing that a policy-oriented research institution in the field of international affairs independent from the government was most urgently needed in Japan. On April 1, 2011, JFIR was reincorporated as a “public interest foundation” with the authorization granted by the Prime Minister in recognition of its achievements.

### [Purpose]

The Forum is a private, non-profit, independent, and non-partisan organization dedicated to improved understanding of Japanese foreign policy and international relations. The Forum takes no institutional position on issues of foreign policy, though its members are encouraged not only to analyze but also to propose alternatives on matters of foreign policy. Though the Forum helps its members to formulate policy recommendations on matters of public policy, the views expressed in such recommendations represent in no way those of the Forum as an institution and the responsibility for the contents of the recommendations is that of those members of the Forum who sign them alone.

### [Organization]

JFIR is a membership organization with four categories of membership, namely, (1) corporate, (2) associate corporate, (3) individual and (4) associate individual. As for the organizational structure of JFIR, the “Board of Trustees” is the highest decision making body, which is in charge of electing the “Directors” and of supervising overall activities of JFIR, while the “Board of Directors” is an executive body, which is in charge of the management of day-to-day operations of JFIR.

#### ■ Board of Trustees

ARIMA Tatsuo	KOIKE Yuriko
HAKAMADA Shigeki	KUROYANAGI Nobuo
HATTORI Yasuo	OHYA Eiko
HIRONAKA Wakako	SAKAMOTO Masahiro
HIRONO Ryokichi	SATO Ken
INOUE Akiyoshi	WATANABE Toshio
ISHIGAKI Yasuji	YAMAGUCHI Norio
ITO Tsuyoshi	

#### ■ Board of Directors

IMAI Takashi	Chairman
ITO Kenichi	President
WATANABE Mayu	Executive Director
HANDA Haruhisa	Director
KAMIYA Mataka	Director
KIYOHARA Takehiko	Director
MORIMOTO Satoshi	Director
TAKUBO Tadae	Director

#### ■ Auditors

NAITOH Masahisa
SHIMADA Haruo

### [Activities]

#### ■ Policy Recommendations

The fundamental purpose of JFIR is to promote policy-oriented research. Therefore, all the activities of JFIR are directed towards that purpose. Two “Councils” were set up specifically for this purpose. One is for the policy recommendations in the long-term perspective and the other is for those in the short-term and immediate perspective. The former is the “Policy Council” and the latter is the “Emergency Policy Council.” In the case of the “Policy Council,” a task force headed by a member of the “Policy Council” and staffed by research fellows of JFIR assists the “Policy Council” for making an intensive in-depth analysis of the issue and working out a draft of the policy recommendations.

When more than two thirds of the full members of the “Policy Council” endorse the draft or its revision, it is approved and becomes the recommendations of those members of the “Policy Council” who sign it. It should be noted that in this and other cases, the Forum takes no institutional position on issues of foreign policy, though its members are encouraged not only to analyze but to propose alternatives on matters of foreign policy. Though the Forum helps its members to formulate policy recommendations, the responsibility for the contents is that of those members of the Forum who sign them alone.

Since 1988 the “Policy Council” has publicly announced 37 sets of policy recommendations and presented them to the Prime Minister of Japan. Recent policy recommendations have covered themes such as “Positive Pacifism and the Future of the Japan-U.S. Alliance,” “Prospects and Challenges for the Acceptance of Foreign Migrants to Japan,” “Expansion of China and Japan's Response,” “Japan's Energy Strategy in the Age of Globalization,” “Positive Pacifism and Japan's Course of Action,” etc.

### ■e-Forum “Hyakka-Seiho”

In tandem with the core activities of the “Policy Council” in making policy recommendations, another important pillar of JFIR’s activities is the e-Forum “Hyakka-Seiho” which means “Hundred Flowers in Full Bloom” (<http://www.jfir.or.jp/cgi/m-bbs/>). The e-Forum, which started on April 12, 2006, is open to the public, functioning as an interactive forum for discussions on foreign policy and international affairs. All articles posted on the e-Forum are sent through the bimonthly e-mail magazine “Meru-maga Nihon Kokusai Fōramu” in Japanese to about 10,000 readers in Japan. Furthermore, articles worth attention for foreigners are translated into English and posted on the English website of JFIR (<http://www.jfir.or.jp/e/index.htm>) as “JFIR Commentary.” They are also introduced in the e-mail magazine “JFIR E-Letter” in English. “JFIR E-Letter” is delivered bimonthly to about 10,000 readers worldwide.

### ■International Exchanges

Through policy-oriented international exchange, JFIR not only keeps abreast of the trend of the global public opinion, but also strives to play a part in the formation of a public opinion that reflects Japan’s positions. With this in mind, JFIR has been sponsoring international dialogues, meetings, symposia and workshops, etc. As of September 2015, JFIR has held 103 such international exchange meetings. In addition, JFIR also supports similar activities of its sister organization, the “Global Forum of Japan.”

### ■Foreign Policy Luncheon

The “Foreign Policy Luncheon” is organized monthly to provide an occasion for members of JFIR to meet, in an informal and confidential manner, with senior officials of the Japanese Government and other authorities in the field of international affairs. Speakers are invited to give a talk which is followed by questions and answers. The meeting is conducted in Japanese. The “Foreign Policy Luncheon” is held under the co-sponsorship of JFIR with its sister organizations, the “Global Forum of Japan,” and the “Council on East Asian Community.”

### ■Diplomatic Roundtable

The “Diplomatic Roundtable” is organized, taking advantage of an occasion of a visit to Japan of a person prominent in various fields of activities abroad, for the purpose of providing an occasion for the visiting speaker to meet and exchange views with his or her counterparts in the membership of JFIR. Unless the speaker agrees to speak in Japanese, English is, in principle, the language used in the “Roundtable” and no translation is provided. The “Diplomatic Roundtable” is held under the co-sponsorship of JFIR with its sister organizations, the “Global Forum of Japan,” and the “Council on East Asian Community.”

### ■Regular Research Programs

JFIR’s various researchers from both Japan and abroad are engaged in research projects either collectively or individually, and the results of their research are published in a series of reports. The theme of latest programs includes “The Ukraine Crisis and Japan’s Diplomacy That Takes a Panoramic Perspective of the World Map,” “Maritime Territorial Issues in East Asia and Strategy for Crisis Management,” “Promoting Japan’s Foreign Policy on shared values and interest,” and “Space Diplomacy in Major Countries,” etc.

### ■Special Research Programs

In addition to the “Regular Research Programs” mentioned above, JFIR organizes multi-year “Special Research Programs” on an ad hoc basis to conduct research, exchanges, and recommendations on international and diplomatic issues that demand attention, with their outcomes announced to the public. The main programs under operation are as follows:

1. “Japan - U.S. Alliance Study Group” aims to study Japan’s security strategy of which the U.S.-Japan alliance serves as a main pillar.
2. “Russia Study Group” aims to study Japan’s strategy toward Russia, particularly in relation to the Northern Territories issue.
3. “Network of East Asian Think-tanks (NEAT)” aims to work as a Japan unit of the network of think tanks in ASEAN+3 nations, for research cooperation on the integration of the East Asia region.
4. “East Asia Forum (EAF)” aims at enhancing understanding and cooperation among industry-government-academia in ASEAN+3 nations.

### ■Publications

JFIR publishes extensively results of its various research activities both in Japanese and in English. The publications comprise (1) JFIR Series Publications, (2) Policy Council Recommendations, (3) Emergency Policy Recommendations, (4) Regular Research Program Reports, (5) International Exchange Reports, (6) Special Research Programs Reports, (7) Promotional Materials and (8). English Publications. As a part of the Promotional Materials, JFIR publishes a quarterly “Bulletin” reporting on JFIR’s activities. A complete detailed list of all publications is available on JFIR’s website (<http://www.jfir.or.jp>) where selected publications may be purchased. Moreover, on the website, several English publications are available in their entirety free of charge. Recent publications include the 37th set of policy recommendations on “Positive Pacifism and Japan’s Course of Action.”

[Address]

17-12-1301, Akasaka 2-chome Minato-ku, Tokyo, 107-0052, Japan

[Tel] +81-3-3584-2193 [Fax] +81-3-3505-4406

[E-mail] [jfir@jfir.or.jp](mailto:jfir@jfir.or.jp) [URL] <http://www.jfir.or.jp/>

## 6. An Introduction to East Asian Institute, National University of Singapore

The East Asian Institute (EAI) was set up in April 1997 as an autonomous research organization under a statute of the National University of Singapore. It is the successor of the former Institute of East Asian Political Economy (IEAPE), which was itself the successor of the Institute of East Asian Philosophies (IEAP), originally established by Dr Goh Keng Swee in 1983 for the study of Confucianism.

The main mission of EAI is to promote both academic and policy-oriented research on East Asian development, particularly the political, economic and social development of contemporary China (including Hong Kong and Taiwan), and China's growing economic relations with the region and the world at large, including Japan, Korea and ASEAN.

To promote academic exchange and to enable its research findings to reach out to a wider segment of the public, EAI organizes seminars and publishes research papers on a regular basis. EAI also participates in joint research projects with government ministries and statutory boards in Singapore, promotes collaborative programmes with similar institutions in the region as well as organizes regional and international conferences and workshops on East Asian issues.

The long-term vision of EAI is to develop into the region's foremost research institution on East Asian development. While its initial focus was on contemporary China, the Institute has extended its research efforts to Japan and Korea as it builds up its resources.

[Address]

469A Bukit Timah Road

Tower Block #06-01

Singapore 259770

General Enquiries: (65) 6516 3715      Fax: (65) 6779 3409

## 7. An Introduction to International Relations Department, University of Indonesia

The Department of International Relations was established in 1985. The Department's vision is to become an excellent academic community and a competent and credible partner for the Indonesian Government and society in the field of International Relations. To meet this vision, the Department provides education, research, and community engagement with specific areas of International Security, International Political Economy, and Transnational Society. The focus area is Indonesia's foreign policy, ASEAN, and Asia Pacific. The Department consists of competent lecturers and researchers with expertises in those focus.

The Department maintains the International Relations Laboratorium as a center for academic development and teaching; it also regularly publishes an academic journal namely Global. The Department sponsored the establishment of ASEAN Study Center and Center for International Relations Studies (CIReS) of FISIP UI. The Department has become hubs for several networks, including The Network of East Asian Thinktanks (NEAT), Network of ASEAN Studies in Indonesia (NASI) and Southeast Asian ASEAN Studies Association. The Centers and the Networks have been very active in conducting various research and seminars in the national, regional and global levels as well as maintaining vast networks with national and international partners.

In regard to teaching program, the Department of International Relations has two educational program, Undergraduate (Bachelor) and Graduate level (Master). Both programs are well-accredited with "A" rank and implement implements the competency-based curriculum under the newly set Indonesian National Qualification Framework. The Programs' student intake is among the most competitive Undergraduate Program in Indonesia. The Programs' graduates work in various sectors including government agencies (i.e. Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Ministry of Home Affairs, Ministry of Trade, State Secretariat, and local governments), international institutions (e.g. UNDP, IOM, UNHCR, and ASEAN Secretariat), foreign embassies, national and multinational business, education, research institutes, journalism, non-governmental organizations and (NGOs) as well as being entrepreneurs.

[Address]

Hero Utomo Kuntjoro-Jakti Room  
Nusantara 2 Building, 2nd Floor  
Faculty of Social and Political Sciences  
Universitas Indonesia  
Depok 16424 – West Java  
Phone/Fax : +6221 7873744

# MEMO



## **The Global Forum of Japan (GFJ)**

17-12-1301, Akasaka 2-chome Minato-ku, Tokyo, 107-0052, Japan

[Tel] +81-3-3584-2193 [Fax] +81-3-3505-4406

[E-mail] [gfj@gfj.jp](mailto:gfj@gfj.jp) [URL] <http://www.gfj.jp/>