

ASEAN and Its People: Regional Internationalism and the Politics of Exclusion

Noortmann, M.

Post-print deposited in [Curve](#) April 2016

Original citation:

Noortmann, M. (2014) 'ASEAN and Its People: Regional Internationalism and the Politics of Exclusion' in Matthias Maass (Ed). Foreign Policies and Diplomacies in Asia: CHANGES IN PRACTICE, CONCEPTS, AND THINKING IN A RISING REGION (pp: 93-108). Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press. ISBN: 9789089645401

<http://press.uchicago.edu/ucp/books/book/distributed/F/bo18041963.html>

Copyright © and Moral Rights are retained by the author(s) and/ or other copyright owners. A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge. This item cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the copyright holder(s). The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

CURVE is the Institutional Repository for Coventry University

<http://curve.coventry.ac.uk/open>

5. ASEAN and Its People: Regional Internationalism and the Politics of Exclusion

Math Noortmann

Introduction

An ASEAN of the People, by the People and for the People – the title of the report of the First ASEAN People’s Assembly – voiced a strong constitutional appeal to Southeast Asian’s political elite (Centre for Strategic and International Studies 2001). The idea of a people-oriented turn in the regional integration process in Southeast Asia was building momentum towards the signing of the Charter of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations in Singapore in November 2007. Over a period of less than seven years, the term *people* increasingly permeated both diplomatic and scholarly language (Severino 2006; Tan 2007). The idea that ‘ASEAN needs to shed its image of being an elitist organisation comprising exclusively diplomats and government officials’ infiltrated elite circles (Eminent Persons Group 2007). It was even suggested that the Southeast Asian elites understand the need to ‘reach out and engage the ordinary people of ASEAN with the ASEAN project’ in order to prevent a ‘disconnect[ion] between the elite and the people’ in the Southeast Asian integration project (Koh 2006). With the signing of the ASEAN Charter, however, that momentum was defied by Southeast Asian political elites (Koh 2006).

There is little to nothing in ASEAN’s constitutive document which signals that the Southeast Asian elites are soliciting the engagement and cooperation of the Southeast Asian people, neither directly through representation and judicial review, nor indirectly through civil society organizations. It seems that Southeast Asian *regionalism*, and the political and people oriented interests of Southeast Asian’s elites

have been profoundly misread. The activist focus on ASEAN's so-called Track 2 and Track 3 diplomacy ignored the elitist character of these mechanisms (Caballero-Anthony 2005). The political role of non-governmental actors has been profoundly overrated in the Southeast Asian context (Aviel 1999; Aviel 2000: 17). In terms of the people/elite dialectics, critical ASEAN scholarship must not only engage in politically scrutinizing NGOs in Southeast Asia and but also determine which NGOs are serving their own interests and which ones are serving the people's interest (Petras & Veltmeyer 2001). Analysts of regional integration, both in the European and the Southeast Asian context, have always recognized and stressed the intrinsic role of the ruling elites in those processes (Haas 1958a; Moravcsik 1993; Marks 1997; Case 2002; Richmond et al. 2002; Acharya 1999).¹ However, in the attempt to understand and explain integration processes, the people and the elite/people dialectics have been generally ignored. People have been reintroduced as an element of analysis in political and legal science only recently. The reawakening of the multitude has led philosophers and analysts of globalization and regional integration to come to a conclusion that the usual practices of international law and politics are over (Mény 1998; Hardt & Negri 2006). The conclusion, however, that has (as of yet) not been confirmed by the ASEAN experience.

In this article, I will argue that the people are neglected and ignored in both practicing and discoursing on Southeast Asian integration. Mere characterization of regional integration as an elite project does not automatically engage people in the discussion. There exists a doubt that the institutional process of Southeast Asian integration was initiated by elites. Unlike the European case, Southeast Asian elites were not directly compelled to include people in their regional integration schemes and to move beyond the Westphalian politics of internationalism. In the Southeast Asian

context, elites adhered to the traditional scheme of strict intergovernmentalism, which was based on the premise of the exclusion of people. It is suggested in this paper that the politics of excluding/including people have determined and are still determining the development of Southeast Asia's regional integration.

Elites, People and Theories of Regional Integration

The European Experience: Post-international Regionalism, or Bringing the People

In

The beginning of the institutional practices of regional integration is generally located in European time and space during the post-World War II era. Therefore, the first generation of regional integration theories is almost exclusively shaped by designs and currents of the European institutions. Among the first generation of regional integration theories, neofunctionalism is by far the most influential.

To Ernst Haas, political integration was the following:

[T]he process of attaining [a political community] among nation states ... the process whereby *political* actors in several distinct national settings are persuaded to shift their loyalties, expectations and *political* activities towards a new and larger centre, whose institutions possess or demand jurisdiction over the pre-existing national states. (1961; emphasis added)

In that sense, Haas posited integration as a post-international or a proto-supranational legal and political phenomenon in a traditional international arena.

In 'The Challenge of Regionalism', Haas posed a fundamental question about the 'hierarchical level at which social action relation to integration is thought to take place':

Does successful responsiveness, communication and the de-emphasis of divisive issues rest on mass participation in politics or its minimisation? Are numerical small groups of economic, industrial, administrative and military elites the crucial actors or must the analytical focus be put on political parties and their constituencies? (1958a: 445)

Haas's query indicates that he was, by no means, indifferent to different political roles of the mass and the elites. That observation in itself did not constrain neofunctionalists, however, from adopting a qualified, but conclusive international, elitist perspective:

[T]he nature of the elite structure is singled out as being of crucial importance ... [I]t is equally desirable that "international" contacts among elites of similar status and outlook in all the political units be made to flourish ... Whenever a given doctrine associated with integration has been adopted by a politically crucial elite as its own and thus lifted from advocacy initially confined to literary and philosophical circles, integration has acquired a momentum of its own; it "has taken off". (Haas 1958a: 443-4)

Semi-elitist agencies like the European movement did not provide a doctrine useful for the study of the integration process according to Haas. It merely constituted a loose association of all the contingent-wide groups favouring *some kind* of European unity (Haas 1958a). Haas focused on the governing political elites. Specific interest groups like the ones in business and labour sector with the most interest in market integration in the 1950s, were irrelevant to Haas as a *group*. For his understanding of the integration process, it is sufficient 'to single out and define the political elites, ... the leaders of all relevant political groups, ... which in the bureaucratized nature of the European organisations [play] a manipulative role' (Haas 1958b:115).

To the extent that Haas questioned the underlying assumptions of his approach, the neglect of the emancipation of the peoples of Europe was not one of them. Haas thereby disregarded that some of these assumptions were intrinsically linked to some form of non-governmental activity and idealism. Haas, for example, questioned the assumption that 'a definable institutional pattern must mark the outcome of the process of integration' (1976). However, he did not reconsider his opinion in 1958 that the European movement was unable to agree on the *governmental institutions* which had to *mark the outcome of the process of integration* as insignificant (Haas 1958b). By

adopting an elite-centred approach to European integration, neofunctionalism carved itself a successful niche in the more traditional state-oriented understandings of international relations, but at the same time it overlooked or ignored the position of the people as a specific institutional feature of regional integrative processes.

The ASEAN Model: Regional Internationalism, or Bringing the National Elites Back In

The ASEAN project, which was launched in the second half of the 1960s, had a number of significant points in common with the EC's project, which had started a decade earlier. Although both were elitist projects, soon after their inceptions, they took off in different directions.

In its first seven years of existence, ASEAN easily qualified itself as a 'club of foreign ministers' (Fifield 1979). The first summit of the heads of government in Bali in 1976 was the result of events that were external to ASEAN, rather than being the result of politics of regional integration. By the end of the 1970s, ASEAN's greatest asset was considered to be its '*spirit of cooperation*': a spirit which was largely found in the rhetoric of security and social, cultural and economic cooperation and which was 'growing, reaching out from the governing elites to the influential groups in business, the professions and the media' (Frost 2008). A study by Monte Hill based on a quantitative assessment of ASEAN's community formation confirmed that '[t]here appears to be no movement whatsoever toward regional community formation among the five ASEAN countries' in that first period of its existence (Hill 1976: 575). Some of the conclusions of that study – such as the fact that elite students, for example, preferred

to study in countries outside the ASEAN region – are probably still valid today (Hill 1976).

Acharya in his excellent *The Quest for Identity* characterizes Southeast Asian regionalism as follows:

[A]n elite-driven process in which human rights and democracy don't figure. Despite its claims to be based on broad historical, cultural and societal ties, the drive for regionalism is to a large extent reflected in the need of the postcolonial elite to ensure regime survival. (2000:140)

James Cotton takes Acharya's conclusion one step further and states that 'ASEAN was created for the end of keeping particular elites in power' (2002). Both opinions recognize the importance of elites in very much the same way as Haas did in his neofunctional explanation of European regional integration. In opposition to Haas, Acharya and Cotton are more explicit and critical in regards to the motivations of the Southeast Asian elites. There is, however, no indication that the European elites were differently motivated, or that the motivations of the European and Southeast Asian elites had different normative qualities. However, if these elites indeed applied different politics of regionalization and regional institutionalization for power-political purposes, Cotton's critical *elite community* perspective would be more appropriate than a neofunctional perspective. The latter theory's original preoccupation with a defined institutional and supranational outcome disqualifies the approach for an easy adoption to the explanation of the Southeast Asian integration process.

Bringing the People Back In?

The qualified disqualification of neofunctionalism as an explanatory theory also endorsed other scholars to revitalize or develop new theoretical explanations for Europe's regional integration process in the early days of Comparative Regional

Integration Studies. John Galtung (1968), for example, stressed that integration is an interrelated complexity of values, actors and resource exchange. Moreover, Karl W. Deutsch came to understand the dynamics of integration processes as having basis on 'essential background conditions' such as the involvement of civil society at large (Deutsch et al. 1957: 5). While all of these approaches moved away from the state-centred international relations approaches and created space for allowing non-state actors back, the more critical, neo-Marxist people and elites dialectic were generally ignored.

That ignorance can still be found in contemporary Comparative Regional Integration Studies, particularly in weakly grounded social constructivist approaches to regional integration and regional institutional developments. How seriously constructivism can be misunderstood and uncritically adopted in this respect is made clear by Mely Caballero-Anthony, who argues the following:

Constructivism proved to be a useful framework in explaining the lack or absence of concrete, formal mechanisms in ASEAN since the approach goes beyond the consideration of power and material interest and sensitizes us to the salience of ideational factors, to actors and agents that shape these ideas beyond the state and the intersubjective understanding that take place. (2005:257)

Southeast Asia's potential transition from a 'sovereignty-bound' form of regionalism (what I call regional internationalism) towards integrative regionalism has been based by observers on such phenomena of 'regionalization without regionalism', 'soft regionalism', and more recently the concept of 'new regionalism' (Acharya 2002b).

The concept of *new regionalism* revolves around a variety of themes, of which the idea of regionalism from below is just one. While this aspect of new regionalism is well recognized, the role and position of people are still ignored. In its typical

constructivist vain, new regionalism acknowledges and describes rather than investigates integration from below. International relations narratives on regional integration and regionalism still subsume the interest of the people under the imagined interests of their national states.

Representation of non-governmental values such as culture, education, social norms, religion, law etc. guarantees that integration becomes a comprehensive process, which encompasses all aspects of society. An integration process, which ultimately aims at one specific form of integration, is likely to fail as it lacks Deutsch's essential background conditions.

Towards the end of the 20th century, people were brought back in the discourses of regional integration. In Europe, the integration process entered a flow acceleration, which triggered increasing popular challenge to such an extent that Yves Mény concluded in 1998 that 'constitutionalism has grown to its limits and ruling elites are in crisis'. He observed processes, which 'reverse the post-war trend characterised by a persistent and still ongoing process of elite domination under the cover of "constitutionalism" and exclude people from the political process, a trend towards "politisisation" characterised by "agencies, authorities, courts and QUANGO"' (Mény 1998). According to Mény, that transformation has not only been supported by 'political, economic and social elites' but also by 'academics' (1998).

Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri observe a similar phenomenon at a global level, where the traditional forms of intergovernmental representation had come under popular scrutiny. According to Hardt and Negri (2006), the passage of sovereignty is no longer possible without regard to the multitude. The question as to the relationship between and the different roles of elites and people in integration projects has not only

significant implications for the legal and political theories of regional integration, but also for the politics and institutional designs of global integration (Noortmann 2006).

In the transformation of the complexities of justice in regional and global order formation, it is increasingly important to distinguish between *peoples* and *people*. According to Hardt and Negri, the latter term, *people*, refers to a kind of ‘oneness’ that ‘synthesises or reduces social differences’ because ‘the component parts of the people are indifferent in their unity; they become an identity by negating or setting aside their differences’ (2006). *People* are *plural singularities* with social, religious and political differences within (Hardt & Negri 2006). *People* is an inclusive concept, which accepts those differences within and the different identities of individuals that make up an ever-growing community. On the other hand, *peoples* is an exclusive concept as it divides people along ethnical or racial lines, and it is an useful concept in the maintenance of the international order.

Bangkok + 40: What Is in It for the Southeast Asian People?

The People in the ASEAN Charter

‘We, the Peoples’... the resemblance between the opening words of the Charter of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations and the famous first words of the Charter of the United Nations cannot be missed. The use of the language of old style internationalism could not be more profound. Assuming that drafters of the ASEAN Charter were aware of historical, political and legal contingencies of the term *peoples* and that the term *peoples* was an intentional choice, the opening phrase of the ASEAN Charter pinpoints ASEAN’s predominant problem.

The term *peoples* refers to the concept of nationhood, and through the idea of the nation-state, incorrectly so to states. At the same time, it serves to avoid the use of

the conventional terminology: *heads of state*, *heads of government* or *states*. While the latter language would be more in line with overall international, diplomatic practices, it would also convey that treaty-making is an elite procedure. As stated in the introduction, the text of the ASEAN Charter defies the expectation that Southeast Asia's elites are turning Southeast Asian integration and ASEAN's institutional development into an inclusive process. Since ASEAN came into being, the essential reasons for its existence have changed. The external political and military threat of communism has been set aside by the economic threat of globalization. The new internal security problem, which Bilveer Singh has termed 'the Talibanisation of Southeast Asia' has replaced the notion of *konfrontasi*, which has shaped the thinking of ASEAN's elites (2007). Furthermore, it has been its *raison d'état* for a long time, but which according to many Southeast Asian writers has become unthinkable now. It must be questioned, however, whether these environmental shifts have affected ASEAN's elites to the extent that they feel the necessity of shifting from an *international* unity among the ASEAN nations, towards a *transnational* unity among its people. The latter would definitely require the institutional involvement of traders and entrepreneurs, producers and consumers, and employers and labourers where economic integration is concerned and the involvement of artist and their public, clergyman and believers, teachers and students took cultural, religious and educational integration into consideration.

The text of the ASEAN Charter is far from ambiguous in this respect. Only one of the fifteen purposes of the ASEAN Charter refers to ASEAN's people. According to 1(13), the ASEAN Charter seeks, 'to promote a people-oriented ASEAN in which all sectors of society are encouraged to participate in, and benefit from the process of

ASEAN integration and community building’, except for more general questions concerning the relationship between Article 1(13) and all other objectives listed in Article 1. Indeed, the main question is: What is meant by a ‘people-oriented ASEAN’? Unfortunately, the answer involves a substantial amount of educated guesswork, as the ASEAN Charter does not provide us with an answer. Except for the reference to the ‘promotion of people-to-people interaction’ as one of the tasks of the ASEAN Foundation (Article 15(1)), *people* are omitted from the substantive text of the ASEAN Charter and excluded from the practices and procedures of the organization.

The text of the Charter stands in strident contrast with the idea of the Eminent Persons Group (EPG) that there exists a need:

To cultivate ASEAN as a people-centred organisation and to strengthen the sense of ownership and belonging among its people, including enhancing the participation of and interaction among Parliamentarians in ASEAN Member States (AIPA), representatives’ civil society organisations, the private business sector, human rights groups, academic institutions and other stakeholders in ASEAN. (Singh 2007: 6)

The EPG’s report on the ASEAN Charter furthermore suggested ‘empowering’ the people and ‘involving people in *functional* cooperation activities in ASEAN’ (Singh 2007: 20; emphasis added). The report, however also falls short of indicating the means to achieve those purposes. Rather than setting out mechanisms and procedures for people’s empowerment and involvement, the report adheres to a top-down vision and endorses the idea that all this has to be *promoted* rather than affected.

The perception of ASEAN’s former Secretary-General, Rudolpho Severino (2006), of ASEAN’s problem in Southeast Asia’s search for an ASEAN Community reflects how flawed the conception of Southeast Asia’s regional integration and the role of ASEAN is. ASEAN should be an institutional tool, not an objective. For the past forty years, ASEAN is claimed to have been successful in avoiding war between the

ASEAN member states, but it has definitely not contributed to the creating of a Southeast Asian identity. Since *identity* is the result of *identification*, the people of Southeast Asia will not establish a common identity if they cannot identify themselves with ASEAN as the tangible object of Southeast Asia. And that is precisely the internal challenge that the region and its institutional vehicle is facing and it is there that we find crossroads, dilemmas and challenges. What mechanisms are available for the people of Southeast Asia to identify them with ASEAN as a new transnational political construct?

The concept of *unity out of diversity* – ASEAN's leitmotiv – is not so much 'an elite conceit' as Donald E. Weatherbee claims but a core element of the Southeast Asian elite swindles. 'Unity out of diversity' is the Southeast Asian elite version of the Caesarian adagio *divide et impera* [divide and rule]. The Southeast Asian elites rule because of the myth of an amalgam of historical, religious, ethnic, cultural, political and economic diversities. This is not to say that these diversities are non-existent. On the contrary, Southeast Asia constitutes diversity, like every other region. The question is how this diversity is politically narrated and turned into a mythical truism.

While that idea is an appealing one to those who envisage regional integration as a process from below, it raises the question as to the politics of determining the 'needs of ASEAN's people'. Who determines what people need and how; or through which procedures? That question circumvents the dialectics of normative change. Norm creation is always a dynamic process in which the norm itself is a subject and an object of creation and recreation, adoption and rejection, generalization and particularization, and prescription and application. There is little doubt that the dynamics of norm creation involve such processes as diffusion, framing and grafting. There is equally little contention on the issue of 'norm localisation [as a] reinterpretation and re-presentation

of the outside norm' (Acharya 2004). The problem remains the same: who reinterprets and who re-presents the outside norm? Here, I differ from Acharya's (2004) idea that transnational norms have to be spread through *local agents* as key norm takers. Acharya's (2004) description of these key norm-takers as having 'legitimacy', 'authority' 'credibility' and 'prestige' indicates that we are not talking about people but about self-acclaimed elites. These elites do not necessarily act in the interest of the people and it is not unlikely that norms will or will not be localized according to elite preferences and politics, such as the Westphalian norm of state sovereignty.

Norm diffusion, grafting and framing in a regional context is not simply a matter of taking outside transnational norms in, but also a matter of taking inside, national norms out. This is another form of regional localization and adoption of norms. The idea of the localization of norms in a regional context can only be properly called localization in the dialectics of the global and the local. In terms of the ten ASEAN states, regional norm adaptation is a form of transnationalization rather than localization. Where are ASEAN's people in this process? How can they formally represent their individual, societal or corporate interests? According to Hiro Katsumata and See Seng Tan (2007:1), 'An ideal ASEAN' is 'for people and governments', which is an ASEAN that serves both interests. According to the latter authors, the term *people* refers to a variety of actors 'inside states', and 'the interests of these actors include the promotion of human rights and democracy, safeguarding their communities from the threat of terrorism, the enhancement of their business interest, gender equality and international exchange and friendship' (Katsumata & Tan 2007). Assuming that these, in themselves, laudable objectives reflect the true interests of the people, the question is

not so much as how to promote these interest but how to protect them and how to provide the people with procedures and tools for their protection.

Putting people at the centre is not a matter of mere reference to human rights. There is little value in mere reference to human rights whether it is in the ASEAN Charter's preamble, list of objectives (Article 1(7)) or in its articles (Article 2(i)), or in the intention to 'establish an ASEAN human rights body' (Article 14) or not that warrants the conclusion that we are witnessing a paradigm shift in ASEAN's recognition of its own people. Can we expect that ASEAN human rights body would be granted to adopt a different approach to complaints of individuals and violations of human rights than ASEAN's hailed and criticized principle of consensus?

The presence of a formal body, which could hear and investigate human rights violations and complaints, does not necessarily have to be a judicial institution. Between a full-scale human rights court and no complaint procedure at all, there is a wide range of quasi-judicial, political and administrative complaint procedures that permit individuals to voice their concerns more directly and formally within the intergovernmental organization. The further procedural management and supervision of a complaint is a different problem altogether. Complaint procedures can be arranged along the lines of: (1) the World Bank Inspection Panel, (2) UN Human Rights Council or treaty-based commissions, with their different opting in/out possibilities or (3) the various human rights procedures in other regional organizations (EU, Council of Europe, OAS, OSCE). The ultimate question for ASEAN is whether they are able to fully engage the private sector in the integration process or not. If individuals and organizations are not provided with a formal independent forum to complain about violations of the rights under ASEAN treaties and regulations, these rights and

regulations are virtually non-existent. At most, one could maintain that these then would have a normative political value. In two specific sectors, possible changes are likely to be noticed: the private business sector and the NGO sector.

ASEAN's Business Elites

The earliest schemes for involving business stakeholders in ASEAN date back to the 1981 Basic Agreement on ASEAN Industrial Complementation and 1983 Basic Agreement on ASEAN Industrial Joint Venture. These schemes had 'very limited success', according to Davidson (2002), notwithstanding several improvements and amendments over time. The reasons for the failure of these schemes have never been the subject of in-depth study or policy analysis. However, the top-down, state-initiated project approach, and the intrinsic exclusion of ordinary and spontaneous private sector initiatives must be taken into account as possible reasons for the ineffectiveness of the schemes.

While the need to involve the private sector is officially recognized time and again in a variety of ASEAN agreements and projects, very little has materialized. For example, in Article 6 of the 1992 Framework Agreement on Enhancing Economic Cooperation entitled Private Sector Cooperation, it is stipulated as follows:

Members States recognise the complementarity of trade and investment opportunities, and therefore encourage, among others, cooperation and exchanges among ASEAN private sectors and between ASEAN and non-ASEAN private sectors, and the consideration of appropriate policies aimed at intra-ASEAN and extra-ASEAN investments and other economic activities.

Also, in non-binding declarations such as the 1997 Hanoi Action Plan, which draws an implementation map for the ASEAN Vision 2020, the enhancement of the private sector involvement is envisaged.

Unfortunately, one must conclude that the ASEAN vision does not include more than ‘a study to identify high-impact investment opportunities in key areas under the food, agriculture and forestry sectors in ASEAN and to provide essential information for investment decisions on these opportunities’, and to establish ‘networking and strategic alliances with the private sector to promote investment and joint opportunities in ASEAN’ (Hanoi Plan of Action 1998).

ASEAN’s Non-governmental Elites

The worldwide proliferation of NGOs in the 1990s reached Southeast Asia at the end of that decade. Since then, the Southeast Asian NGO scene has become more diversified and pluriform (Aviel 1999; Aviel 2000). While there is little doubt that the number of people oriented in grassroots groups and community organizations has increased, so have NGOs with a profound government, donor or business orientation (Reinalda 2001). Southeast Asian NGOs are not exempted from the idea that NGOs are ‘too close for comfort’ (Hulme & Edwards 2013). Moreover, under the ASEAN scheme of NGO accreditation, an elitist community of ASEAN QUANGOs (quasi-NGOs) has been created, which are intended to serve ASEAN rather than the Southeast Asian people. There is little reason, therefore, to exclude Southeast Asia from contemporary critical discourses on the role and position of NGOs (Donini 1995; Petras & Veltmeyer 2001; Noortmann 2003). Especially, because the normative approach to NGOs in Southeast Asia tends to neglect the distinction made above, in that sense, NGOs’ role and positions are misrepresented as representing rather than serving Southeast Asia’s people. Two examples serve to demonstrate the fundamentally flawed perception of ASEAN’s NGO community: (1) the concept of ‘entities associated with ASEAN’, in

particular, ‘accredited civil society organisations’ and (2) the concept of a ‘Track 2 diplomacy’ and, in particular, the setting up of an ASEAN People’s Assembly.

Annex 2 of the ASEAN Charter lists five categories of the so-called ‘entities associated with ASEAN’: (1) parliamentarians, (2) business organizations, (3) think tanks and academic institutions, (4) accredited civil society organisations and (5) other stakeholders in ASEAN (Register of ASEAN-Affiliated CSOs 2009). Whether and to which extent these organizations are truly civil society organization must be questioned. Not only are most of the listed NGOs (semi)industrial organizations or professional organizations; also almost all of these NGOs should be labelled as QUANGOs or GONGOs. Again, the main question is, How can ASEAN facilitate NGOs in their representational function?

JoAnn Aviel’s studies (1999; 2000) on the Southeast Asian NGO community have demonstrated that in the field of human rights and environmental protection, NGOs that are not affiliated to ASEAN have an increasing impact on governmental decision-making in ASEAN.

If Aviel is correct that ‘although NGOs have been on the periphery of ASEAN, the future of ASEAN may depend as much on their activities as on those of ASEAN’s governments and private sector’ (1999:78), the pertinent question to ask, once more, is, How is ASEAN going to secure the possibilities for non-state voices to reach into ASEAN? She holds that ‘networks have been formed which have increased communication between elites and NGOs on these issues [human rights and environment] and have increased functional cooperation’ (Aviel 2000: 29). Unfortunately, here is little in the ASEAN Charter to substantiate that claim.

Based on the status of these NGOs within ASEAN and their specific role, these organizations should be qualified as QUANGOs. NGOs that pursue a proper public interest and serve rather than represent the interest of the people have to face governmental ‘countermovements’ and restrictions in displaying their views, which underlines the differences between elite and non-elite NGOs in Southeast Asia (Aviel 2000). Aviel states as follows:

NGO activity in Southeast Asia continues to grow and is helping to forge links among the people in the region. These links are greatest among the elite, but regional meetings of NGOs and a greater focus on regional issues have helped to increase contacts and regional awareness among more and more people. (1999:89)

Where Aviel refers to Southeast Asia, Caballero-Anthony observes NGO activity in the ASEAN context. She claims that the participation of Track 2 and Track 3 actors in ASEAN processes are contributing to the building of constituency of Southeast ASEAN Community and regionalism. The issue, however, is in the nature of that community which may no longer be anchored on the ASEAN Way, or in its institutional culture that the ASEAN elites had assiduously cultivated throughout the associations history (Caballero-Anthony 2005: 267).

The two positions designate opposite understandings of the position and role of NGOs in regional integration processes. While Aviel believes that ASEAN-NGO relationships may be contentious, Caballero-Anthony insists that the liaison between intergovernmental and non-governmental actors is more harmonious.

Whether, NGOs and the people’s interest that they are supposed to communicate will go hand in hand with ASEAN’s interest is to be questioned. The use of the term *peoples* is likely to be informed by ASEAN’s traditional focus on regional peace and security, which is still the eye-catching first objective of the ASEAN Charter.

Article 1 of the Declaration of Minimum Humanitarian Standards of the ASEAN Charter reads as follows: ‘maintain and enhance peace, security and stability and further strengthen peace oriented values in the region’. ASEAN’s 21st-century vision, as laid down in its Charter, however, seems to be more eclectic than that. The Charter’s multiple objectives include diverse aims such as ‘regional resilience’, ‘creating a single market’, ‘sustainable development’, ‘democracy’ and ‘the strengthening of the ASEAN community’. In this respect, there cannot be any doubt that the ASEAN member states seek to transcend the narrow, *konfrontasi*-informed security language that dominated Southeast Asia’s 20th-century historical and political experience. In the wording of the ASEAN Charter, it is committed ‘to intensifying *community building* through enhanced regional cooperation and *integration*’. Where *community-building* is the objective, *regional cooperation* and *integration* are the tools, and ASEAN is the institutional vehicle. It is in that spirit, aspiration and ambition that Southeast Asian regionalism and ASEAN as its institutional component must be scrutinized. In particular, the role and position of Southeast Asia’s people in the ASEAN process of regional integration have to be subjected to legal and political analysis, both from the perspective of academic understanding as well as policy development.

The ASEAN Institute of Strategic and International Studies (ASEAN-ISIS) is perhaps the best example of non-people oriented GONGOism in ASEAN. Considering it as an association of NGOs, ASEAN-ISIS states its purpose as to ‘encourage cooperation and coordination of activities among policy-oriented ASEAN scholars and analysts, and to promote policy-oriented studies of, and exchanges of information and viewpoints on various strategic and international issues affecting Southeast Asia's and ASEAN's peace, security and well-being’ (12th ASEAN ISIS-IIR Taiwan Dialogue

2010). One of its strategic goals was to obtain ‘recognition from the ASEAN member states as a valuable mechanism for policy-making by institutionalizing the meeting between the Heads of ASEAN-ISIS and the ASEAN Senior Officials [and the establishment of an] international political process – that of “track two” diplomacy’ (12th ASEAN ISIS-IIR Taiwan Dialogue 2010).

Conclusion

In 2005, Donald Weatherbee concluded that ASEAN remains part of an elite scheme, which ‘gives institutional expression to an essentially declaratory regionalism that originates ... in the political will of the Southeast Asian policy elites’. Neither the ASEAN Charter nor the recently inaugurated ASEAN Intergovernmental Commission on Human Rights (AICHR) have changed that state of affairs. The intergovernmental configuration of the AICHR does not signal a change in the practices, concepts and thinking of intra-ASEAN regional policies and diplomacies. Civil society scepticism is justified. The Charter and its bodies institutionalize existing intergovernmentalist politics of exclusion. But not all commentators consider contemporary Southeast Asian regional integration and its institutionalization process as elite business as usual.

Whether the elites of the Southeast Asia have the same ambitious and engaging spirit as the founding fathers of the UN or the EU, there remains something to be seen. An analysis of the ASEAN Charter and its institutional context is not the only way of assessing ASEAN’s true integrating aspirations, but also its commitment to the people of Southeast Asia. We, must in the end, conclude that the ASEAN Charter is another expression of the proverbial ‘Asian Way’ or have the Southeast Asian nations transcended that fallacious combination of the Westphalian paradigm and Asian values.

Regional community-building is a vexed and interactive process: interactive in a sense that it is top down and bottom up, push and pull, inclusive and exclusive. Schemes and projects only reach out to the people but are insufficient. People need to connect, to reach in. Integration can be facilitated, but not moulded. There is not any Southeast Asian discourse that does not reach a conclusion short of answering this vital question: How does ASEAN provide the protection for the interest of its people other than assuming that these interests are perfectly protected by the ruling political and governmental-bureaucratic elites?

None of the actors (such as non-governmental organizations and corporations of individual citizens) has as of yet offered an ASEAN means of redress against an infringement of their interests by either ASEAN member states or ASEAN organs. The ASEAN Charter might have provided a momentum for regional and institutional change. That momentum seems lost for now. The reasons for the lost momentum are eloquently formulated by Ellen Frost:

In this new global and regional context, integration and community building should be understood as code words. They symbolise Asian's leaders' search for autonomy, self-reliance, growth, security, and influence without the conditions and rules imposed by a foreign power or global institutions. These leaders look into the integration movement for opportunities to cope more successfully with domestic challenges and thus to strengthen their national sovereignty, not to share it. This search is at the core of Asia's new regionalism. (2008:11)

The ASEAN Way is not only a particular set of regional values and norms; it is also a particular elitist political and diplomatic culture. In differentiating between various forms of regionalism we should not hesitate to distinguish between those forms of regionalism, which seek to transcend the traditional practices and institutions of the international/Westphalian order and those that are not intended to bring about change

(Hurrell 2007). These forms of regionalism must be called *quasi-regionalism* or *regional internationalism*, if anything at all.

¹ It is submitted here that the traditional arguments against any comparative analysis between Europe and Southeast Asia, because of socio-political, cultural, economic and historical difference between the two regions and henceforth the two regional integration processes, are of a political rather than a analytical nature and cannot be considered to advance the understanding of different political and institutional regional developments. To the extent that regional identities are constructs, regional differences are too. For arguments against comparing Europe and Southeast Asia, see Severino (2006) and Frost (2008).

Bibliography

- ABC News (2010), 'Suu Kyi Slams India over Junta Ties', 24 November 2010. <http://www.abc.net.au/news/stories/2010/11/24/3075649.htm> (accessed 1 December 2010).
- Abramowitz, Morton & Stephen Bosworth (2006), 'America Confronts the Asian Century', *Current History* 105 (690): 147-152.
- Acharya, Amitav (1997), 'Ideas, Identity, and Institution-Building: From the "ASEAN Way" to the "Asia-Pacific Way"?'', *The Pacific Review* 10 (3): 319-346.
- Acharya, Amitav (1999a), 'A Concert of Asia?', *Survival* 41 (3): 84-101.
- Acharya, Amitav (1999b), 'Imagined Proximities: The Making and Unmaking of Southeast Asia as a Region', *Southeast Asian Journal of Social Science* 27 (1): 55-76.
- Acharya, Amitav (2000), *The Quest for Identity: International Relations of Southeast Asia*. Singapore: Oxford University Press.
- Acharya, Amitav (2001), *Constructing a Security Community in Southeast Asia: ASEAN and the Problem of Regional Order*. London: Routledge.
- Acharya, Amitav (2002a), 'Human Security: What Kind for the Asia Pacific?', in David Dickens (ed.), *The Human Face of Security: Asia-Pacific Perspectives*. Canberra: Australian National University, Strategic and Defence Studies Centre.
- Acharya, Amitav (2002b), 'Regionalism and the Emerging World Order: Sovereignty, Autonomy, Identity', in Shaun Breslin et al. (eds), *New Regionalisms in the Global Political Economy*. London: Routledge.
- Acharya, Amitav (2003), 'Democratization and the Prospects of Participatory Regionalism in Southeast Asia', *Third World Quarterly* 24 (2): 375-390.
- Acharya, Amitav (2004), 'How Ideas Spread, Whose Norms Matter? Norm localization and Institutional Change in Asian Regionalism', *International Organization* 58 (2): 239-275.
- Adler, Emanuel (2005), *Communitarian International Relations: The Epistemic Foundations of International Relations*. London; New York: Routledge.
- AFP (2006), 'New Delhi Will Not Meddle with Myanmar: Indian Defence Minister', Agence France-Presse, 3 June 2006.
- Aggarwal, Vinod K. & Min Gyo Koo (2008), 'Economic and Security Institution Building in Northeast Asia: An Analytical Overview', in Vinod K. Aggarwal et al. (eds), *Northeast Asia: Ripe for Integration?*, 1-31. Berlin: Springer.
- Ahamed, E. (2006), 'Reinforcing "Look East" Policy', Ministry of External Affairs. <http://meaindia.nic.in/interview/2006/01/17in01.htm> (accessed 12 May 2008).
- Akaha, Tsuneo (1991), 'Japan's Comprehensive Security Policy: A New East Asian Environment', *Asian Survey* 31 (4): 324-340.
- Akbarzadeh, Shahram (1996), 'Why Did Nationalism Fail in Tajikistan?', *Europe-Asia Studies* 48 (7): 1105-1129.
- Akbarzadeh, Shahram (2004), 'Keeping Central Asia Stable', *Third World Quarterly*, 25 (4): 689-705.
- Alagappa, Muthiah (2003a), 'Preface', in Muthiah Alagappa (ed.), *Asian Security Order: Instrumental and Normative Features*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

- Alagappa, Muthiah (2003b), 'The Study of International Order: An Analytical Framework', in Muthiah Alagappa (ed.), *Asian Security Order: Instrumental and Normative Features*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Alagappa, Muthiah (2009), 'Nuclear Weapons Reinforce Security and Stability in 21st Century Asia', *Global Asia* 4 (1). http://www.globalasia.org/Back_Issues/Volume_4_Number_1_Spring_2009/Nuclear_Weapons_Reinforce_Security_and_Stability_in_21st_Century_Asia.html.
- Alagappa, Muthiah (ed.) (2008), *The Long Shadow: Nuclear Weapons and Security in 21st Century Asia*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Allison, Graham (2010), 'Nuclear Disorder: Surveying Atomic Threats', *Foreign Affairs* 89 (1): 74-85.
- Allison, Roy (2008), 'Virtual Regionalism, Regional Structures and Regime Security in Central Asia', *Central Asian Survey* 27 (2): 185-202.
- Annan, Kofi (2005), 'In Larger Freedom: Towards Development, Security and Human Rights for All', Report of the Secretary-General of the United Nations for decision by heads of state and government in September 2005. New York: United Nations. <http://www.un.org/largerfreedom/>.
- Arase, David (2007), 'Japan, the Active State? Security Policy after 9/11', *Asian Survey* 47 (4): 560-583.
- Arbatov, Alexei et al. (2010), *Strategic Stability after the Cold War*. Moscow: IMEMORAN.
- Archibold, Randal C. (2012), 'China's Cash Buys Inroads in Caribbean', *New York Times*, 8 April, A1.
- Aris, Stephen (2009a), 'A New Model of Asian Regionalism: Does the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation Have More Potential Than ASEAN?', *Cambridge Review of International Affairs* 22 (3): 451-467.
- Aris, Stephen (2009b), 'The Shanghai Cooperation Organisation: "Tackling the Three Evils": A Regional Response to Non-traditional Security Challenges or an Anti-Western Bloc?', *Europe-Asia Studies* 61 (3): 457-482.
- Arora, N. D. (1988), *Political Science for Civil Services Main Examination*, Noida: Tata McGraw-Hill Education.
- Arts, Bas, Math Noortmann and Bob Reinalda (eds) (2001), *Non-State Actors in International Relations*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- ASEAN Secretariat (1976), Treaty of Amity and Cooperation in Southeast Asia (Bali Declaration). Bali: ASEAN. <http://www.aseansec.org/TAC-KnowledgeKit.pdf>.
- Ashley, Richard K. (1989), 'Living on Border Lines: Man, Poststructuralism, and War', in James Der Derian & Michael J. Shapiro (eds), *International/Intertextual Relations: Postmodern Readings of World Politics*. New York: Lexington.
- Associated Press (2009), 'China, Japan, S. Korea to Consider Free Trade Pact', 10 October.
- Associated Press (2010), 'Japan Logs Fewer Babies, More Deaths in 2009', 2 January.
- Attali, Jacques (2009), *A Brief History of the Future*. New York: Arcade Publishing.
- Auelbayev, Bulat (2010), interview with Bulat Auelbayev, Head of Department of the Kazakhstan Institute of Strategic Studies under the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan, 2 September.
- Aviel, JoAnn F. (1999), 'The Growing Role of NGOs in ASEAN', *Asia-Pacific Review* 6 (2): 78-92.

- Aviel, JoAnn F. (2000), 'Placing Human Rights and Environmental Issues on ASEAN's Agenda: The Role of Non-governmental Organizations', *Asian Journal of Political Science* 8 (2): 17-34.
- Ba, A. (2009), *(Re)negotiating East and Southeast Asia: Region, Regionalism, and the Association of Southeast Asian Nations*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Babadjanov, Alisher (2008), *An Analysis of Military Doctrines of CSTO State-members*. Vestnik, MGIMO: Moscow.
- Back, Aaron & Andrew Browne (2010), 'Pragmatism Drove Beijing's Decision to Drop Peg', *WSJ*, 21 June 2010.
- Bailes, Alyson et al. (2007), 'The Shanghai Cooperation Organization', Policy Paper 17 (28). Stockholm: Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI).
- Ball, Desmond (2000), 'The Council for Security Cooperation in the Asia-Pacific (CSCAP): Its Record and Its Prospect', *Canberra Papers on Strategy and Defence no. 139*. Canberra: Australian National University.
- Ball, Desmond and Chong Guan Kwa (eds) (2010), *Assessing Track 2 Diplomacy in the Asia-Pacific Region: A CSCAP Reader*. Singapore/Canberra: S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies, & Strategic and Defense Studies Center, Australian National University.
- BBC (2009a), 'Burma Rejects EU, Asian Pressure', 25 May. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/asia-pacific/8066513.stm> (accessed 14 February 2010).
- BBC (2009b), 'Fresh Burma Aid Appeal Two Years on from Cyclone Nargis', 3 May. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/asia-pacific/8657624.stm> (accessed 4 May 2009).
- BBC (2011), 'BBC Country Rating Poll Reveals Positive Views of Brazil on the Rise in 2011', BBC World Service Country Rating Poll, 7 March. http://www.bbc.co.uk/pressoffice/pressreleases/stories/2011/03_march/07/brazil.shtml.
- Beijing Review* (2009), 'Hu: China Would Never Seek Hegemony', 23 April 2009. http://www.bjreview.com.cn/quotes/txt/2009-04/23/content_192517.htm. (accessed 17 October 2011).
- Bellamy, Alex J. & Sarah E. Davies (2009), 'The Responsibility to Protect in the Asia-Pacific Region', *Security Dialogue* 40 (6): 547-574.
- Berger, Thomas U. (2007a), 'The Politics of Memory in Japanese Foreign Relations', in Thomas U. Berger et al. (eds), *Japan in International Politics: The Foreign Policies of an Adaptive State*, 179-211. London: Lynne Rienner.
- Berger, Thomas U. (2007b), 'The Pragmatic Liberalism of an Adaptive State', in Thomas U. Berger et al. (eds), *Japan in International Politics: The Foreign Policies of an Adaptive State*. London: Lynne Rienner.
- Berman, Maureen R., & Joseph E. Johnson (1977), *Unofficial Diplomats*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Betts, Richard K. (1993-1994), 'Wealth, Power, and Instability: East Asia and the United States after the Cold War', *International Security* 18 (3): 34-77.
- Bhaskar, C. Uday (1999), 'Myanmar: Advancing India's Interests through Engagements', in Bramah Challeney (ed.), *Securing India's Future in the New Millennium*. New Delhi: Orient Longmans.
- Bhatty, Roj Sultan Khan (2008), 'Russia: The Traditional Hegemon in Central Asia', *Perceptions* 13 (Autumn). Istanbul: Centre for Strategic Research.

- Bitzinger, Richard A. (2009), 'A New Arms Race? The Political Economy of Maritime Military Modernisation in the Asia-Pacific', *Economics of Peace and Security Journal* 4(2): 32-37.
- Blainey, Geoffrey (1988), *The Causes of War*. New York: The Free Press
- Blank, Stephen (2007), 'U.S. Interest in Central Asia and Their Challenges', *Demokratizatsiya* 15 (3): 312-334.
- Bobokulov, Inomjon (2006), 'Central Asia: Is There an Alternative to Regional Integration?' *Central Asian Survey* 25 (1-2): 75-91.
- Bohr, Annette (2004), 'Regionalism in Central Asia: New Geopolitics, Old Regional Order', *International Affairs* 80 (3): 485-502.
- Boutros-Ghali, Boutros (1992), *An Agenda for Peace: Preventative Diplomacy, Peacekeeping and Peacemaking*. New York: United Nations. http://www.unrol.org/files/A_47_277.pdf.
- Boutros-Ghali, Boutros (1995), *In Larger Freedom*. New York: United Nations. <http://www.un.org/largerfreedom/>.
- Boutros-Ghali, Boutros (1996), *The United Nations and Rwanda, 1993-1996*. New York: United Nations.
- Burke, Edmund (1967), *Reflections on the Revolution in France*. London: Dent.
- Buruma, Ian (2004), *Inventing Japan, 1853-1964*. New York: Modern Library.
- Bush, George H.W. (1990), *Address Before a Joint Session of the Congress on the Persian Gulf Crisis and the Federal Budget Deficit, 1990-09-11*. George Bush Presidential Library and Museum. http://bushlibrary.tamu.edu/research/public_papers.php?id=2217&year=1990&month=9.
- Busygina, Irina & Mikhail Filippov (2010), 'European Union: From the Particular to the General', *Russia in Global Affairs*. http://www.globalaffairs.ru/number/n_14566. (In Russian)
- Butterfield, Herbert (1949), *Christianity and History*. London: G. Bell & Sons.
- Buzan, Barry (2000), 'The Logic of Regional Security in the Post-Cold War World', in Bjorn Hettne et al. (eds), *The New Regionalism and the Future of Security and Development*, 1-8. London: Macmillan.
- Buzan, Barry (2004), *From International to World Society?: English School Theory and the Social Structure of Globalisation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Buzan, Barry (2010), 'China in International Society: Is "Peaceful Rise" Possible?', *The Chinese Journal of International Politics* 3 (1): 5-36.
- Buzan, Barry & Gerald Segal (1998), 'Rethinking East Asian Security', in Michael T. Klare & Yogesh Chandrani (eds), *World Security: Challenges for a New Century*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Caballero-Anthony, Mely (2004), 'Re-visioning Human Security in Southeast Asia', Paper prepared for the 45th Annual International Studies Association Convention, Montreal, 17-20 March.
- Caballero-Anthony, Mely (2005), *Regional Security in Southeast Asia: Beyond the ASEAN Way*. Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies.
- Calder, Kent E. (1988), 'Japanese Foreign and Economic Policy Formation: Explaining the Reactive State', *World Politics* 40 (4): 517-541.
- Calder, Kent E. & Min Ye (2010), *The Making of Northeast Asia, Studies in Asian Security*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

- Callinicos, Alex (2001), *Against the Third Way: An Anti-capitalist Critique*. Cambridge: Polity Press; Malden: Blackwell Publishers.
- Campos, Joseph. H. (2007), *The State and Terrorism: National Security and the Mobilization of Power*. Hampshire: Ashgate.
- Capie, D. (2010), 'When Does Track Two Matter? Structure, Agency and Asian Regionalism', *Review of International Political Economy* 17 (2): 291-318.
- Carey, Christopher Peter (1997), *Burma: The Challenge of Change in a Divided Society*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Carnegie Endowment for International Peace (2009). Regions: China Mainland. <http://www.carnegieendowment.org/regions/?fa=viewRegions®ion=1000185> (accessed 19 January 2009).
- Carney, Christopher P. & John P. Moran (2000), 'Imagining Communities in Central Asia: Nationalism and Interstate Affect in the Post-Soviet Era', *Asian Affairs* 26 (4): 179-198.
- Case, William. (2002), *Politics in Southeast Asia: Democracy or Less*. Richmond, Surrey: Curzon.
- Centre for Strategic and International Studies (2001), *An ASEAN of the People, by the People, for the People: Report of the First ASEAN People's Assembly*, Batam, Indonesia, 24-26 November 2000. <http://www.aseansec.org/21069.pdf>. (accessed 11 August 2012).
- Cha, Victor D. (2003), 'Nuclear Weapons, Missile Defense, and Stability: A Case for Sober Optimism', in Muthiah Alagappa (ed.), *Asian Security Order: Instrumental and Normative Features*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Chanda, Nyan (2008), 'Globalization and International Politics in Asia', in David Shambaugh & Michael Yahuda (eds), *International Relations of Asia*. Plymouth: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Chea, V. (2010), interview by email with Veasna Chea, Assistant to Cabinet of H.E. Tea Banh, Cabinet of Deputy Prime Minister, Ministry of National Defense, 12 July.
- Checkel, Jeffrey T. (2005), 'International Institutions and Socialization in Europe: Introduction and Framework International Organization', *International Institutions and Socialization in Europe* 59 (4): 801-826.
- Choo, Jaewoo (2009), 'Ideas Matter: China's Peaceful Rise', *Asia Europe Journal* 7 (3): 389-404.
- Chosun Ilbo* (2010), 'S. Korea, China, Japan Put Brave Face on Cheonan Differences', 31 May. http://english.chosun.com/site/data/html_dir/2010/05/31/2010053100700.html. (accessed 11 August 2012).
- Christie, Kenneth & Denny Roy (2001), *The Politics of Human Rights in East Asia*. London: Pluto Press.
- CHS (2003), *Human Security Now: Protecting and Empowering People*. New York: Commission on Human Security.
- Chu, Shulong (2001), 'China, Asia and Issues of Sovereignty and Intervention', *Pugwash Occasional Papers* 2 (1). Pugwash: Nova Scotia. http://www.pugwash.org/reports/rc/como_china.htm.
- Chung, Chien-peng (2004), 'The Shanghai Co-operation Organization: China's Changing Influence in Central Asia', *The China Quarterly* 180: 989-1009.

- Chung, Chien-peng (2006), 'China and the Institutionalization of the SCO', *Problems of Post-Communism* 53 (5): 3-14.
- CIA (2011), 'Japan', *The World Factbook*. Central Intelligence Agency. <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/ja.html> (accessed 12 January 2011).
- Collins, Alan (1996), 'Security Dilemma', in Davis, M. Jane (ed.), *Security Issues in the Post-Cold War World*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Collins, Alan (2007), *Contemporary Security Studies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Collins, Kathleen (2003), 'The Political Role of Clans in Central Asia', *Comparative Politics* 35 (2): 171-190.
- Commission on Global Governance (1995), *Our Global Neighborhood*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Conrad, Sebastian (2003), 'Entangled Memories: Versions of the Past in Germany and Japan, 1945-2001', *Journal of Contemporary History* 38 (1): 85-99.
- Cook, Malcolm & Thomas S. Wilkins (2011), 'The Quiet Achiever: Australia-Japan Security Relations', *Analysis*, Lowy institute for International Policy. <http://www.lowyinstitute.org/>.
- Cossa, R. (1995), 'Asia Pacific Confidence and Security Building Measures', in Ralph A. Cossa (ed.), *Asia Pacific Confidence and Security Building Measures*, 1-18. Washington, DC: The Center for Strategic & International Studies.
- Cotton, James. (2002), 'ASEAN: A Constructivist or an Elite Community?', in James Cotton (ed.), *Crossing Borders in the Asia-Pacific: Essays on the Domestic-Foreign Policy Divide*, 29-42. New York: Nova Science.
- Cox, Robert W. (1999), 'Civil Society at the Turn of the Millennium: Prospects for an Alternative World Order', *Review of International Studies* 25: 3-28.
- CSCAP (2009a), 'CSCAP Study Group on the Responsibility to Protect. Co-Chair's Concept Paper' (also known as R2P Draft 2009), unpublished draft for discussion, 15 November.
- CSCAP (2009b), 'New Challenges to Asia-Pacific Security', published Conference Schedule by Council for Security Cooperation in the Asia Pacific 7th General Conference, Jakarta, 16-18 November.
- Curzon, Lord (1907), *Frontiers*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Da Cunha, Derek (1996), 'Preface', in Derek Da Cunha (ed.), *The Evolving Pacific Power Structure*. Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies.
- Daes, Erica-Irene A. (1990), *Freedom of the Individual under Law: An Analysis of Article 29 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights*. Geneva: United Nations Centre for Human Rights.
- Davidson, P.J. (2002), *ASEAN The Evolving Legal Framework for Economic Cooperation*. Singapore: Times Media Private Ltd.
- Declaration on the Establishment of the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (2001). The Regional Anti - Terrorist Structure of Shanghai Cooperation Organization (RATS SCO). Tashkent: RATS SCO. http://www.ecrats.com/en/normative_documents/2006.
- Der Derian, James (1987), *On Diplomacy: A Genealogy of Western Estrangement*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Desker, Barry (2003), 'The Role of Think-Tanks in East Asia', in Amitav Acharya & Lee Lai To (eds), *Asia and the New Millennium*, 248-254. Singapore: Marshall Cavendish.

- Deutsch, Karl Wolfgang et al. (1957), *Political Community and the North Atlantic Area*. New York: Greenwood.
- Devare, Sudhir (2006), *India & Southeast Asia: Towards Security Convergence*. Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies.
- Deyermond, Ruth (2009), 'Matrioshka Hegemony? Multi-levelled Hegemonic Competition and Security in Post-Soviet Central Asia', *Review of International Studies* 35:151-173.
- Dillon, Michael (1995), 'Sovereignty and Governmentality: From the Problematics of the "New World Order" to the Ethical Problematic of the World Order', *Alternatives* 20: 323-368.
- Diplomatic Conference of Geneva (1949), *Geneva Convention (IV) Relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War*. Geneva, 12 August. <http://www.icrc.org/ihl.nsf/full/380>.
- Dixit, J.N (1996), *My South Block Years: Memoirs of a Foreign Ministry*. New Delhi: UBSPD.
- Donini, Antonio (1995), 'The Bureaucracy and the Free Spirits: Stagnation and Innovation in the Relationship between the UN and NGOs', *Third World Quarterly* 16 (3): 280-298
- Doty, Roxanne Lynn (1996), 'Immigration and National Identity: Constructing the Nation', *Review of International Studies* 22 (3): 235-255.
- Dunne, Tim & Brian Schmidt (2008), 'Realism', in John Baylis et al. (eds), *The Globalisation of World Politics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dunne, Tim & Nicholas J. Wheeler (1999). 'Introduction: Human Rights and the Fifty Years' Crisis', in Tim Dunne & Nicholas J. Wheeler (eds), *Human Rights in Global Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dutta, Sanjay (2006), 'Gas Pipeline: Myanmar Taking India for a Ride', *The Times of India*, 26 March. <http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/articleshow/1465133.cms24>.
- Economic and Commercial Counsellor's Office (2009), 'China Becomes Largest Investor Nation in Myanmar', Embassy of the People's Republic of China in Myanmar, 20 July. <http://mm.mofcom.gov.cn/aarticle/jmxw/200907/20090706411299.html?4008931297=316931864>. (In Chinese)
- Economist, The* (2011), 'What Do You Do When You Reach the Top?', 12 November, 79-81.
- Economist, The* (2012), 'Special Report: State Capitalism', 10 July, 1-18.
- Economist Intelligence Unit (2003), *Country Report: Myanmar*, ed. Danny Richards. London: The Economist.
- Economy, Elizabeth C. (2008), 'Leadership Gap in China', *Washington Post*, 1 December 2008. <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2008/11/30/AR2008113001690.html>
- Economy, Elizabeth & Michel Oksenberg (1999), *China Joins the World: Progress and Prospects*. New York; Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Edwards, Michael & David Hulme (eds) (1995), *Non-governmental Organisations: Performance and Accountability beyond the Magic Bullet*. London: Earthscan.
- Embassy of the People's Republic of China in the Independent State of Papua New Guinea (2009), 'Foreign Ministry Spokesperson Jiang Yu's Regular Press Conference', 2 September. <http://pg.china-embassy.org/eng/fyrth/t581877.htm>.

- Eminent Persons Group (2007). 'Report of the Eminent Persons Group (EPG) on the Asean Charter', ASEAN. <http://www.aseansec.org/19247.pdf> (accessed 11 August 2012).
- Emmers, Ralf (2009), *Geopolitics and Maritime Territorial Disputes in East Asia*. London: Routledge
- Emmerson, D.K. (2005), 'Security, Community, and Democracy in Southeast Asia: Analyzing ASEAN', *Japanese Journal of Political Science* 6 (2): 165-185.
- Emmott, Bill (2008), *Rivals*. London: Penguin.
- Eurasia Daily Monitor* (2008), 'Can Nazarbayev Help Kyrgyzstan Escape Moscow's Pressure?' 5 (170), 5 September 2008. The Jamestown Foundation. http://www.jamestown.org/single/?no_cache=1&tx_ttnews%5Btt_news%5D=33919 (accessed 11 August 2012).
- Evans, Gareth (2008), 'Time for an Aid Invasion?', *The Age*, 19 May. <http://www.theage.com.au/news/opinion/time-for-an-aid-invasion/2008/05/18/1211049061508.html> (accessed 4 August 2012).
- Evans, Paul (1994), 'Building Security: The Council for Security Cooperation in the Asia Pacific (CSCAP)', *The Pacific Review* 7 (2): 125-139.
- Feffer, John (2010), 'North Korea: Why Engagement Now?', *Foreign Policy*, 12 August. <http://38north.org/2010/08/north-korea-why-engagement-now/> (accessed 12 August 2010).
- Feigenbaum, Evan A. (2010), 'Could It Escalate?', post in *Asia Unbound* blog, Council on Foreign Relations, 2 December. <http://blogs.cfr.org/asia/2010/12/02/could-it-escalate/> (accessed 25 July 2013).
- Feigenbaum, Evan A. & Robert A. Manning (2009), *The United States in the New Asia, Council Special Report No. 50*. New York: Council on Foreign Relations, International Institutions and Global Governance Program.
- Fifield, Russell Hunt (1979), 'ASEAN: Image and Reality', *Asian Survey* 19 (2): 1199-1208.
- Fingleton, Eamonn (2008), *In the Jaws of the Dragon: America's Fate in the Coming Era of Chinese Hegemony*. New York: Thomas Dunne Books/St. Martin's Press.
- Fravel, M. Taylor (2011), 'International Relations Theory and China's Rise: Assessing China's Potential for Territorial Expansion', *International Studies Review* 12 (4): 505-532.
- French, Howard W. (2007), 'Letter from China: Myanmar Crackdown Sheds Light on Beijing's Aspirations', *New York Times*, 28 September. <http://www.nytimes.com/2007/09/28/world/asia/28iht-letter.4.7672887.html?scp=28&sq=power%20and%20politics%20in%20myanmar&st=cse21>.
- Friedberg, Aaron L. (1993-1994), 'Ripe for Rivalry: Prospects for Peace in a Multipolar Asia', *International Security* 18 (3): 5-33.
- Friedberg, Aaron L. (2005), 'The Future of U.S.-China Relations', *International Security* 30 (2): 7-45.
- Friedman, Edward & Bruce Gilley (2005), *Asia's Giants: Comparing China and India*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Friedman, George (2009) 'Dr. George Friedman: Japan Destined for Comeback', Stratfor podcast. http://www.stratfor.com/podcast/20090219_dr_george_friedman_japan_destined_comeback.

- Friedman, George (2010), *The Next 100 Years: A Forecast for the 21st Century*. New York: Anchor Books.
- Friedman, George & Meredith LeBard (1991), *The Coming War with Japan*. New York: St. Martins.
- Frost, Ellen. L. (2008), *Asia's New Regionalism*. Singapore: NUS Press.
- Fukushima, Glen S. (2010), 'Reverse Japan's Insularity', *JPRI Critique* XVI (3). http://www.jpri.org/publications/critiques/critique_XVI_3.html (accessed 25 July 2013).
- Fukuyama, Francis (1989), 'The End of History?', *The National Interest* 16: 3-35.
- Fukuyama, Francis (1992), *The End of History and the Last Man*. London: Penguin Books.
- Fuller, Thomas (2009a), 'Ethnic Groups in Myanmar Hope for Peace, but Gird for Fight', *New York Times*, 10 May.
- Fuller, Thomas (2009b), 'Fleeing Battle, Myanmar Refugees Head to China', *New York Times*, 28 August. <http://www.nytimes.com/2009/08/29/world/asia/29myanmar.html>
- Fumagalli, Matteo (2007), 'Framing Ethnic Minority Mobilisation in Central Asia: The Cases of Uzbeks in Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan', *Europe-Asia Studies* 59 (4): 567-590.
- Galtung, Johan (1968), 'A Structural Theory of Integration', *Journal of Peace Research* 5 (4): 375-395.
- Garver, John C. (2001), *Protracted Contest: Sino-Indian Rivalry in the Twentieth Century*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- GCR2P (2009), 'GCR2P Summary on Statements on Adoption of Resolution RES A/63/L80 Rev.1', Global Centre for the Responsibility to Protect. http://globalr2p.org/media/pdf/GCR2P_Summary_of_Statements_on_Adoption_of_Resolution_on_R2P.pdf (accessed May 5, 2010).
- Gibney, Frank (1992), *The Pacific Century: America and Asia in a Changing World*. New York: Scribner's.
- Gibney, Frank B. (2000), 'Reinventing Japan ... Again', *Foreign Policy* 119 (Summer): 74-88.
- Gilley, Bruce (2004), *China's Democratic Future: How It Will Happen and Where It Will Lead*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Gilson, Julie (2007), 'Building Peace of Following the Leader? Japan's Peace Consolidation Diplomacy', *Pacific Affairs* 80 (1): 21-27.
- Global Center for the Responsibility to Protect (2009), GCR2P Summary on Statements on Adoption of Resolution RES A/63/L80 Rev.1 http://globalr2p.org/media/pdf/GCR2P_Summary_of_Statements_on_Adoption_of_Resolution_on_R2P.pdf (accessed May 5, 2010).
- Goh, Evelyn (2007), 'Developing the Mekong: Regionalism and Regional Security in China-Southeast Asia Relations', Adelphi Paper. London: International Institute for Strategic Studies.
- Goh, Evelyn (2007-2008), 'Great Powers and Hierarchical Order in Southeast Asia: Analyzing Regional Security Strategies', *International Security* 32 (3): 113-157.
- Goldstein, Avery (1997-1998), 'Great Expectations: Interpreting China's Arrival', *International Security* 22 (3): 36-73.

- Goldstein, Avery (2000), *Deterrence and Security in the 21st Century: China, Britain, France, and the Enduring Legacy of the Nuclear Revolution*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Goldstone, Jack (2010), 'The New Population Bomb: The Four Megatrends That Will Change the World', *Foreign Affairs* 89 (January/February): 31-43.
- Goodman, Ryan & Derek Jinks (2004), 'How to Influence States: Socialization and International Human Rights Law', *Duke Law Journal* 54 (3): 621-703.
- Gramsci, Antonio (1971), *Prison Notebooks*. London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Gray, Colin (2007), *War, Peace and International Relations: An Introduction to Strategic History*. London: Routledge.
- Green, Michael (2003), *Japan's Reluctant Realism*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gunaratna, Rohan (ed.) (2003), *Terrorism in the Asia-Pacific: Threat and Response*. Singapore: Eastern Universities Press.
- Haacke, Jürgen (2006), 'Myanmar's Foreign Policy: Domestic Influences and International Implications', Adelphi Paper. London: International Institute for Strategic Studies.
- Haas, Ernst Bernard (1958a), 'The Challenge of Regionalism', *International Organization* 12 (4): 440-448.
- Haas, Ernst Bernard (1958b), *The Uniting of Europe: Political, Social, and Economic Forces, 1950-1957*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Haas, Ernst Bernard (1961), 'International Integration: The European and the Universal Process', *International Organization* 15 (3): 366-392.
- Haas, Ernst Bernard (1976), 'Turbulent Fields and the Theory of Regional Integration', *International Organization* 30 (2): 173-212.
- Haas, Marcel & Frans-Paul van der Putten (eds) (2007), *The Shanghai Cooperation Organization: Towards a Full-grown Security Alliance?* Glingendael: Netherlands Institute of International Relations.
- Haas, Mark L. (2007), 'A Geriatric Peace? The Future of U.S. Power in a World of Aging Populations', *International Security* 32 (Summer): 112-147.
- Hackett, James (ed.) (2011), *The Military Balance, 2011*. London: Routledge.
- Hardt, Michael & A. Negri (2006), *Multitude: War and Democracy in the Age of Empire*. New York: Penguin Press.
- Harris, Stuart (2005), 'China's Regional Policies: How Much Hegemony?', *Australian Journal of International Affairs* 59 (4): 481-492.
- Hatch, Walter F. (2010), *Asia's Flying Geese: How Regionalization Shapes Japan*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- He, Yinan (2007), 'History, Chinese Nationalism and the Emerging Sino-Japanese Conflict', *Journal of Contemporary China* 16 (50): 1-24.
- Held, David et al. (1999), *Global Transformations: Politics, Economics and Culture*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Hernandez, Carolina G. (1994), *Track Two Diplomacy, Philippine Foreign Policy, and Regional Politics*. Diliman, Quezon City: University of the Philippines Center for Integrative and Development Studies and University of the Philippines Press.
- Hill, James.A. (2010), interview by email with Colonel James A. Hill, New Zealand Defense Attaché to Indonesia, Timor-Leste and the Philippines, New Zealand Embassy, Jakarta, 19 July.
- Hill, Monte (1976), 'Community Formation within ASEAN', *International Organization* 32 (2): 569-575.

- Hinsley, Francis.H. (1963), *Power and the Pursuit of Peace*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Holliday, Ian & Brendan Howe (2011), 'Human Security: A Global Responsibility to Protect and Provide', *Korean Journal of Defense Analysis* 23 (1): 73-92.
- Holmes, James (2007), *Testimony before the U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission, China's Energy Consumption and Opportunities for U.S.-China Cooperation, to Address the Effects of China's Energy Use*. http://www.uscc.gov/hearings/2007hearings/transcripts/june_14_15/holmes_prepared_remarks.pdf.
- Holslag, Jonathan (2010), *China and India: Prospects for Peace*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Hook, Glenn D. et al. (2005), *Japan's International Relations: Politics, Economics and Security*. London: Routledge.
- Howe, Brendan (2010), 'North Korea's Insecurity Dilemma', *North Korean Review* 6 (2): 57-75.
- Huang, Yasheng (2008), *Capitalism with Chinese Characteristics: Entrepreneurship and the State*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hughes, Christopher W. (2004), *Japan's Remilitarisation*. London: IISS.
- Hulme, David & Michael Edwards (eds) (2013), *NGOs, States and Donors: Too Close for Comfort?* London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Human Rights Watch (2006), 'India: Military Aid to Burma Fuels Abuses', 8 December. <http://www.hrw.org/en/news/2006/12/07/india-military-aid-burma-fuels-abuses> (accessed 11 August 2012).
- Human Security Research Group (2010). Human Security Report 2009/2010. <http://www.hsrgroup.org/human-security-reports/20092010/overview.aspx> (accessed 20 August 2013).
- Huntington, Samuel P. (1993), 'The Clash of Civilizations?', *Foreign Affairs* (Summer): 22-49.
- Huntington, Samuel P. (1996), *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*. New York: Touchstone.
- Hurrell, Andrew (1995), 'Regionalism in Theoretical Perspective', in L. Fawcett & A. Hurrell (eds), *World Politics: Regional Organization and International Order*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hurrell, Andrew (2007), *On Global Order: Power, Values, and the Constitution of International Society*. New York, Oxford University Press.
- Hveem, H. (2000), 'Explaining the Regional Phenomena in an Era of Globalization', in R. Stubbs & G.D. Underhill (eds), *Political Economy and the Changing Global Order*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hywe, Ko (2009), 'Chinese Authorities Seek Damages from Junta', *The Irrawaddy*, 1 October. http://www.irrawaddy.org/article.php?art_id=169072.
- Ienaga, Saburo (1978), *The Pacific War, 1931-1945*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- IISS (2011), *The Military Balance 2011*. London: International Institute for Strategic Studies.
- Ikenberry, G. John (2008), 'The Rise of China and the Future of the West: Can the Liberal System Survive?', *Foreign Affairs* 87 (1): 23-37.
- Indian Chamber of Commerce (2006), 'India-Myanmar Trade & Commerce: Challenges and Prospects', India Chamber of Commerce. <http://www.indianchamber.org/archives.aspx>

- Izvestiya* (2007), 'Leaders of the SCO Member-states Signed Eight Joint Documents', 16 August. <http://www.izvestia.ru/news/406583>. (In Russian)
- Jackson, Richard & Neil Howe (2008), *The Graying of the Great Powers: Demography and Geopolitics in the 21st Century. Major Findings of the Report*. Center for Strategic and International Studies. http://csis.org/files/media/csis/pubs/080630_gai_majorfindings.pdf (accessed 25 July 2013).
- Jacques, Martin (2009), *When China Rules the World: The End of the Western World and the Birth of a New Global Order*. New York: Penguin.
- Jagan, Larry (2009), 'China, Burma Bust up over Border Unrest', *The Irrawaddy*, 4 October. http://www.irrawaddy.org/article.php?art_id=169184.
- Japan Corporate News Network (2011), 'Japan-China Trade in 2010 Exceeds US\$300 Billion to Set New Record', 23 February. http://www.japancorp.net/Article.Asp?Art_ID=23711 (accessed 11 August 2012).
- Jayasuriya, Kanishka (1994), 'Singapore: The Politics of Regional Definition', *The Pacific Review* 7 (4): 411-420.
- Jervis, Robert (1992), 'Political Implications of Loss Aversion', *Prospect Theory and Political Psychology* 13 (2): 187-204.
- Joeseof, Daoud. (1977). 'Preface', *Southeast Asia and the World of Tomorrow*. Jakarta: Centre for Strategic and International Studies.
- Johnson, Chalmers (1982), *MITI and the Japanese Miracle*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Johnson, Chalmers (1984), *Japan: Who Governs? The Rise of the Developmental State*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.
- Johnson, Chalmers (2007), *Nemesis: The Last Days of the American Empire*. New York: Metropolitan Books.
- Joint Press Statement (1998).
- Jones, David Martin & Michael L.R. Smith (2001), 'Is There a Sovietology of South-East Asian Studies?' *International Affairs* 77 (4): 843-865.
- Jones, David Martin & Michael L.R. Smith (2002a), 'ASEAN's Imitation Community', *Orbis* 46 (1): 93-109.
- Jones, David Martin & Michael L.R. Smith (2002b), 'The Perils of Hyper-vigilance: The War on Terrorism and the Surveillance State in South-East Asia', *Intelligence and National Security* 17 (4): 31-54.
- Jones, David Martin & Michael L.R. Smith (2007), 'Making Process, Not Progress: ASEAN and the Evolving East Asian Regional Order', *International Security* 32 (1): 148-184.
- Junne, G. & W. Verkoren (2005), *Postconflict Development: Meeting New Challenges*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner.
- Kahneman, Daniel & Amos Tversky (1979), 'Prospect Theory: An Analysis of Decision under Risk', *Econometrica* 47 (2): 263-292.
- Kakuchi, Suvendrini (2010), 'Higher Pay no Deterrent in China', *Asia Times Online*, 30 July. <http://www.atimes.com/atimes/Japan/LG30Dh01.html>.
- Kaneda, Toshiko (2006), *China's Concern over Population Aging and Health*. Population Reference Bureau. <http://www.prb.org/Articles/2006/ChinasConcernOverPopulationAgingandHealth.aspx>.

- Kang, David C. (2010) *China Rising: Peace, Power and Order in East Asia*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Kaplan, David E. & Andrew Marshall (1996), *The Cult at the End of the World: The Incredible Story of Aum*. London: Hutchinson.
- Kapur, Ashok (2006), *India: From Regional to World Power*. London: Routledge.
- Karaganov, Sergei (2010), 'Global Zero and Common Sense', *Russia in Global Affairs*, 7 July. http://eng.globalaffairs.ru/number/Global_Zero_and_Common_Sense-14889.
- Kato, Norihiro (2010), 'Japan and the Ancient Art of Shrugging', *New York Times*, 21 August. http://www.nytimes.com/2010/08/22/opinion/22kato.html?_r=1.
- Katsumata, Hiro (2003), 'The Role of ASEAN Institutes of Strategic and International Studies in Developing Security Cooperation in the Asia-Pacific Region', *Asian Journal of Political Science* 11 (1): 93-111.
- Katsumata, Hiro (2006), 'Establishment of the ASEAN Regional Forum: Constructing a Talking Shop of a "Norm Brewery"?'', *The Pacific Review* 19 (2):181-198.
- Katsumata, Hiro & See Seng Tan (eds) (2007), *People's ASEAN and Governments' ASEAN*. Singapore: S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies.
- Katz, Daniel (1959), 'Consistent Reactive Participation of Group Members and the Reduction of Intergroup Conflict', *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 3 (1): 28-40.
- Katzenstein, Peter J. (1996), *The Culture of National Security: Norms and Identity in World Politics*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Katzenstein, Peter J. (2008), *Rethinking Japanese Security: Internal and External Dimensions*. London: Routledge.
- Kaufman, Victor S. (2001), 'Trouble in the Golden Triangle: The United States, Taiwan and the 93rd Nationalist Division', *China Quarterly* 166: 440-456.
- Kavalski, Emilian (2010), 'Shanghaied into Cooperation: Framing China's Socialization of Central Asia', *Journal of Asian and African Studies* 45 (2): 131-145.
- Kazakhstan News* (2010), 'One of the Priorities of the Kazakhstan Chairmanship at the SCO Will Be to Help Kyrgyzstan – Nazarbayev', 11 June. <http://www.newskaz.ru/politics/20100611/612218.html> (Kazakh).
- Keane, John (2012), 'Weibo and the Rise of Monitory Democracy', *Bangkok Post*, 18 February.
- Keens-Soper, Maurice (1973), 'The Liberal Disposition of Diplomacy', *International Relations* 5: 908-916.
- Kent, Ann (2002), 'China's International Socialization: The Role of International Organizations', *Global Governance* 8 (3): 343-364.
- Keohane, Robert O. & Joseph S. Nye (1997), 'Interdependence in World Politics', in George T. Crane & Alba Amawi (eds), *The Theoretical Evolution of International Political Economy: A Reader*, 122-132. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Khong, C.O. (1997), 'Asian Values: The Debate Revisited', in '*Asian Values' and Democracy in Asia*, proceedings of a Conference held on 28 March at Hamamatsu, Shizuoka, Japan. <http://www.unu.edu/unupress/asian-values.html#DEBATE>.
- Khoo, Nicholas (2004), 'Deconstructing the ASEAN Security Community: A Review Essay', *International Relations of the Asia-Pacific* 4: 35-46.
- King, Gary & Christopher Murray (2001), 'Rethinking Human Security', *Political Science Quarterly* 116 (4): 585-610.

- Kissinger, Henry (1957), *A World Restored: Castlereagh, Metternich, and the Problem of Peace*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Kissinger, Henry (1995), *Diplomacy*. New York: Touchstone.
- Kivimäki, Timo (2011), 'What Price Democracy? How the West Could Learn from East Asia', *Global Asia* 6 (4): 54-61.
- Koh, Tommy (2006), 'ASEAN Unity and Integration', talking points for the 16th ASEAN Banking Conference Plenary Session, 16 November. http://www.spp.nus.edu.sg/ips/docs/pub/sp_TommyKoh_Pointers-ASEAN%20Banking%20Conference_161106.pdf.
- Kraft, Herman J.S. (2000), 'Unofficial Diplomacy in Southeast Asia: The Role of ASEAN-ISIS', CANCEPS Paper no. 23. Toronto and Vancouver: Canadian Consortium on Asia-Pacific Security.
- Krauthammer, Charles (1991), 'The Unipolar Moment', *Foreign Affairs* 70 (1): 11-23.
- Kubicek, Paul (1997), 'Regionalism, Nationalism and Realpolitik in Central Asia', *Europe-Asia Studies* 49 (4): 637-655.
- Kubicek, Paul (1998), 'Authoritarianism in Central Asia: Curse or Cure?', *Third World Quarterly* 19 (1): 29-43.
- Laffey, Mark (2000), 'Locating Identity: Performativity, Foreign Policy and State Action', *Review of International Studies* 26: 429-244.
- Lam, Peng Er (2009), *Japan's Peace-Building Diplomacy in Asia: Seeking a More Active Political Role*. London: Routledge.
- Lam, Peng Er (2011), 'Japan in 2010: Foreign Relations Setbacks Impacting on Domestic Politics', *East Asian Policy* 3 (1): 37-44.
- Langford, John W. & K. Lorne Brownsey (eds) (1991), *Think Tanks and Governance in the Asia Pacific Region*. Halifax: The Institute for Research on Public Policy.
- Lankov, Andrei (2010), 'How to Stop the Next Korean War', *Foreign Policy*, 16 December. http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2010/12/16/how_to_stop_the_next_korean_war?page=full (accessed 16 December 2010).
- Laugen, Jens (2004). 'Annex 7: Drugs and Human Trafficking.' *Cumulative Impact Assessment and Nam Theum 2 Contributions*. Oslo: NORPLAND and EcoLao.
- Lavrov, Sergei (2006), 'The Rise of Asia, and the Eastern Vector of Russia's Foreign Policy', *Russia In Global Affairs* 4 (3): 68-80.
- Layne, Christopher (2006), *The Peace of Illusions: American Grand Strategy from 1940 to the Present*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Levy, Jack S. (1998), 'The Causes of War and the Conditions of Peace', *Annual Review of Political Science* 1 (June): 139-165.
- Li, Cheng (2008), *China's Changing Political Landscape: Prospects for Democracy*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Li, Mingjiang (2011), *Soft Power: China's Emerging Strategy in International Politics*. Lanham: Lexington Books.
- Liang, Chi-shad (1997), 'Burma's Relations with the People's Republic of China: From Delicate Friendship to Genuine Co-operation', in Peter Carey (ed.), *Burma: The Challenge of Change in a Divided Society*, 71-93. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Liew, Leong H. (1997), *The Chinese Economy in Transition: From Plan to Market*. Cheltenham: E. Elgar.

- Lijun, Sheng (1995), 'China's Foreign Policy under Status Discrepancy, Status Enhancement', *Contemporary Southeast Asia* 17 (2): 101-125.
- Little, Richard (1995), 'Neorealism and the English School: A Methodological, Ontological and Theoretical Reassessment', *European Journal of International Relations* 1: 9-34.
- Little, Richard (2007), *The Balance of Power in International Relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Liu, Jianfei (2011), *Democracy and China*. Beijing: New World Press.
- MacDonald, Juli A. et al. (2005), *Perspectives on China: A View from India*. Washington, DC: Allen Hamilton.
- Mahbubani, Kishore (1998), *Can Asians Think?* Singapore: Times Books International.
- Mahbubani, Kishore (2008), *The New Asian Hemisphere*. New York: Public Affairs.
- Malik, J. Mohan (1998), 'Burma's Role in Regional Security – Pawn or Pivot?', in Robert I. Rotberg (ed.), *Burma: Prospects for a Democratic Future*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Manila TOR (2010), 'Terms of Reference on Information Exchange', SEARSF 2010 Document of ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF) Inter-Sessional Support Group on Confidence Building Measures (ISG-CBM), Meeting of Heads of Defense Universities, Colleges and Institutions.
- Marat, Erica (2008), 'National Ideology and State-building in Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan', Silk Road Paper. Central Asia-Caucasus Institute & Silk Road Studies Program.
- Marketos, Thrassy N. (2009), *China's Energy Geopolitics: The Shanghai Cooperation Organization and Central Asia*. New York: Routledge.
- Marks, Gary (1997), 'A Third Lens: Comparing European Integration and State Building', in Jytte Klausen & Louise Tilly (eds), *European Integration in Social and Historical Perspective, 1850 to the Present*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Mastanduno, Michael (2003), 'Incomplete Hegemony: The United States and Security Order in Asia', in Muthiah Alagappa (ed.), *Asian Security Order: Instrumental and Normative Features*, 141-170. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Maul, Hanns W. (1994), 'Call Girls in the Old World: Of Multilateral Think Tanks, Dialogue Programs and Other Promiscuous Activities in and around Europe', in Paul M. Evans (ed.), *Studying Asia-Pacific Security: The Future of Research, Training, and Dialogue Activities*, 275-296. Toronto: Joint Centre for Asia Pacific Studies, University of Toronto and York University.
- Mearsheimer, John J. (2001), *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Mearsheimer, John J. (2005), 'Clash of the Titans. A Debate with Zbigniew Brzezinski on the Rise of China', *Foreign Policy* 146: 46-49.
- Mearsheimer, John J. (2006), 'China's Unpeaceful Rise', *Current History* (April):160-162.
- Medvedev, Dmitriy (2010), Remarks at the meeting on social and economic development of the Russian Far East, Russian Presidential Executive Office, 2 July. <http://kremlin.ru/transcripts/8234>. (In Russian)
- Meinecke, Friedrich (1957), *Machiavellianism: The Doctrine of Raison D'état and Its Place in Modern History*, trans. Douglas Scott. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

- Menon, Nivedita & Aditya Nigam (2007), *Power and Contestation: India since 1949*. Halifax & Winnipeg: Fernwood.
- Menon, Rajan (1995), 'In the Shadow of the Bear: Security in Post-Soviet Central Asia', *International Security* 20 (1):149-181.
- Menon, Rajan & Hendrik Spruyt (1999), 'The Limits of Neorealism: Understanding Security in Central Asia Author', *Review of International Studies* 25 (1): 87-105.
- Mény, Yves (1998), 'The People, the Elites and the Populist Challenge', Jean Monnet Chair Paper RSC No. 98/47. http://www.eui.eu/RSCAS/WP-Texts/JM98_47.html.
- Mercer, Jonathan (2005), 'Prospect Theory and Political Science', *Annual Review of Political Science* 8 (1): 1-21.
- Ministry of Defence of PRC (2010), 'Peace Mission 2010, SCO Anti-terrorism Joint Exercise'.
<http://eng.mod.gov.cn/SpecialReports/SCO%20Joint%20Military%20Exercises.htm> (accessed 11 August 2012).
- Ministry of Defense of Japan (2010), *National Defense Program Guidelines*. http://www.mod.go.jp/e/d_act/d_policy/national.html.
- Ministry of Economic Development and Trade (2010), *The Strategic Plan of Development of Republic of Kazakhstan until 2020*, decree signed by President of Kazakhstan Nazarbaye, 1 February. <http://www.minplan.kz/2020/> (accessed 11 August 2012). (In Russian)
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs of PRC (2008), 'Kyrgyzstan Proposes to Accept the Food Security Strategy of the Members of the SCO', People's Republic of China, 31 October. http://russian.china.org.cn/international/txt/2008-10/31/content_16693967.htm. (In Russian)
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan (2002), *ODA White Paper*. <http://www.mofa.go.jp/policy/oda/white/2002/index02.html>.
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan (2007), *Japan-Australia Joint Declaration on Security Cooperation*. <http://www.mofa.go.jp/region/asia-paci/australia/joint0703.html> (accessed 5 August 2012).
- Ministry of Defense of Japan (2008), *Defense of Japan*. http://www.mod.go.jp/e/publ/w_paper/2008.html (accessed 20 August 2013).
- Ministry of Defense (2010). *National Defense Program Guidelines*. http://www.mod.go.jp/e/publ/w_paper/2010.html (accessed 20 August 2013).
- Ministry of Information of Myanmar (2002), *Myanmar Facts and Figures*. Yangon: State Peace and Development Council.
- Moe, Wai (2009a), 'Chinese, Burmese Military Leaders Discuss Border Security', *The Irrawaddy*, 11 December. http://www.irrawaddy.org/highlight.php?art_id=1738414.
- Moe, Wai (2009b), 'Is China Two-timing the Generals?', *The Irrawaddy* 17 (6), September. http://www2.irrawaddy.org/article.php?art_id=16676 (accessed 25 July 2013).
- Mohan, C. Raja (2007), 'Balancing Interests and Values: India's Struggle with Democracy Promotion', *Washington Quarterly* 30 (3): 99-115.
- Moravcsik, Andrew (1993), 'Preferences and Power in the European Community: A Liberal Intergovernmentalist Approach', *Journal of Common Market Studies* 31 (4): 473-524.

- Moravcsik, Andrew (1997), 'Taking Preferences Seriously: A Liberal Theory of International Politics', *International Organization* 51 (4): 513-553.
- Morrison, Charles E. (2009-2010), 'Megatrends Will Shape Long-Term Future of Asia Pacific Region', *Observer & EWCA Update* (Fall/Winter). East-West Center.
- Morris-Suzuki, Tessa (1998), *Reinventing Japan: Time, Space, Nation*. New York: M.E. Sharp.
- Mosher, Steven W. (2000), *Hegemon: China's Plan to Dominate Asia and the World*. San Francisco: Encounter Books.
- Mulgan, Aurelia George (1993), 'Japan's Participation in UN Peacekeeping Operations: Radical Departure or Predictable Response?', *Asian Survey* 33 (6): 560-575.
- Mulgan, Aurelia George (2009), 'Hatoyama's East Asia Community and Regional Leadership Rivalries', *East Asia Forum*.
<http://www.eastasiaforum.org/2009/10/13/hatoyamas-east-asia-community/>
- Muni, S. D. (2002), *China's Strategic Engagement with the New ASEAN: An Exploratory Study of China's Post-Cold War Political, Strategic and Economic Relations with Myanmar, Laos, Cambodia and Vietnam*. Singapore: Institute of Defence and Strategic Studies.
- Mydans, Seth (2007), 'More Than Just a Fighting Force, Myanmar's Military Is the Nation's Driving Force', *New York Times*, 7 October.
<http://www.nytimes.com/2007/10/07/world/asia/07junta.html?scp=17&sq=power%20and%20politics%20in%20myanmar&st=cse>
- Naing, Saw Yan (2009), 'China's Dilemma: Junta Oil and Wa Refugees?', *The Irrawaddy*, 30 September 2009.
http://www2.irrawaddy.org/article.php?art_id=16893.
- Natsios, Andrew S. (2004), 'Foreign Assistance in the Age of Terror', remarks by Andrew S. Natsios, Administrator, United States Agency for International Development, 21 April.
<http://www.usaid.gov/press/speeches/2004/sp040421.html>.
- Nau, Henry R. (2002), *At Home Abroad: Identity and Power in American Foreign Policy*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Nesadurai, Helen E. S. (2003), *Globalisation, Domestic Politics and Regionalism: The ASEAN Free Trade Area*. London: Routledge.
- New York Times* (2007a), 'Chinese Diplomats Criticize Myanmar's New Capital', 23 May.
- New York Times* (2007b), 'India's Identity Crisis in Myanmar', 15 October.
<http://www.nytimes.com/2007/10/15/opinion/15iht-edindia.1.7893453.html>
(accessed 11 August 2012).
- Nicolson, Harold (1969), *Diplomacy* (3rd ed.). London: Oxford University.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich (1956), *The Genealogy of Morals*. New York: Doubleday Anchor.
- Noortmann, J.M.P.H. (2006), 'The Role of Civil Society in International Institutional Reform: Decreasing the Private by Increasing the Private', in A.A. Fijalkowski (ed.), *International Institutional Reform*, 320-328. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Noortmann, Math (2003), 'Who Really Needs Article 71? A Critical Approach to the Relationship between NGOs and the UN', in Wybo Heere (ed.), *From Government to Governance: The Growing Impact of Non-state Actors on the International and European Legal System*, 320-328. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.

- NORPLAN & EcoLao (2004), 'Cumulative Impact Analysis and Nam Theun 2 Contributions'. http://www-wds.worldbank.org/external/default/WDSContentServer/WDSP/IB/2005/09/15/000011823_20050915115516/Rendered/PDF/E385v120Cumul1t0Analysis11Dec02004010.pdf.
- Nourzhanov, Kirill (2009), 'Changing Security Threat Perceptions in Central Asia', *Australian Journal of International Affairs* 63 (1): 85-104.
- Nye, Joseph S. (2004), *Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics*. New York: Public Affairs.
- Okhujonov (2009).
- Olsen, Edward A. (2004), 'Homeland Security: Learning from Japan', *Independent Institute* 18 November. http://www.independent.org/publications/policy_reports/detail.asp?type=full&id=17.
- O'Neill, Barry (2001), *Honor, Symbols and War*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Oros, Andrew (2008), *Normalizing Japan: Politics, Identity and the Evolution of Security Practice*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Page, Benjamin & Tao Xie (2010), *Living with the Dragon: How the American Public Views the Rise of China*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Panikkar, K.M. (1944), *The Future of South East Asia*. New York: Macmillan.
- Paul, T.V. (2009), 'Complex Deterrence: An Introduction', in T.V. Paul, Patrick M. Morgan & James J. Wirtz (eds), *Complex Deterrence: Strategy in the Global Age*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Pei, Minxin (2012), 'Capitalist Gains of a Hardline Regime', *Bangkok Post*, 22 February.
- People's Daily Online* (2010a), 'China Dismisses Intent for Hegemonic Role in World Affairs', 9 February. <http://english.peopledaily.com.cn/90001/90776/90883/6892051.html> (accessed 17 October 2011).
- People's Daily Online* (2010b), 'China, Japan, S. Korea Agree to Further Strengthen Trilateral Cooperation', 16 May. <http://english.people.com.cn/90001/90776/90883/6986586.html#> (accessed 20 May 2010).
- Perkovich, George (2001), *India's Nuclear Bomb: The Impact on Global Proliferation*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Perlez, Jane (2006a), 'Myanmar Is Left in Dark, an Energy-Rich Orphan', *New York Times*, 17 November. <http://www.nytimes.com/2006/11/17/world/asia/17myanmar.html?scp=68&sq=power%20and%20politics%20in%20myanmar&st=cse21>.
- Perlez, Jane (2006b), 'Power and Politics in Myanmar – Asia – Pacific – International Herald Tribune', *New York Times*, 16 November. <http://www.nytimes.com/2006/11/16/world/asia/16iht-myanmar.3561993.html?pagewanted=2&sq=power%20and%20politics%20in%20myanmar&st=cse&scp=321>.
- Petras, James & Henry Veltmeyer (2001), *Globalization Unmasked*. London: Zed Books.

- Pitsuwan, Surin (2008), keynote address by ASEAN Secretary-General Dr Surin Pitsuwan at the launch of the RSIS Centre for Non-Traditional Security (NTS) Studies, Traders Hotel, Singapore, 6 May. http://www.rsis.edu.sg/NTS/Events/Launch/keynote_address_by_Surin_Pitsuwan_-transcript.pdf.
- Putnam, Robert D. (1988), 'Diplomacy and Domestic Politics: The Logic of Two-Level Games', *International Organization* 42 (3): 427-460.
- Pyle, Kenneth B. (2007a), *Japan Rising*. New York: Public Affairs.
- Pyle, Kenneth B. (2007b), 'Reading the New Era in Asia: The Use of History and Culture in the Making of Foreign Policy', *Asia Policy* 3 (January): 1-11.
- Radtke, Kurt W. & Raymond Feddema (2000), *Comprehensive Security in Asia: Views from Asia and the West on a Changing Security Environment*. Boston: Brill.
- Rajaretnam, M. (1996), interview with M. Rajaretnam of the Singapore-based Information Resource Centre, July.
- Ramakrishna, Kumar & See Seng Tan (eds) (2003), *After Bali: The Threat of Terrorism in Southeast Asia*. Singapore and London: World Scientific and the Institute of Defence and Strategic Studies.
- Rashid, Ahmed (2000-2001), 'The New Struggle in Central Asia: A Primer for the Baffled', *World Policy Journal* 17 (4): 33-45.
- Rashid, Rehman (2001), 'Agenda Malaysia: The ASEAN People's Assembly', *Report of the First ASEAN People's Assembly*, 237-240. Jakarta: Centre for Strategic and International Studies.
- Redfield, R., R. Linton, and M.J. Herskovits (1936), 'Memorandum for the Study of Acculturation', *American Anthropologist* 38: 149-152.
- Register of ASEAN-Affiliated CSOs (2009).
- Reiko, Kosugi (2006), 'Youth Employment in Japan's Economic Recovery: "Freeters" and "NEETs"', *Japan Focus*, 11 May. http://www.japanfocus.org/-Kosugi_Reiko/2022.
- Reinalda, Bob (2001), 'Private in Form, Public in Purpose: NGOs in International Relations Theory', in Bas Arts, Math Noortmann and Bob Reinalda (eds), *Non-State Actors in International Relations*, Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Richardson, Lewis F. (1960), *Statistics of Deadly Quarrels*. Pittsburgh: Boxwood Press.
- Rieker, Pernille (2006), *Europeanization of National Security Identity: The EU and the Changing Security Identities of the Nordic States*. London: Routledge.
- Rix, Alan (1987), *Japan's Aid Programs: Quantity vs. Quality*. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.
- Roy, Denny (1994), 'Hegemon on the Horizon? China's Threat to East Asian Security', *International Security* 19 (1):149-168.
- RSIS-NTS (2010), 'Regional Consultation on the Responsibility to Protect', Singapore: RSIS-NTS. http://www.rsis.edu.sg/publications/conference_reports/RtoP_240810.pdf (accessed 24 April 2011).
- Russett, Bruce (1994), *Grasping the Democratic Peace*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Sagan, Scott & Kenneth Waltz (1995), *The Spread of Nuclear Weapons: A Debate*. New York: Norton.

- Sajjadpour, Seyed Kazem (1994), 'Iran, the Caucasus and Central Asia', in Ali Vanauzizia and Myron Weiner (eds), *The New Geopolitics of Central Asia*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Sakamaki, Sachiko & Yuriy Humber (2011), 'Kan Pledges to Open up Japan, Seek Freer Trade with EU, Asia', *Bloomberg*, 29 January. <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2011-01-29/kan-pledges-to-open-up-japan-seek-freer-trade-with-eu-asia.html>.
- Samuels, Richard J. (2007a), *Securing Japan*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2007.
- Samuels, Richard J. (2007b), 'Securing Japan: The Current Discourse', *The Journal of Japanese Studies* 33 (1): 125-152.
- Sato, Yoichiro & Masahiko Asano (2008), 'Humanitarian and Democratic Norms in Japan's ODA Distributions', in Yoichiro Sato & Keiko Hirata (eds), *Norms, Interests, and Power in Japanese Foreign Policy*, 111-128. New York: Palgrave.
- Satow, Ernest (1957), *A Guide to Diplomatic Practice* (4th ed.), London: Longmans.
- Schelling, Thomas (1960), *The Strategy of Conflict*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Schmitt, Eric (2008), 'Gates Accuses Myanmar of "Criminal Neglect"', *New York Times*, 2 June.
- Schuman, Michael (2010), 'A Clouded Outlook', *Time*, 2 August.
- SCO (2001), 'Declaration on the Establishment of Shanghai Cooperation Organisation, Shanghai', Shanghai Cooperation Organisation website. <http://www.sectsco.org/>.
- SCO (2002), 'Brief Introduction to the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation', Shanghai Cooperation Organisation website. <http://www.sectsco.org/EN/brief.asp> (accessed 5 May 2010).
- SCO (2010a), 'Charter of the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation', Shanghai Cooperation Organisation website, <http://www.sectsco.org/EN/show.asp?id=69> (accessed 6 April 2010).
- SCO (2010b), 'Chronicle of Main Events at SCO in 2010', Shanghai Cooperation Organisation website, <http://www.sectsco.org/EN/show.asp?id=255> (accessed 6 April 2011).
- SEARSF American Paper (2010), 'Assessing Military Transparency', Southeast Asia Regional Security Forum 2010, 27-30 June, Diamond Ballroom, Diamond Hotel, Manila, Philippines.
- SEARSF Australian Paper (2010), 'Northeast Asia in the Context of Southeast Asian Security', Southeast Asia Regional Security Forum 2010, 27-30 June, Diamond Ballroom, Diamond Hotel, Manila, Philippines.
- SEARSF Chinese Paper (2010), 'Significance of ASEAN to Regional Cooperation', Southeast Asia Regional Security Forum 2010, 27-30 June, Diamond Ballroom, Diamond Hotel, Manila, Philippines.
- SEARSF New Zealand Paper (2010), 'ASEAN Significance to Regional Cooperation', Southeast Asia Regional Security Forum 2010, 27-30 June, Diamond Ballroom, Diamond Hotel, Manila, Philippines.
- SEARSF Program (2010), Southeast Asia Regional Security Forum 2010, 27-30 June, Diamond Ballroom, Diamond Hotel, Manila, Philippines.
- SEARSF Vietnamese Paper (2010), 'Speech by the Commandant of NDA Vietnam in Southeast Asia Regional Security Forum', Southeast Asia Regional Security

- Forum 2010, 27-30 June, Diamond Ballroom, Diamond Hotel, Manila, Philippines.
- SEARSF Wrap-up (2010), Southeast Asia Regional Security Forum 2010, 27-30 June, Diamond Ballroom, Diamond Hotel, Manila, Philippines.
- Selth, Andrew (2008), 'Even Paranooids Have Enemies: Cyclone Nargis and Myanmar's Fears of Invasion', *Contemporary Southeast Asia* 30 (3): 379-402.
- Seth, Sushil (2011), 'China Hegemony to Face Resistance', *Taipei Times*, 29 August.
- Sevastyanov, Sergey (2008), *Intergovernmental Organizations of East Asia*. Vladivostok: Dalnauka. (In Russian)
- Severino, Rodolfo (2006), *Southeast Asia in Search of an ASEAN Community: Insights from the Former ASEAN Secretary-General*. Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, Katsumata.
- Shambaugh, David (2006), 'Asia in Transition: The Evolving Regional Order', *Current History* (April):153-159.
- Shambaugh, David (2008), 'International Relations in Asia: The Two-Level Game', in David Shambaugh & Michael Yahuda (eds), *International Relations of Asia*. Plymouth: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Shambaugh, David (ed.) (2005), *Power Shift: China and Asia's New Dynamics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Sharpe, S. (2003), 'An ASEAN Way to Security Cooperation in Southeast Asia?', *The Pacific Review* 16 (2): 231-250.
- Sheives, Kevin (2006), 'China Turns West: Beijing's Contemporary Strategy towards Central Asia', *Pacific Affairs* 79 (2): 205-224.
- Shim, Sang-Hyung (2011), 'What Drives China's Rise to "Great Power"', *POSRI Chindia Quarterly* 3 (Summer):13-18.
- Shimoyachi, Nao (2004), 'Chinese Submarine Intrusion Considered an Act of Provocation', *Japan Times*, 13 November.
- Shulong, Chu (2001), 'China, Asia and Issues of Sovereignty and Intervention', *Pugwash Online*, January. http://www.pugwash.org/reports/rc/como_china.htm (accessed 25 July 2013). <http://search.japantimes.co.jp/member/member.html?nn20041113a4.htm>.
- Sieff, Martin (2010), *Shifting Superpowers: The New and Emerging Relationships between the United States, China and India*. Washington, DC: CATO Institute Press.
- Simon, Sheldon W. (2002), 'Evaluating Track II Approaches to Security Diplomacy in the Asia-Pacific: The CSCAP Experience', *The Pacific Review* 15 (2): 167-200.
- Singh, Bilveer (2007), *The Talibanization of Southeast Asia: Losing the War on Terror to Islamist Extremists*. Westport: Praeger Security International.
- Sinha, Rakesh (2001), 'World's Biggest Democracy Gives a Valentine's Day Gift to Myanmar', *Indian Express*, 15 February.
- Smith, Dianne L. (1996), 'Central Asia: A New Great Game?', *Asian Affairs* 23 (3): 147-175.
- Smith, Sheila A. (2010), 'Kan's Kiheitai-Japan's Militia', post in *Asia Unbound* blog, Council on Foreign Relations, 10 June. <http://blogs.cfr.org/asia/2010/06/10/prime-minister-naoto-kan%E2%80%99s-militia/>
- Soesastro, H., C. Joewono, & C.G. Hernandez (2006), 'Introduction', in H. Soesastro, C. Joewono & C. G. Hernandez (eds), *Twenty-Two Years of ASEAN ISIS*:

- Origin, Evolution, and Challenges of Track Two Diplomacy*, 1-16. Jakarta: CSIS Publications.
- Soeya, Yoshihide (2005), 'Japanese Security Policy in Transition: The Rise of International and Human Security', *Asia Pacific Review* 12(1):103-116.
- Soeya, Yoshihide (2010), 'An East Asian Community and Japan-China Relations'. *AIJSS-Commentary* 89 (30 April), The Association of Japanese Institutes of Strategic Studies. http://www.jiia.or.jp/en_commentary/201004/30-1.html.
- Soeya, Yoshihide et al. (eds) (2011), *Japan as a Normal Country? A Nation in Search of Its Place in the World*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Soguk, Nevzat (1993), 'Reflections on the "Orientalized Orientals"', *Alternatives* 18 (3): 361-384.
- Sohn, Yul (2010), 'The Post-Crisis Economic Change and the Future of Regionalism in East Asia', paper presented at the conference 'East Asia in the Multi-Polar World' at Far Eastern National University, Vladivostok, 9-10 September.
- Sovasteev, Vitaliy (2009). *Japan's Geopolitics: From the Ancient Times to the Present*. Vladivostok: Far Eastern University Press. (In Russian)
- Steinberg, David I. (1990), *The Future of Burma: Crisis and Choice in Myanmar*. Lanham: University Press of America.
- Steinberg, David I. (2001), *Burma: The State of Myanmar*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Stobdan, P. (1998), 'Central Asia in Geo-political Transition', *Strategic Analysis* 22 (1): 95-118.
- Stobdan, P. (2008), 'Shanghai Cooperation Organisation: Challenges to China's Leadership', *Strategic Analysis* 32 (4): 527-547.
- Storey, Ian J. (2009a), 'China a Major Player in S-E Asia Pipeline Politics', *Straits Times*, 23 September.
- Storey, Ian J. (2009b), 'Sino-Myanmar Ties: Border Conflicts a Test of Beijing's Influence', *Viewpoints*. Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies. <http://www.iseas.edu.sg/viewpoint/is3sep09>.
- Sun, Yatsen (1953), *San Min Chu I*, trans. Frank W. Price. Taipei: China Cultural Service.
- Suryodiningrat, Meidyatama (2000), 'Will RI Commit ASEAN's Sin?' *The Jakarta Post*, 26 July.
- Sutter, Robert G. (2012), *Chinese Foreign Relations: Power and Policy since the Cold War*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Swanström, Niklas (2005), 'China and Central Asia: A New Great Game or Traditional Vassal Relations?', *Journal of Contemporary China* 14 (45): 569-584.
- Taipei Times* (2010), 'Japan Suspects Chinese Cyber Attacks', 19 September. <http://www.taipeitimes.com/News/world/archives/2010/09/19/2003483219>. (accessed 11 August 2012).
- Tajin, M.M. (2000), *National Security of Kazakhstan: New Understanding, New Approaches*. Almaty: Analitika.
- Takahashi, Sugio (2008), 'Transformation of Japan's Defence Industry? Assessing the Impact of the Revolution in Military Affairs', *Security Challenges* 4 (4): 101-115.
- Takao, Yasuo (2008a), *Is Japan Really Remilitarising? The Politics of Norm Formation and Change*. Clayton: Monash University Press.

- Takao, Yasuo (2008b), *Reinventing Japan: From Merchant Nation to Civic Nation*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Tan, Andrew T.H., and J.D. Ken Boutin (eds) (2001), *Non-Traditional Security Issues in Southeast Asia*. Singapore: Select Publishing for Institute of Defence and Strategic Studies.
- Tan, Andrew T.H., and Kumar Ramakrishna (eds) (2002), *The New Terrorism: Anatomy, Trends and Counter-Strategies*. Singapore: Eastern Universities Press.
- Tan, See Seng (2005), 'Non-official Diplomacy in Southeast Asia: "Civil Society" or "Civil Service"?'', *Contemporary Southeast Asia* 27 (3): 370-387.
- Tan, See Seng (2007), *The Role of Knowledge Communities in Constructing Asia-Pacific Security: How Thought and Talk Make War and Peace*. Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press.
- Tan, See Seng & Kumar Ramakrishna (2004), 'Interstate and Intrastate Dynamics in Southeast Asia's War on Terror', *The SAIS Review of International Affairs* 24 (2): 91-105.
- Tanter, Richard (2009), 'About Face: Japan's Remilitarisation'. Melbourne: Nautilus Institute at RMIT.
- Terada, T. (2003), 'Constructing an "East Asian" Concept and Growing Regional Identity: From EAEC to ASEAN+3', *The Pacific Review* 16 (2): 251-277.
- Thaler, Richard (1980), 'Toward a Positive Theory of Consumer Choice', *Journal of Economic Behaviour and Organization* 1 (1): 39-60.
- Than, Tin Maung Maung (2003), 'Myanmar and China: A Special Relationship?', in Daljit Singh & Chin Kin Wah (eds), *Southeast Asian Affairs 2003*. Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies.
- Than Han, Daw (1988), 'Common Vision: Burma's Regional Outlook'. Washington, DC: Institute for the Study of Diplomacy, Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service, Georgetown University.
- Thornton, John L. (2008), 'Long Time Coming: The Prospects for Democracy in China', *Foreign Affairs* (January/February).
- Tsunoda, Tomoko & Brad Glosserman (2009), 'The Guillotine: Japan's Demographic Transformation and Its Security Implications', *Pacific Forum CSIS: Issues and Insights* 9 (10). <http://csis.org/publication/issues-insights-vol-09-no-10>.
- Tuchman, Barbara W. (1972), 'If Mao Had Come to Washington: An Essay in Alternatives', *Foreign Affairs* 51 (October): 44-64.
- Tucker, Richard (1981), *The Purposes of American Power: An Essay on National Security*. New York: Praeger.
- Twitchett, Denis & Frederick W. Mote (eds) (1998), *The Cambridge History of China: The Ming Dynasty (1368-1644). Vol. 8, part 2*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division (2009), 'World Population Prospects: The 2008 Revision'. http://www.un.org/esa/population/publications/wpp2008/wpp2008_highlights.pdf.
- UNDP (1994), *Human Development Report*. United Nations Development Programme. New York: Oxford University Press.
- UNDP-GOL (2006), 'International Trade and Human Development', in *The Third Lao PDR National Human Development Report*. United Nations Development Programme-Government of Laos.

- <http://www.undplao.org/whatwedo/bgresource/humandev/UNDP-NHDR06c.pdf>.
- UNESCO (2012), 'Introducing UNESCO: What We Are'. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation. <http://www.unesco.org/new/en/unesco/about-us/who-we-are/introducing-unesco/>.
- UN General Assembly (2005), '2005 World Summit Outcome', Draft resolution referred to the High-level Plenary Meeting of the General Assembly by the General Assembly at its 59th session. http://www.responsibilitytoprotect.org/files/2005_World_Summit_Outcome_Document.pdf (accessed 3 May 2010).
- UN Security Council (2006), 'Security Council Resolution 1674 [on Protection of Civilians in Armed Conflict]' <http://www.unhcr.org/refworld/docid/4459bed60.html>.
- UN World Conference on Human Rights (1993), 'Final Declaration of the Regional Meeting for Asia of the World Conference on Human Rights (Bangkok Declaration)'. http://law.hku.hk/lawgovtsociety/Bangkok_Declaration.htm (accessed 3 May 2010.)
- US-China Economic and Security Review Commission (2007), *China's Energy Consumption and Opportunities for U.S.-China Cooperation to Address the Effects of China's Energy Use*, 14 June. http://www.uscc.gov/pressreleases/2007/agenda/07_06_14_15agenda.php (accessed 11 August 2012).
- US Embassy (2010), 'US Embassy Cables: China Losing Patience with Burma', *Guardian.com*, 9 December. <http://www.theguardian.com/world/us-embassy-cables-documents/137835?guni=Article:in%20body%20link> (accessed 25 July 2013).
- Usubaliev, Ednan (2009), 'The "China Factor" in the Foreign Policy of Kyrgyzstan: The Bilateral and Regional Levels'. Central Asia Informational Portal. <http://www.centrasia.ru/newsA.php?st=1236599880>. (In Russian)
- Wæver, Ole (1995), 'Securitization and Desecuritization', in Ronnie Lipschutz (ed.), *On Security*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Walker, R.B.J. (1992), 'Gender and Critique in the Theory of International Relations', in V. Spike Peterson (ed.), *Gendered States*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel M. (1974), *The Modern World-system: Studies in Social Discontinuity*. New York: Academic Press.
- Waltz, Kenneth (2008a), 'A Reply (to Critics of Sagan and Waltz)', in Kenneth Waltz (ed.), *Realism and International Politics*. New York: Routledge.
- Waltz, Kenneth (2008b), 'Nuclear Myths and Political Realities', in Kenneth Waltz (ed.), *Realism and International Politics*. New York: Routledge.
- Walzer, Michael (1983), *Spheres of Justice: A Defence of Pluralism & Equality*. New York: Basic Books.
- Walzer, Michael (1985), 'The Moral Standing of States: A Response to Four Critics', in Charles Beitz et al. (eds), *International Ethics*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Wanandi, J. (2006a), 'In Memoriam: Noordin Sopiee – An ASEAN Thinker, a Founder of ASEAN ISIS, and a Great Friend', in H. Soesastro, C. Joewono & C.G. Hernandez (eds), *Twenty-Two Years of ASEAN ISIS: Origin, Evolution, and Challenges of Track Two Diplomacy*, ix-xi. Jakarta: CSIS Publications.

- Wanandi, J. (2006b), 'ASEAN ISIS and Its Regional and International Networking', in H. Soesastro, C. Joewono & C.G. Hernandez (eds), *Twenty-Two Years of ASEAN ISIS: Origin, Evolution, and Challenges of Track Two Diplomacy*, 31-42. Jakarta: CSIS Publications.
- Wardell, Simon (2006), 'Chinese Government Reportedly Approves Myanmar-China Crude Pipeline Plans', *HIS Global Insight*. 17 April.
- Wassener, Bettina & Matthew Saltmarsh (2011), 'China Urges U.S. to be Responsible on Debt', *New York Times*, 14 July, B6.
- Watanabe, Yashushi & David McConnell (eds) (2008), *Soft Power Superpowers: Cultural and National Assets of Japan and the United States*. London: M. E. Sharpe.
- Weatherbee, Donald E. (2005), *International Relations in Southeast Asia: The Struggle for Autonomy*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Weiss, Stanley A. (2007), 'Myanmar's Neighbours Hold the Key', *New York Times*, 7 March. <http://www.nytimes.com/2007/03/07/opinion/07iht-edweiss.4828056.html?scp=63&sq=power%20and%20politics%20in%20myanmar&st=cse21>
- Wendt, Alexander (1999), *Social Theory of International Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wesley, Michael (2011), *There Goes the Neighbourhood: Australia and the Rise of Asia*. Sydney: Lowy Institute.
- White, B. (2006), 'Diplomacy', in J. Baylis & S. Smith (eds), *The Globalisation of World Politics* (3rd ed.), 387-403. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Whitlock, Craig (2012), 'U.S. Eyes Return to Some Southeast Asia Military Bases', *The Washington Post*, 23 June. http://www.washingtonpost.com/world/national-security/us-seeks-return-to-se-asian-bases/2012/06/22/gJQAKP83vV_story.html?hpid=z2.
- WHO (2002), *World Report on Violence and Health*. Geneva: World Health Organization.
- Wight, M. (1966), 'Western Values in International Relations', in H. Butterfield & M. Wight (eds), *Diplomatic Investigations: Essays in the Theory of International Relations*, 89-131. London: Allen & Unwin.
- Wilkins, Thomas S. (2011), 'Japanese Alliance Diversification: A Comparative Analysis of the Indian and Australian Strategic Partnerships', *International Relations of the Asia-Pacific* 11 (1): 115-155.
- Wines, Michael (2011), 'Wary Rivals, U.S. and China Try to Reach Truce on Military Strategy', *New York Times*, 14 July, A8.
- Wolfers, Arnold (1952), "'National Security" as an Ambiguous Symbol', *Political Science Quarterly* 67 (4): 481-502.
- Wolfers, Arnold (1962), *Discord and Collaboration: Essays on International Politics*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Woods, Lawrence T. (1993), *Asia-Pacific Diplomacy: Nongovernmental Organizations and International Relations*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia.
- World Bank (2009), 'Indicators: GNI per Capita, Atlas Method'. <http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GNP.PCAP.CD>. (accessed 9 December 2009).
- World Tribune* (2008), 'Japan's "Demographic Time Bomb" Impacting Workforce, Economy', 22 May.

- http://www.worldtribune.com/worldtribune/WTARC/2008/ea_japan0163_05_21.asp.
- Xinhua* (2009a), 'A Milestone & New Starting Point for China, Japan, ROK', 11 October. http://news.xinhuanet.com/english/2009-10/11/content_12209114.htm (accessed 11 August 2012).
- Xinhua* (2009b). 'Myanmar-India Border Road Upgrade to Complete by 2010: Report', *China View*, 15 March. http://news.xinhuanet.com/english/2009-03/15/content_11014083.htm (accessed 16 March 2009).
- Xinhua* (2011), 'China's Top Political Adviser Says China Committed to Opening-up, Peaceful Development', 6 April. http://news.xinhuanet.com/english2010/china/2011-04/06/c_13815608.htm. (accessed 17 October 2011).
- Yamamoto, Tadashi (1995), *Emerging Civil Society in the Asia Pacific Community: Nongovernmental Underpinnings of the Asia Pacific Regional Community*. Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies and Japan Center for International Exchange.
- Yue, Jianjong (2008), 'Peaceful Rise of China: Myth or Reality?' *International Politics* 45 (4): 439-456.
- Yuzawa, Takeshi (2010), *Japan's Security Policy and the ASEAN Regional Forum: The Search for Multilateral Security in the Asia-Pacific*. London: Routledge.
- Zakaria, Fareed (2004), *The Future of Freedom: Illiberal Democracy at Home and Abroad*. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Zaw, Aung (2009), 'Brothers at Arm's Length', *The Irrawaddy*, 2 September. http://www.irrawaddy.org/article.php?art_id=167042.
- Zehfuss, Maja (2002), *Constructivism in International Relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Zhang, Yunling (2011), 'Emerging Force: China in the Region and the World', *Global Asia* 6 (4): 18-21.
- Zhao, Suisheng (2009), 'Chinese Nationalism and Approaches toward East Asian Regional Cooperation', International Institutions and Global Governance Program, Japan Studies Program, Council on Foreign Relations.
- Zheng, Bijian (2005), 'China's "Peaceful Rise" to Great-Power Status', *Foreign Affairs* 84 (5): 18-24.
- Zisk, Kimberley Marten (2001), 'Japan's United Nations Peacekeeping Dilemma', *Asia-Pacific Review* 8 (1): 21-39.
- Zoellick, Robert B. (2005), 'Whither China: From Membership to Responsibility? Remarks to the National Committee on U.S.-China Relations'. National Committee on United States-China Relations.

