

Besorgnis, dass das Reich der Mitte dort nun eindeutig als Bedrohung benannt werde. Mit dem bisherigen „stillen Wettrüsten“, in dem Tokio Nordkorea als Rechtfertigung seiner Verteidigungsanstrengungen genutzt habe, sei es demnach vorbei. Die Verstärkung des Militäraufgebots auf Okinawa und weiteren Nansei-Inseln beispielsweise sei ein Anzeichen dafür, dass Japan direkt auf die Militärpolitik Chinas reagiere, indem es versuche, durch glaubwürdige Abschreckungsfähigkeit eine Machtbalance herzustellen. Da Tokio jedoch zugleich nach einer Verbesserung der diplomatischen Beziehungen mit Peking strebe und sein Verteidigungsbudget beschneide, müsse das Wettrüsten aber keinesfalls außer Kontrolle geraten.

Im fünften und letzten Panel hielt Dr. Christian Wagner, Forschungsgruppenleiter Asien der Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik, einen Vortrag zum Thema „Feind Nr. 1? Militärische Aspekte der China-Politik Indiens“. Zwischen beiden Ländern existierten enge wirtschaftliche Verflechtungen, die politische Konflikte, wie die Streitigkeiten um Arunachal Pradesh, Myanmar und das chinesisch-pakistanische Verhältnis, in den Hintergrund rückten. Die Modernisierung der indischen Streitkräfte sei nicht gegen die Volksrepublik, den wichtigsten Handelspartner des Landes, sondern gegen Pakistan gerichtet, das weiterhin maßgeblich die Sicherheitspolitik Indiens bestimme. Sollte sich Indien auch bei seinen Rüstungsanstrengungen an China orientieren, könne von einem Wettrüsten demnach dennoch nicht die Rede sein. Vielmehr sei ein Nebeneinander von Kooperation, Wettbewerb und Konflikt zu beobachten, in dem die beiden Länder „business partners, not friends“ blieben.

In seinem Schlusswort kam Jun.-Prof. Dr. Martin Wagener zu dem Fazit, konkrete militärische Reaktionen regionaler Großmächte auf den Ausbau der chinesischen Streitkräfte ließen sich durchaus nachweisen. Allerdings könne man nicht immer eindeutig bestimmen, ob das Reich der Mitte der Auslöser des Rüstungswettlaufes sei oder selbst nur auf Rüstungsanstrengungen anderer reagiere. Unbestreitbar aber bleibe, dass Asien aus der Weltpolitik nicht mehr wegzudenken sei. Obschon momentan noch die Welt der Globalisierung die Oberhand auf dem größten Kontinent habe, so tue ein sicherheitspolitischer Dialog doch Not. Einen Beitrag zu ebendiesem leisteten die Trierer China-Gespräche.

Julia Wurr

Decentralization and Democratization in Southeast Asia

Freiburg, 15.-17. Juni 2011

Nestled in the green foothills of the Black Forest, among the “*Bächle*” of Freiburg’s medieval streets, an international and multidisciplinary group of scholars and practitioners assembled for three days in June to assess the status of “Decentralization and Democratization in Southeast Asia.” The conference was sponsored by the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF) and held under the auspices of the Freiburg University’s Southeast Asia Studies Program

(<http://areastudies.uni-freiburg.de/>) entitled “*Grounding Area Studies in Social Practice*”. With a special section on a decade of decentralization in Indonesia, the conference highlighted the importance of the region’s dynamism within a globalized context of decentralized democratization. In the wake of the Cold War, ten years after the pioneering “big bang” programs in the Philippines, newly democratizing Indonesia embarked on even bolder decentralization reforms. Simultaneously, Vietnam’s incremental decentralization process contrasts with the recent military coup and political unrest in Thailand, and decentralization programs primarily in service of neo-patrimonialism in Cambodia. The regional diversity of decentralization and its complex entainment with central bureaucracies, entrenched militaries, and money politics provided key areas of focus for the conference. In particular, the ten year anniversary of the implementation of Indonesia’s decentralization offered a critical moment to evaluate the achievements and shortcomings of these economic, historical, political, and cultural processes.

An evening reception hosted by the City of Freiburg offered an opportunity for the conference committee chairs, Günther Schulze, Jürgen Rüländ, and Judith Schlehe (University of Freiburg) to welcome more than 150 conference participants from Europe, North America and Southeast Asia and to introduce the conference topic. The following Thursday morning, an opening statement by Günther Schulze on a decade of decentralization in Indonesia highlighted the dynamism, diversity, and relative under-theorization of decentralization in Southeast Asia as a fundamental justification for creating the conference and crafting its international and interdisciplinary design. In the first of three plenary sessions that followed, historian and anthropologist Henk Schulte Nordholt (KITLV, Leiden) presented “Decentralization and Democracy in Indonesia: Strengthening Citizenship or Regional Elites?” This session initiated the first of a lively series of discussions originating from questions about anti-corruption measures, cultural democracy, geographical factors, social networking technology, and the entrenchment of local elites within decentralization processes. The session made clear that decentralization and democratization do not always coincide, an insight corroborated by other conference contributions. Following two plenary sessions from Marcus Mietzner (Australian National University, Canberra), “Indonesia ten years after decentralization: local identity and the survival of the nation-state,” and Neil McCulloch (University of Sussex, Brighton) “Does better local governance improve district growth performance in Indonesia?” two afternoon parallel sessions included a total of more than forty individual presentations within six separate panels. These panels approached decentralization from interdisciplinary perspectives ranging from issues of local government proliferation (pemekaran), disaster risk management, public service delivery, fiscal decentralization, economic growth, local identity, political discourse, forest usage, corruption, and religion.

Braving a typical evening June rain shower and a brief cable car journey to the foothills of the Schwarzwald, participants found scenic and delicious refuge in the

Restaurant Dattler with a dinner speech by The Ambassador of the Republic of Indonesia to Germany, his Excellency Dr. Eddy Pratomo. On Friday morning, a third parallel session offered seven panels with more than thirty individual presentations ranging from topics of “Decentralization and Local Elites” to “Culture and Media.” A late morning Round Table discussion, “Past Experiences and the Future of Democratization and Decentralization in Indonesia” prompted a provocative debate from panelists Jörg-Werner Haas (GIZ Indonesia), Heru Subiyantoro (Indonesian Ministry of Finance), William Wallace (World Bank), and Andy Yentriyani (Commission on Violence against Women, Indonesia). A conference closing speech by Judith Schlehe highlighted the value of an interdisciplinary approach and area studies focus when exploring decentralization from a grounded perspective linked to social practices of democratization. As conference organizers asserted, “the outcome of this renegotiation of governance structures, economic patterns and cultural identifications is by no means clear.” Nevertheless, this transnational gathering of academics and practitioners generated timely analysis and created much-needed debate charting developments in decentralized and democratic processes within the context of an unpredictable Southeast Asian future.

Eric J. Haanstad

SASE Mini Conference

Universidad Autonoma de Madrid, 23. Juni 2011

Research into the “Diversity of capitalism” originally focussed on the theoretical and empirical examination of the European and U.S. experiences. The mini-conference took place within the SASE conference in Madrid on June 23rd, and brought Asia into the forefront of the theoretical and empirical discussion of the ‘Diversity of capitalism’ approach and propose the very existence of Asian models of capitalism. Panel 1 on the Asia in the diversity of capitalism aimed at a better understanding of the diversity of Asian capitalism and addressed conceptual questions. Speakers were Barbara Krug (Rotterdam School of Management), Hideaki Miyajima (WIAS), and Michael Witt (INSEAD). Panel 2 on innovation and institutions in Asia brought together scholars engaged in studying national innovation systems as well as the diversity of capitalism approaches. Papers were presented by Cornelia Storz (University of Frankfurt) and by Nahee Kang (University of Manchester). Panel 3 on institutional change in Japan and other Asian countries analysed exogenous factors inducing institutional change, and focussed especially on the impact of neo-liberal policies. Papers were presented by Harald Conrad (University of Sheffield), Shimada Takaharu (Keio University), and Sebastien Lechevalier (EHESP). The papers were discussed by Bruno Amable (University Paris 1), and Gregory Jackson (Free University Berlin). For further information please see <http://www.sase.org>.

Cornelia Storz, Sebastien Lechevalier