

Humanitarian Assistance and Disaster Relief (HADR) as a Non-traditional
Security Issue in ASEAN: Vietnam's Interests and Policies

By
Nguyen Thi Thuy Ha

A Thesis
Submitted to the Victoria University of Wellington in Partial
Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of
International Relations (MIR)

School of History, Philosophy, Political Science and International
Relations

Victoria University of Wellington
2013

Abstract

Humanitarian Assistance and Disaster Relief (HADR) has never received as much attention from the world's leaders as it does today. This is because in addition to causing economic losses, disasters -both natural and man-made - have increasingly impacted on the quality of human life and human dignity. Disasters have become 'securitized' and have become increasingly understood as part of a 'non-traditional' security (NTS) agenda. The goal of disaster reduction and mitigation has become a greater priority for governments.

In the wake of the 2004 Indian Ocean tsunami, ASEAN countries have paid greater attention to HADR as a non-traditional security issue. HADR is one item under the ASEAN Socio Cultural Community, whose aim is to contribute to building a people-oriented and socially responsible ASEAN Community. HADR has also become the subject of various cooperation activities and mechanisms among regional and extra-regional countries, including the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF) and the ASEAN Defense Ministers Meeting (ADMM).

As a disaster-prone country, Vietnam has an interest in cooperating with regional states in dealing with, combating, preventing and reducing disasters. Active participation in regional HADR activities provides Vietnam with the chance to deal with its own natural disasters, and creates opportunities for Vietnam to pursue its wider objective of a open, diversified and multilateralized foreign policy.

Acknowledgement

I wish to express my gratitude to the Joint Program between Vietnam Program 165 (under the Central Committee of Organization) and the Government of New Zealand for a grant, which enabled me to pursue the Masters Program on International Relations at Victoria University of Wellington jointly organized by the University and the Diplomatic Academy of Vietnam.

I would like to express my grateful thanks to my Supervisor, Dr. David Capie for his encouragement, guidance and comments on my thesis.

My sincere thanks to all professors and staff of Victoria University of Wellington from whom I acquired useful knowledge and passion for my studies and research.

My heartfelt thanks to my family – my parents, my husband and my children for their support throughout the period of my course.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iii
ABBREVIATIONS	iv
INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER 1: Literature Review and Methodology.	3
Literature Review	3
<i>The Copenhagen School and Definition of Nontraditional Security.</i>	3
<i>Securitization of Non-military Threats in Southeast Asia.</i>	6
<i>Humanitarian Assistance and Disaster Relief in Southeast Asia as a NTS issue.</i>	10
CHAPTER 2: Nontraditional Security in Southeast Asia	13
2.1 ASEAN's Security Concerns	13
2.2 Nontraditional Security in ASEAN	18
CHAPTER 3: Humanitarian Assistance and Disaster Relief as a NTS Issue in ASEAN	27
3.1 Humanitarian Assistance and Disaster Relief and Securitization of HADR	27
<i>The Concept of Humanitarian Assistance and Disaster Relief</i>	27
<i>Humanitarian Assistance and Disaster Relief Securitization</i>	29
<i>How Humanitarian Assistance and Disaster Relief has been securitized globally</i>	31
3.2 Humanitarian Assistance and Disaster Relief Issue in ASEAN and Southeast Asian countries	39
CHAPTER 4: Vietnam's Interests and Policies on HADR.	47
4.1 Vietnam's active participation in bilateral and multilateral institutions on HADR.	47
4.2 Vietnam's interests and policies on HADR.	55
CONCLUSION	67
BIBLIOGRAPHY	73

Abbreviation

AADMER	ASEAN Agreement on Disaster Management and Emergency Response
ACDM	ASEAN Committee on Disaster Management
ADMM	ASEAN Defense Ministerial Meeting
ADMM+	ASEAN Defense Ministerial Meeting Plus
AEGDM	ASEAN Experts Group on Disaster Management
AHA Center	ASEAN Coordinating Centre for Humanitarian Assistance and Disaster Management
ARDEX	ASEAN Regional Disaster Emergency Response Exercise
ARF-DiREX	ASEAN Regional Forum – Disaster Relief Exercise
ASEAN	Association of Southeast Asian Nations
ARF	ASEAN Regional Forum
EAS	East Asia Summit
HADR	Humanitarian Assistance and Disaster Relief
HIV/AIDS	Human Immunodeficiency Virus/ Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome
ICRC	International Committee of Red Cross
IDNDR	International Decade for Natural Disaster Reduction
IAEE	International Association for Earthquake Engineering
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
NTS	Nontraditional Security
SARS	Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome
SEANWFZ	Southeast Asia Nuclear Weapon Free Zone
TAC	Treaty of Amity and Cooperation
UN	United Nations
WB	World Bank
ZOPFAN	Zone of Peace, Freedom and Neutrality

Introduction

Security is a fundamental concern of states. However, the concept of security has changed its meaning over time and is understood today as involving an extremely diverse range of threats¹. In the last three decades, the number of inter-state wars and armed conflicts has declined,² while humanity has suffered increasing calamities caused by hazards from non-military sources. These so-called ‘non-traditional’ security (NTS) issues have attracted more and more attention from governments in Asia and around the world.

A new approach to the concept of security was put forward by Barry Buzan and the Copenhagen school in the 1980s. It highlighted the extension of security threats to go beyond the traditional security concept of political and military threats to include challenges from other sectors such as culture, economics and environment. The Copenhagen school also argued that an issue comes into security agenda through what is called “securitization” which is defined as “a successful speech act”³ by actors (that could be states, non-state actors or even the nature).

In Asia, NTS has been taken seriously. Its place on the regional policy agenda is often traced to the joint communiqué of the 6th summit between ASEAN and China, which included references to “trafficking in illegal drugs, people-smuggling including trafficking in women and children, sea piracy, terrorism, arms-smuggling, money-laundering, international economic crime and cyber crime”⁴

Southeast Asian countries, with their own historic and development characters, have recently stepped up cooperation on NTS issues such as transnational crime, illegal migration, maritime piracy, humanitarian assistance and disaster relief. In addition to providing an overview of NTS issues in Southeast Asia, this thesis argues that the region’s historic and geographic characters have shaped ASEAN members’ security concerns. The regional financial crisis in the 1990s and the Indian Ocean tsunami in 2004 played a critical role in raising regional awareness of the importance of dealing with NTS issues. Of the wide range of issues on the NTS agenda, humanitarian

¹ Richard H. Ullman, “Redefining security”, *International Security*, Vol. 8, No.1, Summer 1983, p.133

² “Armed conflicts 1989 – 2006”, *Journal of Peace Research*, Vol.44, No.5, Sep 2007, p630-631.

³ Holger Stritzel, “Towards a Theory of Securitization: Copenhagen and Beyond”, *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol.13 (3), p.358.

⁴ Joint Declaration of ASEAN and China on Cooperation in the Field of Non-traditional Security Issues, 6th ASEAN-China Summit, Phnom Penh, 4 November 2002, retrieved from <http://www.vifindia.org/document/2002/joint-declaration-of-asean-and-china-on-cooperation-in-the-field-of-non-traditional-security-issues>

assistance and disaster relief (HADR) is one of the topics that has enjoyed the most activities and attention.

The thesis explores HADR as a nontraditional security issue in ASEAN and examines Vietnam's participation in HADR activities as an empirical case study. Through the securitization process of HADR and ASEAN cooperation on HADR, the thesis provides a general understanding on HADR as a new nontraditional security issue in ASEAN.

Although HADR has been mentioned since the establishment of ASEAN in 1967, it was the devastating tsunami that hit in Southeast Asia in 2004 and the humanitarian crisis that followed that has pushed regional cooperation to leap forward by pressuring ASEAN states' leaders to securitize HADR as a NTS issue. The successful securitization of HADR has resulted in various institutional measures and mechanisms to deal with HADR, including the establishment of the ASEAN Committee on Disaster Management, the signing of ASEAN agreement on Disaster Management and Emergency Response, the current ARF, ADMM and ADMM Plus agenda that covers HADR and the possible mobilization and use of force and military assets of one countries into another territory for HADR operations.

As an ASEAN member, Vietnam has actively participated in all the regional HADR mechanisms. By analyzing Vietnam's changing security concerns and its policies on HADR, this thesis contends that, as is the case with other ASEAN members, Vietnam has a range of interests in supporting regional HADR operations. It helps Vietnam address its own problem with natural disasters, but it also provides an opportunity to advance its wider goal of diversifying and multilateralizing its foreign relations.

The thesis is in four chapters. Chapter one provides a review of the literature on securitization, discussing the argument of the Copenhagen School that a host of new policy issues have the ability to be securitized. Chapter two discusses the emergence of non-traditional security issues as a growing area of attention in Southeast Asia. The third chapter looks at HADR issues as a sub-set of the non-traditional security agenda in the region. Finally chapter four discusses Vietnam's interests and policies in engaging in a growing range of HADR activities.

CHAPTER 1: LITERATURE REVIEW

Literature review:

The notion of security has evolved over time, reflecting concerns on essentially vital issues to either the state, the regime, the people or all of them for a certain period of time. As history made a critical turn in early 1990s, there has been arising a need of re-conceptualizing “security”. This chapter will analyze the way in which security has been re-conceptualized in academic literature. The purpose is to provide an overview of the evolution of the notion of “security” after the Cold War and the inclusion of nontraditional security challenges, especially, humanitarian assistance and disaster relief (HADR) issue, into a “reconceptualized security”. The chapter is thus divided into three parts. The first part is about the evolution of the concept of security since the end of the Cold War which is represented by the “Copenhagen School of thought” and Barry Buzan. This part will also outline the concept of nontraditional security. The second part deals with the securitization of nonmilitary threats in Southeast Asian region with a definition of nontraditional security threat. And the third part elaborates on why HADR has become a security issue in Southeast Asia.

The Copenhagen School and Definition of Nontraditional Security

During the Cold War, Stephan Walt claimed that the scope of security is “the study of the threat, use, and control of military force”.⁵ However, since security is a concept that evolves over time, it is, therefore, a concept of historicity. Since the middle of the Cold War, it is the obsessions of the military and nuclear competition between the two superpowers that lead the world to a “security dilemma” and a possible “zero-sum game” caused by a possible nuclear war that triggered a debate over the issue of widening or narrowing security studies. During the Cold War, the bipolar international order and its prevailing military strategies and deterrence doctrines had created a dominated security concept that mainly related to such terms as force capabilities/deployment, balances of military power, great power rivalry and nuclear weapons. As Edward Kolodziej observed “a focus on threat manipulation and force projections became central, almost exclusive concerns of security studies”.⁶ After the end of the Cold War, however, due to the disappearance of superpower rivalry, the relative importance of political-military threats seemed diminished while the importance of economic, environmental and societal sectors has increased as a result of globalization, increased state interdependence. Other challenges such as climate change and mounting number of natural disasters have also grown in profile. From such circumstances, the requirements of extending the traditional concept of security objects, actors and security-maintaining method have been analyzed. The requirement of reconceptualizing security was first acknowledged by scholarly circles that initially arose in the middle of

⁵ J. Jackson Ewing, “Converging Peril: Climate Change and Conflict in the Southern Philippines”, RSIS Working Paper, 23 November 2009.

⁶ David A. Baldwin, “Security Studies and the End of the Cold War”, the Journal of World Politics 48 (October 1995), 117 – 141, p.123.

the Cold War. Quite a number of scholars have raised their concern of finding a new security definition that properly reflects the current international relation situation, serving as an effective tool for foreign policy makers. This explains a literature evolution on security reconceptualization since the late stage of the Cold War with such authors as Simon Dalby, Barry Buzan, Ole Waever and Jaape de Wilde. In general, these authors advocate the extension of traditional security concept that focuses mainly on military aspect to other sectors also, namely culture, economics and environment. Among the authors, pioneer scholars in re-conceptualizing security are Barry Buzan, Ole Waever, Jaape de Wilde⁷ with their book “Security: a new framework for analysis”. The book put forward new ideas of securitization and desecuritization. However, for the purpose of this thesis, the author will analyze the “securitization” aspect only.

In 1983, Buzan’s book “People, States and Fear: the national security problem in international relations” put forward a new concept of the “security complex”.⁸ This notion starts a new understanding of security links among states, which then acts as a basic level to understand the state security in the global context by analyzing the relation between states and global international system. About a decade later, Barry Buzan together with Ole Weaver and Jaap de Wilde published a new book titled “Security: a new framework for analysis” and started a new school of thought on redefining security which is called the Copenhagen school, which then become an influential approach for security studies.⁹ As reviewed by David Skidmore and Johan Eriksson¹⁰, the Copenhagen school proposes that security should be extended to go beyond the traditional focus on state and political – military competition. Instead, it should focus on all other sectors: cultural, economic and environmental. In their books, the authors re-analyzed the referent object of security, the actors and the securitization process. They argued that there are no ‘objective’ threats but issues become ‘security’ issues through the attachment of the meaning to specific policy concerns. That means any issue can become a threat after being successfully securitized by legitimate actors. These two writers also shared what they observed from the works of Barry Buzan and his colleagues on securitization which is, therefore, understood as a process of making “security” attachable and labeling “security” to an issue to make it essential to national security and deserving to be a priority from all possible sources for settlement/ solution. Securitization is conducted through a speech act by securitizing actors to persuade audience of the importance or danger of an issue to national security. Based on the assumption that through successful securitization, any issue may become existential threat, the Copenhagen school stresses much of their study on securitization. They contend that, security studies should focus on “identifying, locating and measuring the

⁷ Barry Buzan, Ole Weaver and Jaap de Wilde are professors of the Copenhagen University.

⁸ Barry Buzan, “People, States and Fear: the National Security problem in international relations”, p.106.

⁹ Johan Eriksson, Book Review of “Security: A New framework for analysis” by Barry Buzan, Ole Waever and Jaap de Wilde, the Journal of Contingencies and crisis management, Vol.9, No.1, p. 61.

¹⁰ David Skidmore is from the Drake University while Johan Eriksson is from the Department of Political Science, Sodertorns Hogskola – University College, Sweden.

salience of securitizing moves by leading actors”.¹¹ They propose a more comprehensive framework for security analysis which put an issue under multi-dimensional study. This framework is applied to both traditional and non-traditional sectors.

The authors also elaborate the understanding of referent objects, actors involving in the securitization process.

Different from traditional concept of threats to states’ security (which is direct and mainly military-related), the authors bring about a whole new concept of security’s subject, threats to such security and how an issue become a threat and treated like a threat. In terms of “security for whom”, the book argues that state is not the only object whose security must be cared for. Therefore, in his work, Barry Buzan and his associates use the term “referent object” instead of “state”, which involves broader meaning since “state” is only one of the objects. They argue the referent object of security is “traditionally, but not necessarily, the state, incorporating government, territory and society”.¹² The authors also provide details on referent objects in different sectors: military, politics, economics and society.

An object, whose survival is of essential importance, can be varied to include states and non-state actors, principles or even the environment. Similarly, threats may arise from various sources from aggressive activities of other states or unfavorable social trends. Moreover, they may manifest themselves in different sectors, including culture, economics, and environment besides the traditional political and military ones. By using this definition, the Copenhagen school has broadened the scope of objects which should be secured, and widened the range of threats that possibly endanger those objects’ security. Traditionally, threats are defined as visually direct military activities against a state’s survival (whether real or potential). Therefore, it is taken for granted that, state’s security is and has always been challenged by other state’s military strength. In contrast, the Copenhagen school argues that a threat exists only when it is perceived by an important object as harmful and dangerous to the object’s survival. That means, not only military-relating issue may bring harms to an object, but any issue may do so, as soon as it is perceived by the object to be existentially harmful and dangerous. And the new danger is often addressed in actor’s speech act. For example, in his speech calling for national and global campaign to fight against terrorism after the “9/11” event, the US President, George Bush used the word “evil”¹³ to refer to Al Qaeda, which made the terrorists different and separated from the remaining world, underlining

¹¹ David Skidmore, Book Review of “Security: A New framework for analysis” by Barry Buzan, Ole Waever and Jaap de Wilde, the American Political Science Review, Vol.93 (Dec 1999), p.1010-1011.

¹² Barry Buzan, Ole Weaver and Jaap de Wilde, “Security: A new framework for analysis”, p.21.

¹³ Text of George Bush’s speech, The Guardian, Friday 21 September 2001, retrieved from <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2001/sep/21/september11.usa13>

that Al Qaeda was a threat to all of other religions and to the “Western value system”¹⁴. Moreover, what makes the Copenhagen school’s position on security different from traditional one is the notion that a new issue is placed on the security agenda only after being securitized. Securitization is a process in which, an agent successfully persuades a given target audience that some valued referent object faces existential threats. As soon as the securitization is successful, the threat is put on the security agenda as an existential threat and it then receives proper attention and emergency responses from the governing politics and policy makers. For a successful securitization, language plays an important role. Since the securitization is undertaken by securitizing actors in delivering speech act, language is an indispensable component which makes the actor’s speech persuasive. By pointing Al Qaeda as “evil” and called the whole world for a “war on terror”¹⁵, the US President created a new “ideology” of fear and repression¹⁶ in efforts to ask other countries and religious people to stand in his line, which was strongly expressed in his saying “you are with us or against us”.¹⁷

New concepts of security have made the Copenhagen school an influential approach in security studies since it broadens the scope of security as the world enters changing circumstances. The perception of a need for a broader security concept has been shaped in minds of various global, regional and national policy-makers. Perception of broader scope of security threats was reflected in the statement in 1991 by the NATO Secretary General Manfred Worner that “the immense conflict building up in the Third World, characterized by growing wealth differentials, an exploding demography, climate shifts and the prospect of environmental disaster, combined with resource conflicts, cannot be left out of our security calculations”.¹⁸ In 1994, an UN’s global Human Development Report argued that the concept of security “has for too long been interpreted narrowly: as security of territory from external aggression, or as protection of national interests in foreign policy or as global security from the threat of nuclear holocaust. Forgotten were the legitimate concerns of ordinary people who sought security in their daily lives. For many of them, security symbolized protection from the threat of disease, hunger, unemployment, crime, social conflict, political repression and environmental hazards”.¹⁹

As Johan Eriksson notes, the Copenhagen school has made an important contribution to security studies as they have moved a few further steps from the

¹⁴ Janicke Stramer, “The Language of War: George W. Bush’s Discursive Practices in Securitizing the Western Value System in the War on Terror”, paper presented at the 4th Global Conference on War, Virtual War and Human Security, 2nd May – 5th May 2007, Budapest, Hungary.

¹⁵ Text of George Bush’s speech, The Guardian, Friday 21 September 2001, retrieved from <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2001/sep/21/september11.usa13>

¹⁶ “War on Terrorism”, retrieved from <http://www.globalpolicy.org/war-on-terrorism.html>

¹⁷ Marianne Stone, “Security According to Buzan: A Comprehensive Security Analysis”, Security Discussion Paper Series 1, Spring 2009.

¹⁸ J. Jackson Ewing, “Converging Peril: Climate Change and Conflict in the Southern Philippines”, RSIS Working Paper, 23 November 2009, p. 6.

¹⁹ Richard Jolly and Deepayan Basu Ray, “The Human Security Framework and National Human Development Reports: A Review of Experiences and Current Debates”, May 2006, p. 4.

“original state-centered” to a broader security scope. The lack of empirical evidence, however, is their biggest weakness in the theory. Though the Copenhagen scholars focused their studies on Europe only, their position have been viewed, followed by quite a number of scholars all over the world, including those in the Southeast Asia.²⁰

In summary, the Copenhagen school scholars’ securitization approach has the potential to deliver a new framework for security studies and analysis globally. A growing number of ASEAN scholars have followed and applied the Copenhagen school’s framework to the studies of non-traditional security issues in Southeast Asia. Their studies have drawn attention from regional leaders and had some influence on state’s policy makers and on both national security and regional security patterns.

Securitization of Non-military threats in Southeast Asia.

Following the global trend in security literature of extending security concept from traditional political and military threats to include economic, cultural, environmental threats, this part of the thesis will describe changes in perception of Southeast Asian countries in general of nontraditional security challenges and spend some part of the writing on the definition and nature of nontraditional security issues.

In Southeast Asia, like anywhere else in the world, in the early 1990s, military security and economic development have become intertwined. In the last two decades, Southeast Asian countries have undergone through ups and downs economically, socially and politically. As Southeast Asian countries were on their rapid development path in the 1990s, the economic and financial crisis started in Thailand in 1997 was a big blow that brought down economic achievements of all Southeast Asian rising tigers. Thailand and Indonesia, the most heavily-affected by the crisis, had been suffered with financial difficulties, social and political stability as thousands of enterprises went bankruptcy and millions of people were living under poverty line at that time. At that moment, economic and social instability resulted in resignation of Indonesian President and the Thai Prime Minister.²¹

Additionally, the avian flu epidemic spread in 2001, the tsunami in 2004 with heavy destruction, prolong and transnational effect require collaborative responses from regional countries. Threats from non-military sources have shown ASEAN countries with the fact that threats from other sectors are as economically, politically and socially destructive as traditional military threats. This is even more essential as the Asia – Pacific region is anticipated as the most dynamic and prosperous area in the twenty first century. Regional security, therefore, becomes essential not only to regional countries but their regional neighbors also. Non-traditional security issues, since then, have been put on ASEAN security agenda and discussed in various regional security fora.

²⁰ Mely Caballero-Anthony, Ralf Emmers, Amitav Acharya are familiar Asian writers on Nontraditional Security, who have studied and applied the Copenhagen school of thought in Asia’s specific circumstances and cases

²¹ Etel Solingen, “Crisis and Transformation: ASEAN in the New Era”, Institute of Defense and Strategic Studies, Singapore.

Although there is still no concise and condense definition of NTS, there was a great advance in regional acknowledgment of NTS both academically and politically, which results in proactive regional cooperation on the issue.

Academically, non-traditional security issues in Asia in general and in Southeast Asia in particular have been studied by many scholars. Muthiad Alagappa, Mely Caballero-Anthony, Ralf Emmers, Amitav Acharya are well-known writers on Southeast Asian non-traditional security.²² The establishment of the Asian Regional Institute on Non-traditional Security under the Ford Foundation's sponsorship has helped in promoting regional NTS studies and manifests the regional concentration on these new-arising security issues.²³

Drawing on the Copenhagen school's position on NTS, Asian scholars have agreed with the school's contention of securitization and extended such securitization of the so-called Euro-centric theory to the very context in Asia. In his book, titled "Non traditional security in Asia – Pacific: the dynamics of securitization", Ralf Emmers took the case of Thailand, Singapore and Australia and analyzed the process of securitization of drug trafficking, piracy/ maritime terrorism and people smuggling in those three countries respectively.²⁴ Through these empirical studies, Emmers, applies the new security framework put forward by the Copenhagen school, analyzes the role of the state as securitizing actor while the referent objects are different: the national sovereignty, territorial integrity, the people as well as economic development and prosperity of the countries analyzed. In his analysis, the three securitizing actors (the governments of Thailand, Singapore and Australia) succeeded in persuading their audience (elite and people) of the danger that drug trafficking, maritime terrorism and people smuggling would bring to the states respectively.²⁵ As a result of successful securitization, those three issues were treated like security issues, thus, received prompt responses from the government as well as funding assistance. Quick responses helped early and pre-emptive dealing with the issues, thus would bring more effective results. Rommel C. Banlaoi (National Defense College of the Philippines) argues the securitization of the anti-drug campaign in Thailand helped the Thaksin government get re-elected. Similarly, the securitization of people smuggling issue in Australia helped to reduce the

²² Mely Caballero-Anthony, together with Amitav Acharya and Ralf Emmers are co-ed of the books titled "Studying Non-traditional Security in Asia: Trends and Issues" published in 2006 and "Non-traditional security in Asia: Dilemmas in Securitization published in the same year.

²³ For more information about the organization, please go to its website at: <http://www.rsis-ntsasia.org>

²⁴ Rommel C. Banlaoi (National Defense College of the Philippines), Review of the book titled "Nontraditional Security in the Asia – Pacific: the dynamics of securitization" by Ralf Emmers, *Contemporary Southeast Asia*, August 2004, p.388.

²⁵ Why do I need a footnote here, since in previous sentence, I wrote: "in his book, titled "Non traditional security in Asia – Pacific: the dynamics of securitization", Ralf Emmers takes the case of Thailand, Singapore and Australia and analyzed the process of securitization of drug trafficking..." and have footnote for this already (footnote no. 20???)

number of people smuggled by boat to Australia and led to the reelection of the John Howard government.²⁶

Mely Caballero-Anthony, Ralf Emmers, Amitav Acharya also adopt the position of the Copenhagen school, analyze and extend it to the Asian context. In their book “Nontraditional security in Asia: dilemmas in securitization”, they argue that traditional security focuses on external military threats and assert that the old concept should be modified and extended in the new global and regional context. While adopting the notion of securitization put forward by the Copenhagen school and applying it to Asian countries (mostly Southeast Asian nations), the authors pointed out some issues that, in their view, should be securitized as nontraditional security threats namely: irregular migration and labor movements, maritime piracy, infectious diseases and HIV/ AIDS, poverty and human security, small arms and drug trafficking, resource scarcity relating to the Mekong river basin.²⁷

In addition to books and studies by regional and outside authors, NTS has been mentioned plentifully in regional study journals and conferences. The widespread expression of concern about NTS has led to a growing tendency and acknowledgement of designating any security concern that is nonmilitary in nature is nontraditional security. Almost all Asian authors writing on NTS agree with the notion on new security challenges put forward by Barry Buzan and his associates. All of the authors and literature on nontraditional security have come up to a definition of NTS, put forward by the Consortium for NTS Studies in Asia, which differ from the traditional concept as “challenges to the survival and well-being of the peoples and states and that are primarily out of non-military sources such as climate change, infectious diseases, natural disasters, irregular migration, food shortage, people smuggling, drug trafficking and transnational crime”.²⁸

There is also a consensus that besides the nature of non-military, NTS issues have several similar characteristics of being transnational in scope and transmitted rapidly, rising in very short notice. Due to such characters, NTS is hard to be solved entirely by efforts and resources of any single state.²⁹

²⁶ Rommel C. Banlaoi (National Defense College of the Philippines), Review of the book titled “Nontraditional Security in the Asia – Pacific: the dynamics of securitization” by Ralf Emmers, *Contemporary Southeast Asia*, August 2004, p.389.

²⁷ David Capie, Review of the book titled “Nontraditional Security in Asia: Dilemmas in Securitization”, edited by Mely Caballero-Anthony, Ralf Emmers and Amitav Acharya, *Pacific Affairs*, Vol.80, No.2, *East Asia Cross-Regionalism* (Summer, 2007), p. 350-352.

²⁸ Mely Caballero-Anthony, “Nontraditional Security and Multilateralism in Asia: Reshaping the Contours of Regional Security Architecture”, Policy Analysis Brief, the Stanley Foundation, June 2007, p.1. This definition of the term “nontraditional security” is used by the Consortium for nontraditional security studies in Asia, otherwise known as NTS-Asia. For more details, see the NTS-Asia website at <http://www.rsis-ntsasia.org>.

²⁹ Mely Caballero-Anthony, “NTS Challenges, Regional Governance, and the ASEAN Political – Security Community (APSC)”, Asia Security Initiative Policy Series – Working Paper No.7, September 2010.

Besides environmental degradation caused by Indonesia forest fires and hazes, and several natural disasters (typhoon Ketsana or Cyclone Nargis), as mentioned above, the three events that have essentially placed great focus for Southeast Asia on regional NTS cooperation are the 1997 financial crisis, the SARS epidemic in 2001 and the 2004 tsunami. The 1997 financial crisis started from Thailand and then spread all over the region and caused huge damage to Southeast Asian regional and national economies with currency devaluation, capital flight and high debt burdens which then led to serious impacts on social, economic, political and cultural aspects of intra and extra regional relations.³⁰ The crisis had also set back the economic achievements that regional countries had gained (increasing the poverty rate after reaching the fastest poverty reduction rate: drop by two-third in 20 years, from 1975 – 1995). The SARS epidemic in 2001 started with one patient with the avian flu virus in Hong Kong then spread over almost all Southeast Asian countries and caused a US\$18-60 million loss.³¹ The third issue was the 2004 tsunami that swept over 11 countries in Southeast and Southern Asia and killed about 220,000 people.³² The huge losses caused by NTS challenges to regional countries and economies led to a conclusion that the transnationality and “magnitude of the NTS and their impacts beyond national boundaries, render any national response inadequate. In other words, the nature of NTS problems requires not only national response but also close regional cooperation to address them”.³³

The attachment of security label to these nonmilitary threats has been a significant development. More importantly, the security framing is an effective way to bring attention to these threats, which helps in conveying urgency and in commanding governmental resources to address them in a prompt and comprehensive manor. This is well reflected in recent ASEAN institutional development on NTS as well as on-field cooperation for humanitarian assistance and disaster relief operations.

Humanitarian Assistance and Disaster Relief in Southeast Asia as a Non-traditional Security issue.

Since the 1990s, the term “non-traditional security” has been repeated and increasingly widely mentioned all over the world in general and in Southeast Asia in particular. With the collapse of the Soviet Union and the world bipolar order, a danger of a possible third world war is, thus, subsequently diminished. On the contrary, threats from non-military sources are rising, endangering socio-economic and political stability at all level: national, regional and global. Evidently, though the possibility of another world war is rare, arms conflicts caused by ethnic wars, political uprisings are still witnessed. Besides, heavy destruction and calamity in lives and assets caused by natural

³⁰ Etel Solingen (Institute of Defense and Strategic Studies, Singapore), “Crisis and Transformation: ASEAN in the New Era”, Working Paper No.16, May 2001, p. 4.

³¹ Mely Caballero-Anthony, “NTS Challenges, Regional Governance, and the ASEAN Political – Security Community (APSC), Asia Security Initiative Policy Series – Working Paper No.7, September 2010, p. 1.

³² Heike Hasenauer, “Tsunami disaster”, Soldiers Mar 2005, ProQuest Central, p.24

³³ Rizal Sukma (CSIS, Jakarta), “ASEAN and Nontraditional Security”, December 2010.

disasters, and terrorism are still recorded in everyday life in vast areas over the globe, thus constraining global economic achievements, eroding people's living standards and bringing about political instability.

The emergency of such new threats has drawn attention from both scholarly and political elite circles. There is not yet a global consensus on what non-traditional security means, since the issues that would be categorized as non-traditional security are often contextually defined. However, with assumption that such non-military threats, if not well prevented and solved, will possibly lead to socio-economic and political instability, all issues from climate change, natural disaster, terrorism, drug trafficking, hunger and poverty to scarcity of natural resources are all now under securitization by various states at different levels. There are quite a number of scholars writing on HADR as a nontraditional security issue, of which most familiar writers are Mely Caballero-Anthony, Ralf Emmers, Amitav Archarya.

It is commonly acknowledged that "non-traditional security issues are those that challenge the survival and well-being of peoples and states and that arise primarily out of non-military sources"³⁴. In fact, studies on non-traditional security so far just focus on what are visible threats to referent objects' security while many others are life-threatening also, namely improper provision of aids, late human evacuation in destructive disasters. The 2004 tsunami disaster relief crisis, therefore, was a hot subject not only for the accumulation of excessive humanitarian assistance over the globe but also for drawing experience in how to make humanitarian assistance proper and effective.³⁵ Humanitarian assistance and disaster relief, thus, has been becoming a focus in ASEAN's internal and extra regional cooperation activities. This thesis seeks to provide a general understanding of HADR as a nontraditional security issue, its securitization in ASEAN with Vietnam's participation in regional HADR operation taken as an empirical case study.

As noted and analyzed by Tan Teck Boon and Allen Yu-Hung Lai in their article in the *International Policy Digest*, in the last decade, the Southeast Asian region has experienced two major natural disasters: the 2004 Indian Ocean tsunami and the 2008 Cyclone Nargis. From what has been done and what has not been done from the disasters it can be concluded that: (i) natural disasters are often transnational and cause devastation that one single country will find hard to recover from; (ii) Southeast Asian countries are not well-prepared for humanitarian assistance and disaster relief.

It is noteworthy that it was not that the tsunami or the cyclone was unexpected or that Southeast Asian countries failed to prepare. The fact is that, disaster relief agencies in Southeast Asia were simply not capable enough in assessing the disaster situation which prevented them from providing effective and efficient relief operations. More

³⁴ Mely Caballero-Anthony, "Nontraditional Security, Regionalism, and the State in Southeast Asia".

³⁵ James Thompson, "Humanitarian Performance and the Asian Tsunami", the *Drama Review*, Vol.55, No.1, Spring 2011 (T 209), pp 70 – 83.

importantly, humanitarian assistance was considered as external interference by some countries, which creates a major obstacle to timely delivery of aid relief in disasters.³⁶

While regional countries are facing more and fiercer natural disasters, questions about HADR operations in ASEAN have grown. They include whether Southeast Asian countries are well aware of the need for cooperation on and willing to participate in humanitarian assistance and disaster relief, or what they have done and what are obstacles for further and effective humanitarian assistance and disaster relief operation in the region. The issue has attracted attention from Southeast Asian countries' leaders and was put on the agenda of ARF and regional ADMM meetings, a signal that the issue is securitized and dealt with as a non-traditional security issue. The first ARF inter-sessional meeting held in New Zealand in 1997 (three years after the ARF inauguration) was on HADR, highlighting that HADR should be responded domestically and under international cooperation. The meeting also put forward an idea that ARF members should cooperate closely in dealing with HADR in each member country.³⁷ About a decade later, in 2006, at the 12th ARF meeting in Kuala Lumpur, ARF leaders issued the ARF Statement on Disaster Management and Emergency Response, which enhanced existing cooperation and regional mechanism of international disaster management and emergency response.³⁸

While government documents on HADR are scarce, this thesis aims to provide an overview of HADR issue in Southeast Asia in recent years as a nontraditional security issue. It uses Vietnam's participation in regional HADR operations as a case study, while also exploring the efficacy of regional cooperation on HADR.

There are several reasons for choosing HADR as the focus for this study. First, there is a lack of capacity in ASEAN countries to deal with HADR while they are facing more and more natural disasters. A deeper look into the regional cooperation on HADR could facilitate greater understanding of ASEAN countries' motivation in HADR institutional cooperation. Second, though HADR is not a new issue, there is little scholarly work that has focused on the issue in Southeast Asia. This thesis therefore seeks to provide an overview of ASEAN's cooperation on HADR as a nontraditional security issue. It examines challenges to the HADR securitization process and questions the prospects for ASEAN's future cooperation on this increasingly important issue.

³⁶ For more information, please go to: <http://www.internationalpolicydigest.org/2012/05/15/disaster-management-in-southeast-asia-issues-and-challenges/>

³⁷ Information retrieved from ARF website at: <http://aseanregionalforum.asean.org/library/arf-chairmans-statements-and-reports/143.html>

³⁸ Information retrieved from ARF website at: [http://aseanregionalforum.asean.org/files/library/ARF%20Chairman's%20Statements%20and%20Reports/The%20Thirteenth%20ASEAN%20Regional%20Forum,%202005-2006/ARF%20Statement%20on%20Disaster%20Management%20and%20Emergency%20Response%20\(Final\).doc](http://aseanregionalforum.asean.org/files/library/ARF%20Chairman's%20Statements%20and%20Reports/The%20Thirteenth%20ASEAN%20Regional%20Forum,%202005-2006/ARF%20Statement%20on%20Disaster%20Management%20and%20Emergency%20Response%20(Final).doc)

CHAPTER 2: NON-TRADITIONAL SECURITY IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

In the last decade of the 20th century, the collapse of the Soviet Union made the long-standing bi-polar world a unipolar system. After two bloody world wars, since the 1980s there has been a decline in the number of armed conflicts all over the world and in the East Asian region in particular.³⁹ Despite the fact that China is recently rising as the biggest challenge to the US hegemony, it is predicted that there is still only a small possibility of war or conflict exploding between the existing power and the emerging power. As China's former president Hu Jintao stated at 2012 meeting of the US - China Strategic and Economic Dialogue, "we should prove that the traditional belief that big powers are bound to enter into conflict is wrong, and instead seek new ways of developing relations between major countries in the era of economic globalization".⁴⁰ The region has come to face with NTS threats instead and NTS has become a new subject for the regional security dialogues and cooperation.

This chapter provides an introduction to the Southeast Asian region as well as the evolution of NTS issue as a concept in the ASEAN in an effort to explain why NTS has drawn much of the regional countries' attention. The first section (2.1) looks at the region geographically and historically to make a brief description of the conditions that may have effects on its economic development and security. This section also deals with the regional history of struggling against colonialism for independence and the formation of ASEAN that has influenced regional state leaders in security-related policy-making process. The second section (2.2) is about the evolution of NTS in ASEAN as a security concept and provides explanations for the recent centrality of NTS issues in ASEAN security cooperation within the region as well as with extra-regional countries. Overall, this part provides information on NTS issues in ASEAN, explanation why this issue has come up to state leaders in policy-making process.

2.1 ASEAN's security concerns:

While ASEAN countries have enjoyed peace and stability since ASEAN foundation three decades ago, there is no guarantee that this can be sustained for an indefinite period of time in the future since it not only depends on ASEAN and its

³⁹ "Armed conflicts 1989 – 2006", Journal of Peace Research, Volume 44, Number 5, September 2007, p630-631.

⁴⁰ Robert B. Zoellick, "US, China and Thucydides", The National Interest Journal, July – August 2013 issue.

members but neighboring countries also.⁴¹ The formation of ASEAN and creation of instruments for security such as the ZOPFAN, TAC, SEANWFZ, are ASEAN's instruments in managing the situation of peace and security.⁴² The group has also created new regional and extra regional institutions for keeping peace and security recently such as ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF), the ASEAN Defense Minister Meeting Plus (ADMM+), etc.

In terms of state development history, Southeast Asian nations are small and developing states, which all have undergone through prolong colonialism. However, by the late 1950s, the ending of wars associated with the colonial rule brought independence to the majority of Southeast Asian countries.⁴³ The Cold War with fierce competition between two superpowers (the Soviet Union and the United States), accompanied with ideological difference, had divided the region into two rival camps: Indochina states (including Vietnam, Lao and Cambodia) versus the remaining ASEAN states, who kept skeptical eyes on the other during the Cold War.⁴⁴ The ending of the Cold War brought an end to the regional rivalry and opened up a new chapter to the regional relation, an era of cooperation for mutual benefits.⁴⁵ The formation of ASEAN, especially the participation of all ten regional countries in one united institution of ASEAN, has made ASEAN a regional organization that is playing a proactive role in dealing with regional issues as well as in maintaining peace, stability for development in the Southeast Asian region in particular, for the Asia – Pacific region in general.

In the middle of the 1960s, while the Cold War was at its peak, the Southeast Asian region was heavily torn apart both by influences of the two superpowers and by internal disputes among regional states. In the historical period that Realism was the

⁴¹ M.C. Abad, Jr., "The Role of ASEAN in Security Multilateralism: ZOPFAN, TAC and SEANWFZ", Paper presented at the ASEAN Regional Forum Professional Development Program for Foreign Affairs and Defense Officials, Banda Seri Begawan, 23-28 April 2000, page 1.

⁴² M.C. Abad, Jr., "The Role of ASEAN in Security Multilateralism ZOPFAN, TAC and SEANWFZ", page 1.

⁴³ UN Human Security Report 2009 - 2010, page 48, it is written that "by the late 1950s, the wars associated with the ending of colonial rule – all of which were in Southeast Asia – were over".

⁴⁴ This idea is noted by Hari Singh in "Vietnam and ASEAN: the Politics of Accommodation" (Australian Journal of International Affairs – Jul 1997; 51:2) as he wrote "Yet, ideology was also instructive in shaping antagonistic attitude".

This view is also shared by Muthiah Alagappa in the article "A changing Asia: Prospects for war, peace, cooperation and order" (the Political Science, 63(2), 155 - 185) about the situation in Asia region (including Southeast Asian region) that: "Political, security and economic interaction among countries in the region was strongly influenced by the global rivalry between the two superpowers (the United States and the Soviet Union) as well as the interests and actions of the retreating colonial powers (the United Kingdom, France, the Netherlands and Portugal).

⁴⁵ This is written by Chin Kin Wah in his article "ASEAN: facing the 5th Decade" (Contemporary Southeast Asia: A Journal of International and Strategic Affairs, Vol.29, No.3, Dec 2007, pp. 395 – 405) that: "Vietnam membership in 1995 was a significant milestone in the ending of the regionalized Cold War".

prevailing theory, the formation of a communist Vietnam was a serious military threat to Southeast Asian nations. Besides, during the 1960s, the region was undergoing various internal disputes: over the Sabah/ North Borneo territory between Malaysia and Philippines,⁴⁶ or the confrontation between Indonesia and Malaysia over the creation of Malaysia.⁴⁷ In recognition of the need for a more secure environment, as a result of goodwill from and proactive meetings among foreign ministers of Indonesia, Malaysia, Philippines, Singapore and Thailand, the ASEAN Declaration was officially signed on 8th August 1967 to mark the establishment of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), whose aim was about cooperation in the economic, social, cultural, technical, educational and other fields, and in promotion of regional peace and stability through abiding respect for justice and the rule of law and adherence to the principles of the United Nations Charter.

The Bangkok Declaration in 1967 states that ASEAN was set up “to promote regional peace and stability through abiding respect for justice and the rule of law in the relationship among countries of the region and adherence to the principles of the United Nations Charter”.⁴⁸ The Declaration also opened chances for admission of all states in the Southeast Asian region who share its aims, principles and purposes.

In 1976, ASEAN’s principles were further elaborated in the Treaty of Amity and Cooperation in Southeast Asia (TAC). As the Cold War ended, new members were added in Brunei in 1984, Vietnam in 1995, Laos and Myanmar in 1997 and Cambodia in 1999. ASEAN today includes all 10 Southeast Asian countries. The TAC has become the decisive document that rules ASEAN intra and extra regional cooperation as it is required that any states coming to cooperate with ASEAN or ASEAN members should ratify TAC and follow TAC provisions.

With full membership, ASEAN has actively contributed to the regional confidence, institutional building and cooperation in all fields. ASEAN is also a central actor for regional security cooperation within the wider regional security network. The ASEAN central role in moderating the Asian Regional Forum (ARF), the ASEAN+3 initiatives, ASEAN Defense Ministers Meeting Plus (ADMM+) is a strong evidence of the region’s efforts in finding solutions for new (non-traditional) security challenges.

⁴⁶ Erwin S. Fernandez, *Philippine – Malaysia Dispute over Sabah: a Bibliographic Survey*, Asia – Pacific Social Science Survey, Vol.7 No.1, Dec 2007, De la Salle University – Manila.

⁴⁷ Suter Keith, *the Association of South East Asian Nations*, Contemporary Review, (Autumn 2007), p 337 - 340.

⁴⁸ For more information, please see the ASEAN Declaration at www.asean.org/news/item/the-asean-declaration.

After decades of colonialism, ASEAN countries gained their independence in the fierce competition over the globe and Southeast Asian region of the Cold War. Being designated by geography as small states and after decades of being as pawns by big powers, ASEAN countries are fully aware of and treasure the values of peace, independence and non-interference. For that reason, the first and highest priority of these countries along the ASEAN formation process is national and regional security, although the economic aspects were the basic and original imperative. The formation of ASEAN as a group of small states with its Bangkok Declaration in 1967 aims to build Southeast Asia into a region of peace, freedom and prosperity against the backdrop of the Cold War as well as the regional strong opposition to the current global division and competition as well as strong commitment of building trust and peace among regional countries. It was stated clearly in the Declaration that the ASEAN's objective at its founding was "to accelerate the economic growth, social progress and cultural development in the region through joint endeavors in the spirit of equality and partnership in order to strengthen the foundation for a prosperous and peaceful community of Southeast Asian Nations".⁴⁹ The Declaration also states the ASEAN nations' determination in "sharing a primary responsibility for strengthening the economic and social stability of the region and ensuring their peaceful and progressive national development, and that they are determined to ensure their stability and security from external interference in any form or manifestation in order to preserve their national identities in accordance with the ideals and aspirations of their peoples".⁵⁰

ASEAN's aspiration has been further promoted through the 1971 Declaration of ASEAN Zone of Peace, Freedom and Neutrality (ZOPFAN) and the Treaty of Amity and Cooperation (TAC). The Kuala Lumpur Declaration signed in 1971 at the ASEAN Foreign Ministerial Meeting marked the ASEAN agreement on creating a Zone of Peace, Freedom and Neutrality (ZOPFAN) since ASEAN countries desired "of bringing about a relaxation of international tension and of achieving a lasting peace in South East Asian Nations".⁵¹ The creation of ZOPFAN was an instrument for ASEAN countries in their struggle to maintain peace and security for the region and ASEAN countries themselves. By putting forward new concept of an ASEAN of "neutrality", the 1971 Declaration did not only clearly state an ASEAN position against outside intervention

⁴⁹ The ASEAN Declaration Bangkok, 8th August 1967, at www.asean.org/newa/item/the-asean-declaration-bangkok-declaration.

⁵⁰ The ASEAN Declaration Bangkok, 8th August 1967

⁵¹ ASEAN's "Zone of Peace, Freedom and Neutrality Declaration", issued in Kuala Lumpur on 27th November 1971.

into regional affairs but was also a firm commitment that ASEAN countries will do their best for keeping the region out of outside intervention, for peace maintenance and regional stability.

The Treaty of Amity and Cooperation (TAC) was signed at the first summit of the ASEAN Heads of Government in 1976 and aimed at further strengthening the relationship among ASEAN countries. The Treaty set out fundamental principles of political framework for inter-state relations. It also stated the possibility of reaching out to the rest of Southeast Asian countries to build a complete and strong ASEAN as a regional organization. More importantly, the Treaty constituted essential guidelines for other ASEAN-led regional institutions such as the ASEAN + 3, Asian Regional Forum, ADMM, EAS.

Since the end of the Cold War, there have been great changes to the global politics and international relations: the confronting bipolarity no longer exists, the world order is developing towards a more multi-polar system. The emergence of the Asia - Pacific as the most dynamic region of globe and China's rise to challenge the US's world leading role has made the US focus on the region. With geo-political position in the Asia Pacific, the new world situation has given ASEAN great chance of acting as a middle power in various regional institutions (the EAS, ARF, ADMM, ASEAN+3).

From what has been analyzed above, for almost 30 years, through the ASEAN development and institutionalization process, it is evident that from its foundation, ASEAN countries have put much of their attention on security matters. In the new era, as interstate wars have become increasingly rare, ASEAN has been faced with various nontraditional security challenges, including Humanitarian Assistance and Disaster Relief.. ASEAN states have reconceptualized security to include nontraditional security issues, not apart from its initial imperative of an ASEAN striving for peace, independence and non interference, ASEAN countries are currently trying their best to extend cooperation in new area of nontraditional security in to all regional institutions, including ARF and ADMM.

Geographically, Southeast Asia lies in the world's most natural disaster-exposed region, historically one divided by wars and external intervention. Peace and independence for development, therefore, are precious and treasured by regional countries. This also explains why national security concern is the major dynamic for regional cooperation and institutionalization.

Southeast Asia is a sub-region of Asia, consisting of 11 countries that are south of China, east of India, west of New Guinea and north of Australia, namely: Brunei, Cambodia, East Timor, Indonesia, Laos, Malaysia, Myanmar, Philippines, Singapore, Thailand and Vietnam. The area consists of two geographic regions: mainland and peninsular. The mainland countries (Cambodia, Laos, Myanmar, Thailand and Vietnam), share borders with each other, while, those on Malay peninsular (Brunei, East Timor, Indonesia, Philippines and Singapore), each of which contains various islands scattering in the Indian Ocean. Geographically, the region lies on the intersection of geographical plates that suffers with heavy seismic and volcanic activity. The region, therefore, bears natural disasters at a proportion much higher than any other continents. As shown in the table below, almost 55% of the people killed and more than 91% of the people affected by natural disasters in the period from 1993 - 2006 are from Asia.⁵² This proportion is much higher than those of Americas and Europe.

Table 1: Distribution of natural disaster impacts by continent: 1993 - 2006

	% of reported disasters	% of people reported killed	% of people reported affected	% of Estimated damage
Africa	22.67	28.03	5.43	1.97
Americas	18.49	7.21	1.72	28.57
Asia	35.70	54.86	91.22	33.63
Europe	19.43	9.57	1.09	35.03
Oceania	3.72	0.33	0.54	0.80
Total (abs. number)	2,935	531,159	2496.2 million	654.6 billion \$US

Source EM-DAT, CRED, University of Louvain, Belgium.

The second sub-section provides description and evolution of new security challenges to ASEAN countries and explanation for the creation of new ASEAN-centered security mechanisms.

2.2 Nontraditional security in ASEAN:

As discussed above, due to state-building history and geopolitics, security has always been a major concern of ASEAN countries. Due to strategic changes in

⁵² Le Le Zou and Yi Ming Wei, "Driving factors for Social Vulnerability to Coastal Hazards in Southeast Asia: Result from Meta-analysis", *Nat Hazards* (2010) 54: 901 – 929, p905.

international relations in the late 20th century: the bi-polar world order no longer exists and China is currently rising as a new world big power challenging the US's world leading role while exercising its power over surrounding countries on territorial dispute in the East Sea (or the South China Sea); humanity is now facing with huge amount of destructive disasters caused by the nature that could not be solved by any single country. As Peter Hough has argued, while "military threats in the 21st century are as apparent as ever and maybe even greater than during the Cold War, the simple fact remains that they are not the only threats that face states, people and the world as a whole".⁵³ Against such backdrop, lying on the geographic plate that is most stricken with heavy seismic and volcanic activity⁵⁴, ASEAN countries are facing with both traditional and nontraditional security issues. While looking into the development of the issue of NTS within ASEAN, this section of the thesis argues that it is the emergence and enormous impacts of nontraditional security issues that has contributed to the evolution of reshaping the regional security architecture, thus, making ASEAN member countries closer, more cooperative on soft issues and even more sensitive security issues. Since the 1970s, ASEAN countries have shared the concept of comprehensive security put forward by Japan that is broader than the traditional concept of military security. However, it was the financial crisis in 1997 that seriously damaged ASEAN countries' economic gains that triggered a new ASEAN approach to security matters.⁵⁵

The concept of comprehensive security has been understood by ASEAN countries since the 1970s, when the concept was put forward in 1978 for the first time by a group of experts led by Japanese Prime Minister Ohira. In 1980, a report entitled "Report on Comprehensive National Security" was submitted to the Government of Prime Minister Suzuki. According to the Report, the notion of security needed to be broadened, to include various factors such as economy, diplomacy and politics⁵⁶. The new security concept received strong support from ASEAN countries, though perceived differently. The comprehensive security concept was interpreted by ASEAN countries to incorporate domestic and essentially nonmilitary threats. Different from the Japanese interpretation of the comprehensive security concept that focuses more on Japan's external threats (such as shortage of food and energy), and justify Japan's increased military budget, the ASEAN interpretation is more inward-looking as it was used to deal

⁵³ Peter Hough, "Understanding Global Security" (Abingdon: Routledge, 2004), p. 7.

⁵⁴ Le Le Zou and Yi Ming Wei, "Driving factors for Social Vulnerability to Coastal Hazards in Southeast Asia: Result from Meta-analysis", *Nat Hazards* (2010) 54: 901 – 929, p905.

⁵⁵ Mely Caballero-Anthony, "Nontraditional Security and Multilateralism in Asia: Reshaping the Contours of Regional Security Architecture/", Policy Analysis Brief, the Stanley Foundation, June 2007.

⁵⁶ J.W.M. Chapman, Reinhard Drifte, I.T.M. Gow, "Japan's Quest for Comprehensive Security"

with both internal and external threats to ASEAN countries' security.⁵⁷ Generally, in ASEAN, comprehensive security doctrine places importance on economic issue while adding "important political dimensions related to domestic stability and regime survival".⁵⁸ The concept of comprehensive security, therefore, was more related to state-capacity building by member countries that should be strong enough to combat with internal and external security threats. This interpretation is coincident with the group's objective at the grounding stage: to ensure its members' survival by enhancing the regional peace and security, by proclaiming neutrality of ASEAN member countries and prevention of external intervention as stated in the ASEAN formation Declaration in 1967.⁵⁹

ASEAN's advocacy for the new concept of comprehensive security revealed that the group had long concerned about a broader implication of security and security threats. As Mely Caballero-Anthony argues, "within ASEAN, comprehensive security was, for a long time, considered the reorganized security concept that structured the understanding among the political elites about what security meant for the region."⁶⁰ More specifically, Muthiah Alagappa states that "comprehensive security implied security that goes beyond (but does not exclude) the military to embrace the political, economic and socio-cultural dimensions".⁶¹ Additionally, though the concept of comprehensive security has been broadened to refer to nonmilitary threats, at that time state security was still the major security concern. Great changes in international and regional relations in the post-Cold War period have contributed to making changes in regional perception of security which is seen as a move toward people-centered security.⁶²

As the Cold War ends, it was initially hoped that the region would enjoy long-lasting peace and stability since the geopolitical and security tensions brought about by the Cold War would eventually pass over. Instead, the region had to face with both

⁵⁷ David Dewitt, "Common, Comprehensive, and Cooperative Security", the Pacific Review, Vol.7, Issue 1, 1994, p. 411.

⁵⁸ Amitav Acharya, "Human security: East Versus West?", Institute of Defense and Strategic Studies - Singapore, September 2001, p.10.

⁵⁹ The ASEAN Declaration Bangkok, 8th August 1967, at www.asean.org/newa/item/the-asean-declaration-bangkok-declaration.

⁶⁰ Mely Caballero-Anthony, "National Security, Regionalism, and the State in Southeast Asia" – Chapter 7 of the "Transnational Trends: Middle Eastern and Asian Views", The Henry L. Stimson Center, July 2008, page 139 - 154.

⁶¹ Muthiah Alagappa, "Asian Security Practices: Material and Ideational Influences", Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998.

⁶² Maria A Kusalasari, "Moving from state-centered to people-centered security in ASEAN", the Jakarta Post, July 19, 2011.

traditional and new security threats that it has ever experienced. The financial crisis in 1997, the avian flu pandemic started in late 2003 and the tsunami over Southeast Asia in 2004 have proved that threats to regional national security may come from nonmilitary sources and bring more harm to a greater number of people than traditional threats of interstate wars and conflicts.

The 1997 financial crisis that started in Thailand and then swept over “tiger economies” of Southeast Asia (namely Thailand, Malaysia, Singapore, Indonesia), Hongkong and South Korea had brought down the economic miracle achievements of these countries as it caused huge losses (about 70%) in stock markets of the affected economies, thus forced some of these countries to ask the IMF for massive financial assistance. Besides, the unprecedented crisis also meant retrenchment in certain sectors such as construction, manufacturing and financial crisis, thus, consequently, leading to high rate of unemployment and a decrease in social welfare. In terms of unemployment generated by the financial crisis, the International Labor Organization (ILO) has estimated an increase in unemployment of 3 million in Indonesia, 1.5 million in Thailand, and about 150,000 in Malaysia.⁶³ Until then, the plight of vulnerable groups and societies that seriously affected by the economic crisis has ever exposed to ASEAN countries, thus challenging the region’s traditional emphasis on state security as the main security referent.⁶⁴

Additionally, the economic crisis seriously impacted the regional countries’ political stability. Prior to the crisis, ASEAN countries were known as having economic development pattern characterized as “crony capitalism” that based on close connection of the ruling circles and business circles (Malaysia, Thailand) or nepotism (Indonesia). The crisis was a big blow to ASEAN affected countries as they all suffered political upheavals after the crisis. In Thailand, the former Prime Minister, Chuan Leekpai, the opposition leader, took over after an orderly cabinet transition. In Indonesia, the crisis weakened president Suharto politically and personally and he was finally replaced in 1998 by vice president B.J. Habibie. In Malaysia, though the government of Prime Minister Mahathir Mohamad remained in place, differences over how to respond to the

⁶³ Suthad Setboonsarng, “ASEAN Economic Cooperation adjusting to the crisis”, retrieved from the ASEAN website at: <http://www.asean.org/resources/item/asean-economic-co-operation-adjusting-to-the-crisis-by-suthad-setboonsarng>.

⁶⁴ Mely Caballero-Anthony, “Nontraditional Security, Regionalism, and the State of Southeast Asia”, the *Journal of Southeast Asia*, June 2007, p. 139 – 154.

crisis caused confrontation between the Prime Minister and his Finance Minister Anwar Ibrahim.⁶⁵

Economic depression and social instability brought on by the 1997 financial crisis eventually led to political instability of affected countries. It exposed them to non-military threats whose destructiveness and lingering impacts were no lesser than that of military threats. During the regional financial crisis, the concept of comprehensive security, was criticized for putting too much emphasis on state security as the main referent object.⁶⁶ The political failure and instability that resulted from the crisis, the exposition of plight of vulnerable groups and societies as a result of the economic crisis, therefore, ignited a debate over reconceptualization of security and reorientation of the security referent towards the security of individuals, societies, and groups rather than only focusing on states.

The term “nontraditional security” - whether it be threats, issues or challenges, has become familiar and increasingly heard in various ASEAN regional meetings such as the ASEAN summit, the ARF, ASEAN + 3 and the ADMM. Various ASEAN Ministerial Meetings have stated ASEAN member countries’ commitments on combating nontraditional security threats such as the ASEAN Ministerial Meeting on 2002 entitled with the motto that “responding to challenges: securing a better future” showed ASEAN countries’ commitment to combat against terrorism⁶⁷ or the ASEAN Ministerial Meeting on Transnational Crime is responsible for the implementation of the ASEAN Plan of Action to combat transnational crime.⁶⁸ Additionally, there are various ASEAN expert groups on different subjects such as infectious diseases, environment, energy and natural disaster relief. In addition to regional institutions, a Consortium on Nontraditional Security Studies of Southeast Asian countries has been built under the sponsorship of Ford Foundation, whose main purpose for existence is to provide a forum for scholars and policy-makers both inside and outside the region to discuss and

⁶⁵ Etel Solingen, “Crisis and Transformation: ASEAN in the New Era”, Institute of Defense and Strategic Studies - Singapore, May 2001.

⁶⁶ Mely Caballero-Anthony, “Nontraditional Security, Regionalism, and the State in Southeast Asia”, Chapter 7 of the “Transnational Trends: Middle Eastern and Asian Views”, The Henry L. Stimson Center, July 2008, page 140.

⁶⁷ Joint Communique of the 35th ASEAN Ministerial Meeting at Bandar Seri Begawan, 29-30 July 2002, at www.asean.org/news/item/joint-communique-of-the-35th-asean-ministerial-meeting-bandar-seri-begawan-29-30-july-2002-3.

⁶⁸ A compilation of ASEAN Declarations, Joint Declarations, and Statements on Combating Transnational Crime and Terrorism, Security Cooperation Division, ASEAN Political-Security Department at www.asean.org/resources/archives

analyze NTS issues in the region; to convene regional and international meetings for consolidation of NTS-related studies and researches.⁶⁹

Though it is usually understood that NTS issues are threats that come from non-military sources, one of the fundamental challenges for analyzing and finding solution for any NTS issue is to define what is and what are categorized in the so-called NTS. As defined by the Consortium, nontraditional security are challenges to the survival and well-being of peoples and states that arise primarily out of non-military sources, such as climate change, resource scarcity, infectious diseases, natural disasters, irregular migration, food shortage, people smuggling, drug trafficking and transnational crimes.⁷⁰ After the attack on the United States in September 2001 and the bombing in Bali (Indonesia) in October 2002, terrorism and transnational crime were added to the list of nontraditional security challenges in the region.

In 2002, the regional first cooperation between ASEAN and an outside country, China, on nontraditional security issues resulted in the issuance of the Joint Declaration of ASEAN and China on Cooperation in the field of Nontraditional Security Issues. This stated their shared position on nontraditional security issues such as trafficking illegal drugs, people smuggling including trafficking in women and children, sea piracy, terrorism, arms smuggling, money laundering, international economic crime and cyber crime. Drugs, transnational crime and terrorism have dominated the ASEAN and ASEAN-led regional security agenda for the majority of the 1990s while maritime security and HADR have gained greater prominence in recent years and drawn great attention from regional countries. In 2005, ASEAN members signed the ASEAN Agreement on Disaster Management and Emergency Response, following which were the establishments of the ASEAN Committee on Disaster Management and the ASEAN Coordinating Center for Humanitarian Assistance on disaster management. The issue of HADR has become more and more dominant in regional and extra-regional security agenda of the ADMM, ADMM+3 and the ARF.

Overall, those threats are posing new challenges to regional and international peace and stability. However, the list of NTS has also gotten longer as ASEAN countries have enlarged their circle of cooperation. In 2005, the ARF seminar on nontraditional security issues provided an extensive list of NTS, stating that “Terrorism

⁶⁹ For more information, please go to the Consortium web page at: www.rsis-ntsasia.org/ourConsortium/introduction.html.

⁷⁰ Mely Caballero-Anthony, “Nontraditional Security and Multilateralism in Asia: Reshaping the Contours of Regional Security Architecture?”, Policy Analysis Brief, the Stanley Foundation, June 2007.

and other nontraditional security issues such as illicit drug trafficking, infectious diseases, HIV/AIDS, people smuggling and human trafficking, corruption, money laundering, cyber crime, piracy, environmental degradation, corruption and illegal logging”.⁷¹

Though there is not yet a concrete definition of nontraditional security and different cooperation mechanisms on NTS may differ in focus, NTS issues can be said to have some common characteristics. As Mely Caballero-Anthony has said, “aside, from being nonmilitary in nature, [NTS issues] share other common characteristics: they are transnational in scope (neither purely domestic nor purely interstate); they arise at very short notice and are transmitted rapidly owing to globalization and the communication revolution; they cannot be prevented entirely, but coping mechanisms can be devised; national solution are often inadequate, and thus regional and multilateral cooperation is essential; and finally, the object of security is no longer just the state (state sovereignty or territorial integrity) but also the people (their survival, well-being, and dignity), at both individual and societal levels.”⁷²

All these characteristics of NTS are easily seen in various regional crises. For example, both the economic crisis in 1997 and the avian flu pandemic (SARS) in 2003, started in one country (Thailand in case of the crisis and Hongkong – China in case of the SARS), but then spread rapidly through the region. Or the tsunami in 2004, the worst natural disaster by far, with an earthquake of 9.0 on Richter scale about 30km off the west coast of Sumatra, Indonesia, affected coastal areas of Thailand, Malaysia, Myanmar, India’s Andaman Island and Nicobar islands and Tamil Nadu state, Sri Lanka, Maldives.⁷³ In all these three cases, the solution required regional or even trans-regional assistance and cooperation. After the 1997 crisis, ASEAN countries created an agreement with China about setting up a financial pool for related countries in case of such crisis. The 2004 Indian Ocean tsunami set new records for world-wide humanitarian assistance. The impacts of these crises and disasters are region-wide and often beyond national capacity in terms of response. Cooperation and assistance among countries are, therefore, required for solution and rebuilding. More importantly, with

⁷¹ Dr. Mark G. Rolls, “ASEAN and the Nontraditional Regional Security Agenda”, India – New Zealand, India Track II, 13 – 14 September 2001.

⁷² Mely Caballero-Anthony, “Nontraditional Security, Regionalism, and the State in Southeast Asia”, Chapter 7 of the “Transnational Trends: Middle Eastern and Asian Views”, The Henry L. Stimson Center, July 2008, page 140.

⁷³ Prema-chandra Athukokala, “Disaster, Generosity and Recovery: India Ocean Tsunami”, Working Papers in Trade and Development, the Australian National University, April 2012.

profound and wide-scale impacts, such nontraditional security challenges constitute new dynamics of security both regionally and internationally.

In 1990s, as globalization increased, interdependence among countries became deeper, thus making economic development, social well-being and military security increasingly intertwined. As the Copenhagen school has argued with its new approach to security, any issue can be labeled as “national security” through the securitization process. In securitizing a range of non-traditional issues, ASEAN countries have rightly recognized that there are a series of problems that are beyond the capacity of any individual countries to respond to, thus requiring collective actions as well as cooperation with extra-regional dialogue partners.

At the establishment of ASEAN as a regional institution, the concept of comprehensive security was strongly advocated by members as this concept fitted with ASEAN’s priority at that moment. All its member countries were weak post-colonial states, and therefore in need for preservation and consolidation of their territorial integrity, political independence and reduction of influences from external actors. That explains the state-centric security concept adopted by Southeast Asia countries. The changing world order and emergence of new pattern of threats to security have put ASEAN member countries in a position of reshaping regional security architecture while striving for a central position in regional security mechanism.⁷⁴ As a result of their struggle for independence from colonialism, the most important and highest principle adopted by ASEAN countries is non-intervention and requiring consensus among regional countries for any solution to regional problems. NTS issues are often less-sensitive, thus less controversial and difficult to broach while easier to reach agreement and cooperation upon. This explains why ASEAN’s security agenda is mainly focused on non-sensitive issues. Especially, as the region is suffering potential tensions as the result of territorial claims in the East Sea (South China Sea) among regional countries and China, NTS is thought to be “best platform upon which to encourage cooperation and cohesion among states in the region.”⁷⁵

As countries prone to natural disasters, Southeast Asian countries have to face multifaceted security threats, both traditional and nontraditional. As the number of inter-state armed conflicts has become smaller, traditional military threats are no longer the

⁷⁴ Angela Pennisi di Floristella, “Are non-traditional security challenges leading regional organizations towards greater convergence? The EU and ASEAN security system in comparative perspective”, *Asia Europe Journal* (2013).

⁷⁵ Rizal Sukma, “The Evolving Regional Security Architecture in East Asia: Challenge or Opportunity for NTS”, Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS), Indonesia.

only major threats to national security. Additionally, nontraditional challenges have been recognized as a growing threat to regional security. The 1997 financial crisis served as a catalyst to make ASEAN countries more concerned about nontraditional security issues. One of these, humanitarian assistance and disaster relief, has become an important new field of regional security cooperation. This accelerated after the 2004 Indian Ocean tsunami, which saw the securitization of HADR and the development of new ASEAN cooperation mechanisms.

CHAPTER 3: HADR AS A NON-TRADITIONAL SECURITY ISSUE IN ASEAN

As analyzed in previous chapters, various NTS issues have been securitized and labeled with “security”, reflecting their prominence in ASEAN’s current security cooperation. Against the backdrop of the post Cold War world where the Asia – Pacific is rising as the world’s most dynamic area, ASEAN’s efforts in building an image of itself as a resilient, integrated and proactive regional organization, therefore depends on the way it deals with and settle regional problems. Humanitarian assistance and disaster relief (HADR) emerged as a priority in the wake of the 2004 Indian Ocean tsunami⁷⁶ and there is now an imperative for regional cooperation in this area.⁷⁷

Continuing on from the previous chapter, this chapter will provide a general understanding of how HADR has been securitized and discuss ASEAN security cooperation in this field. To this end, the chapter contains two sections: the first provides information on the evolution of the issue of humanitarian assistance and disaster relief while the second part elaborates the evolution of HADR in various regional security cooperation mechanisms in East Asia. The second section also provides an explanation of how HADR has been securitized by intra and extra regional countries, with ASEAN becoming a key focal point for various security mechanisms.

3.1. HADR and securitization of HADR:

The concept of humanitarian assistance and disaster relief

The concept of humanitarian assistance was mentioned in the 19th century by the Swiss businessman Henry Dunant, who witnessed the bloody battle between French and Austrian armies and sought to provide help for soldiers wounded in the battle.⁷⁸ Despite his great efforts, thousands of soldiers died. Though he did not succeed in saving them, his proposal for groups of trained volunteers to care the wounded for humanitarian purposes was the inspiration for the creation of the Committee of Five, which then became the International Committee of the Red Cross, working worldwide to provide humanitarian help for people affected by conflicts and armed violence and to promote the laws that protect victims of wars. On Dunant’s suggestion, a legal basis, the Geneva Convention 1949 and its Protocols - core of the International Humanitarian Law, was built to provide guidelines and legal framework for the protection of affected people as well as those involving in the humanitarian assistance process in wars and armed

⁷⁶ Scott Watson, “The ‘human’ as referent object?: Humanitarianism as securitization” Security Dialogue 2011 42:3, p. 12.

⁷⁷ Mark G. Rolls (University of Waikato), “ASEAN and the Nontraditional Regional Security Agenda”, India – New Zealand Track II Dialogue, September 2010.

⁷⁸ Information retrieved from the website of the International Committee of Red Cross at <http://www.ifrc.org/en/who-we-are/history/>

conflicts. As provided by the International Committee of Red Cross (ICRC), international humanitarian law, which is also known as the law of war or the law of armed conflict, is “a set of rules which seek, for humanitarian reasons, to limit the effects of armed conflict. It protects persons who are no longer participating in the hostilities and restricts the means and methods of warfare”.⁷⁹ The concept of “humanitarian assistance”, therefore, was first mentioned in the context of helping distressed people in armed conflict.⁸⁰

The Geneva Convention has been then supplemented with additional protocols, which also set principles for relief activities. Although HADR activities are often intended for the purpose of humanity, in fact, there have been various cases where states have used humanitarian assistance as a disguise for military interventions with a range of other interests such as those conducted in Somali, Haiti, Bosnia, Angola, Mozambique and Kosovo.⁸¹ However, in order to prevent a possible abuse of humanitarian assistance, there have been efforts to exclude the use of force⁸² or set out parameters for ensuring that states employ forces in a humane way and only toward humanitarian outcomes.⁸³ The Protocols to the Geneva Convention are, therefore, supplemented with a set of principles which say humanitarian operations must be carried out with neutrality, impartiality and independence. Additionally, since humanitarian assistance is carried out to save lives and reduce suffering, it is often focused on a short period of time and for activities in the immediate aftermath of a disaster. In short, humanitarian assistance typically refers to the impartial and neutral act of assistance and relief in response to natural disasters (such as earthquakes, floods, typhoons, famine, etc) or man-made disasters.

In the field of humanitarian securitizing discourse, the term “humanitarian” is commonly used by academics, humanitarian agencies and states to refer to the “promotion of human welfare and the alleviation of human suffering”.⁸⁴ The United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs also attaches humanitarian work with the “alleviation of human suffering” in disasters and emergencies.⁸⁵

⁷⁹ For more information, please go to: <http://www.icrc.org/eng/resources/documents/legal-fact-sheet/humanitarian-law-factsheet.htm>.

⁸⁰ Information retrieved from website of the International Committee for the Red Cross at: <http://www.icrc.org/eng/war-and-law/overview-war-and-law.htm>

⁸¹ Scott Watson, “The “human” as referent object?: Humanitarianism as securitization”, *Security Dialogue* 2011 42:3, p.4.

⁸² For more information, please go to the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) website at <http://www.icrc.org/Web/eng/siteeng0.nsf/html/5W9FJY>.

⁸³ Scott Watson, “The “human” as referent object”, p.4.

⁸⁴ Scott Watson, “The “human” as referent object”, p.5.

⁸⁵ United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA), *Annual Report (2009)*. New York: United Nation Secretariat.

In a similar way, “disaster” is also defined by various international (humanitarian) organizations. The UN officially describes a disaster as “a sudden, calamitous event that causes serious disruption of the functioning of a community or a society causing widespread human, material, economic and/ or environmental losses which exceed the ability of the affected community or society to cope using its own level of resources”.⁸⁶ The World Health Organization has its own definition of disaster as “events that occur when significant numbers of people are exposed to hazards to which they are vulnerable, with resulting injury and loss of life, often combined with damage to property and livelihoods”.⁸⁷

In East Asia the concept of disaster is also mentioned in the ASEAN Regional Forum Strategic Guidance for humanitarian assistance and disaster relief as “complex mix of occurrences and maybe the result of natural forces (extreme weather or geological activity) or human activity (conflict, social upheaval and pollution). Disasters can cause widespread human displacement and suffering, and retard economic and social development for lengthy periods”.⁸⁸

In summary, the scope of HADR is normally associated with the protection and promotion of human life and human dignity as well as immediate and prompt assistance for such purposes in disasters and emergencies. As countries are faced with more and more natural and man-made disasters, more and more humanitarian assistance operations have been carried out globally. The concept of HADR has also evolved to include the rebuilding and improvement of pre-disaster prevention and management mechanisms within the affected zone.

HADR Securitization:

Humanitarian assistance in armed conflicts and natural disasters is a subject that is attracting increased global concern.⁸⁹ There is a growing recognition that international collaboration to alleviate hardship brought about by causes that go beyond the control of those who suffer most immediately is increasingly required. In a globalized world like

⁸⁶ UN/ISDR 2004.

⁸⁷ B. Wisner and J. Adam, “Environmental Health in emergencies and disasters”, World Health Organization 2002, p.4.

⁸⁸ ASEAN Regional Forum Strategic Guidance for Humanitarian Assistance and Disaster Relief

⁸⁹ Howard Mann, Review of the Book titled “International Humanitarian Assistance: Disaster Relief Actions in International Law and Organization” by Peter Macalister-Smith, the International and Comparative Law Quarterly, Vol.36, No.3 (July 1987).

It is also written in the European Commission’s General Guidelines on Operational Priorities for Humanitarian Aid in 2013 (Brussels, 27 Nov 2012, p.2) that “In 2012, the global humanitarian context remained challenging. While the number of people affected by humanitarian crises went down in 2011 – 2012 and there were a smaller number of natural disasters and conflicts registered world-wide, the increasing global vulnerabilities and the vast economic damage caused by disasters remained a major source of concern.”

the one today, it is not only possible for more people to see large-scale disasters and human sufferings through communication technology, it is also possible to mobilize global capabilities for humanitarian assistance for victims worldwide. However, one challenge is how to mobilize and coordinate the resources needed to prepare for, protect against and respond to such disasters. One way that has been attempted is through the securitization of HADR, in an effort to attract support from political, economic and militarily sources to deal with disastrous events.

Barry Buzan and his colleagues, in their studies of securitization, identify five sectors (military, political, economic, societal and environmental) and argue that each of these five sectors, in the process of securitization, has its own existential threats, referent objects and nature of survival.⁹⁰ For instance, the security of the societal sector can be characterized with the concept of identity while state security is organized with the concept of sovereignty.⁹¹ HADR, in its securitization process, also has its own referent objects and emergency measures. As mentioned above, HADR relates to humanitarian activities to save human lives and relieve human suffering caused by natural and man-made disasters. Therefore, HADR security is organized around the concept of human life and human dignity as the referent object of security. Such human life and human dignity can be existentially threatened by natural and/or man-made disasters and emergencies. In these disasters and emergencies (which are existential threats), human life and dignity (the referent object), can be saved only by prompt and adequate responses.

The Copenhagen school argues there are three elements of securitizing discourse: (i) existential threats to a referent object; (ii) emergency action; (iii) effects on inter-unit relations by the breaking free of rules.⁹² First, in the HADR securitization process, as analyzed above, natural and man-made disasters are understood to be existential threats while human life and dignity are their referent objects. Second, in terms of emergency action, the alleviation of human suffering in disasters may be conducted by sudden mobilization of available sources for relief operation, prompt responses for recovery from disasters, reconstruction after disasters and preventive measures against disasters. Third, the last element is, in fact, the implementation of measures that are “exceptional, or outside the normal bounds of political procedure”.⁹³ In the case of HADR, this could

⁹⁰ Scott Watson, “The “human” as referent object?: Humanitarianism as securitization”, *Security Dialogue* 2011 42:3, p. 5.

⁹¹ Scott Watson, “The “human” as referent object”, p.5.

⁹² Barry Buzan et al., “Security: A New Framework for Analysis”, p. 26.

⁹³ Barry Buzan et al., “Security: A New Framework for Analysis”, p. 24.

be understood as the unprecedented mobilization of available resources (including military resources) for relief operations, cooperation among countries in such a way that they have never cooperated before. Generally, securitization involves the creation of an issue as a security issue through the discursive practices of political elites seeking to justify exceptional measures that violate existing rules. In some cases, “the securitization is so successful that it becomes institutionalized”.⁹⁴ Securitization is, therefore, ad hoc and discursive on the one hand, but highly institutionalized at the other hand. Additionally, as Scott Watson argues, the exceptionality of HADR in some current HADR operations is that states and NGOs - the securitizing actors - in responding to recurrent threats to human insecurity, have called for armed humanitarian operations. The 2004 Southeast Asian tsunami can be seen as an example of this exceptional response and institutionalization. The tsunami led to unprecedented financial support being mobilized: \$7.3 billion USD raised in bilateral aid by governments and up to \$5.7 billion donated to Red Cross organizations and other NGOs.⁹⁵ After the tsunami, with increased regional acknowledgement of the profound impact from nontraditional security challenges such as natural disasters, ASEAN countries pushed forward regional cooperation and cooperation with outside countries on the issue. Regional states have conducted joint military exercises for humanitarian assistance in event of natural disasters. They have even developed the idea of advancing cooperation on the use of ASEAN military assets and capacities in HADR.⁹⁶ This is especially exceptional as ASEAN member countries have traditionally avoided multilateral military cooperation and stress the importance of the principles of non-interference and consensus as their highest rules.

In summary, the Copenhagen school of thought has put forward a new framework for securitizing nontraditional security issues, among which, HADR is increasingly attracting attention. The next section will explain in greater detail how HADR was securitized globally and regionally (within ASEAN) drawing on the Copenhagen school’s new security framework for analysis.

How HADR has been securitized globally

The world has undergone various catastrophes including armed conflicts, terrible epidemics and destructive disasters. Human inventions and industrial and technological

⁹⁴ Scott Watson, “The “human” as referent object”, p.8.

⁹⁵ James Thompson, “Humanitarian Performance and the Asian Tsunami”, p.71.

⁹⁶ ASEAN Leaders’ Statement on Cooperation in Flood Prevention, Mitigation, Relief, Recovery and Rehabilitation – adopted at Bali, Indonesia at the 19th ASEAN Summit on 7th Nov 2011. For details, please go to: <http://www.asean.org/archive/document/19th%20summit/Flood.pdf>

revolutions have created the potential for man-made catastrophes such as the chemical accident in India in 1984, the nuclear accident in Chernobyl in the former Soviet Union in 1986.⁹⁷ At the end of the Cold War, the number of wars and arms conflicts reduced.⁹⁸ However, humanity has to face with damage and calamities caused by epidemics and natural disasters, which are threatening quality of human life and human dignity, thus, possibly triggering unpredictable political and economic consequences to state governments. Recently, East Asia suffered from such devastating natural disasters as the 2004 India Ocean tsunami and the well-known ‘triple disaster’ - the massive earthquake followed by a powerful tsunami which led to a nuclear accident that struck Japan in 2011. The 2004 Indian Ocean tsunami affected 11 countries, killed more than 225,000 people, displaced many more and destroyed boats, businesses and huge swathe of property across geographically disparate coastlines.⁹⁹ The triple disaster cost Japan 15,854 deaths, 26,992 injured, 3,155 missing. The World Bank estimated that total cost of the disaster was about \$238 billion¹⁰⁰, making a severe jolt to the Japanese economy and making it the most expensive disaster in recent history.¹⁰¹ Such damages created a huge amount of work for the affected countries’ governments in terms of resettling people’s life in the affected areas, economic recovery and reconstruction in the post-disaster period.

The actual statistics about the damage caused by natural disasters are, for some reasons, the most illustrative to state leaders and policy makers in broadening the security paradigm. The two most important landmarks in the securitization process of HADR globally are the issuance of the Yokohama strategy, which provides guidelines for natural disaster prevention, preparedness and mitigation and the Hyogo framework for action 2005 - 2015 which is aimed at building resilience of nations and communities to disasters. Both these fundamental initiatives were put forward initially by Japan, and strongly supported by the United Nations.

In the late 1980s, a group of American and Japanese earthquake engineering scientists proposed that scientific knowledge could be used to alleviate suffering from natural disasters and that it should be required to have international cooperation and

⁹⁷ David P. Fidler, “Governing catastrophes: security, health and humanitarian assistance”, *International Review of the Red Cross*, Vol. 89, No. 866 June 207, p.249.

⁹⁸ John Mueller, “War has almost Ceased to Exist: An Assessment”.

⁹⁹ James Thompson, “Humanitarian Performance and the Asian Tsunami”, *the Drama Review*, Vo.55, No.1, Spring 2011 (T 209), p. 70 - 83.

¹⁰⁰ David M. Arase, “The Impact of 3/11 on Japan”, *the Journal of East Asia* (2012) 29: 313 – 336, p.314.

¹⁰¹ David M. Arase, “The Impact of 3/11 on Japan”, *Journal of East Asia* (2012) 29: 313 – 336, p.314.

action for disaster reduction.¹⁰² The idea of the International Decade for Natural Disaster Reduction (IDNDR) was originated at the 8th World Conference on Earthquake Engineering in San Francisco in July 1984.¹⁰³ At the Conference, Mr. Frank Press (President of the US National Academy of Sciences), in his keynote address in the Opening Ceremony, called for joint efforts to plan for a decade for natural disaster reduction as he said: "I believe there is great need, and much support can be found, to establish an International Decade of Hazard Reduction. This special initiative would see all nations joining forces to reduce the consequences of natural hazards."¹⁰⁴ His proposal was strongly endorsed by the IAEE and the Conference delegates. The delegates also recommended prompt action for implementation.¹⁰⁵ With efforts from Japanese scientists, an ad hoc committee consisting of scientist from various Japanese universities was formed to act jointly with the National Committee for Disaster Science. The Committee, with presentation of Frank Press (President of the US Academy of Sciences) organized several symposia as part of the campaign for the IDNDR in Japan. The symposia held on 20 October 1987 in Tokyo was "Natural Disasters and the International Decade for Natural Hazard Reduction" and the other one held on 21 Oct 1987 in Nagoya was "Seminar on Regional Disaster Prevention".¹⁰⁶ Both symposia attracted great audiences and helped in spreading the idea of IDNDR as well as calling support for it. As the result of great efforts from scientists, on 11 December 1987, at its 42nd session, the United Nations General Assembly unanimously adopted a resolution which decided to designate the 1990s as the International Decade for Natural Disaster Reduction (IDNDR) under the auspices of the United Nations.¹⁰⁷ The Decade was launched in January 1990. The resolution said:

¹⁰² Satoru Nishikawa, "From Yokohama Strategy to Hyogo Framework: Sharing the Japanese Experience of Disaster Risk Management", the Asian Journal of Environment and Disaster Management, Vol.2, No.3 (2010), p.252.

¹⁰³ International Association for Earthquake Engineering (IAEE), Bulletin of the New Zealand National Society for Earthquake Engineering, Vol.21, No.4, December 1988, retrieved from [http://www.nzsee.org.nz/db/Bulletin/Archive/21\(4\)0290.pdf](http://www.nzsee.org.nz/db/Bulletin/Archive/21(4)0290.pdf)

The International Association for Earthquake Engineering (IAEE) is a non-profit organization, established in February 1963 with Central Office in Tokyo. The IAEE aims to promote international cooperation among scientists and engineers in the field of earthquake engineering through interchange of knowledge, ideas, and results of research and practical experience. For more information about IAEE, please go to its website at: <http://www.iaee.or.jp/>

¹⁰⁴ Tsuneo Katayama, International Decade for Natural Disaster Reduction: Working against Time, A Presentation made at the United Nations University on 13 October 1993, Tokyo, Japan, retrieved from <http://archive.unu.edu/unupress/lecture8.html>

¹⁰⁵ International Association for Earthquake Engineering (IAEE), Bulletin of the New Zealand National Society for Earthquake Engineering, Vol.21, No.4, December 1988.

¹⁰⁶ Kenzo Toki, "The International Decade for Natural Disaster Reduction in Japan", presented at the Expert's Group Meeting at UNESCO, France and at National Academy of Science, USA, March 1988, retrieve from: http://www.preventionweb.net/files/30465_japanidndrtoki.pdf

¹⁰⁷ United Nations, United Nations General Assembly Resolution A/RES/42/169, (1987).

“Considering that natural disasters, such as earthquakes, windstorms (cyclones, hurricanes, tornadoes, typhoons), tsunamis, floods, landslides, volcanic eruptions, wildfires and other calamities of natural origin, have claimed about 3 million lives worldwide in the past two decades, adversely affected the lives of at least 800 million more people and resulted in immediate damages exceeding \$23 billion,

Recognizing that the effects of such disasters may damage very severely the fragile economic infrastructure of developing countries, especially the least developed, land-locked and island developing countries, and thus hamper their development process,

Recognizing the responsibility of the United Nations system for promoting international co-operation in the study of natural disasters of geophysical origin and in the development of techniques to mitigate risks arising therefrom, as well as for co-ordinating disaster relief, preparedness and prevention, including prediction and early warning,

Convinced that concerted international action for the reduction of natural disasters over the course of the 1990s would give genuine impetus to a series of concrete measures at the national, regional and international levels,

...

*Decides to designate the 1990s as a decade in which the international community, under the auspices of the United Nations, will pay special attention to fostering international co-operation in the field of natural disaster reduction”.*¹⁰⁸

The objective of the Decade was to reduce through concerted international action, loss of life, property damage and social and economic disruption caused by natural disasters such as earthquakes, windstorms, tsunamis, floods, landslides, volcanic eruptions, wildfires.¹⁰⁹

Overall, in addition to calling all governments to participate in concerted actions for natural disaster reduction during the Decade, the resolution on IDNDR also called on all governments to take necessary measures themselves for natural disaster reduction such as building national disaster-mitigation programs as well as national economic, land-use and insurance policies for disaster prevention at all levels within their borders (communal, district and central); mobilizing all possible sources and support from public and private sectors for attaining the Decade’s objectives and goals; increasing

¹⁰⁸ United Nations, United Nations General Assembly Resolution A/RES/42/169, (1987).

¹⁰⁹ Satoru Nishikawa, “From Yokohama Strategy to Hyogo Framework”, p.252.

national public awareness of natural disasters and of significance of preparedness, prevention, relief and short-term recovery activities on natural disasters.¹¹⁰ Thanks to the resolution on IDNDR, the issue of natural disasters and their impacts on human life was brought to an international political fora for the first time.

Later, the United Nations General Assembly, adopted another resolution at the 48th session organized in December 1993, to further promote international cooperation on natural disasters. Resolution number 48/188 adopted by the United Nation General Assembly in 1993 decided to convene the World Conference on Natural Disaster Reduction in the following year, which was hosted by the Government of Japan. The Conference was then held in Yokohama and adopted the “Yokohama Strategy and Plan of Action for a Safer World, Guidelines for Natural Disaster Prevention, Preparedness and Mitigation”. The Yokohama Strategy was the “first internationally agreed document outlining the broad spectrum of actions necessary for natural disaster reduction at local, national and international level”.¹¹¹ The Strategy was also the first internationally agreed document raising the issue of natural disaster as a threat to human life and consequently to state’s economy and development. Its text states “sustainable economic growth and sustainable development cannot be achieved in many countries without adequate measures to reduce disaster losses”.¹¹² During the meeting of the World Conference on Natural Disaster in 1994, participants express their serious concerns of impacts on humanity and states of natural disaster, as they issued the so-called Yokohama message saying that: “We, the State Members of the United Nations and other States, having met at the World Conference on Natural Disaster Reduction, in the city of Yokohama, Japan, from 23 May to 27 May 1994, in partnership with non-governmental organizations, and with the participation of international organizations, the scientific community, business, industry and the media, deliberating within the framework of the International Decade for Natural Disaster Reduction, expressing our deep concern for the continuing human suffering and disruption of development caused by natural disasters”.¹¹³ The Strategy also called on governments for cooperative actions for natural disaster reduction at local, national and international levels, demanding the

¹¹⁰ Satoru Nishikawa, “From Yokohama Strategy to Hyogo Framework”, p.254.

¹¹¹ Satoru Nishikawa, “From Yokohama Strategy to Hyogo Framework”, p.255.

¹¹² The Yokohama Strategy and Plan of Action for a Safer World – Guidelines for Natural Disaster Prevention, Preparedness and Mitigation at the World Conference on Natural Disaster Reduction, Yokohama, Japan, 23-27 May 1994, retrieved from: <http://www.ifrc.org/Docs/idrl/I248EN.pdf>

¹¹³ Yokohama Strategy and Plan of Action for a Safer World, Guidelines for Natural Disaster Prevention, Preparedness and Mitigation.

“development of a global culture of prevention as an essential component of an integrated approach to disaster reduction”.¹¹⁴

The Yokohama Strategy at the World Conference on Natural Disasters represents a joint statement of all UN member countries on natural disasters in terms of (i) disasters’ impacts on human life and states’ strength and how to deal with and prevent them; (ii) stressing the importance of interdependence among countries all over the world and borderless impacts by natural disasters. All countries, therefore, share common interests of maintaining global peace, stability and safety and share responsibility to save human life. The Strategy also called for regional and international cooperation in dealing with natural disasters as such cooperation would enhance states’ abilities to mitigate disasters through sharing information and experiences in responding to natural disasters.¹¹⁵

In the middle of 1990s, the worst ever earthquake in Kobe, Japan, forced Japanese government to reconsider its disaster warning and prevention system. After the earthquake research programs for disaster reduction brought new findings and inventions, including those on house building as an effort of disaster prevention and mitigation measures. At the beginning of the 21st century, the desire to share experiences led Japan to express its willingness to host another World Conference on disaster reduction. As a result of Japan’s effort, in December 2003, at the 58th session, the United Nations General Assembly adopted a resolution allowing convention of a World Conference on Disaster Reduction in 2005, hosted by the Japanese Government in Kobe, Hyogo which would have the goal of reviewing the implementation of the Yokohama Strategy and further promoting international cooperation in disaster reduction.

After one decade of the implementation of the Yokohama Strategy and its Plan of Action, the Strategy was reviewed in the World Conference on Disaster Reduction convened in January 2005. It concluded by stressing, “the importance of disaster risk reduction being underpinned by a more proactive approach to informing, motivating and involving people in all aspects of disaster risk reduction in their own communities”.¹¹⁶ The review of the Yokohama strategy also pointed out the scarcity of resources allocated for disaster risk reduction, either at national or regional level and identified

¹¹⁴ Satoru Nishikawa, “From Yokohama Strategy to Hyogo Framework”, p 255.

¹¹⁵ Yokohama Strategy and Plan of Action for a Safer World, Guidelines for Natural Disaster Prevention, Preparedness and Mitigation.

¹¹⁶ Hyogo Framework for Action 2005 – 2015: Building the Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disasters, the Final report of the World Conference on Disaster Reduction in Hyogo, Japan in 2005, p.2

gaps and challenges in the governance; the identification, assessment and early warning of risks or the preparedness for effective response and recovery.

Lessons drawn from the review of the Yokohama Strategy and its Plan of Action were, therefore, incorporated into the Hyogo Framework for Action 2005 - 2015: Building the Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disasters adopted in the World Conference on Disaster Reduction in 2005.¹¹⁷ After one decade, the need to address the issue of natural disasters was well acknowledged as it was written in the Report of the World Conference on Disaster Reduction in 2005 that “There is now international acknowledgement that efforts to reduce disaster risks must be systematically integrated into policies, plans and programs for sustainable development and poverty reduction, and supported through bilateral, regional and international cooperation, including partnership”.¹¹⁸ The Framework also provided a comprehensive plan for action for the next decade with priorities in (i) ensuring that all states shall take disaster risk reduction as important objective at central and local level which is endorsed by strong institutional basis for implementation; (ii) enhancing the system of risk identifying, assessing, monitoring and early warning; (iii) forming a sense of safety and resilience at all levels; and (iv) strengthening the disaster preparedness for effective response at all levels.¹¹⁹

Through these twin processes, scientists, Japan and the United Nations became the most important actors working to securitize HADR, while its referent object remains human life and dignity. The securitization process started with the proposal made by Frank Press at the 8th World Conference on Earthquake Engineering in San Francisco in July 1984 as he called for “joining forces” of all nations to “reduce the consequences of natural hazards”.¹²⁰ The issue was then spread among both scientists and governmental officials through symposia: with the presence of Frank Press, two symposia were held in Japan: the symposia titled “Natural Disasters and the International Decade for Natural Hazard Reduction” conducted by the Science Council of Japan and the “Seminar on Regional Disaster Prevention” held by the United Nations Center for Regional

¹¹⁷ Hyogo Framework for Action 2005 – 2015: Building the Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disasters, p.3.

¹¹⁸ Hyogo Framework for Action 2005 – 2015: Building the Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disasters, p.1.

¹¹⁹ Hyogo Framework for Action 2005 – 2015, Building the Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disasters, p.6.

¹²⁰ International Association for Earthquake Engineering (IAEE), Bulletin of the New Zealand National Society for Earthquake Engineering, Vol.21, No.4, December 1988, retrieved from [http://www.nzsee.org.nz/db/Bulletin/Archive/21\(4\)0290.pdf](http://www.nzsee.org.nz/db/Bulletin/Archive/21(4)0290.pdf)

Development.¹²¹ These great efforts by scientists and Japanese Government contributed to the widely support from UN member countries to pass a resolution to designate the 1990s the International Decade for Natural Disaster Reduction. Furthermore, the issue also attracted attention by the number of death toll or damage caused by natural disasters. In his presentation made at the United Nations University in Tokyo in 1993, Professor Tsuneo Katayama¹²² stated that “in the last 20 years, the United Nations reports that natural disasters have claimed almost three million lives and have adversely affected more than 800 million people world-wide”.¹²³

It can be said that the speech act of HADR securitization was conducted internationally through various national, regional and international conferences to persuade and call for globally joint hands from countries all over the world. In this case, the target audience was various: national scientists, governmental officials or elite circles or participants in World Conferences on Natural Disasters. The speech act can also be said to have been successfully conducted through keynotes of scientists in the conferences, by which scientists convey the importance of the issue, the urgency of required measures to deal with the issue as well as the call for joint actions. The speech act was so successfully conducted that it led to the issuance of two fundamental UN resolutions that call for local, national and international cooperation on disaster mitigation reduction. That means the implementation of measures to combat natural disasters was highly institutionalized: at the highest form (United Nations resolution) and with a large number of participating states (168 countries took part in the Hyogo Conference in 2005 as the UN members).

In summary, the concept of humanitarian assistance has its origins in the 19th century with calls for assistance for affected people in wars and armed conflicts. The international humanitarian law based on Geneva Convention and Protocols provides a legal foundation for humanitarian assistance operations. Since the end of the Cold War, the sharp reduction in the number of wars and armed conflicts and the rising number and increasing destructiveness of natural disasters means disasters have been seen increasingly as threats to national security and have become securitized. The Yokohama Strategy and the Hyogo framework are two major crucial landmarks in the securitization

¹²¹ Kenzo Toki, “The International Decade for Natural Disaster Reduction in Japan”, presented at the Expert’s Group Meeting at UNESCO, France and at National Academy of Science, USA, March 1988, retrieve from: http://www.preventionweb.net/files/30465_japanidndrtoki.pdf

¹²² Mr. Tsuneo Katayama is Director of the International Center for Disaster Mitigation Engineering, Institute of Industrial Science, University of Tokyo.

¹²³ Tsuneo Katayama, “International Decade for Natural Disaster Reduction: Working against time”, a presentation made at the United Nations University on 13th Oct 1993, in Tokyo, Japan.

of HADR as a subset of non-traditional security. This securitization process was initiated and promoted by scientists with strong endorsement from Japan and support from the United Nations. The securitization is said to be successfully conducted as it won the world's attention on and agreement to join hands for disaster reduction. This is not only clearly reflected at the global level, but also in regional cooperation and national programs for disaster mitigation and reduction. The final part of this chapter will discuss ASEAN's approach to cooperation on HADR.

3.2 HADR issue in ASEAN and Southeast Asian countries

As it was discussed in chapter 2, Southeast Asia is a disaster prone region. Therefore, the region has put great emphasis on HADR operation and cooperation at both regional and extra-regional levels. The securitization of HADR is occurring and has become an increasingly important focus for regional security cooperation. Although HADR has long received attention from regional countries, it was the 2004 tsunami that took the issue of HADR to a new level of importance in ASEAN countries' security thinking and pushed regional countries to be more proactive in cooperation on HADR, thus, creating new dynamics for regional security cooperation.

Since the establishment of ASEAN, Southeast Asian countries have acknowledged and paid great attention to devastating consequences of natural disasters. In order to prepare for and minimize the potential damage from natural disasters, a team of experts from ASEAN member countries was set up in 1971, called Experts for the Establishment of ASEAN Combined Operation against Natural Disasters. Additionally, in the 1976 Declaration of ASEAN Concord, signed by Heads of State/Government at the 1st ASEAN Summit on 24th February 1976, there was an article, saying "natural disasters and other major calamities can retard the pace of development of member states. They shall extend, within their capabilities, assistance for relief of member states in distress".¹²⁴ Moreover, on 26th June 1976, Foreign Ministers of ASEAN countries signed the Declaration on Mutual Assistance on Natural Disasters at the 9th ASEAN Ministerial Meeting. This Declaration called on regional countries to take joint actions and provide mutual help in response to natural disasters. Cooperation could include everything from sharing disaster warning information to supplying goods, medicine and relief assistance. The Declaration also urged member countries to take part in and/ or facilitate the delivery of supplies and assistance to the distressed country. The most important contribution of the Declaration is the provision that requires member

¹²⁴ 1976 Declaration of ASEAN Concord, at <http://www.aseansec.org/5049.htm>.

countries to designate a national government agency acting as internal coordinating body. This could be considered as the starting point for further institutionalization of disaster management.

ASEAN's attention to HADR was also reflected in the gradual institutionalization of HADR cooperation mechanisms. In 1993, the Experts for the Establishment of ASEAN Combined Operation against Natural Disasters was renamed the ASEAN Experts Group on Disaster Management (AEGDM).¹²⁵ Though this is not a well-structured organization, the Expert Group would be the foundation of ASEAN future institution building process on humanitarian assistance and disaster relief. The 12th meeting of the Asian Experts Group on Disaster Management in 2002 decided to upgrade the AEGDM into a full-fledged committee called the ASEAN Committee on Disaster Management (ACDM). In 2003, following the decision of the ASEAN Standing Committee, the ASEAN Committee on Disaster Management (ACDM) was officially established to further strengthen ASEAN's role in regional cooperation on disaster management and emergency response. ACDM is an organized entity at a higher level compared to the ASEAN Experts Group on Disaster Management, which consists of heads of national agencies responsible for disaster management of ASEAN member countries and it is scheduled to convene annually. The Committee is responsible for disaster management of ASEAN member countries and assumes overall responsibility for coordinating and implementing the regional activities.¹²⁶ ACDM shared the same vision and purposes with the AEGDM. Viewing regional countries as disaster-resilient nations who share a common bond in seeking to minimize negative effects of disasters, following the sense of mutually assisting and complementing each other in pursuit for safer communities and sustainable development, ACDM's goal is to outline regional strategies, priority areas and activities in disaster management within the framework of regional cooperation among ASEAN member countries.

The Indian Tsunami in 2004 that swept over the region has further accelerated ASEAN cooperation on HADR. The tsunami hit South and Southeast Asian countries and caused serious destruction in these countries with total death toll of 226,000 people, which was "equivalent with all of the natural disasters of the previous ten years".¹²⁷ The

¹²⁵ For more information, please go to the ASEAN DRR Portal at <http://202.46.9.39:8889/About/ASEANCommitteeonDisasterManagement.aspx>

¹²⁶ For more information, please go to the ASEAN official website at <http://www.asean.org/communities/asean-socio-cultural-community/category/overview-2>

¹²⁷ Pierre Ozer, "The tsunami in Southeast Asia – a retrospective analysis of the management of an apocalyptic natural disaster", retrieved at: <http://cybergeogeo.revues.org/24607>

disaster has exposed the regional countries to the fact that they are disaster-prone and the impacts from natural disasters are tremendous. In his statement in the Senior Policy Forum on “Mega disaster – a global “tipping point” in natural disaster policy, planning and development” held in Hawaii on 15-16 August 2006, the Secretary General of ASEAN stated that “the mega disasters, in particular the Indian Ocean tsunami of 26 December 2004, put everyone off guard. The impact was so overwhelming, and the loss of life and poverty was unprecedented. It showed us that our communities are vulnerable to natural hazards, and such vulnerability is heightened as long as development policy in those communities does not appropriately take into account disaster risks”.¹²⁸ The tsunami raised not only the matter of preparedness for disasters but also the matter of effective donation/ support management. For that reason, the unprecedented and tremendous impacts of the tsunami urged ASEAN’s leaders to convene a special meeting which was held on 6 January 2005, about only two weeks after the tsunami. In this meeting, ASEAN countries were able to launch a Declaration on Action to Strengthen Emergency Relief, Rehabilitation, Reconstruction and Prevention on the Aftermath of Earthquake and Tsunami Disaster of 26th December 2004, paving the way for the ASEAN signing of the Agreement on disaster management and emergency response (AADMER) on 26 July 2005. ASEAN’s leaders acknowledged that the disaster impacts went beyond resource ability of any single country, as it was reflected in the Declaration: “This unprecedented devastation needs unprecedented global response in assisting the national governments to cope with such disaster. This would entail efforts in emergency relief, rehabilitation, and reconstruction that may take five to ten years, with resources that cannot be borne by any individual country”.¹²⁹ Furthermore, ASEAN countries emphasize “the need to coordinate better and ensure that those contributions would be effective and sustainable, to truly address the suffering of the victims and to prevent such calamity from recurring”.¹³⁰ This aims at

¹²⁸ ASEAN’s Secretary General (Mr. Ong Keng Yong), “Mega disasters and resulting “tipping points”: an ASEAN view”, a presentation at the Senior Policy Forum on “Mega disasters – a global “tipping point” in natural disaster policy, planning and development” held in Hawaii on 15-16 August 2006, retrieved from <http://www.asean.org/comunities/asean-socio-cultural-community/item/statement-by-secretary-general-of-asean-2>.

¹²⁹ “Declaration on action to strengthen emergency relief, rehabilitation, reconstruction and prevention on the aftermath of earthquake and tsunami disaster of 26 December 2004” issued in the special ASEAN leaders’ meeting on aftermath of earthquake and tsunami, Jakarta, 6 January 2005, retrieved from <http://www.asean.org/news/item/special-asean-leaders-meeting-on-aftermath-of-earthquake-and-tsunami-jakarta-6-january-2005>.

¹³⁰ “Declaration on action to strengthen emergency relief, rehabilitation, reconstruction and prevention on the aftermath of earthquake and tsunami disaster of 26 December 2004”, issued in the special ASEAN leaders’ meeting on aftermath of earthquake and tsunami, Jakarta, 6 January 2005, retrieved from <http://www.asean.org/news/item/special-asean-leaders-meeting-on-aftermath-of-earthquake-and-tsunami-jakarta-6-january-2005>.

providing an “effective mechanism to achieve substantial reduction of disaster losses in lives and in the social, economic and environmental assets of the regional countries, and to jointly respond to disaster emergencies through concerted national efforts and intensified regional and international cooperation”.¹³¹ In realizing the AADMER, regional countries finalized the Standard Operating Procedures for Regional Standby Arrangement and Coordination of Joint Disaster Relief and Emergency Response Operation (SASOP) and established the ASEAN Coordinating Centre for Humanitarian Assistance on Disaster Management (AHA Centre), which served as effective tools for regional cooperation on HADR.

HADR has additionally become a topic of concern to members of wider regional security groups such as the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF). The creation of ARF in 1994 reflected the recognition of ASEAN’s members that its cooperative security approach needed some kind of institutional foundation. Through its development, ARF broadened the agenda of regional security cooperation and increased participation in multilateral security dialogues.¹³² HADR was mentioned for the first time at one of ARF inter-sessional meetings on disaster relief in 1997. Only three years after the establishment of ARF, disaster relief was raised and discussed in the ARF inter-sessional meeting (ISM), making it a topic of increasing concerns from participating countries. HADR was seen as an aspect of comprehensive security which could only be solved by both national and international efforts. ISM participants agreed on the “importance of discussion of disaster relief as an aspect of comprehensive security, and a valuable confidence building measure for the ARF”¹³³ and stressed “the enormous capacity of disasters to damage local economies and social stability and hence the security of states”.¹³⁴ They recognized that “major disasters do not respect political boundaries, but are a common problem for all states of the region. Partnership and cooperation among states are essential in dealing with disasters”.¹³⁵ The Summary

¹³¹ For more information, please go to <http://www.asean.org/news/item/asean-agreement-on-disaster-management-and-emergency-response-vientiane-26-july-2005-3>.

¹³² Mark Rolls, “Centrality and Continuity: ASEAN and the Regional Security since 1967”. *The Journal of East Asia* (2012) 29: 127 – 139.

¹³³ Summary Report of the ARF Inter-Sessional Meeting Support Group on Disaster Relief, Wellington, 19-20 February 1997, retrieved from: <http://aseanregionalforum.asean.org/library/arf-chairmans-statements-and-reports/143.html>.

¹³⁴ Summary Report of the ARF Inter-Sessional Meeting Support Group on Disaster Relief, Wellington, 19-20 February 1997, retrieved from: <http://aseanregionalforum.asean.org/library/arf-chairmans-statements-and-reports/143.html>.

¹³⁵ Summary Report of the ARF Inter-Sessional Meeting Support Group on Disaster Relief, Wellington, 19-20 February 1997, retrieved from: <http://aseanregionalforum.asean.org/component/content/article/3-public-library/143-summary-report-of-the-arf-inter-sessional-meeting-on-disaster-relief--wellington-19-20-february-1997.html>

report from the meeting also asks member countries to enhance cooperation in delivering disaster relief. As the result of the meeting, an initial database of contact person in charge of HADR in each country was set up. Almost a decade later, in July 2007, at the 14th ARF Ministerial Meeting, ARF's General Guidelines for Disaster Relief Cooperation were adopted. The Guidelines establish a basic framework among ARF participating countries to promote more effective cooperation and reduce losses due to frequent disasters. Cooperation on HADR was further called for as the ARF issued its Humanitarian Assistance and Disaster Relief Strategic Guidelines, which aim at promoting a common understanding among ARF members of civil - military cooperation and coordination procedures so as to improve interoperability and cooperation between ARF members, and reduce their response time in disaster relief. These Strategic Guidelines also provided high level of guidance for military-military and civil-military cooperation in preparing and undertaking HADR activities.¹³⁶ Additionally, ARF member countries also took part in joint exercises on disaster relief (ARF DiREX) with three exercises have been held in 2009, 2011 and 2013 in Philippines, Indonesia and Thailand respectively. The exercises have been recognized as landmark events in improving the capacity of the region's disaster response mechanism in a multinational operational context.¹³⁷

More recently HADR has become an important element of the work of ASEAN Defense Ministers' Meeting (ADMM), which is the highest defense mechanism within ASEAN. Being established in 2006, ADMM is held on annual basis and facilitates ASEAN defense ministers to discuss and exchange view on current defense and security issues as well as challenges in the region. The establishment of ADMM in Kuala Lumpur in May 2006 was regarded as "a monumental event that has paved the way for the evolution of ASEAN security and defense cooperation among ASEAN defense establishment".¹³⁸ Since ADMM inception, defense cooperation among ASEAN countries has grown steadily, especially in the field of HADR.¹³⁹ The third ADMM held in Thailand in February 2009 adopted a concept paper on how ASEAN military assets

¹³⁶ ASEAN Regional Forum Strategic Guidance for HADR, p. 213 – 215.

¹³⁷ Background information on ARF DiREX, retrieved from:

<http://www.arfdirex2013.org/about/background.html>

¹³⁸ This was noted in the Joint Declaration of ASEAN Defense Ministers on Strengthening ASEAN Defense Establishments to meet the Challenges of Non-traditional Security Threats issued on 26th February 2009, retrieved from the ADMM website at: <http://admm.asean.org/dmdocuments/3.%20Joint%20Declaration%20ASEAN%20Defence%20Ministers%20on%20Strengthening%20ASEAN%20Defence%20Establishment%20to%20Meet%20the%20Challenges%20of%20NTS%20Threats.pdf>.

¹³⁹ Overview of the ADMM, retrieved from the ASEAN website at: <http://www.asean.org/communities/asean-political-security-community/category/overview-5>

and capabilities could be used in HADR. The Concept Paper on using military assets in HADR reflects concerns of regional countries on HADR and the requirement for their cooperation in such field as it says “the increasing number of disasters as well as the unprecedented scale of the international response indicates that there is indeed a sense of urgency to establish an ASEAN standby arrangement for emergency response and risk reduction”.¹⁴⁰ The Concept Paper also shows ASEAN experience and lessons learnt from previous natural disaster that the use of militaries played an important part in HADR operation: “the participation of the military and its ability to muster assets and capacities to respond in a timely manner has proven to be a useful tool in assisting relief efforts in the affected areas”. At the same time, the Joint declaration of ASEAN Defense Ministers on strengthening ASEAN defense establishments to meet the challenges of NTS threats was also issued in the same period with the Concept Paper on using military assets in HADR, which set out regional countries’ concerns about “the increasingly serious nature of nontraditional and transnational security threats which have become important factors of uncertainty affecting and posing new challenges to regional and international peace, stability and prosperity”¹⁴¹. It also noted that “regional and international cooperation needs to be strengthened to meet NTS challenges and the future need for ASEAN defense establishments to cooperate with non-military sectors, bodies, civil society organizations”.¹⁴² Regional countries also affirmed their support for the promotion of cooperation on NTS concerns, agreeing for the development of coordination mechanisms for “military participation, consider the conduct of combined training and exercises in disaster relief and emergency response operations, consider establishing more links and coordination mechanisms between the ASEAN member states to enable efficient and faster delivery of aid in humanitarian assistance and disaster relief”.¹⁴³ The agreement was another step towards concrete cooperation among ASEAN countries. In addition to regional cooperation, HADR has been an issue in the

¹⁴⁰ Annex D to the Concept Paper on the use of ASEAN military assets and capacities in humanitarian assistance and disaster relief, retrieved from the ADMM website at: <http://admm.asean.org/dmdocuments/8.%20ANNEX%20D%20ADOPTED%20Concept%20The%20Use%20of%20ASEAN%20Military%20Assets.pdf>.

¹⁴¹ Joint Declaration of ASEAN Defense Ministers on Strengthening ASEAN Defense Establishments to meet the Challenges of Non-traditional Security Threats issued on 26th February 2009, retrieved from the ADMM website at: <http://admm.asean.org/dmdocuments/3.%20Joint%20Declaration%20ASEAN%20Defence%20Ministers%20on%20Strengthening%20ASEAN%20Defence%20Establishment%20to%20Meet%20the%20Challenges%20of%20NTS%20Threats.pdf>.

¹⁴² Joint Declaration of ASEAN Defense Ministers on Strengthening ASEAN Defense Establishments to meet the Challenges of Non-traditional Security Threats issued on 26th February 2009.

¹⁴³ Joint Declaration of ASEAN Defense Ministers on Strengthening ASEAN Defense Establishments to meet the Challenges of Non-traditional Security Threats issued on 26th February 2009.

ADMM-Plus cooperation mechanism as the regional countries acknowledge the need for cooperation with non-ASEAN countries also. In the Concept Paper of the ADMM-Plus adopted at the 2nd ADMM in November 2007, it is written that “open and inclusive multilateral security frameworks are needed to facilitate the channels of communication and cooperation, both within ASEAN and between ASEAN and countries outside Southeast Asia”¹⁴⁴ since the region “face a set of complex transnational security challenges on traditional and non-traditional security issues, such as terrorism and humanitarian assistance and disaster relief”.¹⁴⁵ The formation of ADMM-Plus was regarded by ASEAN’s leaders as ‘a robust, effective, open and inclusive component of the regional security architecture that would enable the ADMM to cooperate with the non-ASEAN countries to build capacity and better prepare ASEAN to address the complex security challenges’.¹⁴⁶ Furthermore, the ADMM-Plus countries have agreed to hold HADR operation exercises together. The first ever ADMM-Plus HADR/Military Medicine Exercise was conducted in Brunei from 16 – 20 June 2013 with participation of 10 ASEAN countries and eight major powers.

In summary, HADR has long been concerned by ASEAN members who situate in a disaster-prone area. However, HADR has attracted much more concerns from regional countries after the Indian tsunami in 2004 which heavily destructed some Southeast Asian countries. The tsunami forced ASEAN’s leaders to convene a special meeting to find post-disaster solution, caused the signature of the Agreement on disaster management and emergency response (AADMER) on 26 July 2005. HADR has also been a topic of various regional cooperation mechanism such as the ADMM or the ARF. The region’s increasing concern on HADR can be seen in the process of “HADR securitizing” at regional level: within the ASEAN itself and within the ARF with participation from external countries. In most discussions of HADR, the referent object is human life and dignity. However, in the case of the ASEAN countries, losses in human life and properties caused by enormous disasters are also associated with a challenge to a state’s sustainable development. Therefore, HADR has been considered

¹⁴⁴ ADMM-Plus Concept Paper adopted at the 2nd ADMM held in Singapore from 13 – 15 November 2007, retrieved from the ADMM website at: http://admm.asean.org/dmdocuments/4.%20Annex%20G_ADMM-Plus%20Concept%20Paper.pdf.

¹⁴⁵ ADMM-Plus Concept Paper adopted at the 2nd ADMM held in Singapore from 13 – 15 November 2007.

¹⁴⁶ Joint Declaration of the ASEAN Defense Ministers on Strengthening ASEAN Defense Cooperation for Stability and Development of the region, adopted at the 4th ADMM held in Hanoi on 11 May 2010, retrieve from: <http://admm.asean.org/dmdocuments/4.%20ANNEX%2010%20JOINT%20DECLARATION%20ADM-M-4.pdf>.

by ASEAN leaders as a NTS issue. The HADR securitization process within Southeast Asia has been undertaken by ASEAN members who have been active participants in various regional fora on HADR. Their speech acts can be seen in texts, declaration and agreements that have pressed in regional mechanisms to reach agreement on HADR-related issues. Proactive HADR operations and activities in both civil and military sectors underscore how HADR has been and continues to be a security topic of high concerns.

CHAPTER 4: VIETNAM'S INTERESTS AND POLICIES ON HADR

HADR is one of the activities that should be carried out under global programs for disaster management and reduction. HADR is defined as neutral and impartial assistance for disaster-affected countries during and/or after the disaster for the purposes of post-disaster recovery and reconstruction.¹⁴⁷ As one of the five countries most vulnerable to natural disasters, HADR has therefore had a substantial impact on Vietnam's social-economic development. In striving to build a strong and sustainable economy with a prosperous population, disaster risk management and reduction has become vital to Vietnam. In recent years, Vietnam has been active in various international and regional institutions contributing to activities on disaster management and reduction. At the same time, Vietnam has also been proactive in implementing programs for disaster management and reduction within its borders in term of both legal and practical measures. This chapter discusses Vietnam's participation in regional and global HADR activities and examines the underlying impetus for Vietnam's acceptance of HADR as a security issue. It argues that HADR is not only essential for Vietnam's sustainable economic development, it is also an instrument which helps the country conduct its diversified foreign policy. Regionally, HADR has been a way to push ASEAN countries closer through disaster relief operations and activities.

The chapter is in two parts. The first section explores Vietnam's HADR cooperation in bilateral and multilateral mechanisms, arguing that those cooperation mechanisms have brought opportunities for Vietnam to gain access to various funding sources for national disaster-resilience building and sustainable development. The second section discusses the connection between Vietnam's changing concept of security and its active participation in regional HADR operations, with the current regional focus on NTS as new and emerging security threats. It argues that while ASEAN is striving to keep its "driving seat" role in regional cooperation, active participation in ASEAN-centered mechanisms and activities helps Vietnam by boosting its implementation of its foreign policy goals and enhancing its position in the region.

4.1 Vietnam's active participation in bilateral and multilateral institutions on HADR

Bilateral cooperation on HADR

Among countries with which Vietnam has established cooperation on humanitarian assistance and disasters bilaterally, the US is the most important since

¹⁴⁷ For more information, please go to: <http://www.icrc.org/eng/resources/documents/legal-fact-sheet/humanitarian-law-factsheet.htm>

humanitarian assistance and disaster relief has received great emphasis from the two countries' leadership. HADR is also a factor paving the way for further defense cooperation between the two former enemies.

Humanitarian assistance and disaster relief played an important role in the warming of Vietnam – US relations over the last two decades. At initial stage of a newly re-established relation between the two countries, humanitarian assistance programs worked as an ice-breaker/ lubricant to ease the suspicion after a bitter war and long time tension between the two countries. The US's humanitarian assistance activities in Vietnam started in late 1990s with the donation of disaster assistance relief supplies to the victims of Typhoon Linda in 1997 as well as to the flood victims in the central province of Thua Thien – Hue in 1999¹⁴⁸. The US Department of Defense's Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster and Civic Aid (OHDACA) program has funded various humanitarian assistance projects in Vietnam, including constructing medical facilities and provision of medical supplies in Quang Binh, Quang Tri and Lai Chau province.¹⁴⁹ In addition, the US's humanitarian assistance in Vietnam also takes place in the context of training exercises and military operation. In June 2003, sixteen US Navy medical personnel joined with Vietnamese Army doctors and nurses in a humanitarian assistance program that promoted host country relations by conducting medical education, training and patient care in the surgical management of injuries caused by explosive ordnance.¹⁵⁰

Humanitarian assistance and disaster relief remains so important to the bilateral relationship that it has been a consistent focus in the two countries' bilateral political, security and defense dialogues since 2008. Most recently, in a joint statement by US President Barack Obama and Vietnam President Truong Tan Sang, it was noted (under the heading of defense and security) that “the two Presidents agreed to expand mutually beneficial cooperation to enhance capabilities such as search and rescue and disaster response”.¹⁵¹

Additionally, Vietnam also signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with Australia in 2010, which covers practical cooperation between the two countries on

¹⁴⁸ Retrieved from the website of the US Embassy in Vietnam at: <http://vietnam.usembassy.gov/usassistancevn1.html>

¹⁴⁹ Retrieved from the website of the US Embassy in Vietnam at: <http://vietnam.usembassy.gov/usassistancevn1.html>

¹⁵⁰ For further information, please go to the website of the US Embassy in Vietnam at: <http://vietnam.usembassy.gov/usassistancevn1.html>.

¹⁵¹ “Joint Statement by President Barack Obama of the United States of America and President Truong Tan Sang of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam”, retrieved at <http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2013/07/25/joint-statement-president-barack-obama-united-states-america-and-preside>

humanitarian assistance and disaster relief. In 2009, the two countries decided to establish a Comprehensive Partnership aimed at expanding political ties and public policy exchanges, promoting economic growth and trade development, continuing development assistance and technical cooperation, building defense and security ties and supporting people-to-people links. The signing of the Memorandum of Understanding was described as a further step to “provide the framework for enhanced practical cooperation between Australia and Vietnam in areas including strategic level policy dialogue, military training and exercises, humanitarian assistance and disaster relief”.¹⁵² It also paved the way for future joint military training and exercises of the two countries. In terms of HADR, Australia has made a large contribution to Vietnam’s efforts in humanitarian assistance and building national disaster resilience. In 2011, Australian AID made a contribution of A\$500,000 to the International Federation of the Red Cross Emergency Appeal for the serious flooding over the Mekong Delta in Vietnam in the same year. Australia also supports Vietnam in improving community resilience to natural disasters and implementing a national Community Base Disaster Risk Management (CBDRM) program. Through other non-governmental organizations (NGOs), such as through a partnership with Oxfam, Australia provided technical assistance to support Vietnam’s Disaster Management Centre in preparing operational guidance, a monitoring and evaluation framework and training materials.¹⁵³

Vietnam’s participation in multilateral institutions for disaster reduction.

Vietnam has also taken part in various international conferences relating to natural disasters, of which the most important is the UN World Conference on Disaster Reduction in January 2005, “where delegates from 168 UN member states, including ministers from European countries, unanimously adopted the Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA) 2005 - 2015”¹⁵⁴ on building national resilience to disasters.

The 1995 Kobe earthquake and the Indian Ocean tsunami in 2004 showed the severe social and economic damage that natural disasters can cause to affected countries, thus threatening their sustainable economic development. In recognition that these hazards can impact on the process of reaching the Global Millennium Goals, the World Conference for Disaster Reduction was held in 2005 in Kobe, Japan following

¹⁵² Asia News Monitor, “Vietnam and Australia to conduct joint military exercises” (2010, Oct 12), retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/1243263098?accountid=14782>.

¹⁵³ Information is retrieved from the Australian Embassy in Vietnam at <http://www.ausaid.gov.au/countries/eastasia/vietnam/Pages/humanitarian.aspx>

¹⁵⁴ Satoru Nishikawa, “From Yokohama Strategy to Hyogo Framework: Sharing the Japanese Experience of Disaster Risk Management”, Asian Journal of Environment and Disaster Management, Vol.2, No.3 (2010), p. 258.

the 58th session of the United Nations General Assembly's adoption of a resolution for the conference convention.¹⁵⁵ The Conference was aimed at solutions for mitigating impacts of natural disasters and building national capacities to natural disasters as shown in the motto of the Hyogo Framework for Action 2005 - 2015: Building Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disasters (HFA).

In compliance with its commitments to follow the HFA Vietnam has been proactive in conducting practical disaster risk management projects as well as in building national legal framework for national disaster prevention, response and mitigation.

Vietnam's multilateral and bilateral cooperation on humanitarian assistance and disaster relief have made a useful contribution to its national process of building resilience. Through various internationally funded projects, Vietnam has gradually been upgrading and building new facilities to enhance national disaster management and building legal framework for disaster prevention, reduction and management. As it is likely one of the most significantly impacted nations in the world from climate change¹⁵⁶, Vietnam has received various funds from international donors for disaster risk reduction and management, of which the most effective one was the Natural Disaster Risk Management Project with major fund from the International Development Agency. The project's objectives are the establishment and implementation of comprehensive natural disaster risk management framework to assist the Government of Vietnam to strengthen the capacity of national and local disaster risk management institutions, to reduce the vulnerability to flood and storm hazards in project areas and to increase the efficiency of post-disaster recovery and reconstruction efforts.¹⁵⁷ The European Commission's Humanitarian Aid Office also financed a project with joint participation of various NGOs in the so-called "Joint Advocacy Network Initiative (JANI) which promotes community-based disaster risk management (CBDRM).¹⁵⁸

In terms of its national legal framework, Vietnam has issued two important guidelines which are: (i) the National Strategy on Natural Disaster Prevention, Response and Mitigation (National DRM Strategy) issued in 2007; and (ii) law on disaster

¹⁵⁵ Satoru Nishikawa, "From Yokohama Strategy to Hyogo Framework: Sharing the Japanese Experience of Disaster Risk Management", *Asian Journal of Environment and Disaster Management*, Vol.2, No.3 (2010), p. 258.

¹⁵⁶ Pamela McElwee, "The Social Dimensions of Adoption to Climate Change in Vietnam", the World Bank's Development and Climate Discussion Paper, Dec 2010, p. xiii

¹⁵⁷ Retrieved from the World Bank Vietnam website at: <http://www.worldbank.org/vi/results/2013/04/09/vietnam-disaster-risk-management-project>

¹⁵⁸ Joint Advocacy Network Initiative (JANI), "Framework on Community-based Disaster Risk Management in Vietnam".

prevention and management, which will be effective on 1st May 2014. These two legal instruments were the result of Vietnam's national implementation process, following its participation in international conventions and they provide a legal framework for disaster risk management activities.

The objective of the National DRM Strategy is to “mobilize all resources to effectively implement disaster prevention, response and mitigation from now up to 2020 in order to minimize the losses of human life and properties, the damage of natural resources and cultural heritages, and the degradation of environment, contributing significantly to ensure the country sustainable development, national defense and security”.¹⁵⁹ The law on disaster prevention and management is the first comprehensive legislative document to address disaster risk management.

At regional level, in contributing to realizing the world determination in disaster reduction, as well as in calling for regional countries to join hands in disaster management and relief, Vietnam has actively participating in all regional disaster-related institutions and programs. Vietnam took part in the ASEAN Committee on Disaster Management (ACDM) as it was established in 2003. ACDM was the regional committee mainly responsible for disaster management. In building a region of disaster-resilient nations and communities, ACDM developed an ASEAN Regional Program on Disaster Management (ARPD) to provide framework for regional cooperation for the period of 2004 – 2010. One of the important activities under ARPD was the ASEAN Agreement on Disaster Management and Emergency Response (AADMER), which was signed by all ASEAN member countries, including Vietnam, in July 2005. The agreement created a legal framework for ASEAN member countries to cooperate and provide assistance in case of disasters in any of the member countries. Besides, Vietnam also took part in partnership project for disaster reduction in Southeast Asian region (PDR-SEA II); joining in implementation of community awareness raising projects.

Additionally, Vietnam and its representatives have contributed actively in other regional forum on disaster management and disaster-related issues such as the ARF and ADMM Plus. It is noteworthy that Vietnam has been very active in participating in various ASEAN Regional Disaster Emergency Response Simulation Exercises (ARF-DiREX), an activity conducted bi-annually since 2009. Moreover, Vietnam also took part in the ASEAN Regional Disaster Emergency Simulation Exercise (ARDEX), one of which was just hosted Vietnam in October 2013 with participation from ASEAN and

¹⁵⁹ Nguyen Huu Phuc, “Vietnam National Progress Report on the Implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action (2009-2011) – Interim, September 2010, p.4.

partner countries. It is also worth noting that for the first time, Vietnam sent troops for exercises outside its border, as its troops took part in the HADR and military medicine exercises held in Brunei in June 2013 within the framework of the ADMM Plus among Defense Ministers from ASEAN and its partners.

What explains Vietnam's increasingly proactive role on HADR in ASEAN and in other regional bodies? Has participation in intra and extra regional HADR operation brought Vietnam broader benefits in terms of its foreign policy of openness and diversification? There are several explanations for Vietnam's active role on regional HADR operation.

First, by participating in the global and regional framework and agreement on disaster management reduction, Vietnam has shown its integration into global and regional activities and joint programs. After the struggle for national independence and reunion, Vietnam suffered the economic embargo imposed by the US and international isolation, which exacerbated the country's economic difficulties. In the middle of 1980s, economic difficulties and the possible loss of aid from the former Soviet Union and Eastern European countries forced Vietnam find its own way for economic development. The solution to the Cambodia issue helped Vietnam dispel the suspicions of neighboring countries and opened chances for normalization of its relation with China, Southeast Asian countries and the US. Two decades after national reunion, in the mid-1990s, Vietnam re-established relations with the US, China, joined ASEAN and finally normalized relations with international financial institutions. Since then, the World Bank (WB), International Monetary Fund (IMF) and ADB have become essential international financial institutions that provided huge economic assistance programs for Vietnam in its process of infrastructure reconstruction and economic restructuring. Additionally, Vietnam has become more active in the international arena, participating in various regional and international forum and conferences, of which, the World Conference on Climate Change and the World Conference on Disaster Reduction are the two most important.

Second, by taking part in the World Conference on Disaster Reduction and ratifying the Hyogo Framework for Action, Vietnam expresses its desires for and commitment to contribute to the outcome of a possible "substantial reduction of disaster losses in lives and in the social, economic and environmental assets of communities and

countries” as stated in the Framework.¹⁶⁰ Two decades since the adoption of “doi moi” policy, Vietnam has made remarkable economic achievements: the average growth rate between 1990 and 1999 was 7.4%.¹⁶¹ In late 1990s, despite impacts from the 1997 financial crisis in the Southeast Asian region, Vietnam growth hit 8% in 2005 and 7.8% in 2006.¹⁶² However, regular and serious natural disasters have undermined the country’s economic achievements. As estimated by disaster statistics, from 1980 to 2010, overall, there were 159 disaster events nationwide causing a total economic damage of nearly 8 billion USD. The flood over the Mekong River Delta in 2001 alone killed 393 people and caused about 1.535 billion VND of economic loss.¹⁶³ The Vietnam Country Disaster Management Handbook notes that “in the last ten years alone, natural disasters have cost Vietnam around 8,000 lives and 1.5% of GDP per year”.¹⁶⁴ Those numbers also show that although preventive measures have been taken, natural disasters brought substantial losses and damages, thus, slowing down Vietnam’s process of poverty reduction and economic development. Natural disasters, therefore, are direct challenge to Vietnam’s sustainable development.

Moreover, it is agreed by countries all over the world that impacts from natural disasters are so severe and unpredictable that responses to them cannot rely on efforts by any individual countries, but instead require joint efforts and collective action on a “global scale for both mitigation and adaptation”.¹⁶⁵ By ratifying the HFA and signing the ASEAN Agreement on Disaster Management and Emergency Response, it has been possible for Vietnam to enjoy financial assistance from developed countries and global funds for disaster management.

Third, geographically Vietnam is a disaster-prone and agriculture-based country. Climate and natural conditions, thus, are essential to Vietnam’s agricultural production and people’s living standards. Participating in HADR operation brings direct benefits for some of Vietnam’s most vulnerable groups of people and industries.

¹⁶⁰ The United Nation International Strategy for Disaster Reduction – “Hyogo Framework for Action 2005 - 2015: Building the Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disasters – Mid-term Review 2010-2011”

¹⁶¹ Anna Welle-Strand, Monica Vlaicu and Arild Tjeldvoll, “Viennam – A New Economic Dragon in Southeast Asia?”, *Journal of Developing Societies*, May 2013.

¹⁶² Center for Excellence in Disaster Management and Humanitarian Assistance, “Country Disaster Response Handbook: Vietnam”, last updated October 2012, p.118

¹⁶³ Center for Excellence in Disaster Management and Humanitarian Assistance, “Country Disaster Response Handbook: Vietnam”, last updated October 2012, p.9.

¹⁶⁴ Center for Excellence in Disaster Management and Humanitarian Assistance, “Country Disaster Response Handbook: Vietnam”, last updated October 2012, p.10.

¹⁶⁵ Center for Excellence in Disaster Management and Humanitarian Assistance, “Country Disaster Response Handbook: Vietnam”, last updated October 2012, p.3

Vietnam's vulnerability to disasters is exacerbated by its topography: mountainous, numerous rivers, a long stretching coastline. The southern part is characterized with the Cuu Long delta being low-lying region with average height of above 5m above the sea level while Dong Thap Muoi and western Hau River being lower than average sea level. That explains why this area has about "1 million hectares being covered by flood water for 2-4 months per year".¹⁶⁶ In terms of climate, Vietnam lies in tropical region with impacts from the Asian monsoon regime. Therefore, although Vietnam's climate is favorable for tropical agricultural development, it negatively influences the country's agricultural production, thus, impacting the economic development due to regular storms, tropical low pressures, floods and other disasters. Estimates suggest, "Vietnam suffers directly from 6 - 10 storms and tropical depressions with heavy rains and floods every year".¹⁶⁷ Preliminary findings showed that from 1994 - 2003, flash floods left 453 people dead and missing, 277 people injured and tens of thousands people affected psychologically and economically¹⁶⁸. Additionally, irrigation works, traffic routes, communication means were seriously damaged with total loss of VND1,700 billion¹⁶⁹.

Vietnam is an agriculture-based country, and until recently, about 70% of its population lived and earned their living in rural area and sectors. A major part of Vietnam population live in low-lying river basins and coastal areas.¹⁷⁰ People's vulnerability to natural disasters is high as disasters happen more frequently, causing serious impacts on the country's socio-economic development, damaging agricultural production, claiming substantial property losses and people's lives. Besides, although the share of agriculture, forestry and aqua-culture production in GDP is the smallest; "these sectors have a very important impact on social security, particularly on the livelihood of more than 70% of the national workforce".¹⁷¹

Different internationally funded projects on disaster risk reduction (for example World Bank and CBDRM projects) have helped Vietnam strengthen its disaster

¹⁶⁶ Vietnam's "National Report on Disaster Reduction in Vietnam" (prepared for the World Conference on Disaster Reduction, Kobe-Hyogo, Japan, 18-22 January 2005), page 7.

¹⁶⁷ Vietnam's "National Report on Disaster Reduction in Vietnam" (prepared for the World Conference on Disaster Reduction, Kobe-Hyogo, Japan, 18-22 January 2005), page 8.

¹⁶⁸ Vietnam's "National Report on Disaster Reduction in Vietnam", p.16.

¹⁶⁹ Vietnam's "National Report on Disaster Reduction in Vietnam", p.16.

¹⁷⁰ Vietnam Country Report in Disaster Management at the 4th AIPA Caucus, 30 April - 3 May 2012, Bangkok, Thailand.

¹⁷¹ Vietnam's "National Report on Disaster Reduction in Vietnam" (prepared for the World Conference on Disaster Reduction, Kobe-Hyogo, Japan, 18-22 January 2005), page 9.

management and reduction structural system, raising public awareness about disaster risks, thus, creating the sense of disaster management and mitigation.¹⁷²

But in addition to the three reasons above, another key reason for Vietnam's active participation on HADR operations in ASEAN is the evolving world view of Vietnam's leaders and policy-makers. HADR cooperation within ASEAN framework is an example of Vietnam's commitment and engagement in the region, thus, acting as an instrument of Vietnam's foreign policy. The impact of disasters has made Vietnam an active player on disaster management and emergency response. It is therefore both the cause and consequence of Vietnam's open and broadened foreign policy, which itself resulted from changes in Vietnam's perception of national security. The next section explains changes in Vietnam's leadership's understanding of security and changes in the country's foreign policy and cooperation. Through an analysis of Vietnam's role in regional cooperation on HADR, it also puts forward the idea that while ASEAN extends NTS cooperation into ASEAN-centered multilateral institutions within the East Asia region, regional HADR cooperation mechanisms are a means for Vietnam to exercise its foreign policy of openness and diversification in an effort to seek for a better position in regional and international relations.

4.2 Vietnam's interests and policies on HADR

ASEAN's new security concerns since the end of the Cold War

As it was discussed in chapter 2, security has been of ASEAN's primary concerns since its establishment in 1967. Since the end of the Cold War, there arose several events that were accounted for the ASEAN's security reconceptualization, namely (i) the changing balance of power among big countries (the US versus China at global level and among China, India and Japan at the regional level), especially the strategic competition between the US and China in the Asia Pacific area caused by the rising of China as a new big power; (ii) the emergence of devastating NTS challenges represented by the 1997 financial crisis, the SARS in 2003 and the Indian Ocean tsunami in 2004. Such events have forced ASEAN countries to "broaden the scope of security analysis from traditional politico-military affairs to embrace NTS issues".¹⁷³

¹⁷² The World Bank has conducted several projects on natural disasters risk management in Vietnam, namely the "Natural Disaster Risk Management Projects" with a total cost of US\$75 million funded by the World Bank and the "Vietnam – Managing Natural Hazard Project" with total cost of US\$167.6 million, of which US\$150 million from World Bank's commitment. For more information, please go to <http://www.worldbank.org/projects/P119684/vn--natural-disaster-risk-management-project-additional-finance?lang=en> and <http://www.worldbank.org/projects/P118783/vietnam-managing-natural-hazards-project?lang=en> respectively.

¹⁷³ Greg Felker, Book review of "Security and Southeast Asia: Domestic, Regional and Global Issues" by Alan Colin, Journal of Contemporary Southeast Asia, Vo.26, No.2, August 2004, p376.

These new security threats established a new foundation for ASEAN to build various regional security cooperation mechanisms, in which it retains its “driver’s seat” role. In this respect HADR has been especially important.

ASEAN was formed in the wake of the confrontation between Indonesia and Malaysia. A key goal of its establishment was to ensure regional reconciliation among regional conflicting countries. However, the establishment of ASEAN also reflected regional countries’ recognition of increasing security interdependence; the desire to build a consolidated group of nations without external interference; and from the acknowledgement of the need to sustain regional peace and stability “that would be open to participation by other states in Southeast Asia and thus be strengthened by it”.¹⁷⁴ The declaration of Southeast Asia as a Zone of Peace, Freedom and Neutrality and the concept of a Southeast Asia Nuclear Weapon-Free Zone (SEANWFZ) was ASEAN’s first expression of regional security. Before the end of the Cold War, ASEAN countries shared the concern of “comprehensive security”, which is a “broader notion of security incorporating domestic as well as essentially non-military threats”.¹⁷⁵ Specifically, this bears the implication that “security that goes beyond (but does not exclude) the military to embrace the political, economic and socio-cultural dimensions”.¹⁷⁶ After the Cold War, ASEAN has actively accelerated regional cooperation in various mechanisms, of which those on HADR can be taken as an example.

As was mentioned in the previous chapter, HADR has been a concern of ASEAN member countries since its establishment. HADR institutionalization has been taking place from the early form of the “Experts for the establishment of ASEAN combined operation against natural disaster” to the well-organized ASEAN Committee of Disaster Management (ACDM). ACDM is a legal entity assuming the overall responsibility in coordinating and implementing regional activities on HADR and consisting of heads of member countries’ national agencies responsible for disaster management.¹⁷⁷

ASEAN regional cooperation on HADR was legalized for the first time with the signing of the ASEAN Agreement on Disaster Management and Emergency Response (AADMER) on 26 July 2005, the first legal framework for all ASEAN member

¹⁷⁴ Mark Rolls, “Centrality and Continuity: ASEAN and Regional Security since 1967”, *Journal of East Asia* (2012) 29: 127 – 139, p.128.

¹⁷⁵ David Dewitt, “Common, Comprehensive and Cooperative Security”. P.411.

¹⁷⁶ Mely Caballero-Anthony, “National Security, Regionalism, and the State in Southeast Asia” – Chapter 7 of the “Transnational Trends: Middle Eastern and Asian View”, the Henry L. Stimson Center, July 2008, p. 139 – 154.

¹⁷⁷ Retrieved from ASEAN DRR Portal at:

<http://202.46.9.39:8889/About/ASEANCommitteeonDisasterManagement.aspx>

countries and provides common ground in responding to disasters within ASEAN. The AADMER is aimed at reducing disaster losses in ASEAN countries, and jointly response to disaster emergencies. Moreover, the AADMER also displays ASEAN's commitment to the implementation of the HFA. Besides common regulations on general principles and objectives on disaster risk identification, assessment and monitoring; disaster prevention and mitigation; disaster preparedness; etc., the AADMER also regulate the establishment of an operational coordinating body, the ASEAN Coordinating Centre for Humanitarian Assistance (AHA Centre) to deal with consolidation and dissemination of capacities from regional countries and to communicating for their utilization. The AHA Center, therefore, facilitates cooperation and coordination among the Parties, and with relevant UN and international organizations, promotes regional collaboration.¹⁷⁸ Additionally, the AADMER also provides for the creation of an ASEAN disaster relief fund financed by voluntary contributions from member countries and other sources. The Agreement also regulates simulation exercises (ARDEX) to test emergency responses. ARDEX is full-scale simulation exercise that seeks to test, practice, review and evaluate existing mechanism in facilitating a close and effective cooperation among ASEAN member states on disaster response and management.¹⁷⁹ ADREX has been presented in various ASEAN's member countries. Another achievement of the AADMER was the establishment of a group called "ASEAN-Emergency Rapid Assessment Team (ERAT) and conduct of various ASEAN training program on disaster preparedness.

Additionally, in an informal meeting of ASEAN Chiefs of Defense Force held in Singapore in August 2007, defense chiefs "agreed to strengthen cooperation among ASEAN militaries through information sharing, intelligence cooperation and capacity building exercises".¹⁸⁰ This was a first step for ASEAN defense cooperation. In 2010, in the 7th ASEAN chiefs of defense force informal meeting in Hanoi, focused on how to improve ASEAN military cooperation to deal with nontraditional security challenges. It decided to organize a table top Humanitarian Assistance and Disaster Relief exercise scheduled to be co-host by Indonesia and Singapore in 2011. Moreover, HADR has also become an important element in the ASEAN Defense Minister Meeting (ADMM). ASEAN Defense Ministers met for the first time in May 2006 (without a representative

¹⁷⁸ Retrieved from the ASEAN website at: <http://www.asean.org/news/item/asean-agreement-on-disaster-management-and-emergency-response-vientiane-26-july-2005-3>

¹⁷⁹ AHA TOR, retrieve from ASEAN website at: <http://www.asean.org>

¹⁸⁰ ASEAN defense chiefs agree to address common challenges, (2007, 2 Aug), Channel News Asia, retrieve from: <http://www.channelnewsasia.com/stories/singaporelocalnews/print/291907/1/.html>

from Myanmar) and agreed to cooperate on defense and security issues. At the second meeting, held in Singapore the following year (this time with Myanmar's Deputy Defense Minister), the ministers signed a Joint Declaration setting up the "framework for dialogue and decision making in the ASEAN defense sector". The 3rd ADMM held in Thailand in 2009, adopted a concept paper on how ASEAN military assets and capacities could be used in HADR.

The recent development of regional cooperation mechanisms in ASEAN has created opportunities for these countries to tackle disaster-related issues. But ASEAN's security role has also extended beyond Southeast Asia as it faces new geopolitical changes most notably China's rise to challenge the US's hegemony regionally and globally. Against this backdrop, ASEAN has chosen to promote regional peace and security and at the same time, maintain its relevance by "embracing the process, and taking an active part in shaping the post Cold War regional security architecture in East Asia".¹⁸¹ ARF cooperation on HADR can be seen as one example.

The ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF) was established in 1994 with hopes that it "would become an effective consultative Asia – Pacific Forum for promoting dialogue on political and security cooperation in the region" and by working with its "ARF partners, ASEAN could help to bring about a more predictable and constructive pattern of relations in the Asia – Pacific".¹⁸² The ARF's principles are: promotion of confidence building among participants; development of preventive diplomacy; and the elaboration of approaches to conflicts. Although ARF is just a forum for political and security dialogue, not a mechanism for conflict management, "it has increased the appeal of regional cooperation and increased the participation in multilateral security dialogue".¹⁸³ Furthermore, the "ARF represents an attempt to expand ASEAN's traditional security thinking and modus operandi from the Southeast Asian sub-region to the wider Asia – Pacific".¹⁸⁴

HADR has been a topic in ARF meetings almost since its establishment. ARF Inter-Sessional Meetings (ISM) on disaster management and response have been held on biannually basis for member countries to exchange views on disaster-related issues. Since the first ARF ISM held in 1997, there have been 12 such meetings held so far. In

¹⁸¹ Rizal Sukma, "ASEAN and Regional Security in East Asia", *Security Politics in Asia and Europe*, p.109.

¹⁸² ASEAN Secretariat. Politics and security overview. Retrieved from: <http://www.aseansec.org/92.htm>

¹⁸³ Huisken R. (2002), *Civilizing the anarchical society: Multilateral security processes in the Asia – Pacific*, *Contemporary Southeast Asia* 24, 187 – 202.

¹⁸⁴ Mark Rolls, "Centrality and Continuity: ASEAN and Regional Security since 1967", *the Journal of East Asia* (2012), 29: p127 – 139, p.131.

inter-sessional meetings, member countries all discuss and agree that cooperation is required among regional and member countries on HADR through such activities as: risk identification and monitoring, promoting disaster prevention and awareness, sharing information and experience in HADR, emergency response and disaster relief and capacity building. Cooperation on HADR in the ARF was further promoted as an ARF Statement on Disaster Management and Emergency Response was issued in the 12th ARF meeting on 28 July 2006, which provided guidelines on ARF continued efforts on Disaster Management and Emergency Response. Importantly, in July 2007, ARF General Guidelines for Disaster Relief Cooperation were issued at the 14th ARF Ministerial Meeting. It is clear then that there are many security cooperation mechanisms at different levels with ASEAN playing the central role. Various regional mechanisms (AADMER, ADMM) and extra regional mechanisms (ARF, ADMM Plus) provide a way for participating countries to discuss HADR issues and tackle the problems. Although these mechanisms do not provide a direct solution for conflict management, at least, they are mechanisms for participating countries to discuss security-related issues (such as HADR) and provide a framework for cooperation. ASEAN intra and extra regional cooperation on HADR and the requirement to use military assets in HADR activities, though recently mentioned and discussed, has created more chances for participant countries to gradually build confidence with each other, thus, reducing possible and potential conflicts.

ASEAN, by expanding relations with major powers and other countries in the vast Asia – Pacific region to maintain regional peace and stability, is creating various security cooperation mechanisms around itself, but remaining in the “driver’s seat”, in an effort to build confidence among regional countries, which normally facilitate cooperation rather than conflicts.

As an ASEAN member, Vietnam has been increasingly proactive in regional integration, especially in HADR operation, in order to select the best position in the region. Cooperation on HADR therefore reflects a change in Vietnam’s foreign policy, showing how it has become in Vietnam’s vital national interest to integrate into the region.

The end of the Cold War, which eased international tensions, had a huge impact on Vietnam’s concept of national security and its foreign policy direction. During the Cold War, as a member of the communist Soviet Union’s camp, Vietnam followed a concept that defined national security based on the two-world view, according to which “the course of global politics was determined by the contradictions between the two

worlds of socialism and capitalism”.¹⁸⁵ National security, therefore, was related to the protection of the state’s survival from political and military threats (which are called traditional security threats). However, Vietnam’s concept of national security has gradually changed, starting from late 1980s, due to changes in Vietnam’s threat perceptions.

In the last decade of the 1980s, as a consequence of deep and profound crisis in the socialist countries (the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe countries), that led to external aid being cut off, Vietnam suffered a severe economic crisis with high inflation, stagnant agricultural and industrial production. This caused low living standards and profound social and political difficulties. Against this backdrop, Vietnam’s urgent task was to “stabilize all facets of the socio economy, building required fundamental premises to promote socialist industrialization process in the following stage”.¹⁸⁶ The 13th Politburo Resolution of May 1988 defined new threats to Vietnam’s security, which were “economic weakness, political isolation, and economical blockage”¹⁸⁷ rather than repeating previous ideological and capitalist threats. By defining the three direct threats to Vietnam’s security, the 13th Resolution made a critical change in Vietnam’s worldview and concept of security. Previously, it held the old view that “opening economic relations with capitalist states would lead to economic dependency and assimilation”¹⁸⁸, completely different from the current world view of “world economic integration” in which integration is perceived positively as an unavoidable process that would bring both opportunities and challenges. Also, by focusing on the economic dimension of threats to national security, Vietnam has changed its concept of security threats from external to internal factors, and away from traditional threats of outside military invasions or attacks. In addition to defining new threats, the 13th Politburo Resolution set a new formula to ensure national security, noting: “with a strong economy, just-enough national defense capability, and expanded international relations, we will be more able to maintain our independence and

¹⁸⁵ Carlyle A. Thayer, “Strategic Posture Review: Vietnam”, the Journal of World Politics View, 15th Jan 2013.

¹⁸⁶ Text in the Resolution of the Vietnam Communist Party Congress VI, (the text in Vietnamese is as following: “ôn định mọi mặt tình hình kinh tế - xã hội, tiếp tục xây dựng những tiền đề cần thiết cho việc đẩy mạnh công nghiệp hóa xã hội chủ nghĩa trong chặng đường tiếp theo”).

¹⁸⁷ Nguyen Vu Tung, “Vietnam’s Security Challenges: Hanoi’s New Approach to National Security and Implications to Defense and Foreign Policy”, presented in the International Workshop on Asia Pacific Security, at the National Institute for Defense Studies, Japan (NIDS) (NIDS Joint Research Series No.5, p.108.

¹⁸⁸ Carlyle A. Thayer, “Strategic Posture Review: Vietnam”, the Journal of World Politics View, 15th Jan 2013.

successfully construct socialism”.¹⁸⁹ This new understanding and thinking laid the basis for Vietnam’s change of foreign policy towards a more open and diversified approach. As Phan Doan Nam concludes in his writing about Vietnam’s diplomacy in 20 years of implementing “Doi Moi”,

the 13th Resolution stressed the role of Vietnam diplomacy in stabilizing politics while giving priority to economic development. The Resolution also provided guidelines for changes in foreign policy, such as: solution of the Cambodia issue, normalization of ties with China, improvement in relations with ASEAN countries, expanding relations with Japan, Western Europe and gradually normalizing relation with the US. The 13th Resolution was, therefore, a fundamental basis for the development and improvement of our foreign policy into an independent, diversified and multilateral one like today.¹⁹⁰

Threats to Vietnam’s national security were further elaborated in the mid-term congress of the Vietnamese Communist Party in January 1994 to include (i) poverty and lagging behind other countries in terms of economics, (ii) deviation from socialist orientation, (iii) corruption, red tape, and inefficient bureaucracy, (iv) peaceful evolution by hostile forces.¹⁹¹

It was clear that the focus of Vietnam’s national security remained mainly domestic as Vietnam’s decision to withdraw all of its troops from Cambodia cleared obstacles and paved the way to expand relations with major powers, regional and other countries. In 1991, Vietnam normalized relations with China. In 1995, Vietnam normalized diplomatic relations with the US, signed a cooperation agreement with the European Union and became ASEAN’s seventh member.¹⁹² Following the announcement of the 7th Communist Party National Congress in 1991 that “Vietnam want to befriend with all countries in the world community striving for peace, independence and development”¹⁹³, by mid-1990s, Vietnam has almost broadened its foreign relations with all major powers and surrounding countries. The list of threats in

¹⁸⁹ Nguyen Vu Tung, “Vietnam’s Security Challenges: Hanoi’s New Approach to National Security and Implications to Defense and Foreign Policy”, presented in the International Workshop on Asia Pacific Security, at the National Institute for Defense Studies, Japan (NIDS) (NIDS Joint Research Series No.5, p.108.

¹⁹⁰ Phan Doan Nam, “Ngoại giao Việt Nam sau 20 năm đổi mới” [Vietnam’s diplomacy after 20 years of implementing “doi moi” policy], at: http://www.cpv.org.vn/cpv/Modules/Preview/PrintPreview.aspx?co_id=30569%20&cn_id=28772#

¹⁹¹ Nguyen Vu Tung, “Vietnam’s New Concept of Security,” in Kurt Radtke and Raymond Feddema eds., *Comprehensive Security in Asia: Views from Asian and the West on a Changing Security Environment*, p.409-410.

¹⁹² Carlyle A. Thayer, “Strategic Posture Review: Vietnam”, *Journal of World Politics Review* on 15 Jan 2012.

¹⁹³ Phan Doan Nam, “Ngoại giao Việt Nam sau 20 năm đổi mới” [Vietnam’s diplomacy after 20 years of implementing “doi moi” policy], at: http://www.cpv.org.vn/cpv/Modules/Preview/PrintPreview.aspx?co_id=30569%20&cn_id=28772#

1994, therefore, explains that Vietnam was no longer internationally or regionally isolated. The threats to Vietnam's national security still lay within its national borders. Although peaceful evolution by hostile forces was mentioned as a fourth threat, it was believed that a strong economy with transparent bureaucracy and rising living standards would bring about stable politics and make peaceful evolution less dangerous.¹⁹⁴

The perception of threats to Vietnam's national security remained unchanged for the following decade, even after the events of September 11, 2001. The IXth Communist Party Central Committee Resolution in January 2004 expressed concerns about dangers to the course of industrialization and modernization as the following: "the low level of productivity, quality, efficiency, and competitiveness of the economy; the graveness of salient social problems including corruption, degradation of morality and life-style; increased activities of "peaceful revolution" and pressures on "democracy", "human rights", ethnic, religious issues by hostile forces that are providing a helping hand to the reactionary and politically opportunistic forces operating in Vietnam".¹⁹⁵ In 2006, the 10th Communist Party Congress identified similar threats in its political report noting: "(i) further economic lagging behind many countries in the region and in the world still exists; Vietnam remains as one of the least developed countries; (ii) increasing political and ethical degradation among party members that is closely related to corruption, red-tape, and wastefulness; (iii) deviation from socialist orientations, economic and social policies and lesser vigilance against "peaceful evolution"; (iv) hostile forces continue to realize the scheme of peaceful evolution to cause unrest and instability and to change the political regime in Vietnam under the pretext of democracy and human rights".¹⁹⁶

These party congress documents suggest that since late 1980s Vietnam has adopted a comprehensive approach to security, which places emphasis on economic development and growth. To this end, it requires a peaceful and stable external environment that would be brought about by the expansion of foreign relations, as "having more friends means having fewer enemies".¹⁹⁷ In implementing the Party's guidelines, Vietnam has adopted a multidirectional foreign policy, to befriend all

¹⁹⁴ Nguyen Vu Tung, "Vietnam's Security Challenges: Hanoi's New Approach to National Security and Implications to Defense and Foreign Policy", presented in the International Workshop on Asia Pacific Security, at the National Institute for Defense Studies, Japan (NIDS) (NIDS Joint Research Series No.5, p.110.

¹⁹⁵ "Politburo Report at the Communist Party 9th Central Committee Plenum", p.15.

¹⁹⁶ "The 10th Communist Party National Congress Documents", p.125

¹⁹⁷ Nguyen Vu Tung, "Vietnam's Security Challenges: Hanoi's New Approach to National Security and Implications to Defense and Foreign Policy", presented in the International Workshop on Asia Pacific Security, at the National Institute for Defense Studies, Japan (NIDS) (NIDS Joint Research Series No.5, p.112.

countries and organizations, regardless of their socio-political system. As a result, Vietnam has established diplomatic relations with all 169 countries including major powers and neighboring countries, economic ties with over 180 countries and territories; has been members of all inter-governmental and international organizations.¹⁹⁸ Since joining ASEAN, Vietnam has played an active role in ASEAN cooperation and making great contribution to strengthening the Association's solidarity and cooperation, pushing the roadmap of building ASEAN Community and implementing the ASEAN Charter as well as improving ASEAN international role and position. Immediately after joining the ASEAN, Vietnam pressed for the admission of Laos, Myanmar and Cambodia, realizing the Association's plan of including all 10 Southeast Asian countries. Vietnam successfully hosted the 6th ASEAN Summit in Hanoi in December 1998, the 34th ASEAN Ministerial Meeting (AMM) and related meetings and the 23rd General Assembly of the ASEAN Inter-Parliamentary Organization (AIPO) in 2002. However, the greatest contribution was arguably Vietnam's performance as ASEAN Chair in 2010, when the group's Master Plan on ASEAN Connectivity was approved.

In the context of the global financial crisis, in 2011 again Vietnamese policy-makers reviewed and revised major political documents and guidelines. This process resulted in new development in Vietnam's perception of threats to national security, although the approach is still comprehensive. While the threats previously defined were restated, new threats have been identified. The 11th Communist Party Congress Resolution identified these as following: "non-traditional security challenges, high-tech crimes in financial - monetary sector, electronics and telecommunication, biology and environment-relating sectors keep increasing".¹⁹⁹ The White Paper on National Defense issued by the Ministry of Defense in December 2009 has similar analysis on security threats. Among other threats, the White Paper, defines "nontraditional security issues such as illegal trafficking of weapons and drugs; piracy, organized transnational crimes, terrorism, illegal migration and immigration; environment degradation, climate change, and epidemics continue to concern Vietnam".²⁰⁰

For the first time, nontraditional security issues are officially mentioned as threats to Vietnam's national security. In addition to threats to national security that mostly

¹⁹⁸ Phan Doan Nam, "Ngoại giao Việt Nam sau 20 năm đổi mới" [Vietnam's diplomacy after 20 years of implementing "doi moi" policy], at:

http://www.cpv.org.vn/cpv/Modules/Preview/PrintPreview.aspx?co_id=30569%20&cn_id=28772#

¹⁹⁹ Text of the 11th Communist Party National Congress Resolution, at:

<http://cpv.ctu.edu.vn/vanbanquydingh/TW/VKDH11/NQ%20Dai%20hoi%20Dai%20bieu%20toan%20quo%20c%20XI.doc>

²⁰⁰ "National Defense White Paper", p10-11.

come from inside the country, external threats are also identified. However, nontraditional security threats are completely different from those new external threats to Vietnam's national security (which are traditional political and military threats). To address non-traditional challenges, Vietnam has participated in multiple ASEAN institutions such as the Ministerial Meeting on Transnational Crime. Vietnam also played an active role in ASEAN's HADR activities, signing the AADMER, taking part in the process of setting up the ASEAN Coordinating Center for Humanitarian Assistance on Disaster Management (AHA Center), building the AHA Center Fund and sending representative to the ASEAN's Emergency Rapid Assessment Team (ERAT). The issue of HADR was considered as essential to Vietnam and the ASEAN regional security as it was officially mentioned for the first time by Vietnam's Prime Minister Nguyen Tan Dung at the 21st ASEAN summit in November 2012. In his speech to the summit, the Prime Minister called for ASEAN countries to prioritize the promotion of effective response to climate change and management of natural and human-made disasters in building ASEAN Social-Cultural Community by boosting ASEAN joint efforts to improve social welfare and service for vulnerable groups and work together to organize ASEAN relief aid exercises.²⁰¹

From the above-mentioned changes in Vietnam's security concept and its foreign policy, it can be said that Vietnam's perception of security increasingly coincides with that of ASEAN organization. Vietnam and ASEAN share similar perceptions of regional security, and value ASEAN's recognition of interdependence among regional states, of the regional countries' common interest of a peaceful and stable region without external interference for development.

In summary, enormous destruction of natural disasters has made HADR an important issue that has captured great concerns from scientists and government leaders worldwide. In efforts to deal with, to reduce impacts from and to manage natural disaster risks, both scientific and political circles around the world have played active role in securitizing HADR through various national, regional and international seminars, workshops and conferences, of which the most import were the World Conferences on Natural Disaster Reduction. The securitization of HADR has been conducted at global level and marked with the adoption of the United Nations General Assembly's Resolution number A/RES/42/169 in 1987 designating the 1990s as the International Decade for Natural Disaster Reduction (IDNDR), the adoption of the Yokohama

²⁰¹ "Vietnam: PM active at ASEAN Summit", Asia News Monitor, Bangkok 20 November 2012. For more information, please go to: <http://search.proquest.com/helicon.vuw.ac.nz/docview/1170801607>

Strategy and Plan of Action for a Safer World, Guidelines for Natural Disaster Prevention, Preparedness and Mitigation in 1994 and the Hyogo Framework for Action 2005 – 2015: Building the Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disasters in 2005 respectively.

As a disaster-prone country, Vietnam has actively participated in HADR-related activities nationally and internationally. At national level, Vietnam has gradually built national framework on HADR, namely (i) the National Strategy on Natural Disaster Prevention, Response and Mitigation (National DRM Strategy) issued in 2007; and (ii) law on disaster prevention and management, which will be effective on 1st May 2014. These two legal instruments are effective tool in providing regulations and guidelines for disaster risk management activities. In parallel with building legal framework for HADR activities, with funds from the World Bank, Vietnam has been implementing various projects on building dykes, irrigation system and other works for disaster reduction; on building disaster resilience at local level.²⁰²

At international level, Vietnam attended various World Conference on Natural Disaster Reduction, verified the Hyogo Framework for Action. In the region, as a member of the ASEAN, Vietnam has been actively taking part in ASEAN-led cooperation mechanism on HADR such as the ASEAN Committee for Disaster Management (ACDM), the ASEAN Coordinating Centre for Humanitarian Assistance (AHA Centre), the ASEAN Defense Ministerial Meeting (ADMM), ADMM Plus, the ARF, etc. Additionally, Vietnam also participates in various HADR operation activities such as the ASEAN Regional Disaster Emergency Response Exercise (ARDEX), the ASEAN Regional Forum – Disaster Relief Exercise (ARF-DiREX).

The ADMM, ARF and other regional and extra regional mechanisms for dealing with HADR as an NTS issue have created legal framework for regional cooperation and acted as instruments for ASEAN to extend its security role to go beyond Southeast Asia region in an effort to promote regional peace and stability while enhancing ASEAN central role in such regional mechanisms. Although, regional security is being threatened by heated territorial disputes in the East Sea, which was said to have arisen an arms race in the region, these mechanisms offer forums for participating countries to

²⁰² For example, the “Natural Disaster Risk Management Projects” with a total cost of US\$75 million funded by the World Bank and the “Vietnam – Managing Natural Hazard Project” with total cost of US\$167.6 million, of which US\$150 million from World Bank’s commitment. For more information, please go to <http://www.worldbank.org/projects/P119684/vn--natural-disaster-risk-management-project-additional-finance?lang=en> and <http://www.worldbank.org/projects/P118783/vietnam-managing-natural-hazards-project?lang=en> for those two projects, respectively.

discuss NTS issues in cooperative way that promise cooperative future. With changes in state leaders world view that led to changes in foreign policy towards a diversified and multilateral one, Vietnam has changed from an isolated country to an active participant in regional institutions and cooperation mechanism. Active involvement in such ASEAN-led mechanisms, especially in those on HADR, Vietnam is able to take advantage in conducting its open and diversified foreign policy, to present its regional integration and gain better position in international relations. As HADR has become a topic for discussion even in ASEAN security forum such as the ADMM and the ARF, HADR promises to attract more and more concerns from ASEAN countries and partners, thus making HADR cooperation mechanism to be effective forum for countries to take part in the shaping of the regional cooperation pattern.

CONCLUSION

The end of the Cold War opened a new era in international relations and cooperation globally and regionally. With the collapse of the former Soviet Union, the bipolar system changed to a unipolar system with the United States as the sole dominant superpower. The end of the rivalry between the former Soviet Union and the United States meant the possibility of another world war was a further step away. As a number of wars and armed conflicts reduced,²⁰³ a new range of threats have captured the attention of policy makers. The world has to come to recognize “new” challenges from non-traditional and non-military sources including terrorism, epidemics, climate change and natural disasters. Calamities such as the 2004 Indian Ocean tsunami (more than 220,000 dead) and the triple disaster that struck Japan in March 2011 (nearly 19,000 dead²⁰⁴) have stunned the world with their destructivity. In recognition of new challenges to people and the world’s safety, for the first time, the 1994 UN’s Human Development Report made the individual the referent object of security.²⁰⁵

In the wake of changes in the 1990s, the Copenhagen school, represented most notably by the work of Barry Buzan, has attracted attention from both scholarly and political circles with their call for reconceptualization of security. The new concept of security put forward by the Copenhagen School means the extension of security to go beyond the traditional concept (that only focuses on political and military threats to a state’s security) to include nontraditional threats in other sectors, namely culture, economy and environment. Three important elements of analysis by the Copenhagen school are: referent security object, securitizing actors and securitization process. The Copenhagen school contends that the state is not the only referent object, there are many others in different sectors: military, politics, economy and society can be a referent object as soon as they are perceived to be threatened by some event. For that reason, any issue may become a security threat after being successfully securitized. The securitization process is conducted by securitizing actors, who could be state representatives, elites or any societal forces. Securitization is understood as a process in which a speech act is provided by securitizing actors to persuade their audience of the particular urgency of addressing a set of challenges.

²⁰³ “Armed conflicts 1989 – 2006”, *Journal of Peace Research*, Vol.44, No.5, September 2007, p.630-631.

²⁰⁴ Linda Sieg and Kiyoshi Takenaka, “Japan PM Abe vows nation to emerge stronger from 2011 triple disasters”, *Reuters*, Mar 11, 2013.

²⁰⁵ Information retrieved at the UNDP website at:
http://www.hdr.undp.org/en/media/hdr_1994_en_contents.pdf

In terms of humanitarian assistance and disaster relief (HADR), has its own referent objects, securitizing actors and emergency measures in its securitization process. As HADR relates to humanitarian activities to promote human welfare and the “alleviation of human suffering” in disasters and emergencies,²⁰⁶ HADR security is associated with the concept of human life and human dignity as the referent object of security. Such referent object can be threatened by natural and/ or man-made disasters and emergencies and can be saved only by prompt and adequate responses. At global scale, HADR securitization started long time ago with various activities initiated by American and Japanese scientists,²⁰⁷ of which the most noteworthy was the calling by Frank Press, the President of the United States National Academy of Sciences, for joint efforts to plan for a decade for natural disaster reduction. He said “I believe there is great need, and much support can be found, to establish an International Decade of Hazard Reduction. This special initiative would see all nations joining forces to reduce the consequences of natural hazards.”²⁰⁸ The calling had been spread widely through seminars and symposia with participation of scientists and officials from many countries.²⁰⁹ As a results of efforts by scientists, on 11 December 1987, the UN General Assembly adopted Resolution number A/RES/42/169 designating the 1990s as the International Decade for Natural Disaster Reduction (IDNDR), aiming at reducing loss of life, property damage as well as social and economic disruption caused by natural disasters through concerted international actions. The importance of HADR was increased as its securitization was furthered strengthened with the adoption of the “Yokohama Strategy and Plan of Action for a Safer World, Guidelines for Natural Disaster Prevention, Preparedness and Mitigation” and the “Hyogo Framework for Action 2005 – 2015: Building the Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disasters” by participants of the World Conferences on Natural Disasters held in 1994 and 2005 respectively. The Yokohama Strategy and Plan of Action was considered the first internationally agreed document on necessary actions for natural disaster reduction at

²⁰⁶ United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA), Annual Report (2009) New York: United Nation Secretariat.

²⁰⁷ Satoru Nishikawa, “From Yokohama Strategy to Hyogo Framework: Sharing the Japanese Experience of Disaster Risk Management”, the Asian Journal of Environment and Disaster Management, Vol.2, No.3 (2010), p.252.

²⁰⁸ Tsuneo Katayama, International Decade for Natural Disaster Reduction: Working against Time, A Presentation made at the United Nations University on 13 October 1993, Tokyo, Japan, retrieved from <http://archive.unu.edu/unupress/lecture8.html>

²⁰⁹ Tsuneo Katayama, International Decade for Natural Disaster Reduction: Working Against Time.

local, national and international level²¹⁰ while the Hyogo Framework provided comprehensive plan for action for countries in dealing with natural disasters. The securitization of HADR has been conducted through speech acts by scientists, officials from different countries as well as UN officials in various national, regional and international conferences to persuade and call for globally joint hands in combating and dealing with natural disasters. In this case, the speech acts could be presentations, speeches delivered in such conference while presenters are securitizing actors. The securitization of HADR has been widely and successfully conducted as it was institutionalized into the Resolutions and/ or programs of the United Nations, which perceived natural disasters as threats to human life and human dignity, called for joint actions against natural disasters and set general guidelines and direction for the implementation of HADR at all levels.

The Southeast Asian countries have paid attention and perceived the importance of regional cooperation in dealing with natural disasters. HADR, therefore, has been an important issue of ASEAN. Having been torn apart by the ideological influences imposed by the two superpowers, the end of the Cold War created a chance for the Southeast Asian countries to build peace, stability and cooperation on their own and within their united region. Moreover, security has long been a priority issue for ASEAN countries and has been understood as having a broad meaning. Since the 1970s, ASEAN countries followed the concept of “comprehensive security” which was broader than the traditional concept of political and military security from outside threats. As perceived by ASEAN countries, comprehensive security meant national strength to sustain political stability, economic development and social harmony. Comprehensive security therefore related to state-capacity building and incorporated both domestic and non-military threats. ASEAN’s advocacy of the concept of comprehensive security shows that the group has long been concerned about addressing a wide range of security threats. Around the turn of the 21st century, however, it was the Southeast Asian financial crisis and the Indian Ocean tsunami that made regional countries aware of the need to pay more attention to nontraditional security challenges. The profound and prolong impacts of the 1997 financial crisis on Southeast Asian countries’ socio-economic and political facets have made regional countries’ leaders pay more attention to non-military challenges. Various meeting of regional senior officials and establishment of crisis responding mechanism proved the importance of the issue. Right

²¹⁰ Satoru Nishikawa, “From Yokohama Strategy to Hyogo Framework: Sharing the Japanese Experience of Disaster Risk Management”, the Asian Journal of Environment and Disaster Management, Vol.2, No.3 (2010), p.255.

after the crisis, realizing that the crisis could make a halt to the ASEAN integration process, in the 6th ASEAN summit, in their statement, ASEAN leaders committed to take bold measures to accelerate the establishment of the ASEAN free trade area, as well as short-term measures to enhance the ASEAN investment climate,²¹¹ Additionally, the region countries also agreed to establish the ASEAN Surveillance Process, which was seen as a complement to the global surveillance exercise undertaken by the International Monetary Fund for the purpose of enhancing macroeconomic stability and financial system in the region.²¹² The financial crisis also set forth for the creation of ASEAN Plus Three mechanism.²¹³ Another event that heavily struck the region was the 2004 Indian Ocean Tsunami. Right after the tsunami, the ASEAN leaders met and launched the Declaration on action to strengthen emergency relief, rehabilitation, reconstruction and prevention on the aftermath of earthquake and tsunami disaster on 26 December 2004.²¹⁴ Heavy destruction of the tsunami placed an emphasis that more attention required for non-traditional security issue in general and HADR in particular. ASEAN's leaders illustrate this securitization model as they have become more aware of new challenges as nontraditional security threats. Successive declarations have used the language of non-traditional security which they have defined nontraditional security as "challenges to the survival and well-being of the peoples and states and that are primarily out of non-military sources such as climate change, infectious diseases, natural disasters, irregular migration, food stage, people smuggling, drug trafficking and transnational crime".²¹⁵

Natural disasters attracted concerns from regional countries since the formation of the ASEAN with the establishment of the Experts for the Establishment of ASEAN Combined Operation against Natural Disasters in 1971, the very initial form the ASEAN Committee on Disaster Management (ACDM) which was set up in 2003. The securitization process of HADR has been conducted and accelerated by ASEAN

²¹¹ "Statement on bold measures", 6th ASEAN Summit, Hanoi, 16 December 1998; retrieve from the ASEAN website at: <http://www.asean.org/news/item/statement-on-bold-measures-6th-asean-summit-hanoi-16-december-1998>

²¹² ASEAN Financial Ministers, "Terms of Understanding on the Establishment of the ASEAN Surveillance Process", Washington,) October 4, 1998; retrieved from http://www.asean.or.id/economic/term_fin.htm.

²¹³ "The Chiangmai Initiative", issued by the Institute for International Economics, retrieved from <http://www.iie.com/publications/chapters.../345/3iie3381.pdf>

²¹⁴ "The ASEAN Agreement on Disaster Management and Emergency Response "; retrieved at <http://www.asean.org/communities/asean-socio-cultural-community/item/the-asean-agreement-on-disaster-management-and-emergency-response>

²¹⁵ Mely Caballero-Anthony, "Nontraditional Security and Multilateralism in Asia: Reshaping the Contours of Regional Security Architecture", Policy Analysis Brief, the Stanley Foundation, June 2007, p.1.

officials and ASEAN countries' leaders. In 2006, the ASEAN Secretary General stated that the impacts of disasters show that "our communities are vulnerable to natural hazards, and such vulnerability is heightened as long as development policy in those communities does not appropriately take into account disaster risks".²¹⁶ Additionally, ASEAN's HADR securitization is reflected in regional agreement on HADR and gradual institutionalization of HADR cooperation mechanisms. ASEAN countries have signed the Agreement on disaster management and emergency response (AADMER) in 2005 which aims to provide an effective mechanism to achieve substantial reduction of disaster losses in lives and in social, economic and environmental assets of the regional countries through concerted national efforts and intensified regional and international cooperation.²¹⁷ Additionally, in realizing the AADMER, ASEAN countries finalized the Standard Operating Procedures for Regional Standby Arrangement and Coordination of Joint Disaster Relief and Emergency Response Operation (SASOP) and established the ASEAN Coordinating Centre for Humanitarian Assistance on Disaster Management (AHA Centre). HADR has become more important recently as it has been discussed in various ASEAN-led security forum such as the ADMM and ARF. In 2007, at the 14th ARF Ministerial Meeting, the ARF's General Guidelines for Disaster Relief Cooperation was adopted, thus, establishing a basic framework among ARF member countries to promote more effective cooperation in reducing losses caused by frequent disasters while the ADMM, ASEAN's highest defense mechanism, in its 3rd session in 2009, adopted a concept paper on how ASEAN military assets and capabilities could be used on HADR.

The enormous destruction caused by natural disasters has made HADR an important issue within and outside of ASEAN countries. Various cooperation mechanisms are evidence of ASEAN's successful securitization of HADR. And HADR promises to remain a hot topic in such ASEAN-led cooperation mechanism. Contributing to such success has been high levels of support from ASEAN member countries, including Vietnam. Active participation on HADR activities at the national, regional and international level has helped Vietnam in disaster management as well as in its process of conducting the foreign policy of diversification and multilateralization.

²¹⁶ Ong Keng Yong (ASEAN Secretary General), "Mega disasters and resulting "tipping points": an ASEAN view", a presentation at the Senior Policy Forum on "Mega disasters – a global "tipping point" in natural disaster policy, planning and development" held in Hawaii on 15-16 August 2006, retrieved from <http://www.asean.org/comunities/asean-socio-cultural-community/item/statement-by-secretary-general-of-asean-2>

²¹⁷ Agreement on disaster management and emergency response, retrieved from <http://www.asean.org/news/item/asean-agreement-on-disaster-management-and-emergency-response-vientiane-26-july-2005-3>

At the global level, Vietnam ratified the Hyogo Framework for Action 2005 – 2015 and cooperated with various international organization such as the World Bank to conduct two projects (WB4 and WB5) which protected people and assets in disaster-prone areas and dealt with post-disaster reconstruction and rehabilitation as well as improving disaster-response capacities. As an agriculture-based country with about 70% of its population living and earning their living in rural area and sectors²¹⁸, HADR, if not dealt with, would have serious negative impacts on the quality of human life and on the state's sustainable development. Therefore, on the one hand, HADR cooperation has a direct practical interest for Vietnam as it builds national capacity to deal with disasters. One the other hand, participation on HADR helps Vietnam further integrate into the region. With changes from a national security approach into a comprehensive security approach during the 1980s, Vietnam is carrying out a foreign policy of diversification and multilateralization. It has been largely successful in doing so, playing an active role as ASEAN Chair and serving on the United Nations Security Council in the last decade and building ties with a range of new partners. HADR cooperation in Southeast Asia provides another way for Vietnam to engage with a wide range of ASEAN and non-ASEAN states. It therefore represents a useful tool for Vietnam to conduct its foreign policy and to integrate itself further into the region.

Started since the 1980s, HADR securitization process has been successfully conducted globally with supports from all countries as well as the United Nations. HADR has recently become a topic of great concerns in ASEAN. The process of HADR securitization has been carried out extensively by ASEAN countries, including Vietnam. The participation in HADR activities has been used by Vietnam as an effective tools to conduct its diversified and multilateralized foreign policy as well as to further integrate into the region.

²¹⁸ Vietnam's "National Report on Disaster Reduction in Vietnam", 2005, p.7

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Anna Welle-Strand, Monica Vlaicu and Arild Tjeldvoll, "Vietnam – A New Economic Dragon in Southeast Asia?", *Journal of Developing Societies*, May 2013.
2. "Armed Conflicts 1989 – 2006", *Journal of Peace Research*, Vol.44, No.5, September 2007.
3. ASEAN Secretariat, *Politics and Security Overview*; retrieved from <http://www.aseansec.org/92.htm>
4. Angela Pennisi di Floristella, "Are Non-traditional Security Challenges Leading Regional Organizations towards Greater Convergence? – the EU and ASEAN Security Systems in Comparative Perspective", *the Asia Europe Journal* (2013) 11: page 21 - 38.
5. Barry Buzan, "People, States and Fear: the National Security Problem in International Relation", *Wheatsheaf Books Ltd.*, 1983.
6. Barry Buzan, Ole Waever and Jaap de Wilde, "Security: A New Framework for Analysis", *Lynne Rienner Publishers, Inc.* 1998.
7. Carlyle A. Thayer, "Vietnam's Security Outlook", Paper presented to the International Workshop on Asia – Pacific Security, National Institute of Defense Studies, Tokyo, Japan, January 17-18, 2012.
8. Carlyle A. Thayer, "Strategic Posture Review: Vietnam", retrieved from the of World Politics Review on 15 Jan 2013, at <http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/12623/strategic-posture-review-vietnam>
9. David Arase, "Non-traditional Security in China - ASEAN Cooperation: the Institutionalization of Regional Security Cooperation and the Evolution of East Asian Regionalism", *the Asian Survey*, Vol. 50, No.4 (July/ August 2010), page 808 – 833.
10. David A. Baldwin, "Security Studies and the End of the Cold War", *the Journal of World Politics* No.48 (October 1995), p. 117 - 141.
11. David M. Arase, "The Impacts of 3/11 on Japan", *the Journal of East Asia* (2012) 29: 313 - 336.
12. David Capie, Review of the book titled "Non-traditional Security in Asia: Dilemmas in Securitization", edited by Mely Caballero-Anthony, Ralf Emmers and Amitav Acharya, *the Pacific Affairs*, Summer 2007, Vol.80 Issue 2.
13. David Capie, "Structures, Shocks and Norm Change: Explaining the Late Rise of Asia's Defense Diplomacy", *Contemporary Southeast Asia: A Journal of International and Strategic Affairs*, Vol. 35, No. 1, April 2013, page 1 - 26.
14. David Dewitt, "Common, Comprehensive, and Cooperative Security", *the Pacific Review*, Vol.7, Issue 1, 1994, pp. 408 - 429.
15. Etel Solingen, "Crisis and Transformation: ASEAN in the New Era", *Institute of Defense and Strategic Studies*, Singapore, May 2001.
16. Hari Singh, "Vietnam and ASEAN: the Politics of Accommodation", *Australian Journal of International Affairs*, Jul 1997; 51, 2; ProQuest Central, page 215.
17. Holger Stritzel, "Towards a Theory of Securitization: Copenhagen and Beyond", *European Journal of International Relations*, Sept 2007, Vol.13 (3), page 357 - 383.
18. "Hyogo Framework for Action 2005 - 2015: Building the Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disasters", Document of the World Conference on Disaster Reduction held from 18 - 22 Jan 2005 at Kobe, Hyogo, Japan, retrieved from <http://www.unisdr.org/wcdr>
19. James Thompson, "Humanitarian Performance and the Asian Tsunami", *the*

- Drama Review, Vol.55, No.1, Spring 2011 (T209), page 70 – 83.
20. John Erickson, Book Review of “Security: A New Framework for Analysis” by Barry Buzan, Ole Waever and Jaap de Wilde, the Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management, Vol. 9, No.1.
 21. John Mueller, “War has almost Ceased to Exist: An Assessment”, the Political Science Quarterly, Vol.124, No.2 (2009), page 297 – 321.
 22. Joint Advocacy Network Initiative (JANI), “Framework on Community-based Disaster Risk Management in Vietnam”.
 23. Le Le Zou and Yi Ming Wei, “Driving Factors for Social Vulnerability to Coastal Hazards in Southeast Asia: Result from Meta-analysis”, Nat Hazards (2010) 54: page 901 – 929.
 24. Marianne Stone, “Security According to Buzan: A Comprehensive Security Analysis”, Security Discussion Papers Series 1, Spring 09.
 25. Mark Rolls, “Centrality and Continuity: ASEAN and Regional Security since 1967”, Journal of East Asia (2012) 29: page 127 – 139.
 25. Mely Caballero-Anthony, “Non-traditional Security and Multilateralism in Asia: Reshaping the Contours of Regional Security Architecture”, Policy Analysis Brief, the Stanley Foundation, June 2007.
 26. Mely Caballero-Anthony, “Non-traditional Security, Regionalism, and the State in Southeast Asia”, Chapter 7 of the “Transnational Trends: Middle Eastern and Asian Views”, issued by the Henry L. Stimson Center, July 2008, page 139 - 154.
 27. Mely Caballero-Anthony, “Non-traditional Security Challenges, Regional Governance, and the ASEAN Political – Security Community (APSC)”, Asia Security Initiative Policy Series – Working Paper No.7, September 2010.
 28. Muthiah Alagappa, “Comprehensive Security: Interpretation in ASEAN Countries”, in Asian Security Issues: Regional and Global, eds. Robert A. Scalapino, et al., Berkeley: University of California, Institute of East Asian Studies, 1988.
 29. Nguyen Huu Phuc, “Vietnam National Progress Report on the Implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action (2009 – 2011) – Interim, Sept 2010.
 30. Nguyen Vu Tung, “Vietnam – ASEAN Cooperation in Southeast Asia”, Security Dialogue, 1993, Vol. 24(1): 85-92.
 31. Nguyen Vu Tung, “Vietnam’s Security Challenges: Hanoi’s New Approach to National Security and Implications to Defense and Foreign Policies”, Chapter 8 of the NIDS Joint Research Series No.5, presented at the NIDS International Workshop on Asia Pacific Security at the National Institute for Defense Studies, Japan.
 32. Phan Doan Nam, “Ngoại giao Việt Nam sau 20 năm đổi mới” (Vietnam’s diplomacy after 20 years of implementing “doi moi” policy), the Journal of the Communist Party of Vietnam, No.14, July 2006, retrieved from website of Communist Party of Vietnam Online Newspaper at : http://www.cpv.org.vn/cpv/Modules/News/NewsDetail.aspx?co_id=30569%20&cn_id=28772
 33. Satoru Nishikawa, “From Yokohama Strategy to Hyogo Framework: Sharing the Japanese Experience of Disaster Risk Management”, the Asian Journal of Environment and Disaster Management, Vol. 2, No. 3 (2010), page 249 - 262.
 34. Scott Watson, “The “Human” as Referent Object?: Humanitarianism as securitization”, the Security Dialogue, retrieved at <http://sdi.sagepub.com/content/42/1/3>
 35. Yokohama Strategy and Plan of Action for a Safer World, Guidelines for Natural Disaster Prevention, Preparedness and Mitigation, the World Conference on Natural Disaster Reduction, Yokohama, Japan, 23 – 27 May 2004, retrieved from

<http://www.ifrc.org/Docs/idrl/1248EN.pdf>

36. Zakaria Haji Ahmad and Baladas Ghoshal, “The Political Future of ASEAN after the Asian Crisis”, the Journal of International Affairs, 75, 4 (1999), page 759 – 778.
37. Vietnam’s “Country Report in Disaster Management” at the ASEAN Inter-Parliamentary Assembly, the 4th AIPA Caucus in 2012 in Bangkok, Thailand.
38. Vietnam’s “National Report on Disaster Reduction in Vietnam” (prepared for the World Conference on Disaster Reduction, Kobe-Hyogo, Japan, 18-22 January 2005).