

East Asian Human Security and Post-Conflict Development in Comparative Perspective

An International Workshop hosted by the Institute for Development and Human Security
Ewha Woman University May 18, 2012

The three largest economies of East Asia, Japan, China, and South Korea, have all experienced growth of such magnitude and under such difficult conditions as not only to have attracted the tag of East Asian economic ‘miracles’ but also to be seen as development models to be emulated. Immediately prior to their periods of growth all experienced the devastating impacts of international conflicts and/or civil upheaval. Not surprisingly then following Japan’s remarkable post-war boom and evolution into an economic powerhouse, other regional economies looked to follow Tokyo’s lead contributing to a perception both within and outside the region of a ‘flying geese’ model East Asian capitalism. More recently, after decades of strife during the civil war and the Cultural Revolution, China has transformed, enjoying such startling and sustained double digit economic growth that it is expected to overhaul the United States as the World’s largest economy within the next two decades. The resilience of China’s growth, continuing even during periods of global economic and political turmoil, has led to talk of a Beijing Consensus as a model for economic development. Finally, through the ‘miracle on the Han river’ South Korea grew from a devastated shell of a state, one of the poorest in the world let alone the region and heavily dependent itself on ODA for 50 years (1945-95), to become the newest member of the OECD DAC, and host of both the G20 and the High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness.

Other apparent post-conflict East Asian development success stories include the tiger economies of Taiwan and Singapore, and more recently Vietnam. Indeed researchers at the IMF note that the spectacular development growth of many economies in East Asia over the past 30 years has amazed the economics profession. Not surprisingly then, the region has experienced something akin to ‘econophilia’ whereby the solutions to all society’s ills are sought through economic growth, development, and modernization. However, these post-conflict development ‘success’ stories do not tell the whole story. Other states in East Asia and in particular certain regions within some of these states, while apparently emerging from similar conflictual backgrounds, and despite significant assistance and investment have far less positive stories to tell. Burma/Myanmar, Lao PDR, East Timor, and North Korea rank among the worst states in the world in terms of both development performance and the measurements of human security. Cambodia fares only slightly better. Indonesia, the Philippines, and Thailand appear stuck in the middle income trap, and each has significant ongoing sub-state internal conflicts (Aceh and West Papua, Muslim Mindanao, and the southern provinces respectively).

Thus the central questions concern: How successfully have individual East Asian countries dealt with the challenges of post-conflict development? What are commonalities and differences in the ways in which East Asians have coped with post-conflict development? Is there an Asian model of post-conflict development, and how does this compare with models from other regions? How transferable are East Asian successes? And what is the role of international communities and organizations? This conference will examine a set of success cases and a set of obstacle cases, as well as the international dimension, and policy prescriptions for East Asian donors and actors in an effort to provide Asian solutions for Asian problems.

The independent variables shared by most if not all of the states under consideration are: conflict, colonial legacy, and nationalism. In order to explain variance in terms of outcome (development/underdevelopment; security/insecurity) the case studies will examine the following intervening policy variables: Developmental state, national project (unified and inclusive), ownership, and a holistic action plan including simultaneous measures address insecurity and underdevelopment at both the national and human level. For example, South and North Korea have similar backgrounds in terms of conflict, colonial legacy, and nationalism yet have diametrically opposed outcomes. The explanation for the variance can be found in the intervening variables, particularly in the lack in North Korea of a holistic action plan. Although North Korea attempted a version of the developmental state (a very flawed version), certainly retained ownership (juche), and had a national project (songun), it has not incorporated development and security policies, and certainly has not addressed these issues at both the national and local/human levels.

Preliminary Program
As of February 28, 2012

09:00-09:30	Registration
09:30-10:00	Welcoming Remarks
10:00-11:30	Panel 1: The International Dimension Brendan Howe – Human Security and Development [Korea] Confirmed Mark Thompson – Governance in East Asia [Hong Kong] Confirmed Boris Kondocho – Responsibility to Protect in East Asia [Korea] Confirmed
11:30-11:45	Coffee Break
11:45-13:15	Panel 2: East Asian Success Stories and Caveats JJ Suh – South Korea [Korea] Confirmed Christian Schafferer – Taiwan [Taiwan] Confirmed Ramses Amer – Vietnam [China] Confirmed
13:15-14:30	Lunch
14:30-16:00	Panel 3: East Asian Obstacle Cases and Policy Prescription David Steinberg – Burma/Myanmar [USA] Confirmation Pending Sorpong Peou – Cambodia [Canada] Confirmation Pending Nathan Quimpo – Philippines/Mindanao [Japan] Confirmed Ed Aspinall – Indonesia/Aceh [Australia] Confirmed
16:00-16:15	Coffee Break
16:15-17:45	Panel 4: Asian Donors and Actors in the Promotion of Human Security Carolina Hernandez – ASEAN [Philippines] Confirmed Keiichi Tsunekawa – Japan [Japan] Confirmation Pending Senior Korean Researcher – South Korea [Korea] TBC Ian Holliday – Rising China and Global Justice [Hong Kong] Confirmed
18:00-20:00	Dinner