Asia-Pacific Security Forum
Asian Elections 2007-2008:
Regional Security Implications

PACIFIC FORUM CSIS
YOUNG LEADERS

Issues & Insights
Vol. 8 – No. 22

Honolulu, Hawaii
November 2008

Pacific Forum CSIS

Based in Honolulu, the Pacific Forum CSIS (www.pacforum.org) operates as the autonomous Asia-Pacific arm of the Center for Strategic and International Studies in Washington, DC. The Forum's programs encompass current and emerging political, security, economic, business, and oceans policy issues through analysis and dialogue undertaken with the region's leaders in the academic, government, and corporate arenas. Founded in 1975, it collaborates with a broad network of research institutes from around the Pacific Rim, drawing on Asian perspectives and disseminating project findings and recommendations to opinion leaders, governments, and members of the public throughout the region.

The Young Leaders Program

The Young Leaders Program invites young professionals and graduate students to join Pacific Forum policy dialogues and conferences. The program fosters education in the practical aspects of policy-making, generates an exchange of views between young and seasoned professionals, promotes interaction among younger professionals, and enriches dialogues with generational perspectives for all attendees. Fellows must have a strong background in the area covered by the conference they are attending and an endorsement from respected experts in their field. Supplemental programs in conference host cities and mentoring sessions with senior officials and specialists add to the Young Leader experience. The Young Leaders Program is currently supported by Chevron, the Henry Luce Foundation, and the Yuchengco Group, with a growing number of universities, institutes, and organizations also helping to sponsor individual participants. For more details, see the Pacific Forum CSIS website, www.pacforum.org, or contact Brad Glosserman, director of the Young Leaders Program, at bradgpf@hawaii.rr.com.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements

The Pacific Forum CSIS is deeply grateful to the Henry Luce Foundation for its support of the Young Leaders program. A special thanks to the co-sponsors of the Asia Pacific Security Forum: the Institute for National Policy Research (Taiwan), the Institute for Strategic and Development Studies (Philippines), and Asia Centre (France) for allowing Young Leaders to participate in the meeting.

Mr. Brad Glosserman thanks Ms. Ana Villavicencio for her assistance in running the Young Leaders program.

The views expressed here represent personal impressions and reflections of Young Leaders program participants; they do not necessarily represent the views of the relevant governments, or the co-sponsoring or parent organizations and institutes

Introduction
By Brad Glosserman

For over a decade, the Asia Pacific Security Forum has provided a unique opportunity for scholars and policy experts from Taiwan, the United States, Southeast Asia, and Europe to discuss regional security issues. This year's meeting focused on the impact of elections on regional developments and there were quite a number of elections to consider: ballots have been held in Taiwan, South Korea, Japan, Malaysia, Thailand, Australia, and Russia, with the U.S. election looming.

Implicit in the discussion – although the wrap-up session tried to dig out this point – was an assumption about the role of democracy in Asia. This issue has taken on growing importance in the wake of the democracy promotion agenda of U.S. President George W. Bush and the readiness of other governments, such as that in Japan, to put democracy at the heart of their own foreign policies. Other governments are not comfortable with that approach: they see it as an attempt to draw lines through the region, as a precursor to a new "containment" policy, or as an unworkable approach that obscures more than it reveals.

Prior to the meeting, we asked our Young Leader participants if they supported the idea of putting democracy at the forefront of the U.S. foreign policy agenda. Not surprisingly, they disagreed among themselves, and it is should be pointed out that nationality provided no indication of which way a Young Leader leaned. The essays that follow – in addition to a conference summary from a Young Leader perspective by Chin-Hao Huang – provide the next generation perspective on this vital question, in the form of a policy memo to the next U.S. president.

While all our Young Leaders agree on the value of democracy and the need for governments to be accountable to their citizens, Young Leaders differ on the best way to achieve that goal. Those who are reluctant to put democracy promotion at the forefront of U.S. foreign policy do so because they fear the negative unintended consequences of such an agenda. They focus on the different forms that democracy takes and the different levels of development among democratic countries and argue that these variations make a single democracy promotion strategy untenable. Moreover, they fear that this approach will make democracy appear to be a tool of U.S. foreign policy. Thus, they write "It is better to maintain democracy's good name by not over-employing it for instrumental purposes of foreign policy." Rather, the U.S. should promote good governance (though it too can be a fuzzy concept). They outline a list of initiatives and areas upon which the next U.S. administration should focus.

The other group concedes those points, but insists "democracy is the core value of human civilization and represents some universal values of human beings." At the same time, the U.S. must respect the differences that emerge as democracy is adapted to particular local conditions. No outside power should impose democracy on a country; rather, "it should be allowed to germinate and develop within specific societies." Especially important, they remind the next president that the presence or absence of democracy should not become a

source of division among countries. There is a "need to temper fervent democracy promotion with a more sober and realistic understanding of the historical, cultural, and political sensitivities unique to each country and region. … States promoting democracy need to be careful and refrain from practices that are perceived as anti-democratic." Finally, they back a policy that focuses on "democracy support" rather than "democracy promotion." Local initiatives should be encouraged. They conclude with specific approaches for particular countries in the region.

The Pacific Forum CSIS Young Leaders program grew out of the belief that the next generation of scholars and specialists had a distinctive perspective on regional security issues that deserved to be heard. Not only would giving them a voice enrich the debates, but it would allow their seniors to better anticipate the future direction of policy within the region. These memos suggest we should start listening to them now.

Executive Summary of YL Forum

By Chin-Hao Huang

From Aug. 10 to 12, 2008, the Pacific Forum CSIS and the Institute for National Policy Research (Taiwan) convened the Asia-Pacific Security Forum to examine "Asian Elections 2007-2008: Regional Security Implications." The conference gathered U.S., European, and Asian think-tank leaders and scholars with expertise in Asian security and development issues as well as democratic trends in the Asia-Pacific region. On the sidelines of the meeting, more than a dozen Young Leaders joined additional deliberations, group discussions, and activities. The following points outline the core themes, conclusions, and conference outcomes on regional democratic trends in Asia and their implications for U.S. foreign and security policy in the region:

1. There is growing uncertainty and potential friction between successful autocracies and established democracies. Participants discussed the prospects of China's expanding political, diplomatic, economic, and military influence in the region. The accretion of China's hard and soft power increasingly garners both regional and global attention. The Chinese leadership's growing ability to embrace rapid economic growth while maintaining and strengthening the Communist Party yields a unique developmental model, and increasing calls from the West on Beijing to accept greater openness, transparency, human rights, and governmental accountability have seen limited to modest success. More important, while Chinese proponents argue that they do not actively "export" their developmental model, countries in Southeast Asia (and beyond, as in Africa) have a growing interest in replicating the Chinese experience. As such, Washington's democracy promotion agenda in the region will need to be tempered and adjusted; it must be perspicacious and more fully recognize these new and emerging trends and take into account the challenges and opportunities posed by the growing appeal of the Chinese developmental model for developing countries in Asia.

2. "Strategic hedge" remains the optimal policy option in dealing with non-democracies in Asia. The United States and its allies and strategic partners in Asia (e.g., Japan, South Korea, Singapore, Australia, and India) continue to hedge their policy options toward such countries as China and Russia. Participants and observers tend to agree that given continued opacity and high degree of unpredictability in non-democracies, hedging allows each state to balance its own national interests while continuing on the path of engagement.

3. Asian regionalism is gaining prominence, yet current thinking on the U.S. role in managing the development of Asian multilateralism remains thin. There appears to be a growing consensus that governments in Asia are actively pursuing effective multilateralism to address emerging security, political, and economic challenges in the region. New and existing regional institutions and architectures will need fine-tuning but Asian policymakers and experts, in general, remain committed to strengthening these institutional capabilities. In light of such trends, what should Washington do to reengage the region in a more complex and multilateral setting in Asia? Washington's

"hub-and-spoke" alliances and partnerships in Asia remain the current focus of U.S. foreign policy toward the region and will need to be recalibrated to stay actively engaged in the region.

4. Regional elections in 2007-2008 indicate mixed signals on the progress and developments of democratization in the Asia-Pacific region. In the case of Russia, for example, a more resurgent and aggressive foreign policy behavior following the latest change of leadership in Moscow has brought about greater instability and unpredictability in Northeast Asia and other parts of Europe. South Korea has seen widespread protests and growing anxiety over the course of U.S.-ROK relations. Japan's seemingly rudderless political leadership has brought forth more questions about the future direction of Tokyo's foreign and security policies. In Thailand, democracy is lurching at best and the country teeters on the brink of another military coup. The ongoing protests in Bangkok and an unyielding coalition government have arrested political reconciliation. In Malaysia, the prospects for a transition between governments would most likely be a long-drawn process and messy. On the brighter spots, elections in Australia and Taiwan have brought in dynamic and leadership with more pragmatic visions. For Australia, it could mean greater interest in improving and expanding the multilateral process in Asia. For Taiwan, cross-Strait relations and U.S.-Taiwan relations bode well for greater stability.

5. U.S. reengagement in Asia could see some policy adjustments. These latest trends and developments in Asian politics and international relations raise important questions for the future of U.S. policy, especially when a new U.S. administration takes office in January 2009. U.S. presence in the region, as some argue, remains vital for maintaining peace and stability. Additionally, Washington continues to wield significant influence and possesses considerable assets in the region that need to be employed more effectively, with greater sensitivity to regional concerns, priorities, and interests. An important conclusion drawn from the two-day meeting is that Washington need not place too much emphasis on "democracy promotion," instead, it should think more critically about ways to help ease the difficult transitional adjustments many of these young and emerging democracies are facing, especially in ways that would minimize risks and instabilities.

Democracy by Other Names, Sweeter Results: Promoting Good Governance, Free Trade, and Multilateral Security

By Shiuan-Ju Chen, Leif-Eric Easley, In-Seung Kay, Hiroki Sato, and Qinghong Wang

Memorandum for the Next President

How to promote democracy abroad will be a key issue on the foreign policy agenda of the next U.S. administration. Both Republicans and Democrats endorse democracy as a goal of policy and call for greater cooperation among democracies. Key advisors to Democratic presidential candidate Barack Obama have elaborated for years their idea of a Concert of Democracies to supplement existing institutions. Republican candidate John McCain outlined his vision of a "League of Democracies" to confront global problems. Washington appears less confident in promoting democracy today than in the recent past, but there is no sign that democracy has been dropped from U.S. policy objectives. This memorandum argues that essential democratic values and processes should be promoted strategically, but that democracy should not be the main banner or overriding principle of U.S. foreign policy.

This memo outlines ways in which democracy is important to international relations and the major limitations of democracy promotion. Focusing on Asia, we argue that Asia-Pacific governments need to be accountable to their people and share responsibility for regional security and economic growth. The authors appreciate the virtues of democracy, and America's moral aspiration for spreading it. However, emphasizing democracy as a political system for universal adoption post-haste can have negative unintended consequences for the practice of democratic values such as freedom of speech and human rights. Rather than prioritize an overt, aggressive democracy promotion strategy, the memo recommends that the United States promote good governance, free trade, and a multilateral security architecture built on U.S. alliances and transnational civil society links. This approach will advance democratic institutions and deepen democratic values without complicating U.S. strategic and economic interests in a region with important transitional democracies and non-democratic governments.

Limitations of Democracy as a Foreign Policy Goal

The United States is one of the leading democracies as well as the only superpower today. As a democracy, the U.S. government is held accountable to its people through free and regular elections, the separation of powers, and the rule of law. A strong democratic infrastructure such as independent media and civil society constantly monitor the political process and keep the system transparent. While such transparency and accountability has a strong influence on U.S. foreign policy, it is considerably less constrained by other major powers or geopolitical conditions because of America's superpower status. This unique combination of power and democracy often gives American decision-makers a sense of

responsibility when dealing with international problems. However, it must be pointed out that America's exceptional position can lead to misperception, particularly the danger of mirror-imaging. Outside the United States, democracy is not a cure-all for domestic and international problems, for the reasons outlined below.

- ***Definitional problem***

Democracies are not all alike. The fact that democracies are at different developmental levels significantly complicates democracy promotion as well as cooperation among a coalition of democracies. Having an election does not guarantee that a country would behave responsibly in its foreign relations. Unless a democracy matures enough to have strong institutions and constitutional restraints, it may be a source of regional instability rather than a reliable partner of the U.S. While external factors are important, it takes many years of internal development to achieve a full-fledged liberal democracy.

Difficulty in defining democracy also complicates membership in a coalition of democracies. What is more, using democracy as a rallying cry for policy is problematic because the term has been overused, lacks clarity, and is increasingly perceived as a foreign policy tool. It is better to maintain democracy's good name by not over-employing it for instrumental purposes of foreign policy.

- ***Danger of transitional or illiberal democracy***

Having free and fair referenda is not synonymous with democracy. Democracies need established liberal institutions and constitutional constraints to make them functional and accountable. Democracy is an imperfect expression of the people's will, which may not be rational all the time. Majority rule can fail the people, especially when rationality breaks down as a result of emotional short-sightedness or nationalism. Majority rule may also result in domestic or diplomatic dilemmas when public opinion contradicts minority rights or national interests. In the worst case, populism under the cover of democracy can breed extreme nationalism or even war. This is why a transitional democracy can be hostile and destabilizing when lacking mature institutions to accommodate a wide range of interests. In such contexts, it is easy for leaders to appeal to nationalism to increase their own power. Such findings lead to concerns that a suddenly democratic China might be much more assertive in its cross-Strait and foreign policies.

- ***Difficulty of adaptation to local cultural and historical contexts***

Democracies cannot be successfully transplanted from one society to another without adaptation to the local cultural and historical context. How to appropriately combine the essence of democracy and different cultures and historical backgrounds needs both wisdom and patience. For example, most Chinese people favor a democratic society, but when China is pushed to accept a foreign political system or is pressured by 'hard power' instruments, Chinese people tend to feel that China is being called uncivilized or discriminated against.

- ***Interests tend to outweigh ideology***

A fundamental question is: what serves as the primary determinant of foreign policy? Scholars and policy-makers have long cited strategic interest. Whether democracy promotes America's strategic interests is controversial and raises old debates between idealism vs. realism in foreign policy. For instance, important U.S. allies in the Middle East are not democracies and are unlikely to achieve democracy in the near future, so prioritizing democracy promotion can present contradictions for U.S. interests.

Moreover, it is easy to forget that the "democratic peace theory" refers to the lack of war – not the certainty of cooperation – among democracies. Democratic countries often have incompatible interests or at least significantly different international priorities. Still, democracies share values and institutions that tend to align or at least mediate common interests. Before offering policy recommendations, this memo argues it is important to understand the ways in which democracy is important to international relations.

Importance of Democracy

Democracy provides productive competition under set rules, but comes with uncertainty and institutional inefficiencies. However, the uncertainty is often less than authoritarian systems face in a crisis, and having civil society solve problems often proves more efficient than government solutions. Democracy theoretically allows for the mobilization of more resources in more ways, and international civil society links can be very useful to deal with transnational problems. Democracy is an important principle in international relations in at least three ways: as a human rights concern, as a source of legitimacy for a country's foreign policy, and as a mechanism for balancing competing state interests, especially when the international power balance trends toward multiple great powers.

- ***As a human rights concern***

Democracy (while not one-size-fits-all in terms of chosen institutional arrangements) is to date the best known form of national political system for advancing and protecting a population's interests. Countries should view democracy as a way to improve people's interests, instead of as an ideology. Democracy holds a government accountable to its people via regular free and fair elections and a rule of law that protects personal and civil freedoms (speech, religion, assembly, private property, access to education and economic advancement, due process, equality under the law, and so on). In democracies, people have incentives to work within the system; they are given opportunities for meaningful participation and representation of their interests. So democracy is important as an ongoing process, a complex system of mechanisms, as a means of connecting the people to a responsive, interest-advancing government. Thus, democracy should be advocated as a preferred form of national political organization in the interest of human quality of life at home and abroad. However, as democracy has various stages and diverse paths of development, it is not easily imposed or demanded of other countries. Hence, the promotion

of democracy, while related to a nation's core military/strategic and economic/trade interests, should be practically integrated into a nation's foreign policy priorities.

- ***As a course of legitimacy for a country's foreign policy***

Democracy is a means of collectively representing the people's will on the world stage, although the appropriate role of public opinion in foreign policymaking is controversial because populist tendencies often run counter to strategic interests. Democracies are also considered better friends by fellow democracies. The mutual recognition of democratic legitimacy involving shared institutions, values, and preferences tends to prevent military conflict and can provide a basis for international cooperation.

- ***As a mechanism for balancing competing state interests***

Democracy among nations (vis-à-vis international dispute resolution and relative influence in international organizations such as the UN, WTO, IMF, and World Bank) is an important principle for negotiating the representation of national interests in international outcomes. Transitioning from the existing world order involves recalibrating the balance and composition of "rule making" states (primarily 19th- and 20th-century great powers of Europe and America) to include rising powers: China, India, and Brazil, re-asserting powers: Japan and Russia, and greater representation from middle powers and developing countries in Latin America, Central and Southeast Asia, Africa, and the Middle East. Multipolarity has historically broken down into war and the international legal structure needed to regulate a democratic international order is underdeveloped, controversial, and (depending on the mechanisms) may be undesirable in terms of efficiency and stability. However, the calls for a more democratic international order (often made, ironically, by non-democracies) must be addressed in the interest of negotiating international cooperation and peace in the face of myriad transnational challenges and a changing international balance of power.

Policy Recommendations

In recognition of different paths to and forms of democracy, and given that the U.S. prefers that its value diplomacy not have negative unintended consequences (e.g., fuel misperceptions about containing China or 'for us or against us' perceptions in Southeast Asia), it makes more sense to promote "good governance." It is difficult to define good governance and no single factor determines the level of governance. It involves responsiveness, fairness, effectiveness, rule of law, open public participation, and consensus-based decisions. Each factor operates in a complementary way and can reinforce each other. Therefore, it is crucial to take a holistic approach to achieving good governance. Well-developed governance matters because it allows citizens to allocate scarce resources for the greater good, rather than at the behest of oligarchs. Moreover, it significantly reduces the level of corruption and the risk of international conflict.

- To promote good governance, the U.S. needs to employ both economic incentives and sanctions. Since the appropriate configuration of trade, aid, and diplomatic policies will vary from country to country, it is of the utmost urgency that the next

administration and Congress invest greater resources in the U.S. Foreign Service, including nimble and effective field offices, better human intelligence, and more effective public diplomacy.

- Good governance should be promoted by attractive international groups or institutions with high standards and benefits of membership. What is more, the contribution of international organizations is needed to help support capacity-building. This includes organizations focused on humanitarian aid, disaster relief, health promotion, technology exchange, and education. Countries' suspicion of external intervention could be reduced by setting operating and coordination procedures before a crisis occurs. Such contingency planning and coordination will provide a gradual promotion of democratic values and institutions focused on citizen welfare without rapidly or directly challenging the political leaders of a country.

- Reform of the United Nations, World Trade Organization, and regional security institutions should be a priority. It is important to find an effective middle ground between unstructured democratic international relations (which would mean too many veto holders and thus deadlock on pressing international challenges) on the one hand and exclusionary/minimalist coalitions of the willing on the other (which are likely too small and transitory to address chronic global challenges).

- Encourage people-to-people exchanges, education opportunities, and young leader forums among countries to draw attention to the value of democracy, below the political radar. Rising education quality and broadening the next generation's understanding of democracy through international exchanges will help build human capital and robust international civil society linkages.

- U.S. interests are served by promoting economic development ahead of political change. Free trade, interdependence, and shared prosperity bring with them the liberalizing forces of globalization. Holding despots to account is important, but democracy is more than getting rid of authoritarians and holding elections. Working democracies require working institutions, and such institutions are more likely to develop over time with trade and engagement. Civil society is also more likely to develop alongside better economic conditions and international engagement.

- The U.S. should exemplify good governance: U.S. policy should advocate democratic values by taking care of problems at home (health care, education, poverty, crime), providing a positive international example and increasing 'soft power' projection.

- The U.S. can and should live up to its role as a beacon for democracy while also providing a humble, mature perspective that democratization is a long, difficult process. Democracy, for all its merits, is not a panacea for global challenges and the suffering of peoples around the world. But promoting democracy by other names – good governance, free trade and multilateral security – will prove well worth the effort.

Prospects for Democratization in the Asia-Pacific Region: Views and Reflections from the Younger Generation

By Chin-Hao Huang, Fan Li, Lianita Prawindarti,
Raymund Jose G. Quilop, Tomoko Tsunoda, and Shanshan Wang

Mr. President,

We would like to share with you our views regarding democracy and democratization in the region. We hope that these thoughts would serve as inputs for future US policy directions toward the Asia-Pacific region.

We recognize that democracy is a complex process in governing societies. It is even considered to be the most tedious form of government. Moreover, democratic societies have the greatest tendency to degenerate into anarchy.

At the same time, we believe that democracy ought to be the underlying principle both at the domestic and international levels. Democracy is the core value of human civilization and represents some universal values of human beings. The value of democracy is the fact that "the strong are just and the weak secure" – a tenet that applies both among individual human beings and individual states as they relate with each other.

At the domestic level, it is only in democratic societies where rights and freedoms, particularly the right of the people to air their opinion of their governments, are assured through a constitution. Indeed, while it may be controversial exactly how democracy can strengthen human rights, it could not be denied that democratic systems better protect the freedom of human beings.

Democracy accommodates diversity and therefore allows the minority to express its views. Democracy thus could facilitate dialogues and mitigate the risk of conflict among contending forces within a society. More importantly, opportunities for people to communicate their opinions at least ensures that the government policies reflect what their people want.

Furthermore, elections held regularly, which are considered the bedrock of democracy, encourages greater predictability and holds public authorities accountable. With their opinion heard and public officials held accountable, it becomes easier for people to support their government's policies, including its foreign policies.

At the international level, a society of democratic states will generally have more stable relations. As is often acknowledged, the likelihood of two democracies going to war with one another is less likely. Democratic states tend to think similarly about contributing to regional and global security and in collaborating in delivering international public goods. Having states that adhere to democratic principles is the closest that the international system could ever get to achieving order. Since inclusiveness and pluralism is inherent in

democracies, democracy provides the best mechanism for mutual respect, understanding, and cooperation among states. Indeed, security and peace are two sides of the same coin.

Thus, democracy should be promoted both in individual societies and to the rest of the international community. Of course, more mature democracies have a responsibility to do so. Some even argue that it is the responsibility of the more powerful democratic states to lead the way in the promotion of democracy.

However, several important principles must be considered as mature democracies promote democracy to the rest of the world. First, societies that believe in democracy should also realize that democracy is not everything nor is it the only game in town. The idea of good governance may be more attractive for some countries – not only for the sake of economic development but for creating the rule of law, greater public transparency, support for civil society, opposition to corruption, and better human rights protection, which are of course found in democratic societies.

Second, democracy should not be used as basis for inclusion or exclusion because this kind of polarization is prone to become a new source of global conflict. Most important is the need to temper fervent democracy promotion with a more sober and realistic understanding of the historical, cultural, and political sensitivities unique to each country and region. Any attempt to democratize a country or a region should be culture-sensitive. States promoting democracy need to be careful and refrain from practices that are perceived as anti-democratic, such as aggression or impositions on societies that are either non-democratic or still in the early stages of democratization.

Indeed, while democracy is the preferred guiding principle in international relations, it should not be imposed by outside powers on a particular society. Instead, democracy should be allowed to germinate and develop within specific societies, free from imposition by external forces. Democracy should be "localized." It varies widely among countries according to the level of maturity of the political culture. Countries that have different interpretations of democracy should learn to respect each other's uniqueness through cross-cultural communications. It is therefore crucial that countries having different political or value systems develop constructive dialogue with each other.

External actors, of course, could help in the development of democracy in certain societies through policy advice as well as technical assistance, particularly in building the capacity of certain societies to practice democracy. In transitional democracies, technical assistance could pave the way for the maturation of such societies.

Thus, it may be more fruitful to pursue "democracy support" rather than "democracy promotion." Promotion is often seen as propagandizing or foisting a concept upon people. Support, however, recognizes the very real drive that people nearly everywhere have to govern their own lives, express themselves freely, and make their own political and economic choices. Supporting indigenous initiatives toward this outcome is usually most welcome and is an appropriate role that respects the underlying value of self-determination inherent in democracy.

More specifically, below are our policy recommendations for U.S. foreign policy toward specific countries:

Malaysia

In the case of Malaysia, a policy of democracy support can be better applied than democracy promotion. *Barisan Nasional*, the ruling coalition, has lost its more than two decades absolute majority in the country's parliament. *Barisan Alternatif*, the opposition coalition, now controls 82 of 222 seats in the parliament. A stronger opposition will bring more checks and balances at the national level; in state governments the push for transparency, against corruption, and potentially for the introduction of local elections will open Malaysian elections further. However, democracy is not only about elections. Malaysian elections have usually been free, but not fair. Therefore, what matters is support for an electoral system that can guarantee transparency, accountability, and justice. Without those three elements, democracy is hollow.

Against this background, the U.S. can support the democratization process in Malaysia by promoting better governance and other state reforms as well as expanding and strengthening civil society. These strategies are safe and effective because they do not grapple with the core issue of political contestation. Malaysia adamantly opposes U.S. democracy promotion efforts as the country fronts the Asian values debate, which should be viewed as a backlash against U.S. pressure for expanding political and civil liberties. The following policies can be pursued by the U.S. under the framework of indirect democracy support:

1. strengthening the rule of law;
2. strengthening parliament, through efforts to build better internal capacity and bolster constituency relations;
3. reducing state corruption through anticorruption commissions and bureaucratic rationalization;
4. expanding and strengthening civil society by supporting local NGOs that are devoted to public interest advocacy, such as on human rights, the environment, and anticorruption issues;
5. strengthening independent media; and
6. promoting democratic civil education.

As regards the issue of combating terrorism and promoting human rights, while the Malaysian government generally respects the rights of its citizens, "serious problems remain," including police torture and killings, the excessive use of the Internal Security Act (ISA), prolonged pretrial detention, the lack of independence and impartiality of the judiciary in high profile cases, "government restrictions, pressure and intimidation" leading to a self-censored press, and restrictions on freedom of assembly. Human Rights Watch has raised similar human rights concerns, particularly over the use of the ISA to suppress political dissent in the name of fighting the war against terror. Since 9/11, however, the Bush administration has played down human rights issues and emphasized counter-terrorism

cooperation, including extensive use of the ISA. The U.S. should pay more attention to how the country upholds the principle of human rights and how the ISA violates human rights.

Indonesia

For Indonesia, democracy support should be geared toward deepening democracy. After holding national elections in 1999 and 2004, as well as a series of local elections, Indonesia is currently consolidating democratic progress. With upcoming elections, both parliamentary and presidential, scheduled to place next year, the next U.S. administration should support the deepening of democratization in the country by focusing on a direct approach. A direct approach helps liberalizing countries build a bridge to democratization after countries have taken pivotal steps such as: moving toward broad respect for political and civil rights and opening the domain of public contestation to all political forces that agree to play by democratic rules. Policies that the U.S. could adopt in this regard may include:

1. programs to strengthen political parties;
2. aid to strengthen election administration entities and pressure on governments to give these entities political independence;
3. support for election monitoring;
4. aid to civic groups that work to improve electoral processes by organizing candidate forums, providing voter education, and promoting voter turnout; and
5. respecting the outcome of the elections, even if they are not to the U.S. liking.

The U.S. should also support democracy in Indonesia through the use of soft power in education. Education is one of the weakest links in the Indonesian system. In principle, schools are available to all Indonesians, but large numbers of children are nonetheless unable to attend. U.S. educational assistance should put a high priority on English-language training in order to create a cadre of Indonesians who can benefit from access to English-language publications and media and in some cases from education in the U.S. or other foreign countries. English is taught in the Indonesian school system but standards are far lower than in most neighboring countries. Indonesians thus find themselves at a disadvantage in today's increasingly interdependent world. This effort can start with a special program to upgrade teachers of English and curriculums at all levels of the education system (primary, secondary, and university).

Finally, the U.S. should consider starting a negotiation for an FTA with Indonesia. An FTA can extend the bilateral relationship between the two countries. As the US and ASEAN have signed a framework agreement in 2003 and an FTA with Singapore has already been signed, it is both timely and constructive that Indonesia and the U.S. further expand the proposal for a bilateral FTA previously discussed by senior U.S. and Indonesian officials.

Burma/Myanmar

In the case of Burma/Myanmar, the U.S. needs to reassess its foreign policy and place greater emphasis on a more holistic and comprehensive strategy that will continue to push for greater transparency, accountability, and democratization in the country. This new

approach calls for a sober reassessment of the situation on the ground as a basis for future policy approaches at the multilateral, bilateral, and internal/civil society levels. More important, we should recognize that while the military junta continues to be the problem, it should also be part of any future solutions in order to prevent Burma from becoming a failed state.

The U.S. needs to realign its aid toward Burma to work more closely with multilateral institutions such as the World Bank, the Asian Development Bank, and the International Monetary Fund to provide higher-impact assistance in the post-cyclone reconstruction phase, providing economic and development assessments of the growing needs throughout the country, and offering humanitarian assistance that addresses such issue areas as public health institutional capacity-building, food production, and the education system.

The U.S. could also facilitate the establishment of a multi-party mechanism for an intensified dialogue that will include the major multilateral organizations such as the EU and ASEAN, as well as China and India – countries that have increasing stakes and interests, like the U.S., in seeing national reconciliation, more meaningful political reform, and continued stability in Burma. The issue of sanctions could also be an item of discussion in such a multilateral format. There is wider acknowledgment today that the largely Western-imposed sanctions directed at Burma have been ineffective and are more of an irritant than a force for regime change. Washington should lead the effort in balancing targeted sanctions with positive incentives through this multilateral effort to effect greater change in the Burmese government's behavior.

Finally, the U.S. should further identify and work with budding civil society organizations within Burma and support alternative channels of bringing news and information which are not state-controlled in the form of print publications such as weeklies and satellite television. Information from the outside is already getting to the Burmese people in such unprecedented ways. Their efforts need to be sustained and strengthened in order for the general public to gain access to valuable and much-needed alternative sources of information. There is also a need to support capacity building programs for advocacy groups and political parties in Burma. The capacity of the so-called "88-generation" – those who were involved in the mass protest in 1988 – to organize discontent and protests through a loose network (as opposed to the older generation's opposition tactics through the more hierarchical National League for Democracy) could be strengthened in Burma. Washington's renewed strategy should explore ways to support a credible opposition movement that can offer a more inclusive platform and agenda for national reconciliation so that the Burmese electorate can choose an alternative way forward.

Japan

The U.S. needs to ensure close communications with Japan in order to retain their established relationship. Japan has been anxious about U.S. approaches to North Korea and it is considered a crucial issue for the U.S.-Japan alliance. The U.S. should be strategic and accommodate Japan within U.S. regional policy in Asia and protect the alliance. North Korea's nuclear missile capability is a great threat to Japan. Japan's missile defense has been

developed and deployed but Japan still greatly depends on the U.S. military capability. It would be costly for the United State to lose Japan's trust given U.S. military and security strategies in Asia. To maintain the U.S.-Japan alliance, the U.S. should further understand Japan's perspective to North Korea, such as its concern over the nuclear and abductee issues and cooperate with Japan for regional stability since a strong alliance is the basis of Asian security.

The U.S. also needs to think through the prospects of redefining the U.S.-Japan partnership to enhance multilateral security cooperation in the region. The U.S. should strengthen ties with Japan to lead the movement to establish a mechanism for multilateral security cooperation to increase stability and form a regional collaborative security framework based on existing ones such as the ASEAN Regional Forum and the Six-Party Talks. The U.S. should facilitate actions, in addition to dialogues which have continued, with Japan, China, and South Korea together to realize a multilateral security mechanism with the intention of becoming a balancer in the regional security framework.

Regarding Japan's Self-Defense Forces, the U.S. should negotiate with the Ministry of Defense and SDF for further cooperation in military matters but at the same time it must recognize the impact of Japan's greater military capability on Asia. The U.S. should carefully take measures to enhance military cooperation without revising Article 9 of the Japanese constitution, which induces anxiety and distrust of other nations toward Japan in the region, especially China and South Korea.

And finally, the U.S. needs to establish a close tie with future administrations and correspond effectively with a possible change of the ruling party from LDP/Komeito coalition to the DJP. Japan's politics are unstable. The U.S. should increase all levels of communication and exchange with political leaders in Japan.

China

Ideology should not be the basis for judging either China or the Chinese people. China's long history of feudalism and Confucian tradition were the foundation of ideology until the early 20th century. In an era of globalization, most Chinese are still struggling to find a 'new faith' that they can relate to and be related with. Democracy could definitely be one of them. The latest debates among Chinese scholars and Chinese government-affiliated think tanks regarding "universal values" and "Western democracy" and the implications for China's democratic reform should be given due attention.

However, democracy is not only about elections or human rights or civil liberties. Democracy requires a high level of public spirit as well as consciousness genuinely generated from the people regarding their civic obligations. The lack of understanding of the Chinese 'public' is partly responsible for the social problems China currently faces, from pollution to food safety. The thrust to increase democracy in China should take this into consideration. It would be a step backward to simply use democracy as a slogan, and even worse to 'politicalize' it.

Democracy will always be an unfinished business, in liberal democracies, transitional democracies or non-democracies. The world cannot be seen as a school of democracy where there are teachers and students as well as a definitive curriculum on how to teach and learn democracy. All countries can be teachers and students at the same time and there is no single valid curriculum for democracy.

APPENDIX A

About the Authors

Ms. Shiuan-Ju CHEN is the 2008-2009 Pacific Forum Vasey Fellow from Taipei, Taiwan. She received her B.A. in Political Science from National Taiwan University in 2005 and her M.A. in International Affairs from the Elliott School of International Affairs, the George Washington University in 2007. Prior to working at Pacific Forum, Ms. Chen interned with CSIS in Washington D.C. and the Institute for National Policy Research in Taiwan. Her research interests include Taiwan domestic politics, China's transition and reform, and cross-Strait relations

Mr. Leif-Eric EASLEY is a Ph.D. candidate at Harvard University's Department of Government and a Visiting Scholar at the UCLA Department of Political Science. His dissertation examines national identity, bilateral trust and security cooperation among Japan, South Korea, China, and the United States. Leif has served as a teaching fellow for Asian International Relations and American Foreign Policy at Harvard. He led the security workshop of the Harvard Project for Asian and International Relations and was an editor for the Harvard Asia Quarterly. Leif has published journal articles and book chapters on the U.S.-Japan alliance, U.S.-South Korea alliance, and Chinese foreign policy. He also writes a monthly column on East Asian security politics for newspapers in Japan, Korea and Taiwan.

Mr. Chin-Hao HUANG is a Research Associate (Office of the Director) with the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI), Stockholm, Sweden. Previously, he was a research assistant with the Freeman Chair in China Studies at the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS), Washington, D.C., U.S.A. Mr. Huang led the CSIS China-Africa project, a multi-year initiative examining Chinese intentions, policies, and practices in Africa and implications for U.S. strategic interests, and co-authored several reports, monographs, and book chapters on China-Africa-U.S. relations. Mr. Huang has also presented conference papers and published other works on Chinese foreign and security policy. Prior to CSIS, he served as executive-director for the Georgetown International Relations Association, a non-profit organization based in Washington, D.C. His research interests include East Asian security issues and Chinese foreign policy.

Mr. In-Seung KAY is a PhD Candidate at the University of Colorado.

Ms. LI Fan is Executive Director of Global Links Initiative, a nonprofit organization on social inclusion and citizen empowerment themes beginning from a Japan-China-U.K. dimension. Ms. Li first worked with nonprofit organizations in 1999 as an intern at Japan NPO Center, a national infrastructure nonprofit organization based in Tokyo. Later she joined the organization as program associate and was responsible for international programs on capacity building of NPOs and collaboration with governments and corporate entities. She was also the coordinator of the Nonprofit Organizations National Network on Law and Tax System Reform. Prior to working for the Japan NPO Center, Fan worked for Shimizu Corporation Shanghai Branch from 1994 to 1999. Fan holds an MA in international

relations from Waseda University (Japan). Prior to this, she studied Public Administration in Leiden University (the Netherlands) and received her BA from Suzhou University with a major in Japanese literature.

Ms. Lianita PRAWINDARTI is a PhD candidate in International Studies at the School of International Studies, University of Trento in Italy. She works on a PhD project on the ASEAN Security Community. She is also currently an adjunct lecturer at the Department of International Relations, University of Indonesia. Ms. Prawindarti holds an MA in European Studies from University of Amsterdam and a BA in International Relations from University of Indonesia. In 2006, she was a visiting research associate at the Rajaratnam School of International Studies, Nanyang Technological University in Singapore. Her research interests include regionalism in Southeast Asia, regionalism in the European Union, and Southeast Asian security.

Mr. Raymund Jose G. QUILOP is an Assistant Professor of Political Science at the University of the Philippines, a Senior Researcher/Analyst of the Office of Strategic and Special Studies, Armed Forces of the Philippines. His areas of interest include the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF), Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), regional security, preventive diplomacy, Philippine relations with the U.S. and China, disarmament issues, democracy and the process of democratization, civil-military relations in the Philippines, and the Mindanao conflict in the Philippines. He serves as an associate editor of the *Philippine Political Science Journal*, an internationally refereed journal published by the Philippine Political Science Association and editor-in-chief of OSS' quarterly journal, the OSS Digest. He holds an MA in Political Science from the University of the Philippines where he also obtained his BA in Political Science (Summa Cum Laude) in 1995.

Mr. Hiroki SATO is an Intern at Pacific Forum CSIS.

Ms. Tomoko TSUNODA, from Tokyo, Japan is another 2008 Vasey Fellow. She was an intern at CSIS in Washington D.C. researching space policy in Asia and assisted the Global Space Development Summit which was held in Beijing in April 2008. Previously, Tomoko worked as a research assistant for Mitsubishi UFJ Research and Consulting in Tokyo and coordinated a project with the United Cities and Local Governments in Barcelona. Tomoko received her Bachelor of Law from Nihon University in 2006 and obtained her Master's degree from Boston University in 2008.

Mr. Qinghong WANG is a doctoral candidate in Political Science at the University of Hawaii-Manoa, is a Pacific Forum Young Leader, and is a 2006-2007 Vasey Fellow. He is from Beijing, China. Mr. Wang received his B.A. in Chinese Language and Literature from Beijing University in 1999 and an M.A. in Chinese Studies and an M.A. in Political Science both from the University of Hawaii in 2003. He previously worked as a language instructor at UH, the Japan-American Institute of Management Science, and the United States Air Force Academy's Chinese Language Immersion Program.

Ms. Shanshan WANG is a Pacific Forum CSIS 2008 Vasey Fellow. She has also been working actively as a Pacific Forum "Young Leader" since 2006. She received both her BA

in diplomacy and MA in international relations from China Foreign Affairs University. She was also a student fellow of Asia Pacific Leadership Program at East-West Center in Hawaii from 2006-2007. She worked as liaison officer at Boao Forum for Asia, interned with People's Bank of China and Boston Consulting Group, and traveled extensively in the Asia-Pacific region. Shanshan is also freelance translator and interpreter and has published four translation works in China. Most recently she has been involved in China's carbon emission trading market and conducted research on China's climate change policy. Her research interest lies in China's foreign policy, China's domestic politics and East Asian security.

APPENDIX B

Asia Pacific Security Forum

Asian Elections 2007-2008:
Regional Security Implications

Institute for National Policy Research (Taiwan)

Co-sponsors:
The Pacific Forum CSIS (US)
Institute for Strategic and Development Studies (Philippines)
Asia Centre (France)

August 10-12, 2008
Double Tree Alana Hotel Waikiki, Honolulu, Hawaii, U.S.A

Agenda

Sunday, August 10

18:30 Welcome Dinner at Hotel Pool Side Restaurant

Day One Monday, August 11

08:30 Continental Breakfast (Room 303)

09:00 **Welcome Remarks**
Hung-Mao Tien, Institute for National Policy Research
Ralph Cossa, Pacific Forum, CSIS

09:10 **Keynote Speech**
James Kelly, Former U.S. Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs

09:40 **Panel One – Elections in South Korea, Japan, Russia: Security Implications for Northeast Asia**

Moderator: Wen-Cheng Lin, Taiwan Foundation for Democracy

Presenters: Heungkyu Kim, Institute of Foreign Affairs and National Security
"South Korea's Elections and Security Implications for Northeast Asia"

Yoshifumi Nakai, Gakushuin University
"Japanese Politics and the Shaping of Its Security Policies"

Yu-Shan Wu, Academia Sinica
"Domestic Politics and Foreign Policy: How Significant is Russia's Power Transfer?"

Discussants: Chih-Cheng Lo, Soochow University
Vincent K. Pollard, University of Hawaii
Michael McDevitt, Center for Naval Analyses Corporation

11:10 Coffee Break

11:20 Open Forum

12:20	**Luncheon at J-Bistro (lobby level)**
Speaker:	Charles E. Morrison, President, East-West Center, U.S.
14:00	**Panel Two – Taiwan's Elections and the Implications for Cross-Strait Relations**
Moderator:	Ralph Cossa, Pacific Forum, CSIS
Presenters:	Wen-Cheng Lin, Taiwan Foundation for Democracy "Taiwan's Elections and the Implications for Cross-Strait Relations"
	Denny Roy, East-West Center "Washington's View of Taiwan's 2008 Elections and Referendum"
	Lowell Dittmer, University of California, Berkeley "China: Maturing Juggernaut"
Discussants:	Yu-Shan Wu, Academia Sinica Heungkyu Kim, Institute of Foreign Affairs and National Security Elizabeth Van Wie Davis, Asia-Pacific Center for Security Studies
15:30	Coffee Break
15:40-16:40	Open Forum
18:00	Transportation to the Residence of Representative Wang
18:30	**Dinner Hosted by Taipei Economic and Cultural Office, Honolulu**

Day Two	**Tuesday, August 12**
08:30	Continental Breakfast (Room 303)
09:00	**Panel Three – Elections in Thailand, Malaysia, and Australia: Security Implications for Southeast Asia and South Pacific**
Moderator:	François Godement, Asia Centre
Presenters:	Charles Salmon, Jr., Asia-Pacific Center for Security Studies "Elections in Thailand and Malaysia and Security Implications for Southeast Asia"
	Brendan Taylor, Australian National University "Rudd's Asia-Pacific Community: Dead in the Water?"
	Carolina G. Hernandez, Institute for Strategic and Developmental Studies "ASEAN Charter and the Building of a Security Community"
Discussants:	Richard Baker, East-West Center
	Chih-Cheng Lo, Soochow University
	John Brandon, Asia Foundation

10:30 Coffee Break

10:45 Open Forum

12:00 **Luncheon at J-Bistro (lobby level)**

13:30 **Panel Four – Security Implications of the 2008 U.S. Elections**
Moderator: Carolina G. Hernandez, Institute for Strategic and Developmental Studies

Presenters: Brad Glosserman, Pacific Forum, CSIS
"The U.S. Elections and Implication for East Asia Security"

Cheng-Yi Lin, Academia Sinica
"The U.S. Elections and U.S.-China Relations"

Francois Godement, Asia Centre
"Viewing the New World's response to the new New World: how Europeans view current U.S. debates and positions on Asia"

Discussants: Lowell Dittmer, University of California, Berkeley
Yoshifumi Nakai, Gakushuin University
Fu-Kuo Liu, National Chengchi University

15:00 Coffee Break

15:10 Open Forum
16:10 **Concluding Panel**
Moderator: Hung-Mao Tien, Institute for National Policy Research

Panelists: Ralph Cossa, Pacific Forum, CSIS
Carolina G. Hernandez, Institute for Strategic and Developmental Studies
Francois Godement, Asia Centre

16:40 Adjournment

APPENDIX C

PACIFIC FORUM CSIS

YOUNG LEADERS

Asia-Pacific Security Forum

Asian Elections 2007-2008: Regional Security Implications

Institute for National Policy Research (Taiwan)

August 10-12, 2008
DoubleTree Alana Waikiki Hotel

Agenda

Sunday, August 10

17:30 YL meeting: introduction to the program *Pool Deck –Mezzanine Level*

19:00 **Welcoming Dinner** *Pool Deck –Mezzanine Level*

Monday, August 11

8:40-9:00 **Registration, Continental Breakfast** *Room 303 – 3rd floor meeting room*

9:00-9:10 **Welcoming Remarks**:
Hung-mao Tien, President and Chairman of the Board,
Institute for National Policy Research, Taiwan
Ralph A. Cossa, President, Pacific Forum CSIS, U.S.

9:10-9:40 **Keynote Speech**: James Kelly, former Assistant Secretary of State

9:40-11:00 **PANEL ONE: Elections in South Korea, Japan, and Russia: Security Implications for Northeast Asia**

11:00-11:20 **Coffee Break**

11:20-12:20 **Open Forum**

12:20-14:00 **Luncheon**

14:00-15:30 **PANEL TWO: Taiwan's Elections and Cross-Strait Relations**

15:30-15:50 **Coffee Break**

18:00

15:50-16:50 **Open Forum**
Young Leaders Dinner (optional)- meet at the lower lobby at 18:00PM

Tuesday, August 12

09:30-11:00 **PANEL THREE: Elections in Thailand, Malaysia, and Australia: Security Implications for Southeast Asia and South Pacific**
Room 303 – 3rd floor meeting room

11:00-11:15 **Coffee Break**

11:15-12:15 **Open Forum**

12:15-14:00 **Luncheon**

14:00-16:00 **PANEL FOUR: Security Implications of the 2008 U.S. Elections**

16:30 **Adjourn**

16:45-18:30 **YL Wrap Up Session**

19:00 **YL dinner** (OPTIONAL)