

4TH ASIA-EUROPE ROUNDTABLE

SPECIAL REPORT

**“Conflict Prevention:
Actors, Institutions and Mechanisms
Sharing Experiences between Asia and Europe”**

A REPORT ON THE 4TH ASIA-EUROPE ROUNDTABLE
HELD ON 18-20 APRIL 2005 IN BERLIN, GERMANY

**Asia-Europe Foundation
Singapore Institute of International Affairs
Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung**



SINGAPORE
INSTITUTE OF
INTERNATIONAL
AFFAIRS



CONTENTS

	Page
I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
II. REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS	3
ANNEXES	
1. Programme of Activities	11
2. List of Participants	17
3. About the Organisers	21

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

We all know that the cost of preventing a conflict is much less than the cost of resolving conflict. While the international community, acting through the UN and regional or other intergovernmental organisations, has set up institutions and mechanisms to build and sustain peace in the decades since World War II, there remain serious constraints to efforts in preventing conflict and building peace. How can the experiences in our two regions contribute to better engagement of the actors, better utilisation of existing mechanisms and further institution-and capacity-building for effective conflict prevention? Those were the questions that the 4th Asia-Europe Roundtable (AER) sought to answer.

The latest in a series of meetings on international relations issues between Asia and Europe, the 4th AER sharpens its focus on issues of conflict management and peace-building. The key message from the roundtable is that actors, institutions and mechanisms for early warning are largely in place already—it is **ultimately a matter of political will to effectively prevent conflict**. Other messages from the meeting include:

- **Intra-state rather than inter-state conflict** now number the majority of conflicts, last longer, and are more brutal and bloody. Therefore, these conflicts require the immediate attention of concerned organisations and other actors in Asia and Europe.
- There is already a dense network and system of institutions and mechanisms in Europe available for conflict prevention and peace-building. However **improved co-ordination among the OSCE, EU, Council of Europe, and NATO** is required.
- There is ample room to create and strengthen **additional conflict prevention mechanisms in the Asian context**. Suggestions included a high commissioner for conflict-related issues and strengthening of the ARF and ASEAN+3 units within the ASEAN Secretariat. While European institutions and mechanisms may not be directly transferable due to the value placed in national sovereignty and on the principle of non-interference, particularly in ASEAN, lessons can be drawn from the European experiences and examples.
- Early warning signals of potential conflict can be traced to long-standing grievances that are latent until a trigger sparks violence. Signs to look out for include sudden changes in patterns of territorial, ethno-religious, governance-related, economic, political, and external factors surrounding the case. Recommendations relating to specific cases include:
 - There are warning signals indicating possible escalation of conflict in **Southern Thailand** that, if not properly managed, could degenerate into a bigger crisis.
 - It is recommended that the EU come to a unified position on **Kosovo** to finally define its legal status as part of an overall strategy for South-Eastern Europe.
 - The establishment of a joint Commission on History Text Books in North-East Asia could mitigate the current dispute between **Japan and China** on the subject, to prevent potential conflicts previously seen in the Balkan context.
- **Civil society has an important role** to play in conflict prevention and has proven particularly relevant in early warning and monitoring of potential conflict.
- A **clearly established multi-stakeholders' consultation mechanism at the Asia-Europe inter-regional level** could be feasible in order to formulate common responses to cross-regional concerns.

Papers were presented on the following topics to launch the roundtable discussion:

- Actors, tools and mechanisms for conflict prevention at the global level, European theatre, and Asian theatre;
- Conflict map of East Asia, conflict map of Europe (from the Atlantic to the Caucasus);

and case studies on:

- Dimensions of the Mindanao conflict,
- Competition for resources in the South China Sea,
- Early warning in the Yugoslav crisis, and,
- Potential conflict arising from migration from Africa to Europe.

Keynote speeches from **Dr. Rolf Muetzenich**, Member of the German Federal Parliament and Chair of the Disarmament & Arms Control Sub-Committee as well as **Dr. Surin Pitsuwan**, Member of Parliament of Thailand and member of the board of the International Crisis Group opened the roundtable.

Participants at the roundtable convened in three separate workshops for more intensive discussions on the following topics: (1) Assessment of current conflict prevention capacity in Asia and Europe, with suggestions for additional tools and mechanisms; (2) Early warning indicators of potential crises and appropriate responses; and, (3) Capacity- and institution-building for regional level and inter-regional responses.

This report is organised as follows: a brief discussion of the concepts of conflict prevention in general that emerged from the meeting and then the output and recommendations from each workshop are presented.

Asia-Europe Roundtables at a Glance

The AER is a joint initiative of the Asia-Europe Foundation (ASEF), the Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung (FES) Office for Regional Cooperation in Southeast Asia (Germany-Singapore office) and the Singapore Institute of International Affairs (SIIA).

1st AER "Regions in Transition"
August 2000 | Singapore

2nd AER "Trans-National Problem-Solving in a Global Era: Towards Multi-Level Governance?"
September 2001 | Warwick, United Kingdom
co-hosted by the Centre for Globalisation and Regionalisation Studies, Warwick University and Corpus Christi College, Oxford University

3rd AER "Peace and Reconciliation: Success Stories and Lessons from Asia and Europe"
October 2003 | Hanoi, Vietnam
hosted by the Institute for International Relations (IIR) of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Vietnam

Experts' Meeting (in preparation for the 4th AER)
June 2004 | Singapore

II. REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS

1. On Conflict Prevention in General

While we have traditionally dealt mostly with international conflicts between states, the **majority of conflicts today are internal**—bloodier, more cruel, and longer than inter-state conflicts—and thus require immediate attention. Information presented from a number of comprehensive data-sets on conflict and political violence in Asia show that since the end of World War II intra-state conflict has far out-stripped inter-state conflict. Moreover, intra-state armed conflicts tend to last longer than inter-state wars (by as much as an average of 5.3 years as compared to 2 years), with average death tolls almost 30 times greater than inter-state wars in the case of civil war and 10 times greater in the case of internal ethnic wars.

Conflict prevention in its broadest sense is a matter of **proper timing and good governance**. Conflict prevention consists, in the long term, of good governance, promotion of democracy and human rights, economic development, and the eradication of poverty. In the short to medium term, conflict prevention generally consists of technical and astute political skills such as facilitation of good offices, mediation, arbitration, adjudication in the sense of judicial settlement, monitoring and peace-keeping, and sanctions (economic, communications, or diplomatic sanctions, and extending as a last resort to military sanctions). Conflict prevention, moreover, encompasses all levels from the global to regional, national and even local spheres of governance.

One key aspect of conflict prevention is **"early warning"**—however the ability to identify, interpret, and act on the signs is far from straightforward. First, the signs may be identified and apparent, but political will is needed for action. In the absence of reasonable or absolute certainty, moreover, it is difficult to effect any action. Any knowledge needs to be conveyed in a meaningful way to the actors and individuals who have the agency to make change. Second, in a perverse way, early warnings may be instrumentalised by some actors to foment discord and "fabricate" the conditions to legitimise intervention; some research has even indicated the correlation between verbal statements, with the escalation, rather than the de-escalation, of the conflict.

An innovation in early warning mechanisms could be to **institutionalise what is currently an informal role for civil society in reading warning signs of trouble**, particularly during the early stages, by providing continuous information on situations in various trouble spots. In other cases, NGOs may be constrained from reacting to signs of even imminent crisis or "hyper-signals", let alone early indications, due to their own self-interest: for instance, fear that they may lose funding from their foreign or international donors.

2. Current Conflict Prevention Capacity in Asia and Europe and Suggestions for Additional Tools and Mechanisms

2.1 Europe

Because of the **multiplicity of actors, focuses and approaches in the European theatre**, the task is not so much to develop additional tools or mechanisms for conflict prevention, but rather **to improve the coordination between those already in place**. The European Union (EU), Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO), the Council of Europe¹ and sub-regional organisations could be considered as the prominent institutionalised inter-governmental conflict prevention

¹ The Council of Europe groups together 46 countries, including 21 countries from Central and Eastern Europe. It is distinct from the 25-nation European Union, but no country has ever joined the Union without first belonging to the Council of Europe.

measures in the European theatre. The Group of Eight (G-8)², as a contact group, and various ad hoc coalitions established in connection to specific cases could also be considered as actors. NGOs, the media and civil society act as distinct players in the complex dynamics of European non-state actors.

The listed actors deploy various approaches to conflict prevention ranging from a comprehensive understanding of security to a military perception and operationally specific concept. Some have a strictly regional focus while others, such as the EU, are broadening their scope beyond the European continent. The approaches to conflict prevention, and the actors involved, vary according to the nature and causes of the conflicts. For example, structural problems and root causes are being addressed through aid, development and capacity-building programs by the EU and civil society organisations, while concrete, violent conflicts are the focus of institutions with military capabilities such as NATO (although the EU is also evolving such capacities, e.g. as deployed in Macedonia).

Coordinating mechanisms need to be established to enhance conflict prevention mechanisms in Europe and to avoid overlapping or conflicting initiatives. Coordination is needed between states and NGOs, among states, between NGOs and between the four major European conflict prevention institutions. As such, the establishment of a **permanent consultative mechanism between NGOs and state agencies under the European Commission**, envisioned to resemble the mechanism existing under the British Department for International Development (DFID), is suggested.

2.2 Asia

There is still room for **additional conflict prevention mechanisms in the Asian context**³, **keeping in mind that European institutions and mechanisms are not directly transferable** due to the regional differences in, for example, political inter-state modus operandi and political space for civil society in the various countries. In the Asian theatre, the ASEAN, ASEAN+3, ARF and APEC (with its focus widening beyond economics since September 11th 2001) can be considered principal fora for managing inter-governmental conflicts.

The various US bilateral alliances as well as the Five-Power Defence Arrangement⁴ are also conflict prevention factors in the region. Global institutions such as the UN and its agencies, the World Bank and the Asian Development Bank are influential as well. Since national militaries in the region at times seem to be beyond the control of the states, the military was mentioned as a conflict prevention (as well as potentially conflict causing) institution in its own right. The private sector, academics—through track-two diplomacy in, e.g., the Council for Security Cooperation in the Asia Pacific (CSCAP) and the ASEAN Institutes of Strategic and International Studies (ASEAN-ISIS)—and civil society organizations with varying degrees of influence in the different countries are important non-state actors.

Generally, the mechanisms in the Asian region can be considered less institutionalised, less autonomous and more limited in scope than the ones referred to in the European context. The political modus operandi of cooperative and comprehensive security through the 'ASEAN way' of informality, leader-centred confidence-building, non-interference and non-intervention largely excludes intra-state conflicts and bilateral disputes from the scope of the regional inter-governmental mechanisms.

² The G8 (Group of 8) is an informal group of eight countries: Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Russia, the United Kingdom and the United States

³ Delineating the two regions, it was agreed by workshop participants that Asia would be understood as Northeast and Southeast Asia while Europe is understood as ranging from the Atlantic to the Caucasus.

⁴ The Five-Power Defence Arrangement (FPDA) is a little-known security consultation mechanism comprising Australia, Malaysia, New Zealand, Singapore and the United Kingdom.

Based on the above situation, the following recommendations are made:

- To facilitate the involvement of nongovernmental organizations in conflict prevention initiatives and utilize the networks and localized knowledge of these groups, governments should establish **advisory bodies** comprising policy-makers, academics, as well as military and NGO representatives.
- **Joint commissions** at the national level between these groups could further foster and enhance a sense of shared responsibility.
- **Regional and inter-regional cross-religious dialogues could be utilised more effectively and be enhanced** to improve dialogue, understanding and involvement across the different religious communities.
- Governments are encouraged to participate in the UN mechanism on the control of **light weapons**, and to adhere to the arms registry to improve transparency on these issues.
- To soften the restrictive understanding of the principle of non-interference, it is suggested that an **ASEAN+3 roundtable**, with a format similar to the Asia-Europe Roundtable, be established to examine cross-boundary issues and promote the handling of these issues at the track-one level as well. Tracks for defence officials could be added to the already established tracks of ASEAN and ARF to institutionalise dialogue on conflict prevention between these key actors.
- Referring to the somewhat ambivalent role of some regional militaries in terms of conflict prevention, it was suggested that **regional defence colleges** be established to promote the professionalisation of and dialogue among national militaries.
- The **ARF and ASEAN+3 units** within the ASEAN Secretariat have potential as conflict prevention institutions and should be strengthened accordingly.
- Finally, the establishment of a **Commission on History Text Books** seems especially pertinent in the North-East Asian context in light of the **current disputes between Japan and China and between Japan and Korea on the subject**, to prevent potential conflicts as seen in the Balkan context.

2.3 Asia and Europe

In terms of recommendations for both Asia and Europe:

- Established reservoirs of experts and eminent persons from, e.g., the military, police and judiciary should be utilised to a greater extent. **ARF Eminent and Experts Persons (EEPs) should be activated**, and brainstorming sessions on how to operationalise the roles of these EEPs be considered.
- Also **existing legal instruments** such as the European Court of Justice and the ASEAN Dispute Settlement Mechanism were mentioned as 'under-utilised' in terms of their conflict prevention potentials.
- **Arbitration and mediation by third parties** could be employed to a greater extent in several cases across the regions, and the capacity and coherence in missions, and financial independence, of NGOs could be strengthened in both Asia and Europe to make them more effective in their conflict prevention efforts.
- The **OSCE's High Commissioner on National Minorities (HCNM)** was generally viewed as an effective mechanism with considerable autonomy, legitimacy, manoeuvrability and high-level political access at his disposal. This mandate allows the

HCNM to be engaged as an external party in internal conflicts involving national minorities through advice, dialogue facilitation, mediation and "quiet" diplomacy, and if necessary provision of a formal early warning to the OSCE Permanent Council. However, the HCNM mechanism is less likely to be replicated in Asia, as it would pose serious concerns over national sovereignty. In the ARF, the **Experts and Eminent Persons (EEPs) could play a useful role**, and this mechanism has a potential that should be utilised further.

3. Early Warning Indicators of Potential Crisis and Appropriate Responses

Early warning indicators must be properly identified and interpreted, especially those that indicate situations that could eventually lead to violence. While there are a number of incidences and situations that indicate rising tension and discord, disputes may still be resolved through dialogue and negotiation. This should be urgently pursued before the situation deteriorates to full-blown conflict with increasing violence.

Furthermore, a distinction needs to be made between **latent instability versus signals of impending violent conflict**. Essentially structural problems within a given country such as endemic poverty and economic inequality, ethnic and long-standing religious differences may never lead to violent conflict without the presence of triggering mechanisms. What needs to be watched are **sudden changes in previous patterns** in a given situation.

3.1 Warning Signs to Watch

Warning signals can be categorised along the following dimensions:

- **Territorial:** border tensions or disputes over territorial separation of peoples, usually stemming from historical and contentious drawing of boundaries
- **Ethno-religious:** tensions arising from cultural differences between groups, usually traceable to historical domination of one group over another or long-standing rivalry
- **Governance:** problems in the administration of basic services, particularly of justice and of police/military apparatus
- **Economic:** tensions over competition for resources and glaring disparities
- **Political:** competition over access to power
- **External:** factors, actors, and incidences external to the localized conflicts (from neighbouring countries, at the regional or national level).

These dimensions have distinct features but some also overlap, which could be an advantage in recognising a potential conflict brewing: if a signal in one category is missed, a related signal may be identified in another category instead. What is needed is the necessary political will and the capacity to read and act upon early warning signs.

Below is the output of the workshop participants' exercise in mapping warning signals for one European and one Asian case: Kosovo since 1981 and Southern Thailand since 2001. Signals identified for Kosovo come from a "hindsight" perspective, as signs leading to the crisis in 1999. For Southern Thailand, however, signals indicate possible escalation of a conflict that, if not properly managed, could lead to a bigger crisis.

Matrix 1. Early Warning Signals in Kosovo and Southern Thailand⁵

Dimensions of Signals	Warning Signals		Common Indicators
	Kosovo	Southern Thailand	
Territorial	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1981-claim for autonomy/republic 1990 claim for independence Exodus of Serbs Influx of Krajina refugees Lack of any clear legal status Massive immigration of Serbs to Belgrade 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sign of latent instability: Colonial boundaries, artificial separation of ethnic-religious community Fleeing of people as refugees 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sign of latent instability: historic territorial division of ethnic groups Heightened refugee movements across borders
Ethno-religious	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sign of latent instability: rapid growth of large Albanian population which increasingly became self-aware and politically conscious as a group Use of Serbian language e.g. in textbooks and change in languages for road signs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sign of latent instability: 75-80% of population are Malay-Muslims with a different language, religion, sense of identity, educational system Perceived undermining of locally-respected teachers in religious schools (<i>pondok</i>) Influx of Buddhist cultural symbols 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Perceived pervasiveness of cultural symbols of dominant group in public space: e.g. education system, use of language
Governance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Judiciary in hands of Serbs Perceived rise in use of Serbian nationalist propaganda 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Abolishment of Center for Border Management which had arguably been effective in addressing issues specific to the Muslim areas for the past 25 years Sudden centralization of power by government and appointment of police/military officials highly distrusted by locals Abductions and torture of locals attributed to police/military Escalated attacks e.g. killings of Buddhists by rebels coupled with harsh police action; the latest incident in which 72 locals were killed in mass arrest during 2004 Ramadhan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Escalation of incidents of police and/or military repression Deterioration of rule of law, particularly perpetrated by the judiciary and police/military
Economy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Early 80s decline and rising unemployment Takeover by Serbs Breakdown of the market Shadow economy (Albanian takeover) funding for Kosovar cause Distinctive and obvious disparities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Large scale development projects in area without local benefits Long-standing disparity in economic benefits Change of attitude with change of political leadership 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sign of latent instability: long-standing disparity in economic benefits Abrupt distinctive and obvious economic disparity between dominant group and dominated group
Political	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1981 student protest on food price rise developed into demand for independence became violent, with 24 killed by police Imposition of Martial Law and repressive rule 1986 rhetoric carried message that violence was needed to solve political problems; Milosevic in Kosovo rose on a Serbian-nationalist, anti-Albanian agenda 1989 Autonomy of Kosovo lifted 1990 dissolution of Yugoslav Communist Party Albanians pushed out of administration 1996 Dayton talks created expectation that Kosovo independence would be addressed; eventually led to frustration Domestic political pressure on Milosevic to demonstrate Serbian nationalism led to repression and killing of 500 Albanians 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prime Minister appointed new minister of interior for the South that created high expectations for positive change but eventually led to disappointment when meaningful change did not occur Rhetoric from central government officials seen as expression of a "Thai nationalism", exclusive of Southern Thailand's Muslims Hard-line policy toward Southern Thailand seen as authoritarian leadership and closing off of political participation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Events raise expectations for positive change but eventual lack of expected outcome sparks deep frustration Government further centralises access to power Rise in nationalist sentiment of dominant group in its action/inaction and rhetoric, particularly its portrayal in the media
External	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1997 – Albania pyramids collapse spillover Conflicting messages from the international community 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Possible involvement from foreign militants Interstate tensions between Malaysia and Thailand; exclusion of Southern Thailand issue from ASEAN Summit agenda Cross border movement of people & arms 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased tension with bordering countries

⁵ This information was gathered from participants of the workshop on Early Warning Signs. The organisers of the conference do not claim ownership nor responsibility for its contents.

Common signs that herald impending crises could be:

- Escalation of violent incidents
- Deterioration of rule of law, particularly grievances of injustice perpetrated by the judiciary and police or military
- Abrupt aggravation of obvious economic disparities, intensified competition over resources
- Heightened refugee movements across borders
- Contestation over the use of cultural symbols in public space
- Frustration over events that had raised expectations, ending in disappointment
- Centrifugal responses to centralist moves of the government to consolidate power and close off political access
- Rise in nationalist sentiment of a dominant group in its action/inaction and rhetoric, particularly its portrayal in the media
- Increased tension with bordering countries

3.2 Responding to the Signs: Some Recommendations

Similar warning signals may be observed from different conflicts, but each situation is likely to warrant different responses. In particular, appropriate responses to possible crises may be different in the two regions because of the differences in political contexts as well as available actors, institutions and mechanisms. The following recommendations are made:

- **Utilise existing national-level mechanisms** that could help mitigate the situation such as human rights commissions, local institutions and other stakeholders that need to be involved in the solution of the problems.
- It is possible to **utilise regional organisations, but not in all circumstances**. For instance, the promise of prosperity and stability that comes with entry into the EU could be an incentive to seek peaceful solutions to tensions in countries that are candidates for accession into the EU.
- Where issues of national sovereignty and non-interference restrict official access to the parties to a conflict, **non-state and non-official conduits could be used by civil society actors** involved in a possible solution to the escalating conflict. This is illustrated by the case of **Southern Thailand**, where it is probably too early (and unwelcome, as far as the government would be concerned) for such mechanisms as an international mediator or an official fact-finding mission. However, there is scope for technical assistance and capacity-building for community associations at the grassroots level, aimed at enabling them to be part of a comprehensive solution. NGOs from neighbouring countries, e.g. the Philippines, could lead in such an endeavour.
- Decisive action from the international community, on the claim or grievance in contention, could eventually be necessary to prevent further escalation. In the case of Kosovo, one of the fundamental problems is the question of its legal status. It is recommended that the **EU come to a unified position on Kosovo** to finally define its legal status as part of an overall strategy for South-Eastern Europe.

4. Capacity and Institution- Building for Regional and inter-regional responses

4.1 Methodology and Framework for conflict prevention

First, the **location of regional and inter-regional mechanisms for crisis prevention needs to be defined**. This means determining when the mechanisms should come into play and monitor potential conflict beyond regular political interactions. Mechanisms for conflict prevention must be located at a level where actors have the capacity to defuse the situation and prevent its deterioration into crisis.

Upon analysis of the nature of the problem, the appropriate actors need to determine whether or not an issue or potential conflict merits early warning or action. This can happen either on the basis of principles or through accurate assessments of potential local and regional implications. For instance, the principled approach is based on normative guidelines; for instance, it is activated when concrete human rights violations are observed. Alternatively, all relevant sectors and political developments need to be monitored in a mechanism that includes relevant sectors of civil society and the public sector. Consultation with experts and the various stakeholders is useful in order to avoid mere reactivity to evolving problems especially after public awareness may have been raised through media coverage.

Case Study: Migration

The workshop participants chose migration issues to illustrate the approach for making recommendations.

Conflicts in the field of migration usually develop for two reasons: (1) insufficient integration of migrants inside host societies, and (2) disparities in income/wealth distribution inside and among countries. Whereas lack of integration of migrants and the opportunity for employers to lower labour standards might cause public reactions, unequal wealth distribution is a strong incentive for migration in itself.

The challenges are twofold: first, the control of migration flows and the prevention of social conflict especially in the labour market on the basis of populist mobilisation, unbalanced geographical distribution of migrants and blurred income standards; and second, the protection of the individual against crime and human trafficking, and promotion of proper integration through labour standards and civil rights of effective participation. So far, in Asia, these challenges have been dealt with at the bilateral level between concerned countries.

4.2 Recommendations

A clearly established **multi-stakeholders' consultation mechanism to work at the Asia-Europe inter-regional level** could be feasible in order to formulate common cross-regional concerns.

A mechanism with a regional scope must reflect the regional opportunities and address the constraints. In the face of a so far low level of institutionalisation and the unlikelihood of a common regional legal framework in the near future, the first feasible step is the implementation of a consultation mechanism. This mechanism might be implemented in the form of a **high commissioner for conflict-related issues**.

A regional mechanism could be made adaptable for a variety of problems, could easily be applied and could serve to create as well as to maintain a certain level of transparency:

- Politically, the advantage is that this would be a trans-national facility where issues of common concern could be addressed on a regional level.

- Practically, such a mechanism could serve as an **early warning facility**.
- It could be a **channel for NGOs** to address concrete issues and a link between civil society and states at the inter-state level.
- It could provide a **framework for fact-finding commissions and for the EEPs**, to help to develop measures and long-term strategies.

In the long term, such informal measures might become institutionalised. Laws can be regionally mainstreamed at the state-level. In the case of migration law, this would include civil and participation rights.

© Asia-Europe Foundation, Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung,
Singapore Institute of International Affairs (April – May 2005)

PROGRAMME OF ACTIVITIES

18th April 2005 (Monday)

10h00 – 12h00	Registration	Venue: Hotel Lobby
13h45 – 16h00	Optional political city tour of Berlin Note: Buses will depart from hotel at 14h00	Venue: Hotel Lobby (Meeting point)
16h00 – 17h30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Registration (continued) ▪ Preparatory Meeting for Speakers, Moderators, Discussants, Rapporteurs 	Venue: Hotel Lobby
18h15	Departure for Reception	Venue: Hotel Lobby (Meeting point)
<p>Opening Session: Welcome Remarks and Dinner Keynote Speech <i>Master of Ceremonies: Mr. Axel Schmidt</i> <i>Head of Office, Office for Regional Cooperation in Southeast Asia, Friedrich Ebert Stiftung</i></p>		
18h30 – 19h00	<p>Cocktail Reception and Welcome Remarks</p> <p>Welcome remarks by Conference Host, Friedrich Ebert Stiftung (5 min)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Dr. Ernst-J. Kerbusch Director, Division of International Cooperation</p> <p>Introductory Remarks from the Asia-Europe Foundation (5 min)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Mr. Hendrik Kloninger Deputy Executive Director</p> <p>Introductory Remarks from the Singapore Institute of International Affairs (5 min)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Dr. Yeo Lay Hwee Executive Director</p>	Venue: "Lochner" Lützowplatz 5 10785 Berlin
19h00 – 19h30	<p>Keynote Address (15 min each)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Dr Surin Pitsuwan Member of Parliament, Thailand</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Dr Rolf Muetzenich Member of the German Federal Parliament / Chair of the Disarmament & Arms Control Sub-Committee</p>	Venue: "Lochner" Lützowplatz 5 10785 Berlin
19h30 – 21h00	Dinner	

19th April 2005 (Tuesday)

08h45	Departure for Venue	Meeting point: Hotel Lobby
Session 1: Actors, tools and mechanisms for conflict prevention <i>Chair: Dr. Surin Pitsuwan</i>		
09h00 – 09h25	<p>Actors, tools and mechanisms for conflict prevention at the global level</p> <p>Speaker: Mr Yasushi Akashi Chairman, the Japan Center for Conflict Prevention</p> <p>Discussant: Dr Miguel Santos Neves Head of Asia Unit, Institute for Strategic and Int'l Studies, Lisbon (Instituto de Estudos Estratégicos e Internacionais – IEEI) (Portugal)</p>	Venue: Conference Room, Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung
09h25 – 09h50	<p>Actors, tools and mechanisms in Conflict Prevention Available in the European Theatre</p> <p>Speaker: Ms Martina Huber Analysis and policy adviser, OSCE Secretariat, Conflict Prevention Centre (Germany)</p> <p>Discussant: Mr Djuanda, SIP Regional Secretary for Geopolitical Observation, Maritime Council for Indonesia and Counselor for Geostrategic Affairs, Office of the President, Republic of Indonesia</p>	
09h50 – 10h15	<p>The Asian Theatre: Conflict Management in East Asia</p> <p>Speaker: Mr M.C. Abad Head of ASEAN Regional Forum Unit, ASEAN Secretariat (Philippines)</p> <p>Discussant: Prof Peter Wallensteen Dag Hammarskjold Professor of Peace & Conflict Research (Sweden)</p>	
10h15 – 11h00	Open Discussion	
11h00 – 11h15	Break and Group Picture	

Session 2A: Overview and Case Studies of Conflict in Asia <i>Chair: Mr Axel Schmidt, FES</i>		
11h15 – 11h40	Conflict map of East Asia Speaker: Dr Muthiah Alagappa Director, East-West Center, Washington (Malaysia) Discussant: Mr. Kevin Villanueva Programme Manager, Network on Humanitarian Development Studies (Spain)	Venue: Conference Room Friedrich- Ebert-Stiftung
11h40 – 12h05	The Mindanao Conflict Speaker: Dr Peter Kreuzer Peace Research Institute, Frankfurt (Germany) Discussant: Dr Renato Cruz de Castro Professor, De La Salle University (Philippines)	
12h05-12h30	Competition for Resources in the South China Sea Speaker: Prof Lee Lai To Head, Dept of Political Science, National University of Singapore Discussant: Dr Khong Cho-oon Chief Political Analyst PXG, Shell International Ltd (UK)	
12h30 – 13h15	Open Discussion	
13h15 – 14h15	Lunch	

Session 2B: Overview and Case Studies of Conflict in Europe <i>Chair: Mr Bertrand Fort</i> <i>Director, Intellectual Exchange, Asia-Europe Foundation</i>		
14h15 – 14h40	Conflict Map of Europe Speaker: Mr Éric Lebedel Director for International Affairs General Secretariat for National Defense, France Discussant: Ms. Le Linh Lan Director, Center for European and American Studies, Vietnam Institute for International Relations, Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Conference Room Friedrich- Ebert-Stiftung
14h40 – 15h05	Early Warning in the Yugoslav Crisis and the Development of Instruments-A European Perspective Speaker: Dr. Heinz Vetschera Senior Lecturer, Institute for Strategy and Security Policy, National Defense Academy, Vienna, Austria Discussant: Prof. Johan Saravanamuttu Dean, Social Transformation Research and Director, Centre for International Studies, Universiti Sains Malaysia	
15h05 – 15h30	Migration from Africa to Europe Speaker: Dr Rachele Schettini President, the Onlus Europa 2010 (Italy) Discussant: Dr Riwanto Tirtosudarmo Senior Researcher, The Research Centre for Society and Culture Indonesian Institute of Sciences	
15h30 – 16h15	Open Discussion	
16h15 – 16h30	Break	

Session 3: Conflict Prevention in Asia and Europe: Gaps, Weaknesses and Solutions		
16h30 – 17h30	<p>Workshop 1: Assessment of current conflict prevention capacity in Asia and Europe and suggestions for additional tools and mechanisms</p> <p>Moderator: Dr Mark Tamthai Deputy Chair, the Strategic Nonviolence Committee, Thailand</p> <p>Rapporteur: Ms Mette Ekeroth Researcher, Singapore Institute of International Affairs</p>	Venue: Conference Room Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung
	<p>Workshop 2: Early Warning Indicators of potential crisis and appropriate responses</p> <p>Moderator: Mr Plamen Tonchev Head of Asia Unit, IIER, (Greece)</p> <p>Rapporteur: Ms Sol Iglesias Project manager, ASEF</p>	Workshop Room 1 Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung
	<p>Workshop 3: Capacity- and Institution-building for regional level and inter-regional responses</p> <p>Moderator: Dr Yeo Lay Hwee Executive Director, Singapore Institute of International Affairs</p> <p>Rapporteur: Mr Bernt Berger Research Fellow, Centre for European Peace and Security Studies</p>	Workshop Room 2 Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung
19h00	Dinner Hosted by the German Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Venue: International Club German Foreign Office

20th April 2005, Wednesday

09h00 – 11h00	Continuation of Session 3 Workshop discussions	Venue: Conference Room Friedrich-Ebert- Stiftung
11h00 – 11h15	Break	
11h15 – 12h15	Summary and write-up of Workshop reports	
12h15 – 13h15	Lunch Remarks by Asia Europe Foundation Governor for Germany Dr. Helmut Haussmann	
Session 4: Concluding Session <i>Chair: Mr. Norbert von Hofmann</i> <i>Former Head of Office, FES Office for Regional Cooperation in Southeast Asia</i>		
13h15 – 14h00	Presentations by rapporteurs of the three Workshops	Venue: Conference Room Friedrich-Ebert- Stiftung
14h00 – 15h30	Open Discussion	
15h30 – 15h45	Break	
15h45 – 16h30	Drafting and adoption of list of recommendations	
	Free Evening	

DIRECTORY OF PARTICIPANTS

PARTICIPANTS

#	NAME	COUNTRY	
1.	Mr. Abad, MC Jr. Head of ARF Unit, ASEAN Secretariat ASEAN Secretariat	Philippines	
2.	Mr. Akashi, Yasushi Chairman, The Japan Centre for Conflict	Japan	
3.	Dr. Alagappa, Muthiah Director, East-West Center, Washington	Malaysia	
4.	Mr. Berger, Bernt Helge Research Fellow Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy	Germany	
5.	Dr. Berkofsky, Axel Senior Policy Analyst The European Policy Centre, Brussels	Germany	
6.	Dr. Castro, Renato Cruz de Chairperson, International Studies Dept. International Studies Department, De La Salle University	Philippines	
7.	Mr. Djuanda SIP Regional Secretary of the Indonesian Maritime Council, Councilor for Geostrategic Affairs Office of the President of the Republic of Indonesia	Indonesia	
8.	Ms. Ernstberger, Petra MdB Member of the German Federal Parliament, Deputy Chair of German-ASEAN Parliamentary Group	Germany	Formatted: Bullets and Numbering
9.	Prof. Feng, Shaolei Dean, School of Advanced International Studies School of Advanced International Studies, East China Normal University Shanghai	China	Formatted: Bullets and Numbering
10.	Mr. Fouquet, David Director, Asia-Europe Project, Brussels	United Kingdom	Formatted: Bullets and Numbering
11.	Mr. Friberg, Erik Research Fellow Centre for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS), Jakarta	Sweden	Formatted: Bullets and Numbering
12.	Dr. Grimheden, Jonas Senior Researcher Raoul Wallenberg Institute	Sweden	Formatted: Bullets and Numbering
13.	Ms. Huber, Martina Analyst Organisation for Security Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), Vienna	Germany	Formatted: Bullets and Numbering
14.	Dr. Cho-Oon, Khong Chief Political Analyst Shell International Limited	Singapore (United Kingdom)	Formatted: Bullets and Numbering
15.	Dr. Kreuzer, Peter Senior Research Fellow Peace Research Institute	Germany	Formatted: Bullets and Numbering
16.	Ms. Lamberti, Alba EU Liaison Manager, International Crisis Group, Brussels	Italy	Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

#	NAME	COUNTRY	
17.	Mr. Lebédel, Eric Director, International and Strategic Affairs General Secretariat for National Defense	France	Formatted: Bullets and Numbering
18.	Prof. Lee, Lai To Head, Department of Political Science National University of Singapore	Singapore	Formatted: Bullets and Numbering
19.	Ms. Le, Linh Lan Director, Center for European and American Studies Institute for International Relations	Vietnam	Formatted: Bullets and Numbering
20.	Dr. Mützenich, Rolf MdB Member of the German Federal Parliament/ Chair of the Disarmament and Arms Control Sub-Committee	Germany	Formatted: Bullets and Numbering
21.	Dr. Muguruza, Christina Churruca Associate Researcher Institute for International Law, Bochum	Spain	Formatted: Bullets and Numbering
22.	Prof. Neves, Miguel Santos Head, Asia Programme Instituto de Estudos Estratégicos e Internacionais	Portugal	Formatted: Bullets and Numbering
23.	Mr. Niño-Pérez, Javier Administrator European Commission	Spain (EC)	Formatted: Bullets and Numbering
24.	Dr. Pitsuwan, Surin Member of Parliament of Thailand, Democrat Party	Thailand	Formatted: Bullets and Numbering
25.	Mr Rufini, Gianni Consultant Centro Studi di Politica Internazionale	Italy	Formatted: Bullets and Numbering
26.	Prof. Saravanamuttu, Johan Dean, Social Transformation Research and Director, Centre for International Studies School of Social Sciences, Universiti Sains Malaysia	Malaysia	Formatted: Bullets and Numbering
27.	Dr. Schettini, Rachele President, Association Europa 2010	Italy	Formatted: Bullets and Numbering
28.	Dr. Sotharith, Chap Executive Director Cambodian Institute for Cooperation and Peace	Cambodia	Formatted: Bullets and Numbering
29.	Dr. Tamthai, Mark Director, Institute for the Study of Religion and Culture	Thailand	Formatted: Bullets and Numbering
30.	Dr. Tirtosudarmo, Riwanto Senior Research Fellow , Indonesian Institute of Science	Indonesia	Formatted: Bullets and Numbering
31.	Dr. Tonchev, Plamen Head of Asia Unit, Institute of International Economics Relations	Greece	Formatted: Bullets and Numbering
32.	Dr. Vetschera, Heinz Head, Department for International Security Policy Institute for Strategy and Security Policy, Austrian National Defence Academy	Austria	Formatted: Bullets and Numbering
33.	Mr. Villanueva, Kevin Manager, Network on Humanitarian Development Studies Universidad de Deusto	Spain	Formatted: Bullets and Numbering
34.	Prof. Wallensteen, Peter Dag Hammkjold Professor of Peace and Conflict Research Dept of Peace and Conflict Research, Uppsala University	Sweden	Formatted: Bullets and Numbering
35.	Mr. Yawnghwe, Harn Director Euro-Burma Office, Brussels	Burma/ Myanmar	Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

OBSERVERS

#	NAME	COUNTRY	
36.	Prof. Distante, Antonella Interpreter Europa 2010	Italy	Formatted: Bullets and Numbering
37.	Dr. Hauswedell, Christian	Germany	Formatted: Bullets and Numbering
38.	Mrs. Hopp, Ulrike Advisor for Conflict Prevention and Peace Building Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development	Germany	Formatted: Bullets and Numbering
39.	Dr. Möller, Kay Senior Research Associate Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik	Germany	Formatted: Bullets and Numbering
40.	Prof. Palmisano, Antonio Luigi Professor, Social and Political Anthropology University of Trieste	Italy	Formatted: Bullets and Numbering
41.	Mr. Paun, Christopher Multilateral Cooperation with Asia, Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Germany	Formatted: Bullets and Numbering
42.	Ms Stumbaum, May-Brit Ulrike Head, Forum European on Foreign and Security Policy German Council on Foreign Relations	Germany	Formatted: Bullets and Numbering
43.	Mr. Torkler, Reinhard Multilateral Cooperation with Asia, Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Germany	Formatted: Bullets and Numbering
44.	Dr. Umbach, Frank Resident Fellow Asia-Pacific Program German Council on Foreign Relations	Germany	Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

JOURNALISTS

#	NAME	COUNTRY	
45	Mr. Batalla Garcia, Javier Diplomatic Correspondent La Vanguardia	Spain	Formatted: Bullets and Numbering
46	Mr. Pathan, Don Foreign Desk Editor The Nation	Thailand	Formatted: Bullets and Numbering
47	Mr. Laczynski, Michael Head, International Department Wirtschaftsblatt	Austria	Formatted: Bullets and Numbering
48	Ms. Bersi, Evridiki Journalist, Foreign Desk Kathimerini	Greece	Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

ORGANISERS

Asia-Europe Foundation

31 Heng Mui Keng Terrace
Singapore 119595
Tel: +65 6874 9700
Fax: +65 6872 1207
Email: bertrand.fort@asef.org

Dr Helmut Haussmann
Asia-Europe Foundation Board Governor for Germany

Mr. Hendrik Kloninger
Deputy Executive Director

Mr. Bertrand Fort
Director, Intellectual Exchange

Ms. Sol Iglesias
Project manager, Intellectual Exchange

Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung

Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung Office for Regional Co-operation in Southeast Asia
7500A Beach Rd #12-320/321/322 The Plaza
Singapore 199591
Tel: +65 6297 6760
Fax: +65 6297 6762
Email: fessing@singnet.com.sg

Mr. Axel Schmidt
Head of Office, FES Office for Regional Co-operation in Southeast Asia

Mr. Norbert von Hofmann
Former Head of Office, FES Office for Regional Co-operation in Southeast Asia

Ms. Katharina Deriks
Project Manager

Dr. Ralph Piotrowski
Head of East Asia Desk

Singapore Institute of International Affairs

Singapore Institute of International Affairs
2 Nassim Road
Singapore 258370
Tel: + 65 67 34 96 00
Fax: + 65 67 33 6217
Email: layhwee.yeo@siaonline.org

Dr. Lay Hwee Yeo
Executive Director and Senior Research Fellow

Ms. Mette Ekerøth
Researcher

ABOUT THE ORGANISERS

The **Asia-Europe Foundation** was created by the Asia Europe Meeting (ASEM) heads of state in 1997 and acts as its manifestation toward Civil Society. ASEF works for intellectual, cultural, and people-to-people exchange among our member-countries in Asia and Europe. In particular, Intellectual Exchange aims to contribute to policy debate and strategic thinking on themes of current and future inter-regional importance between Asia and Europe. Part of ASEF's Intellectual Exchange (IE) portfolio, the conference belongs to the "International Relations" pillar of IE, which focuses on discourse and debate on international relations among states in Asia and Europe, focusing on regional-level issues.

For more information, please visit <http://www.asef.org>

Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung, a German political, non-profit and public interest institution, is active in international dialogue and development cooperation. It was established in 1925 as a political legacy of Friedrich Ebert, Germany's first democratically-elected president. The foundation acts as a German and European NGO and places special emphasis on the establishment of platforms and processes for political dialogue and cooperation between countries, political representatives, governments, and civil society organizations. It also maintains special relations with German and international labour movements.

For additional information, please visit <http://www.fes.de>

The **Singapore Institute of International Affairs** aims to make Singapore a more cosmopolitan and global society through research, policy work and public education on international affairs. Founded in 1961 and registered as a society, it is Singapore's oldest think tank. It is an independent organisation, funded by foundations, membership subscriptions and corporate sponsorship. It receives no regular funding from the Singapore government. As a civic institution, it is open to all who value access to the perspectives, insights and networks on international affairs.

For additional information, please visit <http://www.siaonline.org/>