



The RSIS Working Paper series presents papers in a preliminary form and serves to stimulate comment and discussion. The views expressed are entirely the author's own and not that of the S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies. If you have any comments, please send them to the following email address: isjwlin@ntu.edu.sg.

Unsubscribing

If you no longer want to receive RSIS Working Papers, please click on "[Unsubscribe](#)." to be removed from the list.

No. 212

Japan-Korea Relations and the Tokdo/Takeshima Dispute: The Interplay of Nationalism and Natural Resources

Ralf Emmers

**S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies
Singapore**

10 November 2010

About RSIS

The **S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS)** was established in January 2007 as an autonomous School within the Nanyang Technological University. **RSIS'** mission is to be a leading research and graduate teaching institution in strategic and international affairs in the Asia-Pacific. To accomplish this mission, **RSIS** will:

- Provide a rigorous professional graduate education in international affairs with a strong practical and area emphasis
- Conduct policy-relevant research in national security, defence and strategic studies, diplomacy and international relations
- Collaborate with like-minded schools of international affairs to form a global network of excellence

Graduate Training in International Affairs

RSIS offers an exacting graduate education in international affairs, taught by an international faculty of leading thinkers and practitioners. The teaching programme consists of the Master of Science (MSc) degrees in Strategic Studies, International Relations, International Political Economy and Asian Studies as well as The Nanyang MBA (International Studies) offered jointly with the Nanyang Business School. The graduate teaching is distinguished by their focus on the Asia-Pacific region, the professional practice of international affairs and the cultivation of academic depth. Over 150 students, the majority from abroad, are enrolled with the School. A small and select Ph.D. programme caters to students whose interests match those of specific faculty members.

Research

Research at **RSIS** is conducted by five constituent Institutes and Centres: the Institute of Defence and Strategic Studies (IDSS), the International Centre for Political Violence and Terrorism Research (ICPVTR), the Centre of Excellence for National Security (CENS), the Centre for Non-Traditional Security (NTS) Studies, and the Temasek Foundation Centre for Trade and Negotiations (TFCTN). The focus of research is on issues relating to the security and stability of the Asia-Pacific region and their implications for Singapore and other countries in the region. The School has three professorships that bring distinguished scholars and practitioners to teach and do research at the School. They are the S. Rajaratnam Professorship in Strategic Studies, the Ngee Ann Kongsi Professorship in International Relations, and the NTUC Professorship in International Economic Relations.

International Collaboration

Collaboration with other Professional Schools of international affairs to form a global network of excellence is a **RSIS** priority. **RSIS** will initiate links with other like-minded schools so as to enrich its research and teaching activities as well as adopt the best practices of successful schools.

ABSTRACT

The Tokdo/Takeshima dispute has remained a major irritant in Japan-Korea relations, preventing a deepening of diplomatic ties. This paper claims that the dynamics of the dispute have been informed by nationalism and access to natural resources. It argues that it is precisely the interplay of these considerations that can lead to the rapid escalation of a maritime territorial dispute or conversely to a diffusion of tensions in bilateral relations. Nationalism and the quest for natural resources have, in the context of the Tokdo/Takeshima issue, been locked in a convergent and escalating relationship. Nationalistic sentiments and the imperative to guarantee access to natural resources have reinforced each other in fuelling the dispute. The purpose of this paper is therefore to offer a better understanding of how nationalism and resources influence and interplay in the Tokdo/Takeshima dispute and to identify pathways to cooperation.

Ralf Emmers is Associate Professor and Coordinator of the Multilateralism and Regionalism Programme at the S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS), Nanyang Technological University (NTU), Singapore. Dr. Emmers is the author of *Geopolitics and Maritime Territorial Disputes in East Asia* (Routledge, 2010), *Non-Traditional Security in the Asia-Pacific: The Dynamics of Securitization* (Marshall Cavendish, 2004) and *Cooperative Security and the Balance of Power in ASEAN and the ARF* (RoutledgeCurzon, 2003). He is the co-editor of *Security and International Politics in the South China Sea: Towards a Co-operative Management Regime* (Routledge, 2009), *Order and Security in Southeast Asia: Essays in Memory of Michael Leifer* (Routledge, 2006), *Understanding Non-Traditional Security in Asia: Dilemmas in Securitization* (Ashgate, 2006), and *Non-Traditional Security in Asia: Trends and Issues* (Marshall Cavendish, 2006). Additionally, he has published articles in peer-reviewed journals such as *The Pacific Review*, *Asian Survey*, *Australian Journal of International Affairs*, *Asian Security*, *Contemporary Southeast Asia*, *Contemporary Politics*, *Political Science*, *Pointer* and *Dialogue + Cooperation* as well as numerous book chapters in edited volumes.

Japan-Korea Relations and the Tokdo/Takeshima Dispute: The Interplay of Nationalism and Natural Resources

Introduction

Despite decades of relatively peaceful relations and growing economic interdependence between Japan and the Republic of Korea (ROK), the two countries have failed to establish strong diplomatic ties. Even shared interests in maintaining the U.S. presence in the region, managing the rise of China and uniting against North Korea's nuclear threat have not fully eradicated the memories of their turbulent past. The poor relationship is the result of the historical animosity stemming from the Japanese occupation of Korea from 1910 until 1945. While Koreans often carry a strong sense of resentment for the past actions of the Japanese, the latter have arguably demonstrated "a superiority complex towards Korea inherent in the collective mindsets of former colonizers" (Cha, 2000: 313). Such emotional tension periodically takes on physical manifestation in the form of the countries' territorial dispute over the Tokdo or Takeshima Islands, as they are respectively known to the Koreans and the Japanese.¹ Both Korea and Japan consider the islands to be part of their own territory, making the dispute seemingly intractable and concession next to impossible.

The Tokdo or Takeshima Islands are a group of small islets in the Sea of Japan or the East Sea as it is called in Korea. The disputed islands are respectively 217 km and 250 km from mainland Korea and Japan and located approximately 87 km from Korea's Ullung Island and 157 km from Japan's Ori Island (Figure 1). The islets would appear to be of little initial value to either country, as the contested territory consists of two volcanic rock formations and 30-odd reefs, with total land mass amounting to one-fourteenth of a square mile. Widely considered uninhabitable, a Korean fisherman and his wife are, apart from stationed ROK Coast Guard patrols, the sole residents of the islands. The ROK Coast Guard is patrolling the waters around the islets to reinforce

¹ The Korean name of the islands is romanized either as Tokdo, Tokto or Dokdo. The "Tokdo" spelling is used in this paper. The Islands are also referred to as Liancourt Rocks, after the French whaling ship—the Liancourt—which charted the islets in 1849. The name "Liancourt Rocks" is often used by neutral observers of the dispute.

Korea's control of the disputed islands, in effect since the 1950s, and to dissuade Japanese vessels from approaching.

Figure 1: Map of the Tokdo/Takeshima Islands



Source: Author

Conflict over Tokdo/Takeshima Islands has primarily remained at the diplomatic level, with physical engagement being rare. Skirmishes at sea have, at their most serious, seen the exchange of gunfire between the two sides. The 1950s were the most physically conflictual period of the dispute. With Korea's later establishment of effective control, however, violence between Japan and Korea has been relatively minimal in the decades since. It is important to note here that the Korean physical control over the Tokdo/Takeshima Islands is not meant in a legal sense, as the islands and surrounding maritime areas have continued to be contested. The marginal strategic importance of the islands and the fact that Japan and Korea are military allies of the United States have acted as mitigating factors on the dispute. The Tokdo/Takeshima issue has nonetheless remained an irritant in bilateral relations preventing a deepening of diplomatic ties despite a high level of economic interdependence. Bateman (2000: 22) explains that such irritants "can be quite disproportionate in terms of both their impact on regional relations, the boost to nationalistic fervour and the incentive they provide for acquisition of naval capabilities". After having been in the background for some time, the dispute has re-emerged since the mid-2000s as a spoiler in Japan-Korea relations. The paper seeks to explain why this has been the case by focusing on two primary factors—nationalism and resources—and how they interact with each other.

A large majority of works focusing on the Tokdo/Takeshima dispute tends to be empirical, historical and/or legalistic in their approach. In contrast, this paper seeks to combine a conceptual and factual understanding of the issue by applying a framework structured around a two-dimensional typology. It claims that the dynamics of the conflict are informed by nationalism and access to natural resources. Nationalism, tied to identity and memory politics, is especially critical to the Korean reaction, constituting the main exacerbating force behind its position towards the dispute. The Tokdo/Takeshima issue also resonates with nationalist groups in Japan and evokes domestic nationalistic sentiments. That said, in comparison to the Korean official position, the reactions of the Japanese Government have traditionally been less nationalistic. However, in light of the fact that Korea controls the disputed islands and that its exclusive economic zone (EEZ) overlaps with Japan's in the surrounding semi-enclosed sea, Tokyo's position has also been directly influenced by resource considerations. Besides abundant fishery, the seabed surrounding the Tokdo/Takeshima Islands may have gas potential. In particular, the Tsushima Basin and the Yamato Rise and Trough are expected to have gas and mineral wealth. Ownership over the disputed rocks would enable Japan to claim jurisdiction over these maritime areas.

The paper further argues that nationalism and resource considerations have at times operated in tandem in escalating the Tokdo/Takeshima territorial dispute. The importance of these two attributes and how they might influence and interplay in the dispute is at the core of the paper. It is contended that rather than adopting a single explanation, the Tokdo/Takeshima issue can best be understood by linking these two inter-connected variables. In other words, nationalism and the quest for resources cannot be addressed in isolation as they are mutually reinforcing. Indeed, the fundamental argument developed in the paper is that it is precisely the operation and interplay of the nationalism and resource dimensions that can lead to the rapid and dangerous escalation of the territorial dispute. Conversely, the reduced virulence of the two attributes may lead to the de-escalation and diffusion of tensions. Consequently, cooperative solutions to the Tokdo/Takeshima dispute need to address nationalism and resources simultaneously as the root causes of the conflict and be cognizant of the fact that they intersect each other.

The paper consists of three sections. The first introduces a conceptual framework that ties nationalism and identity politics to economic prosperity and energy security in an attempt at understanding territorial disputes. Nationalism and economic interests are, therefore, regarded as essential features to comprehend the dynamics of such a dispute. The discussion offers an interpretation of nationalism and resource considerations and examines how they might operate and interact with each other in the context of a territorial dispute. The second section reviews the nature of the Tokdo/Takeshima dispute. The final section discusses specifically the role played by nationalism and resource calculations in the Tokdo/Takeshima dispute before applying a two-dimensional typology to offer a better comprehension of its ongoing dynamics.

Drivers of territorial disputes

Nationalism and natural resources

Territory is associated with statehood, national boundaries and nationalism. Borders and physical demarcations remain of vital importance in conception of what it means to have a state. Dodds (2000: 32) notes that “boundaries are central to the discourse of sovereignty as they provide, among other things, the means for a physical and cultural separation of one sovereign state from another”. Boundaries are thus inseparable from political arguments that seek to gain or protect sovereignty (Dodds, 2000). Beyond its physical nature, territory takes on significance for the nationalist meaning ascribed to it. Territoriality is “the social construction of space by political processes that act as platforms for the expression of power” (Flint, 2005: 5–6). Accordingly, for territorial disputes, nationalism becomes critically important as an explanatory factor. Nationalism can be defined and studied in terms of an ideology and doctrine, ethnicity, statehood and/or with reference to popular movements. Nationalism personalizes the nation and increases its resonance to the individual (Dijkink, 2005: 128). Dijkink (2005: 120) argues that for “the complete nation-state, loss of territory is inevitably something comparable to bodily mutilation”. Reconciling the members of a nation with the borders of the state is consequently dependent on the attainment and control of territory. Territory, therefore, remains important not for its material wealth alone, but also for the various social values that may be at stake as well (Forsberg, 1996: 438).

By encompassing both cultural and political beliefs, claims of territorial ownership frequently accompany nationalist ideology as groups seek to claim or defend their “homeland”. Alternatively, established states may themselves invoke state-sponsored nationalistic sentiments in order to arouse public support for territorial claims, or defend themselves from perceived threats to their governmental legitimacy. State elites may thus take advantage of nationalistic sentiments to legitimize their authority. “Pragmatic nationalism” is said to involve protests and demonstrations tolerated, condoned or organized by national governments. In this context, nationalistic sentiments and movements can be used as a diversion, as a legitimizing tool or even as a replacement for a dying ideology.

Natural resources and energy needs have traditionally influenced the foreign policy objectives of states. The question of natural resources has shifted from the low politics of domestic production and consumption to the high politics of national security. A secure energy supply is seen as crucial to meeting a population’s energy demands, guaranteeing a standard of living for certain countries and aiding in the development of others. Natural resources, as an economic and strategic issue, have also been a contributing factor in alliance-building, expansionist policies and the origins of conflict. When considering the finite nature of such resources, the implications for conflict are obvious. Competition over a “variety of resources and historically legitimated claims to national homelands has inspired war throughout history” (Flint, 2005: 6). An abundance of resources can contribute to the economic vitality and political leverage of a state over others. Conversely, a scarcity of resources may leave states in a vulnerable position and dependent on securing their energy supplies from others. The increased demand coupled with a decreased availability of resources has the potential to aggravate existing tensions and instigate violent conflict (Le Billon, 2005: 219).

Nevertheless, natural resources in themselves cannot explain the sources of all conflict. Territorial disputes and ethnic conflict also occur over land that would appear to be limited in their supplies of natural resources. In other words, the most valued territories are not always among the most contested (Forsberg, 1996). Newman (2005: 331) argues that where “boundaries cross both the identity and the resource

divide at one and the same time, the potential for boundary conflict is greatest". This paper argues that this is the case in the Tokdo/Takeshima dispute. In short, while natural resources are important in understanding the origins of many conflicts, they must be examined concurrently with notions of nationalism and territoriality when studying why conflicts occur. The purpose of this paper is, therefore, to offer a better understanding of how nationalism and the quest for resources influence and interplay in a particular dispute and to identify pathways to cooperation or settlement.

Driving factors at work

Beyond the interpretation of nationalism and natural resources as driving factors in a border dispute, it is crucial to analyse their operation and interaction within the dispute under study. In order to do so, this section makes a set of suppositions and introduces a two-dimensional typology.

Let us first turn to the individual operation of nationalism and the quest for resources. It is asserted that the two attributes can operate individually as, and be divided into, escalating or de-escalating factors in a territorial dispute depending on circumstances and trends. Escalating and de-escalating factors refer to conditions that respectively worsen or improve the climate of relations over the respective disputes. Under the escalating factors, one should include disputed territories that evoke strong nationalistic sentiments, especially if they are further incorporated by governments into a wider nationalist strategy, and proven oil and gas reserves for commercial usage in the disputed area. De-escalating factors are expected to include a lessening of nationalistic rhetoric deriving, for example, from an improvement of relations between the claimant states as well as the reaching of an agreement on joint energy exploration and development schemes in parts of the disputed area.

It is important to discuss how the two driving factors may interact with each other. It is assumed that nationalism and resource considerations do not simply co-exist in the Tokdo/Takeshima dispute but rather impact on each other. Hence, beyond the likely co-existence of these variables, this paper seeks to analyse the type of dynamics that may emerge between them. A two-dimensional typology is used when seeking to understand the interplay of these considerations (Table 1). First, the attributes could be in a convergent relationship, where nationalistic sentiments and natural resources

are operating along similar trends, mutually reinforcing each other and generally becoming inseparable from each other. Second, the attributes may be in a divergent relationship, where the operating trends of the respective considerations are reversed. While the empirical assessments of the interplay will not necessarily fall exclusively into one specific category, this typology still provides a conceptual framework to examine the interactive relationships existing between nationalism and natural resources and to investigate the extent to which they influence the territorial dispute under study.

Table 1: Two-dimensional typology

		Natural resources	
		Escalating	De-escalating
Nationalism	Escalating	Convergent	Divergent
	De-escalating	Divergent	Convergent

Source: Author

Some suppositions can be made regarding each dimension of the typology and how they may impact on the dispute. A convergent relationship can either act as a driving source of escalation or de-escalation depending on whether the attributes operate jointly as escalating or de-escalating factors. Deep nationalistic sentiments combined with resource competition have the potential of creating the type of “perfect storm” conditions most likely to lead to an escalation problem. Conversely, the two attributes operating jointly as de-escalating forces would constitute a convergent relationship creating the right set of conditions to manage tensions peacefully and perhaps even resolve the dispute in the longer term.

A divergent relationship between nationalism and the quest for resources may be expected to act as a neutralizing force in a specific dispute. Key here is expected to be the operation of the energy consideration and the possibility for the joint exploration and development of resources. It is assumed that such collaborative energy schemes might act as a de-escalating force capable to some extent of neutralizing ongoing

tensions over overlapping sovereignty claims. By enabling the parties to benefit economically from joint oil and gas development schemes, the de-escalation of the resource consideration may indeed be expected to soften the escalating impact of nationalism.

The nature of the Tokdo/Takeshima dispute

Complicated legal and historical documentation are presented by Korea and Japan to argue that the Tokdo/Takeshima Islands are rightfully their own. Assertions of Korean claims to the islands rest mainly on the basis of discovery and usage, which date back to the sixth century. According to Korean scholars, Tokdo/Takeshima Islands was first conquered in 512 AD by Chi Jung Wang of the Silla Kingdom, as inferred by the *Samguk-Sagi* (Chronicles of Three Kingdoms), Korea's oldest history text published in 1145 (Ue, 2005). Additionally, Korea asserts that various maps confirm its claims to the islands. It further argues that disputes over fisheries in the surrounding waters were resolved in 1696 when Korean control was recognized by Japan and the Tokugawa Shogunate banned Japanese fishing in the area (Weinstein, 2006). Japan, however, counters that the ban only prohibited Japanese passage to Utsuryo Island, and not Tokdo/Takeshima Islands, further asserting that Seoul has yet to demonstrate a clear basis for its claim that Korea controlled the disputed islands prior to Japanese rule (MFA Japan, not dated).

On its part, Japan argues that its sovereignty over the islands was established at the latest by the seventeenth century, noting that several trade families made use of Tokdo/Takeshima Islands for fishing. The earliest records providing evidence for Japan's ownership of the islets are dated later than those of Korea, however, first appearing around 1650 (Sibbett, 1998). The Japanese Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) writes that formal incorporation of Tokdo/Takeshima Islands into Japanese territory was established by a 22 February 1905 Cabinet decision of the Shimane Prefecture in the effort to curb the amount of sea lion hunting taking place (MFA Japan, not dated). Japan considered the territory as *terra nullius* (unclaimed territory) and Korea did not protest the Cabinet decision at the time. Viewing the current Korean occupation of the islets to be "illegal", the Japanese MFA maintains that the country has consistently held the same position on the issue. The 1905 doctrine is,

therefore, said to have simply reaffirmed its already existent claim to the territory. In contrast, Korea dismisses this claim, instead viewing the move as the first by an aggressive and expansionist Japan that would, by 1910, have claimed sovereignty over the entire Korean Peninsula. Korea was colonized by Japan until its wartime defeat at the end of the Second World War in 1945. Prior to its full annexation by Japan in August 1910, Korea had already been transformed into a Japanese protectorate through the Protectorate Treaty of November 1905.

Historical ambiguity over Tokdo/Takeshima Islands is matched by the U.S. hesitancy in effectively deciding the issue following Japan's defeat in the Second World War. The Cairo Declaration of 1943 called for the forfeit of Japanese territory taken "by violence or greed" (cited in Hara, 2007: 17). The 1945 Potsdam Declaration additionally stated that "Japanese sovereignty shall be limited to the islands of Honshu, Hokkaido, Kyushu, Shikoku and other minor islands as we determine" (cited in Hara, 2007: 17). Under the Instrument of Surrender, signed by Japan in September 1945, the terms of both were agreed to. However, the San Francisco Peace Treaty of 1951, in which Japan recognized the independence of Korea, did not directly address the question of the Tokdo/Takeshima islets. The consequent confusion over the offshore territory either specified or implied as belonging to Japan and Korea by these treaties has since left the issue open to debate. While the Koreans argue that the Cairo Declaration returns the disputed rocks to its ownership, the Japanese Government contends that, as Tokdo/Takeshima Islands is viewed as an "integral" part of its own territory, the Declaration is inapplicable (MFA Japan, 2004). Moreover, the deletion of Tokdo/Takeshima Islands from the final version of the San Francisco Peace Treaty was taken by Japan as an international recognition of its sovereignty over the islands (Ue, 2005).

Early versions of the San Francisco draft had concluded that the islets were a part of Korean territory. Until November 1949, circulated proposals by the United States planned for the return of the islands to Korean control. However, within the span of a few years, the United States had switched positions, arguing that there were legitimate historical reasons for believing the islets to be considered Japanese territory (Hara, 2007). By the time the actual Treaty was signed in 1951, the issue was left off the agenda altogether. Reasons for the shift in the U.S. position are uncertain and open to

speculation. As Hara (2007) argues, the context of the Cold War environment at the time contributed substantially to the stance taken by the United States when formulating the final San Francisco Peace Treaty. When Japan surrendered in September 1945, the Korean Peninsula had already been divided into North and South. Fearing that the spread of communism might lead South Korea to fall to its Northern counterpart, it was suggested that many offshore islands, including Tokdo/Takeshima Islands, would best be left in the control of non-communist countries (Hara, 2007). As Japan, at the advent of the Cold War, was viewed as more strategically valuable in the region to the United States, the historical claims of South Korea arguably came to be outweighed by America's focus on its own political and security interests.

Consequently, the San Francisco peace settlement left the issue unresolved by avoiding its discussion entirely. Ironically, while the United States had left the dispute open to contention in order to give itself more strategic manoeuvring room, the Peace Treaty has largely boxed Washington into sustaining its initial position today, despite the end of the Cold War era. As Weinstein (2006) notes, should the United States side with Japan in the current dispute, South Korea, to the U.S. detriment, may become more closely aligned with China or North Korea. Alternatively, however, should South Korea be favoured, Japan may act more independently (Weinstein, 2006). Washington consequently rests its hope on the notion that the two countries will resolve the dispute peacefully between themselves.

Prior to the San Francisco Treaty of 1951, the "MacArthur Line" had demarcated the contested area. It benefited the Korean fishing industry by keeping Japanese boats out of the zone. The San Francisco Treaty terminated the "MacArthur Line" in spite of a Korean request to preserve it. In response, the Korean Government of President Syngman Rhee (Yi Seungman) unilaterally declared the "Peace Line" (known as the "Rhee Line" to the Japanese) in January 1952, circumscribing Tokdo/Takeshima Islands within its territory. Japan responded to the proclamation of the Peace/Rhee Line by refusing to recognize the Korean claim to the islets. In July of that year, Japan declared the ABC line, which included the Tokdo/Takeshima and Jeju Islands. The UN Supreme Commander, Mark Clark, reacted to the bilateral dispute in September 1952 by declaring the "Clark Line", which worked favourably for Korea by including

the islands on its side and which was therefore disregarded by Japan. Korea later established effective control of the islets through its continued presence of the Coast Guard. Normalization of ties between Japan and Korea occurred in June 1965 only when the issue was set aside in favour of advancing relations. The Tokdo/Takeshima Islands were not mentioned in the Treaty on Basic Relations, which normalized bilateral ties.

Driving factors in the Tokdo/Takeshima dispute

Nationalism, identity and memory politics

For Koreans, Japanese claims to the islets are a demonstration of the latter's tendency towards domination and evidence of their own lingering resentment over the war crimes committed by Japanese troops during their occupation of the peninsula. Combined with the repeated visits of former Japanese Prime Minister Junichiro Koizumi to the Yasukuni war shrine (2001–2006)² as well as controversial Japanese textbooks that critics charge of glossing over the nation's violent history, the fact that the dispute over the islets remains an issue is an indication to many Koreans that Japan is not fully remorseful for its past. Thus, Cha (2000: 314) writes that “‘forgiving’ Japan or remaining even mildly neutral to Japanese actions is, in essence, to deny a critical part of one's identity as a Korean”. The emotional significance of the islands to the Korean psyche is largely tied to that of anti-Japanese nationalism. Indeed, parts of the Korean identity “become constructed in linear opposition to Japan” (Cha, 2000: 314). Highly emotive, Korean nationalism over the islands has additionally been evident in the 1980s pop song, “Tokdo is Our Land”, as well as the “Save Dokdo” video game where contestants compete to successfully oust Japanese invaders from the islets. As a further illustration of nationalistic fervour, Korea named the first of its large amphibious ships *Dokdo* when it entered service into the ROK Navy in July 2007.

Japanese domestic politics have in recent years reflected the emergence of a different Japan. This has led to a stronger foreign policy posture and stronger reactions to foreign policy issues. Significantly, then-Prime Minister Junichiro Koizumi passed

² The Yasukuni Shrine honours Japan's war dead, including 14 Class-A war criminals from the Second World War.

legislation to enable Japan to send a small naval contingent in support of the U.S. war in Afghanistan in 2001. This was an episode of major significance as it marked the first occasion that a Japanese force was sent to support combat operations since World War Two (Yahuda, 2004). Japan also sent a contingent to support the United States during its invasion of Iraq in 2003. Tokyo has also strengthened its naval ties with other powers. In April 2007, it conducted, together with India and the United States, joint naval exercises off its coast. Furthermore, domestic debates have focused on the possibility of revising the constitution and removing restrictions on the activities and capabilities of the Japan Self-Defense Forces (JSDF). Article 9 of the Japanese Constitution technically forbids the country from maintaining armed forces. A more nationalist Japan, especially until the electoral defeat of the Liberal Democratic Party (LDP) in August 2009, has influenced its stand on the Tokdo/Takeshima dispute.

Nonetheless, while keeping a close eye on actions undertaken by the Korean Government as well as Japanese nationalist groups and wider popular domestic sentiments, the reactions of the Japanese Government have, in comparison to its Korean counterpart, been less driven by nationalism. Dismissing the war legacy dimension of the dispute, Tokyo has urged the Korean Government to move forward from the past and approach the issue strictly from a territorial and resource exploration point of view. Attempts by Japan to resolve the case at the level of the International Court of Justice (ICJ) have met with resistance from Korea when it was first proposed in 1954, however. A similar proposal was again rejected by Seoul in 1962. According to the Korean position, the Tokdo/Takeshima dispute does not exist, as the islands are indisputably Korean territory (Valencia, 2006). Moreover, as Korea is in actual control of the islands, the Japanese seemingly have nothing to lose by taking the issue before an international arbiter (Weinstein, 2006).

Even so, the Tokdo/Takeshima issue is seen as vitally important for Japan due to the other territorial disputes in which it is involved. Should Japan lose its claim to the islets, similar claims made to the North Territories/Kurils and the Senkaku/Diao yu Islands, contested respectively with Russia and China/Taiwan, may also be undermined. As all these disputes derive from a similar interpretation of the San Francisco Peace Treaty, Japan would, by renouncing its claims over the

Tokdo/Takeshima Islands, weaken its position with regards to the others (Savage, 2006).

Since the San Francisco Peace Treaty, the Tokdo/Takeshima dispute, driven by nationalism and memory politics, has periodically affected Japan-Korea relations, particularly when other overriding concerns for both countries have been absent. In 1982, Tokdo/Takeshima Islands was proclaimed “Natural Monument No. 336” by Korea and later opened to tourists. These developments caused the Japanese Government to complain. After having been in the background for some time, the dispute re-emerged in the mid-2000s. Diplomatic strife over the dispute most noticeably surfaced between the two governments in January 2004 when, despite objections from the Japanese Government, the South Korean Postal Service issued a set of stamps depicting the nature of Tokdo/Takeshima Islands. In response to what it viewed as an instigative move, Japan filed its grievances with the Universal Postal Union, citing violation of the latter’s Charter by Korea. Controversy surrounding the stamps did not deter Koreans from lining up to buy them, however. Even rationed at one per customer, the 2.2 million sheets that had been printed were sold out within three hours. In response, during the spring of that year, a group of right-wing nationalist students from Japan set sail to reclaim the islands. Faced with the threat of military action from Korea, they were, however, turned back by the Japanese Coast Guard. More nationalist rallies were organized throughout the summer of 2004.

In early 2005, Japan’s Shimane Prefectural Assembly further fuelled the dispute by issuing an ordinance proclaiming 22 February to be thereafter known as “Takeshima Day”. This was meant to commemorate the 100th anniversary of Japan’s assumption of control over the islands. This initiative was adopted without the backing of the national government in Tokyo, highlighting a noticeable difference in approach at the national and prefectural level.³ While actions undertaken by the Shimane Prefectural Assembly seem to be driven primarily by nationalism, it can be argued that the position of the Japanese Government is also influenced by energy considerations. The “Takeshima Day” initiative provoked an immediate reaction in Korea. A reformulation of Korea’s formal relations with Tokyo occurred within days of the

³ This point was made by Dr. James Manicom, 5 August 2010. Dr. Manicom is a Postdoctoral Fellow at the Balsillie School of International Affairs.

declaration. Korean citizens also lodged their anger against the newly ordained holiday by burning Japanese flags in front of Korea's Japanese Embassy. A mother and son even cut off their fingers in protest, while other demonstrators set fire to themselves. Ironically, the incident took place during the "Japan-Korea Year of Friendship", meant to celebrate the 40th anniversary of normalized relations between the two countries. In response to the "Takeshima Day" controversy, Japanese Prime Minister Junichiro Koizumi emphasized the need for rationality. He argued that "overcoming emotional confrontation ... is important for both sides to promote friendship through a future-oriented way of thinking" (Japan Focus, not dated).

The invocation of nationalistic sentiments is deemed to be particularly critical in Korean domestic politics. Arguably opportunistic by playing up identity and memory politics, anti-Japanese nationalism is frequently used by Korean political elites to rally popular support from the nation when it is most needed by those in office, or those competing in elections (Koo, 2005). Thus, in March 2005, weeks before a by-election, the Korean Government issued an unusually strong statement condemning the Japanese "Takeshima Day" and stated:

Land was forcefully taken from us in the course of the colonial invasion and was restored to us with national liberation. This is not simply a territorial issue. It is nothing short of a denial of the history of our national liberation as well as a justification of aggression (Japan Focus, not dated).

NB – insert line

Likewise, the National Security Council (NSC) Chairman, Chung Dong-young, called the move by Japan, "a second dispossession of the Korean Peninsula that denies the history of Korea's liberation" (Japan Focus, not dated).

Likewise, Japanese domestic politics have contributed to discussions on the Tokdo/Takeshima issue in recent years. When the Japanese education ministry announced in July 2008 the inclusion of its claims to the disputed islands in curriculum guidelines for middle school teachers, the Korean Government of President Lee Myung-bak recalled its ambassador in Tokyo for three weeks and demonstrations were held in front of the Japanese embassy in Seoul. As an additional

nationalistic message, the Korean Prime Minister, Han Seung-soo, visited the islets and a large military exercise, involving new F-15K fighters, six warships, P-3C patrol aircraft and Lynx anti-submarine helicopters, was held in the disputed area in late July 2008. A revised curriculum guidebook for high school teachers was released in December 2009, which reiterated once again the Japanese territorial claims. In March 2010, the Japanese education ministry approved elementary school social studies textbooks describing the disputed islets as Japanese territory, provoking an immediate Korean diplomatic response and demonstrations, which were held in front of the Japanese Embassy in Seoul. Most recently, the Japanese Government reiterated its claims to the Tokdo/Takeshima islets in its latest diplomatic bluebook released in August 2010, causing Seoul to file an official complaint.

Natural resources

Beyond nationalism and memory politics, the Tokdo/Takeshima Islands have also been important to Japan and Korea due to the natural resources at stake. Though the islands are poor in the fresh water reserves necessary to sustain human life, they are abundant in fish. It has already been noted that the waters surrounding the islets have been exploited by fishermen from both nations for centuries. In addition, it is anticipated that their waters contain natural gas reserves estimated at 600 million tons (Weinstein, 2006). The Korea Gas Corporation projects that the amount of methane hydrate deposits to be found in the surrounding seabed would be capable of fulfilling South Korean demand for natural gas for 30 years (Kim, 2006). Gas exploration is currently undertaken at two sites in waters surrounding the Tokdo/Takeshima Islands, one by the state-owned Korea Gas Corporation and the other jointly by Korea National Oil and Australia's Woodside Petroleum. Korea imports 100 per cent of its gas in the form of liquefied natural gas (LNG). While Japan imports most of its gas in the form of LNG, it also has offshore gas fields in the East China Sea. It is often argued that Japan's renewed interest in and claims to the islands have resulted from the potential large hydrocarbon deposits to be discovered and exploited in the seabed around them. Yet it is worth noting that no natural gas of sufficient commercial value has so far been found.

Prior to the exploration for gas reserves, the availability of abundant fisheries had already caused severe conflicts between Korea and Japan, especially in the 1950s.

Two “provisional” fishing zones were established around the islands in 1999, granting both Japanese and Korean fishermen access to the waters and bringing a commitment from both countries to reduce the amount of fish caught. The 1999 fisheries agreement at least neutralized one of the benefits of sovereignty over the islets; namely, the ability to determine fishing zones (Green, 1999). Yet the issue of control over the seabed was left unsettled. Several rounds of negotiation between the two countries in 2006 produced no result when agreement over how to delineate their respective maritime boundaries could not be reached.

In the early spring of 2006, Japan dispatched two ships with the intention of conducting maritime surveys surrounding the islets, without formal notification to Seoul. The planned surveys of the waters by Japan were revoked following the complaint of the Korean Government and the dispatch of more than 20 warships. Seoul viewed the attempt as a demonstration of Japan’s expansionist ambitions (Weinstein, 2006). Yet it promised not to submit Korean names for seabed features of the area and to rename the Sea of Japan (East Sea) in return for the cancellation of the survey. Some undersea basins and ridges in the surrounding waters have not yet been named. An agreement was signed by the two parties in April 2006, which led to the suspension of the planned surveys in return for Seoul promising not to register Korean names for submarine features near the islets at an International Hydrographic Organization (IHO) meeting in June 2006. The agreement was still perceived in Korea as a concession to Japan. Notably, a statement from the Korean Secretary for Public Information declared:

Exactly 100 years after its occupation of Korea, Japan is again attempting to rob us of our history. The key to the Dokdo issue is the liquidation of the war of the Japanese imperialists’ aggression. In that sense, Dokdo stands at the centre of our efforts to rectify a history distorted by a war of aggression (as cited in Weinstein, 2006).

It is important to note that the entire incident occurred at the time of Korea’s general elections of 11 April 2006, which further escalated the nationalist rhetoric. Nationalism and the search for resources were therefore closely inter-twined in causing the escalation of bilateral tension. On its part, the Japanese Government

warned in the same year that it would send its own Coast Guard to the area should Korean surveyors infringe on their proclaimed EEZ. In July 2006, a South Korean ship conducted a survey in the disputed area, causing the Japanese foreign ministry to complain. The Korean energy ministry reiterated in August 2008 the importance of developing energy resources, such as gas hydrates, in the seabed and announced the building of a solar power facility on the disputed islands. These developments closely followed the controversy over the inclusion in curriculum guidelines of the Japanese claims to the disputed islands, which had strained relations the month before. The concern for energy security has remained since and it should, therefore, be expected that the resource aspect would continue to assume great salience in the Tokdo/Takeshima dispute.

The challenge posed by the overlapping claims to the resource rich seabed has been further complicated since the ratification by Japan and Korea of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) in 1996. The Convention was adopted on 30 April 1982 and came into force on 16 November 1994. The Convention aims to establish a maritime regime by calling for closer cooperation on maritime issues, offering procedures for the resolution of territorial disputes, and introducing new concepts, rights and responsibilities (Wallace, 1992). Yet the 1982 Convention is based on assumptions of agreement on sovereignty and does not provide for resolution of disputes, except through a diplomatic compromise. Arbitration can be compulsory for some maritime disputes although countries can opt out of compulsory arbitration in respect of boundary disputes.

The UN Convention imposes conditions to regulate internal waters, archipelagic waters, territorial seas, contiguous zones, EEZ, continental shelves and high seas. Maritime zones are measured from territorial sea baselines. The Convention provides coastal states with the authority to extend their sovereign jurisdiction under a specific set of rules. It authorizes expansion of the territorial sea to 12 nautical miles and limits the contiguous zone to 24 nautical miles. The EEZ “shall not extend beyond the 200 nautical miles from the baselines from which the breadth of the territorial sea is measured” (UNCLOS, 1983, Article 57). The sovereign rights of a coastal state over the EEZ are limited to the exploration and exploitation of its living and non-living resources. It is estimated that the 200-mile EEZs established by all the coastal states

contain over 90 per cent of all commercially exploitable fish stocks and over 80 per cent of the world's known submarine oil reserves. In some limited circumstances, continental shelves can be extended beyond a limit of 350 nautical miles from territorial sea baselines. The sovereign rights of a coastal state over the continental shelf are reduced to the exploration and exploitation of its sedentary living resources (clams, pearl shells, corals and others) as well as its non-living resources (natural gas, oil and others).

Following their 2006 ratification of UNCLOS, Japan and Korea established their respective EEZs. As Green (1999: 10) writes of the Tokdo/Takeshima dispute, of “marginal strategic importance themselves, the rocks became crucial as markers of each nation's EEZ”. Generating a 200-nautical-mile area from the baseline, an EEZ could indeed grant Tokyo and Seoul critical access to the offshore resources contained therein. Yet, as both states claim sovereignty over Tokdo/Takeshima Islands, their claimed EEZs thereby overlap, raising additional questions of legality for the two sides in their fishing and offshore exploration. Significantly, control over the Tokdo/Takeshima Islands may not be a legitimate basis for claiming an EEZ and continental shelf, as the islets appear unable to sustain human life without external assistance and have no economic life of their own. UNCLOS defines an island as “a naturally-formed area of land surrounded by water, which is above water at high tide” (UNCLOS, 1983, Article 121). An island is also said to be capable of naturally supporting life. In contrast, UNCLOS declares that “rocks which cannot sustain human habitation or economic life of their own shall have no EEZ or continental shelf” (UNCLOS, 1983, Article 121.3). Features that cannot sustain human life and artificial islands are only entitled respectively to a 12-nautical-mile area of territorial sea and a 500-metre safety zone. Nevertheless, despite UNCLOS's definition of what constitutes an island, Japan and Korea may still argue that the Tokdo/Takeshima Islands are in fact islands, possibly with some justification, as no good tests are available to determine the status of features (see Van Dyke, 2009). For example, drinking water was found on the western island in 1965, which still serves the people residing on the Tokdo/Takeshima Islands to this day.

Interplay of Nationalism and Natural Resources

Nationalism and the quest for natural resources have so far been found to be at the core of the Tokdo/Takeshima issue. Deriving from the legacy of the Second World War and domestic politics, the importance of nationalism and popular movements has been observed. Close attention has also been given to the access and supply of resources. Hence, intensified by Korean nationalistic sentiments and antipathy towards the former colonizer, rising nationalism in Japanese domestic politics as well as by the necessity for Tokyo to guarantee access to natural resources, the sovereignty dispute has remained a major irritant in bilateral relations.

Beyond the individual operation of the nationalist and resource attributes, this paper considers the interplay of the two considerations in the Tokdo/Takeshima dispute. As mentioned previously, it is assumed that a convergent and mutually reinforcing relationship between escalating attributes constitute the worst possible outcome of the interplay process. Rising nationalism combined with resource competition can lead to a “perfect storm” scenario and thus possibly to open conflict. It is argued here that the Tokdo/Takeshima issue has been driven by a convergent relationship linking the nationalist and resource attributes in an escalating trend. Each component of the relationship has fuelled and mutually re-enforced the other, as illustrated for example by the events surrounding the “Takeshima Day” and maritime surveys in the mid-2000s as well as the stern Korean diplomatic response to the new Japanese teaching guidelines that was followed by renewed Korean calls for developing energy resources around the islands in 2008. Entrenched nationalistic sentiments, tied to identity and memory politics, have exacerbated the situation by making any form of concessions by the Korean Government on the joint exploration and exploitation of natural resources with Japan impossible. Likewise, the current Japanese claims have exacerbated Korean nationalism by bringing to the fore memory politics associated with the period of Japanese colonialism and exploitation.

For obvious domestic political reasons, successive Korean and Japanese governments have been forced to pay close attention to their respective nationalist groups and their actions. By maintaining the dispute on the wider political agenda, nationalists in both countries have kept the pressure on the policymakers and translated the sovereignty question into an enduring escalating force. Any concession on the territorial claims by

the respective disputants has been made impossible due to the heavy domestic political costs involved. To grasp the political weight of these conservative political platforms, it is worth repeating here that former Japanese Prime Minister Koizumi visited the Yasukuni Shrine yearly between 2001 and 2006 to please and guarantee the support of right wing Diet members from the LDP and nationalist groups in Japan. Koizumi's visits to Yasukuni were pandering to his conservative base so that he could move forward on his own reformist agenda. Foreign affairs with Korea and China were not seen as a priority and suffered accordingly.

Significantly, one should note that Japan-Korea ties have somewhat improved since Koizumi stepped down as prime minister in September 2006. When examined in the wider context of Northeast Asian cooperation, improving bilateral ties between Tokyo on the one hand and Beijing and Seoul on the other contributed to the organization of the first Japan-China-ROK Trilateral Summit Meeting held in Fukuoka, Japan, in December 2008. Yet, beyond improving the climate of relations, greater regionalism in Northeast Asia should not be expected to lead towards the resolution of maritime territorial disputes in the region, given the nature of Asian cooperative security arrangements and their propensity to avoid sovereignty questions as well as the fact that China may not want to get involved in such issues, seeing that it too has territorial concerns of its own.

It was previously noted that gas reserves are suspected to lie in the seabed surrounding the Tokdo/Takeshima Islands. The possible discovery of gas reserves has arguably driven Japan's renewed interest in the disputed area. Its priority to guarantee access to the area's maritime resources is not surprising in light of Korea's control over the islets and overlapping EEZ with Japan. At the heart of Japan's security policy has traditionally been its concern over energy security, as the country is infamous for its lack of natural resources. Japan's dependency on external sources of energy had previously led the state to justify its attack on Pearl Harbour and its expansion into the Sumatran oil fields during the Second World War. Its dependency on external sources of energy remains, to this day, Japan's major weakness.

Let us now examine how nationalism has escalated the resource attribute, and vice versa. It is assumed that natural resources in themselves cannot be used to explain

conflict or cooperation independently from other considerations, as this arguably depends on notions of sovereignty, nationalism and identity. It is, therefore, asserted that nationalistic sentiments and the historical legacy of Japanese colonialism have transformed the resource issue into a source of conflict rather than potential cooperation in the context of the Tokdo/Takeshima dispute. It is, therefore, not surprising that no progress has been made towards joint energy exploration and development. A climate of relations characterized by deeply-rooted nationalism and memory politics has not been conducive to negotiating an agreement on the common development of natural resources in the Sea of Japan (East Sea). The ratification of UNCLOS has further complicated the situation in the disputed area and demonstrated the existing links between the overlapping territorial claims and the energy calculations of the disputants.

Looking at the other facet of the same coin, it is significant to note that the Japanese claims to the islands have fuelled nationalism and anti-Japanese sentiments in Korea. Disregarding the historical legacy of the dispute, the Japanese claims have infuriated Korean nationalist groups and popular sentiments. Korea regards the Japanese claims and its desire to exploit energy resources as a provocation that evokes memories of colonialism and exploitation. The dispute is representative of the emotional tension accompanying the bilateral relationship, as it is perceived in Korea as an illustration of Japan's failure to confront its history.

Japan's attempts at addressing cooperatively the resource dimension of the conflict by seeking jointly to solve the issue of control over the seabed have fuelled nationalistic sentiments in Korea. By focusing on the resource dimension while omitting the historical legacy of the conflict, Tokyo's diplomatic approach has only succeeded in further escalating the situation. Consequently, a divergent relationship between the nationalist and resource attributes, where the operating trends of the two respective considerations are reverse, seems unlikely in the context of the Tokdo/Takeshima dispute. Concretely, this means that collaborative energy schemes, where both parties gain economically from the joint exploitation of resources, should not be expected to soften the escalating impact of nationalism. A reverse outcome should instead be anticipated in the case of Korea. As a result, it is argued in the conclusion of this paper that the root causes of the conflict need to be addressed simultaneously.

Nevertheless, while the Tokdo/Takeshima dispute has repeatedly caused tension in Japan-Korea ties, it is important to stress that no direct clash of arms has so far occurred in the Sea of Japan (East Sea). This can be explained by a Korean and Japanese attempt at keeping the convergent relationship in check and not to allow the dispute to spiral out of control. Nationalist politics and resource competition over the disputed islands have, therefore, not been allowed to jeopardize stable and mutually benefiting economic relations. Despite strong domestic sentiments often manipulated by successive governments for political benefits, Seoul and Tokyo have been careful to keep nationalism in check and to maintain the conflict at a rhetorical level. Likewise, despite rising competition over access to energy resources in the Sea of Japan (East Sea), economic interests as well as the influence of other domestic factors in both countries have certainly contributed in preventing open conflict.

In this context, two mitigating factors to the dispute should be mentioned; namely, deep economic inter-dependence linking the Korean and Japanese economies and their respective defence alliance with the United States. Drawing on Liberal Peace theories arguing that conflict between inter-twined economies tends to be prevented due to the severe financial costs involved, Koo (2005) demonstrates that when lacking a high level of trade in the 1950s, the Tokdo/Takeshima conflict escalated. Conflict in the 1970s, however, faded due to deeper security and economic cooperation, attributable to greater bilateral trade as well as fears of a U.S. retraction from its regional defence commitments. Hence, Koo (2005) argues that the different level of tension between Korea and Japan over the dispute can be associated with varying degrees of inter-dependence between their economies in the post-war period. While this argument is convincing, it is important to note that economic inter-dependence alone failed to prevent a rapid escalation of tension in the mid-2000s. The manoeuvring of strong domestic sentiments in the midst of a general election, as was the case in Korea in early 2006, can for a short time at least undermine the long-term de-escalating impact of economic inter-dependence. With regards to their respective relations with Washington, Cha (2000: 315) argues that the “two allies are so dependent on the great-power patron that at any time this dependence is threatened, security concerns take precedence over everything else for the two, including historical animosity”. Still, a possible U.S. decline and/or relative disengagement from Northeast Asia may hinder the superpower’s ability to pressurize Japan and

Korea into maintaining friendly ties, which may eventually lead to a further surge in nationalism.

Conclusion: Which way forward?

The paper has argued that nationalism and the quest for resources have, in the context of the Tokdo/Takeshima issue, been locked in a convergent and escalating relationship. Nationalistic sentiments and the imperative to guarantee access to natural resources have reinforced each other in fuelling the dispute. In light of these escalating factors, let us conclude this paper by assessing some potential strategies available for achieving conflict management and resolution in the Sea of Japan (East Sea). International arbitration does not constitute a likely scenario to resolve the Tokdo/Takeshima dispute. Japan is keen to present the overlapping claims to the ICJ but Korea has refused to defer the question to an international arbitration. As mentioned before, Seoul does not recognize the dispute as it considers the islands to be indisputably Korean territory. Tokyo has a different attitude to arbitration as it links the Tokdo/Takeshima issue to other territorial disputes it is involved in, namely, the North Territories/Kurils with Russia and the Senkaku/Diao yu Islands with China and Taiwan. Besides the limited prospect for international arbitration, there is, at this stage, no formal framework between Korea and Japan for seeking to resolve the issue bilaterally.

It is asserted, therefore, that the first step towards conflict management should be to reverse the existing convergent and escalating relationship linking the nationalist and resource attributes. A de-escalating relationship between the two driving considerations would create the right set of conditions to manage tensions peacefully and perhaps even resolve the dispute in the longer term. This can only be achieved by addressing the root causes of the conflict simultaneously. While the Japanese Government is distressed by Seoul's defiance of the current denomination of the seabed features, Korea is aggrieved by Japan's challenge to its control over the islands (Weinstein, 2006). Thus, the dispute could potentially be de-escalated if Japan were to recognize Korea's sovereignty to the islets and Korea were to concede Japan greater access to the area's resources. This could mitigate the nationalistic sentiments and resource considerations that have historically fuelled the dispute.

The prospects of such a scenario are unclear, however. As nationalism, identity and the historical legacy of occupation remain so deeply inter-twined in Korea, it seems unlikely that Seoul will be ready any time soon to concede Japan greater access to the area's maritime resources. Making any concession to Japan would be dangerous for Korean policymakers, since nationalistic fervour is very strong in Korea on this issue. Likewise, the likelihood of Japan recognizing Korean sovereignty remains small at this stage, as the Tokdo/Takeshima issue continues to resonate with Japanese nationalist groups and evoke domestic nationalistic sentiments. The prospect of a de-escalating relationship between nationalism and natural resources, therefore, depends greatly on a sustained and long-term process of bilateral reconciliation based on the reduction of nationalistic dispositions and popular antipathy. The Japanese Prime Minister Naoto Kan and his government issuing an apology in August 2010 to mark the 100th anniversary of Japan's annexation of the Korean peninsula should be noted in that context. Furthermore, a deepening of cooperation among the major Northeast Asian powers and increased partnership between Korea and Japan may work to change stereotypical images and thought patterns between the two nations. The emerging process of Northeast Asian regionalism, typified by the Japan-China-ROK Trilateral Summit meetings, should therefore be welcomed as a step in the right direction.

Acknowledgements

The author wishes to thank Sam Bateman, James Manicom, Lee Dongmin, Beverley Loke, Bhubbindar Singh and Joann Saw for their valuable comments.

References

- Associated Press (2006). "S Korea, Japan Make No Progress in Talks to Set Maritime Borders", *International Herald Tribune*, 3 September.
- Bateman, S. (2000). "Naval Cooperation in Northeast Asia: Problems and Prospects", *Maritime Studies*, No. 112 (May/June 2000), pp. 21–31.
- Berfield, S. (1996). "Anger Over an Islet: South Korea and Japan Assert Old and Bitter Claims", *Asia Week*, 23 February.
- Cha, V. D. (2000). "Hate, Power, and Identity in Japan-Korea Security: Towards a Synthetic Material-Ideational Analytical Framework", *Australian Journal of International Affairs*, 54(3), pp. 309–323.
- Dijkink, G. (2005). "Soldiers and Nationalism: The Glory and Transience of a Hard-Won Territorial Identity", in Colin Flint (Ed.), *The Geography of War and Peace*. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 113–132.
- Dodds, K. (2000). *Geopolitics in a Changing World*. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.
- Flint, C. (2005). "Introduction: Geography of War and Peace", in Colin Flint (Ed.), *The Geography of War and Peace*. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 1–15.
- Forsberg, T. (1996). "Explaining Territorial Disputes: From Power Politics to Normative Reasons", *Journal of Peace Research*, 33(4), pp. 433–449.
- GlobalSecurity.Org. (not dated). *Liancourt Rocks/Takeshima/Dokdo/Tokto*. <http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/world/war/liancourt.htm> (4 July 2010 date last accessed).
- Green, M. J. (1999). "Japan-ROK Security Relations: An American Perspective", *Shorenstein APARC*, March. <http://iis-db.stanford.edu/pubs/10060/Green.pdf> (4 July 2010 date last accessed).
- Hara, K. (2007). *Cold War Frontiers in the Asia-Pacific: Divided Territories in the San Francisco System*. New York: Routledge.

International Crisis Group (2005). “North East Asia’s Undercurrents of Conflict”, *Asia Report No. 108*, 15 December.
<http://www.crisisgroup.org/home/index.cfm?id=3834&1=1> (last accessed on 4 July 2010)

Japan Focus (not dated). “Takeshima/Tokdo and the Roots of Japan-Korea Conflict”.
<http://japanfocus.org/245.html> (no longer accessible).

Kim, K. T. (2006). “South Korea Warns of Sea Clash with Japan amid Talks on Disputed Islets; EU Urges Calm”, *Associated Press*, 20 April.

Koo, M. G. (2005). “Economic Dependence and the Dokdo/ Takeshima Dispute Between South Korea and Japan”, *Harvard Asia Quarterly*, IX (4).
<http://www.asiaquarterly.com/content/view/26/> (last accessed on 4 July 2010).

Le Billon, P. (2005). “The Geography of ‘Resource Wars’”, in Colin Flint (Ed.), *The Geography of War and Peace*. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 217–241.

Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan (2004). “The Issue of Takeshima”, March (no longer available).

Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan (not dated). “Outline of the Issue of Takeshima”.
<http://www.mofa.go.jp/region/asia-paci/takeshima/position.html> (last accessed on 4 July 2010).

Newman, D. (2005). “Conflict at the Interface: The Impact of Boundaries and Borders on Contemporary Ethnonational Conflict”, in Colin Flint (Ed.), *The Geography of War and Peace*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005, pp. 321–344.

Savage, T. (2006). “Japan-South Korea Ties on the Rocks: Dokdo/ Takeshima Dispute Once Again Roils the Waters”, *My News International*, 19 April.

Shimane Prefectural Government (not dated) “Takeshima Homepage”.
<http://www.pref.shimane.jp/section/takesima/eng/top.html> (no longer accessible).

Sibbett, B. K. (1998). “Tokdo or Takeshima? The Territorial Dispute Between Japan and the Republic of Korea”, *Fordham International Law Journal*, 21 April, pp. 1606–1646.

Ue, I. (2005). “An Island Dispute with a Past”, *Yomiuri Shimbun*, 20 March.

UNCLOS (1983). *Official Text of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea with Annexes and Index*. New York: United Nations.

Valencia, M. J. (2006). “Settling the Japan/Korea Dispute: An Opportunity to Being a New Era”, 16 June.

http://www.glocom.org/debates/20060616_valencia_set/index.html (last accessed on 4 July 2010).

Van Dyke, J. M. (2003). “The Republic of Korea’s Maritime Boundaries”, *International Journal of Marine and Coastal Law*, 18(4), pp. 509–540.

Van Dyke, J. M. (2009). “Disputes over Islands and Maritime Boundaries in East Asia”, in S. Y. Hong and J. M. Van Dyke (Eds.), *Maritime Boundary Disputes, Settlement Processes and the Law of the Sea*. Leiden: Martinus Nijhoff, pp. 39–75.

Wallace, R. M. M. (1992). *International Law*, second edition. London: Sweet & Maxwell.

Weinstein, M.A. (2006). “South Korea’s and Japan’s Dokdo/Takeshima Dispute Escalates Toward Confrontation”, 10 May.

http://www.pinr.com/report.php?ac=view_report&report_id=487 (last accessed on 4 July 2010).

Yahuda, M. (2004). *The International Politics of the Asia-Pacific*, second revised edition. London: Routledge.

RSIS Working Paper Series

1. Vietnam-China Relations Since The End of The Cold War (1998)
Ang Cheng Guan
2. Multilateral Security Cooperation in the Asia-Pacific Region: Prospects and Possibilities (1999)
Desmond Ball
3. Reordering Asia: “Cooperative Security” or Concert of Powers? (1999)
Amitav Acharya
4. The South China Sea Dispute re-visited (1999)
Ang Cheng Guan
5. Continuity and Change In Malaysian Politics: Assessing the Buildup to the 1999-2000 General Elections (1999)
Joseph Liow Chin Yong
6. ‘Humanitarian Intervention in Kosovo’ as Justified, Executed and Mediated by NATO: Strategic Lessons for Singapore (2000)
Kumar Ramakrishna
7. Taiwan’s Future: Mongolia or Tibet? (2001)
Chien-peng (C.P.) Chung
8. Asia-Pacific Diplomacies: Reading Discontinuity in Late-Modern Diplomatic Practice (2001)
Tan See Seng
9. Framing “South Asia”: Whose Imagined Region? (2001)
Sinderpal Singh
10. Explaining Indonesia's Relations with Singapore During the New Order Period: The Case of Regime Maintenance and Foreign Policy (2001)
Terence Lee Chek Liang
11. Human Security: Discourse, Statecraft, Emancipation (2001)
Tan See Seng
12. Globalization and its Implications for Southeast Asian Security: A Vietnamese Perspective (2001)
Nguyen Phuong Binh
13. Framework for Autonomy in Southeast Asia’s Plural Societies (2001)
Miriam Coronel Ferrer
14. Burma: Protracted Conflict, Governance and Non-Traditional Security Issues (2001)
Ananda Rajah
15. Natural Resources Management and Environmental Security in Southeast Asia: Case Study of Clean Water Supplies in Singapore (2001)
Kog Yue Choong
16. Crisis and Transformation: ASEAN in the New Era (2001)
Etel Solingen
17. Human Security: East Versus West? (2001)
Amitav Acharya
18. Asian Developing Countries and the Next Round of WTO Negotiations (2001)
Barry Desker

19. Multilateralism, Neo-liberalism and Security in Asia: The Role of the Asia Pacific Economic Co-operation Forum (2001)
Ian Taylor
20. Humanitarian Intervention and Peacekeeping as Issues for Asia-Pacific Security (2001)
Derek McDougall
21. Comprehensive Security: The South Asian Case (2002)
S.D. Muni
22. The Evolution of China's Maritime Combat Doctrines and Models: 1949-2001 (2002)
You Ji
23. The Concept of Security Before and After September 11 (2002)
 - a. The Contested Concept of Security
Steve Smith
 - b. Security and Security Studies After September 11: Some Preliminary Reflections
Amitav Acharya
24. Democratisation In South Korea And Taiwan: The Effect Of Social Division On Inter-Korean and Cross-Strait Relations (2002)
Chien-peng (C.P.) Chung
25. Understanding Financial Globalisation (2002)
Andrew Walter
26. 911, American Praetorian Unilateralism and the Impact on State-Society Relations in Southeast Asia (2002)
Kumar Ramakrishna
27. Great Power Politics in Contemporary East Asia: Negotiating Multipolarity or Hegemony? (2002)
Tan See Seng
28. What Fear Hath Wrought: Missile Hysteria and The Writing of "America" (2002)
Tan See Seng
29. International Responses to Terrorism: The Limits and Possibilities of Legal Control of Terrorism by Regional Arrangement with Particular Reference to ASEAN (2002)
Ong Yen Nee
30. Reconceptualizing the PLA Navy in Post – Mao China: Functions, Warfare, Arms, and Organization (2002)
Nan Li
31. Attempting Developmental Regionalism Through AFTA: The Domestic Politics – Domestic Capital Nexus (2002)
Helen E S Nesadurai
32. 11 September and China: Opportunities, Challenges, and Warfighting (2002)
Nan Li
33. Islam and Society in Southeast Asia after September 11 (2002)
Barry Desker
34. Hegemonic Constraints: The Implications of September 11 For American Power (2002)
Evelyn Goh
35. Not Yet All Aboard...But Already All At Sea Over Container Security Initiative (2002)
Irvin Lim

36. Financial Liberalization and Prudential Regulation in East Asia: Still Perverse? (2002)
Andrew Walter
37. Indonesia and The Washington Consensus (2002)
Premjith Sadasivan
38. The Political Economy of FDI Location: Why Don't Political Checks and Balances and Treaty Constraints Matter? (2002)
Andrew Walter
39. The Securitization of Transnational Crime in ASEAN (2002)
Ralf Emmers
40. Liquidity Support and The Financial Crisis: The Indonesian Experience (2002)
J Soedradjad Djiwandono
41. A UK Perspective on Defence Equipment Acquisition (2003)
David Kirkpatrick
42. Regionalisation of Peace in Asia: Experiences and Prospects of ASEAN, ARF and UN Partnership (2003)
Mely C. Anthony
43. The WTO In 2003: Structural Shifts, State-Of-Play And Prospects For The Doha Round (2003)
Razeen Sally
44. Seeking Security In The Dragon's Shadow: China and Southeast Asia In The Emerging Asian Order (2003)
Amitav Acharya
45. Deconstructing Political Islam In Malaysia: UMNO'S Response To PAS' Religio-Political Dialectic (2003)
Joseph Liow
46. The War On Terror And The Future of Indonesian Democracy (2003)
Tatik S. Hafidz
47. Examining The Role of Foreign Assistance in Security Sector Reforms: The Indonesian Case (2003)
Eduardo Lachica
48. Sovereignty and The Politics of Identity in International Relations (2003)
Adrian Kuah
49. Deconstructing Jihad; Southeast Asia Contexts (2003)
Patricia Martinez
50. The Correlates of Nationalism in Beijing Public Opinion (2003)
Alastair Iain Johnston
51. In Search of Suitable Positions' in the Asia Pacific: Negotiating the US-China Relationship and Regional Security (2003)
Evelyn Goh
52. American Unilateralism, Foreign Economic Policy and the 'Securitisation' of Globalisation (2003)
Richard Higgott

53. Fireball on the Water: Naval Force Protection-Projection, Coast Guarding, Customs Border Security & Multilateral Cooperation in Rolling Back the Global Waves of Terror from the Sea (2003)
Irvin Lim
54. Revisiting Responses To Power Preponderance: Going Beyond The Balancing-Bandwagoning Dichotomy (2003)
Chong Ja Ian
55. Pre-emption and Prevention: An Ethical and Legal Critique of the Bush Doctrine and Anticipatory Use of Force In Defence of the State (2003)
Malcolm Brailey
56. The Indo-Chinese Enlargement of ASEAN: Implications for Regional Economic Integration (2003)
Helen E S Nesadurai
57. The Advent of a New Way of War: Theory and Practice of Effects Based Operation (2003)
Joshua Ho
58. Critical Mass: Weighing in on Force Transformation & Speed Kills Post-Operation Iraqi Freedom (2004)
Irvin Lim
59. Force Modernisation Trends in Southeast Asia (2004)
Andrew Tan
60. Testing Alternative Responses to Power Preponderance: Buffering, Binding, Bonding and Beleaguering in the Real World (2004)
Chong Ja Ian
61. Outlook on the Indonesian Parliamentary Election 2004 (2004)
Irman G. Lanti
62. Globalization and Non-Traditional Security Issues: A Study of Human and Drug Trafficking in East Asia (2004)
Ralf Emmers
63. Outlook for Malaysia's 11th General Election (2004)
Joseph Liow
64. Not *Many* Jobs Take a Whole Army: Special Operations Forces and The Revolution in Military Affairs. (2004)
Malcolm Brailey
65. Technological Globalisation and Regional Security in East Asia (2004)
J.D. Kenneth Boutin
66. UAVs/UCAVS – Missions, Challenges, and Strategic Implications for Small and Medium Powers (2004)
Manjeet Singh Pardesi
67. Singapore's Reaction to Rising China: Deep Engagement and Strategic Adjustment (2004)
Evelyn Goh
68. The Shifting Of Maritime Power And The Implications For Maritime Security In East Asia (2004)
Joshua Ho

69. China In The Mekong River Basin: The Regional Security Implications of Resource Development On The Lancang Jiang (2004)
Evelyn Goh
70. Examining the Defence Industrialization-Economic Growth Relationship: The Case of Singapore (2004)
Adrian Kuah and Bernard Loo
71. “Constructing” The Jemaah Islamiyah Terrorist: A Preliminary Inquiry (2004)
Kumar Ramakrishna
72. Malaysia and The United States: Rejecting Dominance, Embracing Engagement (2004)
Helen E S Nesadurai
73. The Indonesian Military as a Professional Organization: Criteria and Ramifications for Reform (2005)
John Bradford
74. Martime Terrorism in Southeast Asia: A Risk Assessment (2005)
Catherine Zara Raymond
75. Southeast Asian Maritime Security In The Age Of Terror: Threats, Opportunity, And Charting The Course Forward (2005)
John Bradford
76. Deducing India’s Grand Strategy of Regional Hegemony from Historical and Conceptual Perspectives (2005)
Manjeet Singh Pardesi
77. Towards Better Peace Processes: A Comparative Study of Attempts to Broker Peace with MRLF and GAM (2005)
S P Harish
78. Multilateralism, Sovereignty and Normative Change in World Politics (2005)
Amitav Acharya
79. The State and Religious Institutions in Muslim Societies (2005)
Riaz Hassan
80. On Being Religious: Patterns of Religious Commitment in Muslim Societies (2005)
Riaz Hassan
81. The Security of Regional Sea Lanes (2005)
Joshua Ho
82. Civil-Military Relationship and Reform in the Defence Industry (2005)
Arthur S Ding
83. How Bargaining Alters Outcomes: Bilateral Trade Negotiations and Bargaining Strategies (2005)
Deborah Elms
84. Great Powers and Southeast Asian Regional Security Strategies: Omni-enmeshment, Balancing and Hierarchical Order (2005)
Evelyn Goh
85. Global Jihad, Sectarianism and The Madrassahs in Pakistan (2005)
Ali Riaz
86. Autobiography, Politics and Ideology in Sayyid Qutb’s Reading of the Qur’an (2005)
Umej Bhatia

87. Maritime Disputes in the South China Sea: Strategic and Diplomatic Status Quo (2005)
Ralf Emmers
88. China's Political Commissars and Commanders: Trends & Dynamics (2005)
Srikanth Kondapalli
89. Piracy in Southeast Asia New Trends, Issues and Responses (2005)
Catherine Zara Raymond
90. Geopolitics, Grand Strategy and the Bush Doctrine (2005)
Simon Dalby
91. Local Elections and Democracy in Indonesia: The Case of the Riau Archipelago (2005)
Nankyung Choi
92. The Impact of RMA on Conventional Deterrence: A Theoretical Analysis (2005)
Manjeet Singh Pardesi
93. Africa and the Challenge of Globalisation (2005)
Jeffrey Herbst
94. The East Asian Experience: The Poverty of 'Picking Winners' (2005)
Barry Desker and Deborah Elms
95. Bandung And The Political Economy Of North-South Relations: Sowing The Seeds For Revisioning International Society (2005)
Helen E S Nesadurai
96. Re-conceptualising the Military-Industrial Complex: A General Systems Theory Approach (2005)
Adrian Kuah
97. Food Security and the Threat From Within: Rice Policy Reforms in the Philippines (2006)
Bruce Tolentino
98. Non-Traditional Security Issues: Securitisation of Transnational Crime in Asia (2006)
James Laki
99. Securitizing/Desecuritizing the Filipinos' 'Outward Migration Issue' in the Philippines' Relations with Other Asian Governments (2006)
José N. Franco, Jr.
100. Securitization Of Illegal Migration of Bangladeshis To India (2006)
Josy Joseph
101. Environmental Management and Conflict in Southeast Asia – Land Reclamation and its Political Impact (2006)
Kog Yue-Choong
102. Securitizing border-crossing: The case of marginalized stateless minorities in the Thai-Burma Borderlands (2006)
Mika Toyota
103. The Incidence of Corruption in India: Is the Neglect of Governance Endangering Human Security in South Asia? (2006)
Shabnam Mallick and Rajarshi Sen
104. The LTTE's Online Network and its Implications for Regional Security (2006)
Shyam Tekwani

105. The Korean War June-October 1950: Inchon and Stalin In The “Trigger Vs Justification” Debate (2006)
Tan Kwoh Jack
106. International Regime Building in Southeast Asia: ASEAN Cooperation against the Illicit Trafficking and Abuse of Drugs (2006)
Ralf Emmers
107. Changing Conflict Identities: The case of the Southern Thailand Discord (2006)
S P Harish
108. Myanmar and the Argument for Engagement: *A Clash of Contending Moralities?* (2006)
Christopher B Roberts
109. TEMPORAL DOMINANCE (2006)
Military Transformation and the Time Dimension of Strategy
Edwin Seah
110. Globalization and Military-Industrial Transformation in South Asia: An Historical Perspective (2006)
Emrys Chew
111. UNCLOS and its Limitations as the Foundation for a Regional Maritime Security Regime (2006)
Sam Bateman
112. Freedom and Control Networks in Military Environments (2006)
Paul T Mitchell
113. Rewriting Indonesian History The Future in Indonesia’s Past (2006)
Kwa Chong Guan
114. Twelver Shi’ite Islam: Conceptual and Practical Aspects (2006)
Christoph Marcinkowski
115. Islam, State and Modernity : Muslim Political Discourse in Late 19th and Early 20th century India (2006)
Iqbal Singh Sevea
116. ‘Voice of the Malayan Revolution’: The Communist Party of Malaya’s Struggle for Hearts and Minds in the ‘Second Malayan Emergency’ (1969-1975) (2006)
Ong Wei Chong
117. “From Counter-Society to Counter-State: Jemaah Islamiyah According to PUPJI” (2006)
Elena Pavlova
118. The Terrorist Threat to Singapore’s Land Transportation Infrastructure: A Preliminary Enquiry (2006)
Adam Dolnik
119. The Many Faces of Political Islam (2006)
Mohammed Ayoob
120. Facets of Shi’ite Islam in Contemporary Southeast Asia (I): Thailand and Indonesia (2006)
Christoph Marcinkowski
121. Facets of Shi’ite Islam in Contemporary Southeast Asia (II): Malaysia and Singapore (2006)
Christoph Marcinkowski

122. Towards a History of Malaysian Ulama (2007)
Mohamed Nawab
123. Islam and Violence in Malaysia (2007)
Ahmad Fauzi Abdul Hamid
124. Between Greater Iran and Shi'ite Crescent: Some Thoughts on the Nature of Iran's Ambitions in the Middle East (2007)
Christoph Marcinkowski
125. Thinking Ahead: Shi'ite Islam in Iraq and its Seminaries (hawzah 'ilmiyyah) (2007)
Christoph Marcinkowski
126. The China Syndrome: Chinese Military Modernization and the Rearming of Southeast Asia (2007)
Richard A. Bitzinger
127. Contested Capitalism: Financial Politics and Implications for China (2007)
Richard Carney
128. Sentinels of Afghan Democracy: The Afghan National Army (2007)
Samuel Chan
129. The De-escalation of the Spratly Dispute in Sino-Southeast Asian Relations (2007)
Ralf Emmers
130. War, Peace or Neutrality: An Overview of Islamic Polity's Basis of Inter-State Relations (2007)
Muhammad Haniff Hassan
131. Mission Not So Impossible: The AMM and the Transition from Conflict to Peace in Aceh, 2005–2006 (2007)
Kirsten E. Schulze
132. Comprehensive Security and Resilience in Southeast Asia: ASEAN's Approach to Terrorism and Sea Piracy (2007)
Ralf Emmers
133. The Ulama in Pakistani Politics (2007)
Mohamed Nawab
134. China's Proactive Engagement in Asia: Economics, Politics and Interactions (2007)
Li Mingjiang
135. The PLA's Role in China's Regional Security Strategy (2007)
Qi Dapeng
136. War As They Knew It: Revolutionary War and Counterinsurgency in Southeast Asia (2007)
Ong Wei Chong
137. Indonesia's Direct Local Elections: Background and Institutional Framework (2007)
Nankyung Choi
138. Contextualizing Political Islam for Minority Muslims (2007)
Muhammad Haniff bin Hassan
139. Ngruki Revisited: Modernity and Its Discontents at the Pondok Pesantren al-Mukmin of Ngruki, Surakarta (2007)
Farish A. Noor
140. Globalization: Implications of and for the Modern / Post-modern Navies of the Asia Pacific (2007)
Geoffrey Till

141. Comprehensive Maritime Domain Awareness: An Idea Whose Time Has Come? (2007)
Irvin Lim Fang Jau
142. Sulawesi: Aspirations of Local Muslims (2007)
Rohaiza Ahmad Asi
143. Islamic Militancy, Sharia, and Democratic Consolidation in Post-Suharto Indonesia (2007)
Noorhaidi Hasan
144. Crouching Tiger, Hidden Dragon: The Indian Ocean and The Maritime Balance of Power in Historical Perspective (2007)
Emrys Chew
145. New Security Dimensions in the Asia Pacific (2007)
Barry Desker
146. Japan's Economic Diplomacy towards East Asia: Fragmented Realism and Naïve Liberalism (2007)
Hidetaka Yoshimatsu
147. U.S. Primacy, Eurasia's New Strategic Landscape, and the Emerging Asian Order (2007)
Alexander L. Vuving
148. The Asian Financial Crisis and ASEAN's Concept of Security (2008)
Yongwook RYU
149. Security in the South China Sea: China's Balancing Act and New Regional Dynamics (2008)
Li Mingjiang
150. The Defence Industry in the Post-Transformational World: Implications for the United States and Singapore (2008)
Richard A Bitzinger
151. The Islamic Opposition in Malaysia: New Trajectories and Directions (2008)
Mohamed Fauz Abdul Hamid
152. Thinking the Unthinkable: The Modernization and Reform of Islamic Higher Education in Indonesia (2008)
Farish A Noor
153. Outlook for Malaysia's 12th General Elections (2008)
Mohamed Nawab Mohamed Osman, Shahirah Mahmood and Joseph Chinyong Liow
154. The use of SOLAS Ship Security Alert Systems (2008)
Thomas Timlen
155. Thai-Chinese Relations: Security and Strategic Partnership (2008)
Chulacheeb Chinwanno
156. Sovereignty In ASEAN and The Problem of Maritime Cooperation in the South China Sea (2008)
JN Mak
157. Sino-U.S. Competition in Strategic Arms (2008)
Arthur S. Ding
158. Roots of Radical Sunni Traditionalism (2008)
Karim Douglas Crow
159. Interpreting Islam On Plural Society (2008)
Muhammad Haniff Hassan

160. Towards a Middle Way Islam in Southeast Asia: Contributions of the Gülen Movement (2008)
Mohamed Nawab Mohamed Osman
161. Spoilers, Partners and Pawns: Military Organizational Behaviour and Civil-Military Relations in Indonesia (2008)
Evan A. Laksmama
162. The Securitization of Human Trafficking in Indonesia (2008)
Rizal Sukma
163. The Hindu Rights Action Force (HINDRAF) of Malaysia: Communitarianism Across Borders? (2008)
Farish A. Noor
164. A Merlion at the Edge of an Afrasian Sea: Singapore's Strategic Involvement in the Indian Ocean (2008)
Emrys Chew
165. Soft Power in Chinese Discourse: Popularity and Prospect (2008)
Li Mingjiang
166. Singapore's Sovereign Wealth Funds: The Political Risk of Overseas Investments (2008)
Friedrich Wu
167. The Internet in Indonesia: Development and Impact of Radical Websites (2008)
Jennifer Yang Hui
168. Beibu Gulf: Emerging Sub-regional Integration between China and ASEAN (2009)
Gu Xiaosong and Li Mingjiang
169. Islamic Law In Contemporary Malaysia: Prospects and Problems (2009)
Ahmad Fauzi Abdul Hamid
170. "Indonesia's Salafist Sufis" (2009)
Julia Day Howell
171. Reviving the Caliphate in the Nusantara: Hizbut Tahrir Indonesia's Mobilization Strategy and Its Impact in Indonesia (2009)
Mohamed Nawab Mohamed Osman
172. Islamizing Formal Education: Integrated Islamic School and a New Trend in Formal Education Institution in Indonesia (2009)
Noorhaidi Hasan
173. The Implementation of Vietnam-China Land Border Treaty: Bilateral and Regional Implications (2009)
Do Thi Thuy
174. The Tablighi Jama'at Movement in the Southern Provinces of Thailand Today: Networks and Modalities (2009)
Farish A. Noor
175. The Spread of the Tablighi Jama'at Across Western, Central and Eastern Java and the role of the Indian Muslim Diaspora (2009)
Farish A. Noor
176. Significance of Abu Dujana and Zarkasih's Verdict (2009)
Nurfarahislanda Binte Mohamed Ismail, V. Arianti and Jennifer Yang Hui

177. The Perils of Consensus: How ASEAN's Meta-Regime Undermines Economic and Environmental Cooperation (2009)
Vinod K. Aggarwal and Jonathan T. Chow
178. The Capacities of Coast Guards to deal with Maritime Challenges in Southeast Asia (2009)
Prabhakaran Paleri
179. China and Asian Regionalism: Pragmatism Hinders Leadership (2009)
Li Mingjiang
180. Livelihood Strategies Amongst Indigenous Peoples in the Central Cardamom Protected Forest, Cambodia (2009)
Long Sarou
181. Human Trafficking in Cambodia: Reintegration of the Cambodian illegal migrants from Vietnam and Thailand (2009)
Neth Naro
182. The Philippines as an Archipelagic and Maritime Nation: Interests, Challenges, and Perspectives (2009)
Mary Ann Palma
183. The Changing Power Distribution in the South China Sea: Implications for Conflict Management and Avoidance (2009)
Ralf Emmers
184. Islamist Party, Electoral Politics and Da'wa Mobilization among Youth: The Prosperous Justice Party (PKS) in Indonesia (2009)
Noorhaidi Hasan
185. U.S. Foreign Policy and Southeast Asia: From Manifest Destiny to Shared Destiny (2009)
Emrys Chew
186. Different Lenses on the Future: U.S. and Singaporean Approaches to Strategic Planning (2009)
Justin Zorn
187. Converging Peril : Climate Change and Conflict in the Southern Philippines (2009)
J. Jackson Ewing
188. Informal Caucuses within the WTO: Singapore in the "Invisibles Group" (2009)
Barry Desker
189. The ASEAN Regional Forum and Preventive Diplomacy: A Failure in Practice (2009)
Ralf Emmers and See Seng Tan
190. How Geography Makes Democracy Work (2009)
Richard W. Carney
191. The Arrival and Spread of the Tablighi Jama'at In West Papua (Irian Jaya), Indonesia (2010)
Farish A. Noor
192. The Korean Peninsula in China's Grand Strategy: China's Role in dealing with North Korea's Nuclear Quandary (2010)
Chung Chong Wook
193. Asian Regionalism and US Policy: The Case for Creative Adaptation (2010)
Donald K. Emmerson
194. Jemaah Islamiyah: Of Kin and Kind (2010)
Sulastri Osman

195. The Role of the Five Power Defence Arrangements in the Southeast Asian Security Architecture (2010)
Ralf Emmers
196. The Domestic Political Origins of Global Financial Standards: Agrarian Influence and the Creation of U.S. Securities Regulations (2010)
Richard W. Carney
197. Indian Naval Effectiveness for National Growth (2010)
Ashok Sawhney
198. Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) regime in East Asian waters: Military and intelligence-gathering activities, Marine Scientific Research (MSR) and hydrographic surveys in an EEZ (2010)
Yang Fang
199. Do Stated Goals Matter? Regional Institutions in East Asia and the Dynamic of Unstated Goals (2010)
Deepak Nair
200. China's Soft Power in South Asia (2010)
Parama Sinha Palit
201. Reform of the International Financial Architecture: How can Asia have a greater impact in the G20? (2010)
Pradumna R. Rana
202. "Muscular" versus "Liberal" Secularism and the Religious Fundamentalist Challenge in Singapore (2010)
Kumar Ramakrishna
203. Future of U.S. Power: Is China Going to Eclipse the United States? Two Possible Scenarios to 2040 (2010)
Tuomo Kuosa
204. Swords to Ploughshares: China's Defence-Conversion Policy (2010)
Lee Dongmin
205. Asia Rising and the Maritime Decline of the West: A Review of the Issues (2010)
Geoffrey Till
206. From Empire to the War on Terror: The 1915 Indian Sepoy Mutiny in Singapore as a case study of the impact of profiling of religious and ethnic minorities. (2010)
Farish A. Noor
207. Enabling Security for the 21st Century: Intelligence & Strategic Foresight and Warning (2010)
Helene Lavoix
208. The Asian and Global Financial Crises: Consequences for East Asian Regionalism (2010)
Ralf Emmers and John Ravenhill
209. Japan's New Security Imperative: The Function of Globalization (2010)
Bhubhindar Singh and Philip Shetler-Jones
210. India's Emerging Land Warfare Doctrines and Capabilities (2010)
Colonel Harinder Singh
211. A Response to Fourth Generation Warfare (2010)
Amos Khan

212. Japan-Korea Relations and the Tokdo/Takeshima Dispute: The Interplay of Nationalism and Natural Resources (2010)
Ralf Emmers