

their country of origin. The rights-based approach might become more prevalent in future resettlement conferences if in such conferences apart from academics and representatives of development agencies and governments, NGOs too participated, as has been suggested by symposium participants. From January 5–9, 2003, the 8th Biannual Conference of the International Association for the Study of Forced Migration (IASFM) will be held in Chiang Mai, Thailand. The conference's agenda includes as a sub-topic development-induced displacement.¹³ It remains to be seen whether NGOs will play a more prominent role in this up-coming meeting.

Stefanie Ricarda Roos

Discourses on Political Reform and Democratization in East and South-east Asia in the Light of New Processes of Regional Community Building

University of Duisburg/Germany, May 22-24, 2002

This interdisciplinary conference was organized by Prof. Heberer and Dr. Claudia Derichs and financially supported by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (German Science Foundation) and the Ministry of School, Science and Research of North Rhine Westphalia.

The objective of this conference was to share the discussion of the impact of current political discourses with scholars from different countries and various disciplines. The topics of the papers presented centered on reform politics in the PR of China, Japan, Korea, the Philippines, Indonesia, Malaysia, and Vietnam.

The three days of conferencing were structured into a theoretical introductory part and case studies from the various countries. Thomas Heberer outlined the power of discourses and the political function of intellectuals. He referred to different definitions of intellectuals and linked these definitions to their role in the modernization process. Narrowing the discussion down to authoritarian states, he differed between etatistic and intellectual-critical discourses. Using the example of the discourse on corruption in the PR China, he demonstrated the significance of discourses for political change. In the closing remarks he formulated the further issues which have to be examined, such as questions concerning the spillover process from the level of discourse into political action, the interaction between intellectuals and the political elite, the networking of other actors in East and Southeast Asia and their involvement in global (reform) discussions.

The second theoretical paper by Lee Lai To (Singapore University) examined different roles of intellectuals in "Asian societies". Distinguishing between their role as developers and disseminators of knowledge, their role in political leadership, as social critics and as social advocates, he outlined some central questions for the region in the near future, e.g. the reliance of many Asian states to use foreign exper-

¹³ Cf. www.iasfm.org for details or contact Professor Francois Crepeau, at iasfm8@droit.umontreal.ca.

tise as a jump-start to create a knowledge-based economy. Failing to clarify his understanding of "Asian societies", "Asian intellectuals" or even the term "intellectuals", Lee nonetheless raised significant questions such as the co-option of intellectuals by influential political figures, the incompatibility of their critical disposition and the joining of political circles of the establishment, and the rise of new civic organizations.

During the discussion Edward Friedman (University of Wisconsin) tried to raise awareness for the need to deconstruct the term "Asian" and to beware of the dichotomized discourses of "Eastern/Western" values. Also, the different roles of the intellectuals in Southeast Asia and East Asia play as political and societal actors were a topic of debate.

Throughout the case study sessions, the above mentioned questions were mainly discussed with reference to specific countries. These papers often only focussed either on the description of reform discourses or the so called actor level. The actual interplay between discourse, actors, and policies, however, was not addressed sufficiently.

The first four sessions focussed on China. Lowell Dittmer (UC Berkeley) applied the theory of learning to the development of foreign policy of the PRC foreign policy from 1949 to the present. Discussing different types of learning (ideological, strategic, forced) in relation to various changes in the international environment and the internal changes in China's (party) leadership, his analysis concentrated on the influence of historical lessons and external events on discourses and actors.

He Zengke (Center for Comparative Politics and Economics, Beijing) provided a detailed overview on the current discourses on political reform in China. One of the issues figuring rather prominently in his discussion, nationalism, was picked up again by Ed Friedman in his succeeding intervention aimed at deconstructing democracy discourse by pointing toward the driving nationalist and chauvinist forces on both sides of the Falungong dispute. Friedman emphasized that the dominant discourse in China is anti-democratic and that even if a democratic discourse existed, it could only serve to constitute new spaces for the discussion on democracy, yet not determine actual democratization processes.

Olga Borokh (Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow) presented a stimulating paper on the current debates on economic thought in China, especially on the relationship between economics and morality. She stressed the importance of translations of Western theoretical works into Chinese and the impact of the social realities after the 'marketization' in China on the discussion of the role (and duties) of economists. Merle Goldman (Harvard University) presented some new insights into the current position of the only opposition party in China, the China Democracy Party, which, according to Goldman, represents what CCP party leaders had feared the most, namely the coalition of workers and intellectuals. Nora Sausmikat (Duisburg University) analyzed the interdependence of content and aim of Chinese reform discourses on the one hand and the institutional affiliation and belonging to specific generations on the other hand. In her analysis, she linked biographical experiences with network abilities and democracy discourses. According to her, these factors determined the different discourse strategies and the success of the travel of ideas.

He Baogang (ANU) and Carol Lee Hamrin (George Mason University) shed fresh light on the importance of the different roles of intellectuals in different political systems. Hamrin demonstrated that during the 1990s, with the shift to economic liberalization, there was a move from discourse to action and that professionalism and new strategies to influence reform evolved under new conditions. He Baogang outlined different models of democracy by concentrating on the village elections in China. He showed for example that a multiparty system is not a *conditio sine qua non* for rural democracy, or the "hybrid model of democracy", in China. This, in turn, triggered a discussion on the basic question whether universal elements of democracy do exist.

The relationship between actors, discourses, and state policies was addressed by some presenters in the sessions on Malaysia and Japan. In the case of Malaysia, global and domestic factors (global economy, Asian financial crisis, the arrest of Anwar Ibrahim) enhanced the role of NGOs at the discourse and the activism level. Saliha Hassan (National University of Malaysia) stated that the discourses forced the state to evaluate its policies, although she did not elaborate on this process in detail. Claudia Derichs (Duisburg University) questioned the (Western) imagination of an "idea travel" from intellectual and public discourse through think-tanks (as transmission belt) into the policy-making level of politics. She stated that each nation-state has its own way of handling the dissemination of ideas. Drawing from the results of her field work in Malaysia, she came to the conclusion that at least three conditions have to be met simultaneously, when an idea is meant to "travel" from the public into the policymaking level: acceptance of the power monopoly of the ruling party/coalition (at least in public statements), access to authorities and the right timing.

With regard to Japan, we were informed of the significance of timing. Jiro Yamaguchi (Hokkaido University) pointed out that the success of the "reform government" under Koizumi was due mainly to the fact the country had already experienced a decade of disappointing attempts at reform. While Yamaguchi concentrated on the debate among politicians, Gabriele Vogt (Hamburg University) focussed on the influence of non-state actors (NGOs). She described new instruments of influence (new media, referendums) which are increasingly used on the grassroots level. Through a detailed description of the project of administrative reform in Japan, Karin Adelsberger (Duisburg University) demonstrated how different groups of intellectuals functioned in this reform as advisors in think-tanks, study-groups or through their appearance in the mainstream media. Again, as mentioned in the case of Malaysia, the impact of discourses on political reform is dependent on alliances between the political elite (here: the bureaucracies) and the discourse participants (here: scholars).

The case of Vietnam highlighted the strategy factor and the importance of international political events for internal processes. Carlyle Thayer (Australian Defense University) demonstrated how different actors try to influence the party reform by petitions, informal in-house seminars and massive media actions. The content of the debates on a multi-party system, the request that political liberalization must accompany economic liberalization, and the three different discourses on liberalism very

much resemble Chinese debates. As pointed out by Patrick Raszelenberg (Duisburg University) the historical trauma of being dominated by China was one of the major factors why the majority of Vietnamese intellectuals are preoccupied with self-reflection and the search for indigenous political concepts. The September 11th attacks forced the Vietnamese to recognize their unfamiliarity with the conflict in Middle East and many used this event to define their own position in the world.

Structural factors like the rise of a civil society as an important force of democratization were emphasized by Dorothy Guerrero (Asia Foundation, Essen) and Martina Timmermann (Institute of Asian Affairs, Hamburg). Following different issue-based discourses like the human rights debate, Timmermann showed how global concepts were filled with regional contents and how they created a "regional identity". The transnational factors of community-building became a hot topic during the following discussions.

The papers at this conference covered an exceptionally wide range of topics. The multitude of different theoretical approaches applied by the participants allowed the conference to offer a rare view into the intricacies of political discourses in East and Southeast Asia. While papers relating to the situation in China clearly outnumbered those dealing with Southeast Asia, they still had something in common, which might be called the "actor-discourse-policy triangle". The quality of the discussions and the participants' passionate engagement guaranteed intense and lively discussions. The conference proceedings will be published next spring.

Nora Sausmikat

International Conference "Bringing the Party Back In: How China is Governed"

Kopenhagen, 7.-9. Juni 2002

Seit der Einleitung der chinesischen Reform- und Öffnungspolitik in den späten 1970er-Jahren gilt die Kommunistische Partei Chinas (KPCh) vielen westlichen Beobachtern als politischer Dinosaurier, der sich in einer zunehmend globalisierten Welt weitgehend überlebt hat. In der andauernden Erwartung, dass der leninistische Ein-Partei-Staat früher oder später demokratisiert oder aber zusammenbrechen würde, trat die Beschäftigung mit gesellschaftlichen Fragen zunehmend in den Vordergrund, während die Partei als eigenständiger Untersuchungsgegenstand immer mehr aus dem Blickfeld politikwissenschaftlicher Analyse geriet.

Ein Vierteljahrhundert nach dem Tod Mao Zedongs, ein Jahrzehnt nach dem Kollaps der Sowjetunion und ein Jahr nach der offiziellen Öffnung der KPCh für Privatunternehmer scheint es allerdings an der Zeit, noch einmal die Frage aufzuwerfen, ob es nicht verfrüht ist, die Partei für obsolet zu erklären. Die Grundthese des Klassikers *Bringing the State Back In* (Evans/Rueschemeyer/Skocpol, 1985), wonach der Staat auch in einer globalisierten Welt seine Relevanz behält, schuf die Anregung für eine internationale Konferenz, die die KPCh erneut in den Mittelpunkt der Analyse rücken sollte. Kjeld Erik Brødsgaard (Kopenhagen) und Zheng Yongnian (Singapur), die Initiatoren der Konferenz, die vom 7. bis 9. Juni 2002 in