



PEACE AND SECURITY IN THE ASIA-PACIFIC REGION WITH SPECIAL ATTENTION TO INDOCHINA AND KOREA

23-26 February 1989

A Conference Report of the Asia-Pacific Dialogue

Host Institutions:

Institute for Peace, University of Hawaii
International Relations Program, East-West Center

Cosponsoring Institutions:

Canadian Institute for International Peace and Security
Centre for the Study of Canada and the Developing World,
Simon Fraser University
Institute for International Relations, University of British Columbia
United Nations University



East-West Center
Honolulu, Hawaii

THE EAST-WEST CENTER is a public, nonprofit educational institution established in Hawaii in 1960 by the United States Congress with a mandate "to promote better relations and understanding among the nations of Asia, the Pacific, and the United States through cooperative study, training, and research."

Some 2,000 research fellows, graduate students, and professionals in business and government each year work with the Center's international staff on major Asia-Pacific issues relating to population, economic and trade policies, resources and development, the environment, and culture and communication. Since 1960, more than 25,000 men and women from the region have participated in the Center's cooperative programs.

Principal funding for the Center comes from the United States Congress. Support also comes from more than 20 Asian and Pacific governments, as well as private agencies and corporations. The Center has an international board of governors. President Victor Hao Li came to the Center in 1981 after serving as Shelton Professor of International Legal Studies at Stanford University.



PEACE AND SECURITY IN THE ASIA-PACIFIC REGION WITH SPECIAL ATTENTION TO INDOCHINA AND KOREA

23-26 February 1989

A Conference Report of the Asia-Pacific Dialogue

Host Institutions:

**Institute for Peace, University of Hawaii
International Relations Program, East-West Center**

Cosponsoring Institutions:

**Canadian Institute for International Peace and Security
Centre for the Study of Canada and the Developing World,
Simon Fraser University
Institute for International Relations, University of British Columbia
United Nations University**



**East-West Center
Honolulu, Hawaii**

Published in 1989 by the International Relations Program, East-West Center,
Honolulu, Hawaii.

Printed in the United States of America.

Additional copies can be obtained by writing to:

International Relations Program
East-West Center
1777 East-West Road
Honolulu, HI 96848

Contents

Preface	v
<i>Stephen Uhalley, Jr.</i>	
Conference Report	1
<i>Charles E. Morrison</i>	
Appendices	
Conference Program	8
Conference Participants	10
The Asia-Pacific Dialogue	13
International Advisory Board	15

PREFACE

As Director of the Asia-Pacific Dialogue I would like to make a few acknowledgments that are not otherwise covered in the enclosed report. First, we recognize the special role performed by the Dialogue's International Advisory Board whose members make signal contributions to the success of this unique project. Particularly deserving of our gratitude on this occasion are the three international advisors who played such an important part in the development and successful execution of this initial conference, now aptly dubbed Honolulu I. These are Hua Di, the Co-Director of China International Technology and Investment Corporation's Research International; Dr. Alexander Kislov, Deputy Director of the Institute of World Economy and International Relations of the USSR Academy of Sciences; and Professor Robert A. Scalapino, Director of the Institute of East Asian Studies at the University of California at Berkeley.

We are grateful for the congratulatory telegrams from Senators Daniel Inouye and Spark Matsunaga, and a special note of appreciation is due Senator Matsunaga for his encouragement of the idea of an Asia-Pacific Dialogue for some time. We are also grateful for the support of the Governor of the State of Hawaii, the Honorable John Waihee, who was abroad at the time of the conference, but who was represented by Lieutenant Governor Ben Cayetano. We are grateful to Mr. Cayetano for addressing the participants and subsequently hosting a reception at the State Capitol. We appreciate the support of Mayor Frank Fasi, who was represented by Dr. Galen Fox, a noted China specialist and former foreign service officer who addressed the conference. We owe special thanks to Dr. Albert J. Simone, the President of the University of Hawaii, for his eloquent welcoming address to the conference, for his reception for the conference participants at College Hill, and for his continuing warm support. And we are appreciative of the thoughtful introductory comments of Professor Jon Van Dyke, the director of the University of Hawaii's Institute for Peace, and for the reception at his home.

I would also like to acknowledge with gratitude the excellent contributions that are continually made to this unique project by the other members of its executive committee: Betty Jacob, formerly Co-Director of the University of Hawaii's Institute for Peace and indefatigable coordinator of the project; Dr. Charles Morrison, Coordinator of the East-West Center's International Relations Program; and Dr. Deane Neubauer, Professor of Political Science and until recently, Dean of Social Sciences at the University of Hawaii.

We are indebted to Fu Jun, the project's capable Administrative Assistant, and to Lynn Haramoto and Sheree Groves, respectively Assistant Program Officer and Project Assistant at the East-West Center, who together helped make the conference a success, and to Xiao Yanming and Yang Daqing for their excellent translating skills.

Stephen Uhalley, Jr.
Professor of History
University of Hawaii

PEACE AND SECURITY IN THE ASIA-PACIFIC REGION WITH SPECIAL ATTENTION TO INDOCHINA AND KOREA

A Conference Report of the Asia-Pacific Dialogue

Charles E. Morrison

INTRODUCTION

From 23 to 26 February 1989, the University of Hawaii's Asia-Pacific Dialogue program convened its first Honolulu Conference on peace and security issues in the Asia-Pacific region at the East-West Center. Academic participants from Australia, Cambodia, Canada, China, Japan, Laos, North Korea, South Korea, Thailand, the United States, the Soviet Union, and Vietnam took part in a discussion focussed on three questions: the prospects for reducing arms; reducing tensions on the Korean peninsula; and ending conflict in Cambodia. This was the first meeting on American soil to have such a wide representation from the socialist and nonsocialist countries in the Asia-Pacific region, and it was exploratory in nature.

Participants met in the opening and closing plenary sessions covering all three topics, but a large part of their conference time was devoted to more intense dialogue in roundtable discussions of the three issues. Each roundtable succeeded in generally identifying points of consensus and differences and drafting an agenda for future dialogue and research.

ASIA-PACIFIC DIALOGUE: ORGANIZATION AND PROCEDURE

The Asia-Pacific Dialogue was established in 1986 to further scholarly discussion and research on especially sensitive issues relating to the peace and security of the region. Housed at the University of Hawaii, the Dialogue is cosponsored by the university's Institute for Peace and the East-West Center's International Relations Program. The United Nations University, the Canadian Institute for International Peace and Security, the Institute for International Relations of the University of British Columbia, and

the Centre for the Study of Canada and the Developing World (Simon Fraser University) were other cosponsoring institutions of the Asia-Pacific Dialogue which was held in February 1989. The activities of the Asia-Pacific Dialogue have also been generously supported by the U.S. Institute for Peace, Dr. Nobumoto Tanahashi, and Friends of the Program. The program is directed by Professor Stephen Uhalley Jr., Department of History, University of Hawaii, who is assisted by a small executive committee drawn from the university and the East-West Center. Associate Professor Betty Jacob, Department of Political Science, served as program coordinator. An International Advisory Board consisting of prominent individuals from countries in the Asia-Pacific region (see Appendix) advises the executive committee. At its first meeting in 1987, this advisory committee recommended giving priority to the question of stability in the Korean peninsula.

In the process of organizing a workshop on Korea, it became apparent that it would not be possible to attract participants from both North and South Korea unless Korean tensions were addressed as part of a broader Asia-Pacific peace and security activity. Consequently, Southeast Asia and arms control issues were added as agenda items. This was discovered to be an effective combination, as each item benefits from the ability to compare and contrast it with another. Honolulu Conference participants generally desired to continue with this combined format, although smaller independent workshops may be convened from time to time on more specific issues. The Honolulu Conference was designed to provide opportunities for three kinds of interaction: the delivery of short papers or prepared presentations in plenary sessions; intense group discussion and the preparation of a group report with recommendations for further work in small roundtable sessions; and opportunities for informal meetings outside the conference proper during receptions, meals, and free time. Plenary statements and discussions in the case of the two regional conflicts (Korea and Cambodia) mainly consisted of restatements of familiar positions. The roundtable discussions allowed much more opportunity for a real exploration of the various positions. The most important interaction probably occurred outside the conference itself. For example, the North and South Koreans had private discussions during break periods and receptions. The Soviet participants met informally with two Cambodians (one an observer) and a Chinese Cambodian specialist for an extended discussion of Soviet policy toward Southeast Asia.

ROUNDTABLE DISCUSSIONS

Militarization Roundtable

The roundtable on reducing military forces in Asia involved participants from Australia, Canada, Japan, the Soviet Union, and the United States.

In contrast with the two roundtables on regional conflicts, this group consisted primarily of scholars familiar with research on arms control issues and had more the character of a meeting planning a research project than a dialogue among individuals with very different positions.

The roundtable focussed on issues associated with the expansion of naval military forces in Northeast Asia. There was a general consensus among the group that the focus of their activities should be on feasible steps to reduce tensions rather than grand strategies of regional arms control. The group identified six priority clusters of issues. These were:

- Confidence-building measures such as transparency of defense activities, intelligence sharing, information sharing on the arms trade, advance notice of military exercises, and the building of institutions to discuss disputes
- Nuclear free zones
- Regional arms trade limitations
- A new regime for nonproliferation of sophisticated conventional weapons
- Identification of potential trouble areas and the feasibility of establishing regional peacekeeping forces for use in such areas
- Decreasing the likelihood of military confrontation by reducing provocative reconnaissance.

In the final plenary session, questions were raised about this work agenda. The most fundamental question concerned the group's approach to their topic: had it been too technical when it should have dealt more with basic patterns of international interactions and domestic pressures leading to regional arms buildups? One participant, for example, urged the roundtable group to focus on underlying "structural" causes of tensions. Others questioned the ordering of the group's priorities and particularly the inclusion, as a high priority item, of the topic of nuclear free zones. Those who supported research in this area argued that such proposals were popular and of interest to many of the region's governments. They also believed zone proposals to be politically attainable. Those who expressed reservations believed that nuclear free zones had to be viewed in the larger context of the superpowers' respective strategic force postures. One American participant, for example, argued that nuclear free zones were inherently one-sided and thus not conducive to strategic stability because of the United States' greater reliance on sea-based deterrents than the Soviet Union.

The Korean Roundtable

The two regional roundtables dealt with issues under negotiation, but since the participants were not government negotiators and since there were also

participants from third countries, there was more freedom to explore these negotiating positions and clarify some of the reasons behind these positions than there would have been in a negotiating session.

The Korean roundtable discussion was characterized by an extensive dialogue conducted primarily by participants from the two Koreas, China, the Soviet Union, the United States, and Canada. There was agreement among the participants on some aspects of both the external and internal dimensions of the tensions in the Korean peninsula. For example, participants noted that the improvement in larger power relations presented a more conducive atmosphere for reducing North Korea-South Korea tensions.

With regard to the internal dimensions, North Korean participants drew attention to the North Korean government's proposal for a confederate state, and a South Korean participant expressed his expectation that South Korea would have its own comprehensive proposal on inter-Korea relations. Participants from both Koreas seemed to agree that reunification could not, at least in the foreseeable future, be based on a convergence of systems. One American expressed skepticism over the concept of an early move to confederation—stating that any attempt to leap over a more realistic and long-term process of societal evolution, now occurring in both socialist and western states, could be explosive. In response, a North Korean said that the confederal proposal is not based on the unification of social systems. A Chinese participant noted the similarity to Chinese notions of “one country, two systems.” A North Korean participant added that, in his view, the confederal state should represent Korea in external relations and should be strictly neutral; the great powers should guarantee its neutrality.

South Korean and American participants generally placed more stress on the need for an expansion of cooperation based on realizable, concrete acts of cooperation. North Korean and Chinese participants, in contrast, gave much of their attention to proposals that they argued would improve the atmosphere for a North-South reconciliation. For example, they urged that the United States and South Korea cancel their annual “Team Spirit” military exercises and urged the withdrawal of any U.S. nuclear weapons on the peninsula. One Chinese suggested a one-year moratorium on “Team Spirit” as a contribution to an improved environment for North-South reconciliation, and another Chinese said that he was absolutely certain that such a moratorium would lead to productive results. A South Korean, however, urged that the productive results come first, creating an environment in which “Team Spirit” would be regarded as less needed.

One of the Korean participants noted that Korea's tragedy was that Korean internal affairs were being discussed by an international group as a problem of regional order. Yet it was clear that the external powers remain integral to a Korean peace process, as implied both by the South

Korean contention that U.S. forces continue to be needed on the peninsula and the North Korean proposal for an international guarantee for the neutrality and security of a confederal Korean state.

In this regard, there was discussion about what kind of intergovernmental international conference might be needed. The most controversial item involved the potential role of Japan. In the words of one participant, Japan had lost "its moral right" to be involved in the internal aspects of a Korean settlement because its past behavior had earned the enmity of all Koreans, and because it had failed to make a proper apology to the Korean people. Other participants argued that it would be a mistake to exclude Japan from any part of a settlement in which other external powers were included. In the concluding plenary discussion of Korean issues, a Japanese participant expressed the fear that exclusion of Japan from discussions of important regional issues could stimulate a negative, chauvinistic nationalism in Japan that would be counterproductive to regional stability.

Despite the sharp difference among participants in the roundtable, there was general agreement that the dialogue was valuable and that more encounters of a similar nature are needed. The Korean participants agreed that they would like to meet again as part of the Honolulu Conference series and that each side would prepare short papers on three topics: peace (security), cooperation, and reunification. One paper on each topic would be written by a scholar from North and South Korea, and these would be circulated in advance of the conference. They also agreed that these papers, which should be summarized in no less than 10 minutes each, would be a point of departure for further dialogue.

There was also considerable discussion within the workshop as to where the dialogue should take place. The Chinese participants, for example, suggested Beijing as a location. In the end, it was agreed that the Korean roundtable should continue to be held within the broader Asia-Pacific Dialogue framework and that Hawaii would be the best location for the second meeting.

Southeast Asia Roundtable

Participants in the Southeast Asia roundtable came from Cambodia, Laos, Thailand, Vietnam, the United States, Canada, and China, with intermittent Soviet participation. The discussion focused on two major topics: Cambodia, and improving relations among the countries of Southeast Asia.

In the case of Cambodia, attention was given to both internal and external aspects. It was agreed that external changes, especially the Sino-Soviet normalization process, favor a settlement to the conflict in Cambodia. It was also agreed that the withdrawal of Vietnamese troops is an essential component in a political settlement of the Cambodian question.

All participants hoped for the earliest possible withdrawal and agreed that external arms supplies should also cease once foreign forces have been withdrawn.

There was also agreement that an international mechanism will be needed to monitor the withdrawal of foreign troops and an election. However, some participants supported the concept of a large peacekeeping force, while others thought such an arrangement was infeasible, unnecessary, or an affront to the national sovereignty of Cambodia.

On the internal issues, roundtable participants agreed on the principle of political self-determination for the Cambodian people, on the need for interim political arrangements to assure a fair election, and on the acceptability of Prince Norodom Sihanouk to head a provisional political organization. They did not agree on the exact character of the provisional arrangements. A Cambodian participant argued that the existing People's Republic of Kampuchea and the Coalition Government of Democratic Kampuchea should both be dissolved and replaced by a quadripartite coalition government. A Vietnamese contended that, although elections should be supervised by a quadripartite body, day-to-day administration should be exercised by the existing structures.

Another disagreement lay in the degree of confidence that the participants had in the abilities of the internal parties to work together. Some believed that once foreign troops have withdrawn, the Cambodian factions will have no choice but to work together. Others feared either continued conflict or a return to genocidal practices.

The Southeast Asian roundtable participants agreed that, since specific external and internal aspects of the Cambodian conflict are being actively addressed in various negotiating contexts, including Sino-Soviet discussions, Sino-Vietnamese discussions, and the Jakarta talks among Cambodian factions and Southeast Asian countries, the group should focus its research and dialogue agenda on broader issues of long-term importance. They identified three major topic areas:

- The major bilateral relationships of special importance to Cambodia, including Sino-Soviet relations, Sino-Vietnamese relations, Thai-Vietnamese relations, and U.S. policies toward the region. These reviews would examine the current state of relations, clarify issues, and recommend steps to improve relations.
- Reconstruction and development of the Cambodian economy following a settlement. Reconstruction of Cambodia's wartorn economy, it was agreed, would require the assistance of both socialist and nonsocialist countries.
- The development of relations between the ASEAN members and the non-ASEAN Southeast Asian members (Vietnam, Cambodia,

Laos, and Burma). Some aspects that should be given attention include the development of regional institutions involving all the countries of the region, economic cooperation, and cultural and educational exchange.

The Next Phase

Although each of the roundtable groups had discussed the possibility of independent meetings, there seemed to be a general consensus at the final plenary session that there was a great deal of value in maintaining linkages among three sets of discussions—one on more general regional peace and security issues and the other two on the areas of greatest regional tension. Accordingly, it was suggested that there be a continuing series to be called “The Honolulu Conferences” after the site of the first meeting. It was also suggested that a second meeting might best take place in late 1989 or early 1990 either in Honolulu or elsewhere in the region. The Asia-Pacific Dialogue organizers agreed to take these suggestions into consideration in putting together a second meeting of this unique conference series.

CONFERENCE PROGRAM

Peace and Security in the Asia-Pacific Region
With Special Attention to Indochina and Korea

23-26 February 1989

Honolulu, Hawaii

A Conference of
The Asia-Pacific Dialogue
Institute for Peace, University of Hawaii

Thursday, February 23

- | | |
|------------------|---|
| 8:00-9:00 a.m. | Registration & Buffet Breakfast
(Jefferson Hall, EWC) |
| 9:00-9:30 a.m. | Opening Session (Asia Room)
Stephen Uhalley, Jr., chairman |
| 9:30-11:00 a.m. | Assembly: Militarism in the Pacific
Rapporteur: Deane Neubauer
10-minute Introductory Papers and Discussion
Douglas Ross, Canada
Alexander Kislov, Soviet Union
Andrew Mack, Australia |
| 11:00-11:30 a.m. | Break |
| 11:30-1:00 p.m. | Assembly: Toward Peace in the Korean Peninsula
Rapporteur: Frank Langdon
10-minute Introductory Papers and Discussion
Hua Di, People's Republic of China
Song Hyo Gyong, Democratic People's
Republic of Korea
Han Sung-Joo, Republic of Korea
Vladimir Ivanov, Soviet Union
Robert A. Scalapino, United States |
| 1:00-2:00 p.m. | Lunch (Jefferson Hall) |
| 2:00-3:15 p.m. | Assembly: Toward Peace in Southeast Asia
Rapporteur: Charles Morrison
10-minute Introductory Papers and Discussion
Mohd Noordin Sopiee, Malaysia
Khieu Kanharith, Cambodia
In Thaddee, Cambodia
Do Xuan Oanh, Vietnam
Pheuipanh Ngaosyvathn, Laos
Khien Theeravit, Thailand |
| 3:15-3:45 p.m. | Summation: James Dator |
| 3:45 p.m. | Return to Kaimana Beach Hotel |
| 7:00 p.m. | Dinner (Maple Garden) |

Friday, February 24

8:00-9:00 a.m.	Breakfast (Jefferson Hall)
9:00-10:30 a.m.	Roundtables
10:30-11:00 a.m.	Break
11:00-12:30 p.m.	Roundtables (continued)
1:00-2:00 p.m.	Lunch (Jefferson Hall)
2:00-4:30 p.m.	Roundtables (continued)
5:00-6:30 p.m.	U.H. President's Reception (College Hill)
7:00 p.m.	International Advisory Board Meeting (President's Conference Room, EWC)

Saturday, February 25

8:00-9:00 a.m.	Breakfast (Jefferson Hall)
9:00-10:30 a.m.	Roundtables (work on rapporteur draft reports)
10:30-11:00 a.m.	Break
11:00-12:30 p.m.	Roundtables (complete their reports)
1:00-2:00 p.m.	Lunch (Jefferson Hall)
2:00-4:30 p.m.	Assembly: Report and Discussion of Militarism in the Pacific Roundtable
5:30 p.m.	Leave Jefferson Hall for Reception
6:00-8:00 p.m.	Peace Institute Reception (Home of Jon Van Dyke)

Sunday, February 26

8:00-9:00 a.m.	Breakfast (Jefferson Hall)
9:00-10:30 a.m.	Assembly: Report and Discussion of Korean Penin- sula Roundtable, Including Collaborative Research Ideas
10:30-11:00 a.m.	Break
11:00-1:00 p.m.	Assembly: Completion of Korean Peninsula Discussion
1:00-2:00 p.m.	Lunch (Jefferson Hall)
2:00-4:00 p.m.	Assembly: Report and Discussion of Southeast Asia Roundtable, Including Collaborative Research Ideas
5:00-6:00 p.m.	Press Briefing/Interviews (Lieutenant Governor's Office, State Capitol)
6:00-8:00 p.m.	Reception at Lieutenant Governor's Office

CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS

OFFICIAL PARTICIPANTS

Australia	Andrew MACK, Executive Secretary, Australian Peace Research Center
Cambodia	KHIEU Kanharith, Chief Editor, <i>Kampuchea</i> IN Thaddee, Editor, <i>Cambodge Politique</i>
Canada	David BELL, Professor, Political Science, University of Toronto Douglas A. ROSS, Director, Centre for International Studies, Simon Fraser University Michael HOWARD, Consultant, Centre for International Studies, Simon Fraser University Frank E. LANGDON, Professor Emeritus, Institute of International Relations, University of British Columbia Kim NOSSAL, Professor, Political Science, McMaster University Richard STUBBS, Associate Professor, Center of Asian Pacific Affairs, University of Toronto
China (PRC)	HUA Di, Co-Director, CITIC Research International TAO Bingwei, Director, Office of Asian and Pacific Studies, China Institute of International Studies
Japan	Susumu AWANOHARA, Senior Visiting Fellow, East-West Center
Korea (DPRK)	SONG Hyo Gyong, Vice Director, Institute for Disarmament and Peace YUN Jong Min, Senior Researcher, Institute for Disarmament and Peace LI Hyong Chol, Senior Researcher, Institute for Disarmament and Peace
Korea (ROK)	HAN Sung-Joo, Professor, Asiatic Research Center, Korea University AHN Byung-Joon, Professor, Political Science, Yonsei University
Laos	Hiem PHOMNACHANH, President, Laos Peace and Friendship Association Pheuiphanh NGAOSYVATHN, Directeur de Recherche, Centre d'Histoire et Civilisations de la Peninsule Indochinoise, Centre National De Recherche Scientifique
Malaysia	Mohd Noordin SOPIEE, Director General, Institute of Strategic and International Studies
Soviet Union	Alexander KISLOV, Deputy Director, Institute of World Economy and International Relations, Soviet Academy of Sciences Vladimir I. IVANOV, Chairman, Department of Pacific Studies, Institute of World Economy and International Relations, Soviet Academy of Sciences

Thailand	KHIEN Theeravit, Director, Institute of Asian Studies, Chulalongkorn University
United States	Robert A. SCALAPINO, Director, Institute of East Asian Studies, University of California at Berkeley Donald ZAGORIA, Professor, Political Science, Hunter College, City University of New York
Vietnam	NGO Ba Thanh, Vice President, Viet Nam Women's Union DO Xuan Oanh, Chairman, Vietnamese Committee for U.S.-Vietnam Cooperation
EWC	Victor Hao LI, President, East-West Center

OFFICIAL OBSERVERS

William KINTNER	Representative, U.S. Institute of Peace
XING Heping	Director, Kampuchea Section, Radio Beijing
Jon VAN DYKE	Director, UH Institute for Peace
Brenda FOSTER	Executive Director, Pacific and Asian Affairs Council
Adam SMYSER	Chairman, Governor's Congress on Hawaii's International Role
Gaye CHRISTOFFERSEN	Assistant Professor, Colorado School of Mines
Andrew McCLEAN	Research Assistant, Australian National University

UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII and EAST-WEST CENTER MEMBERS

Andrew AXLINE, Fellow, EWC
 CHOE Yong-Ho, History, UH
 Richard BAKER, Research Associate, EWC
 Michael HAAS, Political Science, UH
 Robert BOBILIN, Religion, UH
 Rhoda MILLER, American Studies, UH
 James DATOR, Political Science, UH
 Robert SAKAI, History, UH
 Johan GALTUNG, Peace Studies, UH
 Dae Sook SUH, Korean Studies, UH
 Glenn PAIGE, Political Science, UH
 Lou Ann GUANSON, Peace Institute, UH
 Truong-Buu LAM, History, UH

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE PARTICIPANTS
1988-89**

Stephen UHALLEY, JR., Director
Betty M. JACOB, Coordinator
Charles MORRISON, East-West Center
Deane NEUBAUER, UH

STAFF MEMBERS

FU Jun, Administrative Assistant, Asia-Pacific Dialogue
Lynn HARAMOTO, Assistant Program Officer, EWC
Sheree GROVES, Project Assistant, EWC
XIAO Yanming, Interpreter
YANG Daqing, Interpreter

THE ASIA-PACIFIC DIALOGUE

Stephen Uhalley, Jr.
Director

Purpose

The Asia-Pacific Dialogue is a major new project initiated at the University of Hawaii whose aim is to bring together scholars and experts from socialist and nonsocialist countries in the Asia-Pacific region to discuss and research critical issues and underlying causes of conflict with the purpose of both illuminating the problems and searching for peaceful solutions. The Dialogue is based on the premise that to understand the roots of international conflict and the political, economic, social, and cultural realities of the problems, it is essential to work cooperatively with nationals of the areas involved. This means joint determination of what subjects to explore and the most effective means of examining the selected topics.

History

The Dialogue is advised by an International Advisory Board that meets periodically to evaluate the progress of ongoing projects and plan for future programs.

At its first meeting in July 1987, the Board suggested focussing initially on three subjects:

- Regional conflicts: ways and means of peaceful resolution
- Economic domestic reform: implications for international cooperation
- Ethnic, religious, and linguistic conflicts

The Board suggested priority attention should be given to regional conflicts. In August 1988, the Board proposed that a forthcoming conference should include the dialogue on Korea, Indochina, and militarism in the Pacific.

Goals

The Asia-Pacific Dialogue is unique among academic activities. It focuses on specific areas of conflict in this important region, and operates on the assumption that conflict is created, in part, by a rupture of discourse during which disputants lose sight of values, interests, and perspectives of the other party.

Experience in cross-cultural studies has demonstrated that creative scholars, schooled in the art of discourse, regardless of ideologies formed

by different political, economic, and social backgrounds, can help discover bridges leading to new routes of agreement. This is particularly evident when scholars jointly examine problems of mutual concern whose resolution will benefit a region or the international community.

Organized on a nongovernmental basis, this ongoing program recognizes the fact that official government representatives are often hampered by political considerations from full and frank discussion of sensitive issues. By working within the scholarly community, the Dialogue is an effort at second-track diplomacy. By seeking to transcend national and ideological barriers, it attempts to deal with potential areas of conflict in a manner that avoids the constraints of official national positions.

A long-term objective of this project is to create an infrastructure that will enhance public understanding of difficult issues and generate options for reducing tensions in existing or potential conflict situations. Informed academic leaders contribute not only to the substantive dialogue, but also to the dissemination of their ideas through publication of research findings, conference proceedings, feature articles, and books. The use of seminars, workshops, and media communication will help build the public understanding essential to the resolution of problems.

The Dialogue's primary audience is scholars working on Asia-Pacific issues. The secondary audience is statesmen in the region who interact with these scholars and rely on them for policy suggestions. The tertiary audience is the general public.

The program is funded through separate requests to institutions and foundations. Administrative support is provided by the University of Hawaii through the Institute for Peace.

INTERNATIONAL ADVISORY BOARD

**The Asia-Pacific Dialogue
1988-89**

Canada	Geoffrey Pearson, Former Director, Canadian Institute for International Peace and Security
India	Iqbal Narain, Member Secretary, Indian Council of Social Science Research
Indonesia	Jusuf Wanandi, Executive Director, Center for Strategic and International Studies
Japan	Seizaburo Sato, Director, International Institute for Global Peace
China	Hua Di, Co-Director, CITIC Research International
USA	Robert A. Scalapino, Director, Institute of East Asian Studies, University of California at Berkeley
USSR	Alexander K. Kislov, Deputy Director, Institute of World Economy and International Relations, Soviet Academy of Sciences
UNU	Kinhide Mushakoji, Vice-Rector, United Nations University
EWC	Victor Hao Li, President, East-West Center

