

Uigurische speziellen Problemen bei der Ansetzung der Lemmata, z.B. über die Festsetzung der Sprachnorm, da uigurische Texte in fünf verschiedenen Alphabeten geschrieben sind, die Transkription indischer Fremd- und Lehnwörter usw.

Bei der Konferenz wurde deutlich, daß viele Probleme der Lexikographie in den berücksichtigten Sprachen ganz ähnlich sind, so beispielsweise die Schwierigkeit der Abgrenzung des Materials, der Aufbau der Artikel, die Fragen, was als Zitat angeführt und welche Sekundärliteratur zitiert werden sollte, oder die Übersetzung von Spezialbegriffen der Architektur, Philosophie, Rechtskunde usw. Außerdem wurden die Prinzipien diskutiert, nach denen ein Wörterbuch aufgebaut sein sollte, und eine engere Zusammenarbeit zwischen den einzelnen Projekten verabredet.

Siglinde Dietz

Democratization and Cooperation in Asia
Forum of Democratic Leaders in the Asia-Pacific
 Seoul, May 2–3, 1996

In 1995 Professor Dr. Ra Jong-yil and Dr. Park Byeong-seog sent a detailed prospectus to a number of interested people. The idea was to initiate a research project on aspects of democratization and cooperation in Asia with people from the Asia-Pacific region, Europe and the USA joining hands resp. brains in a coordinated approach to deal with such a comprehensive topic. The response was positive and the two Korean scholars began to organize an international conference. Their endeavour was immediately supported by Dr. Kim Dae-jung who in December 1994 had initiated the founding of the Forum of Democratic Leaders in the Asia-Pacific, with himself, Corazon C. Aquino, Sonia Gandhi and Oscar Arias Sanchez as co-presidents. The Forum actively promotes studies in democratization with the firm belief that the rich heritage of democracy-oriented philosophies and traditions of Asia should be the new foundation upon which new capabilities can be developed to overcome the limitations of Western democracy and to establish a higher form of democracy accommodating the essential needs of all human beings. The work of the Forum is not restricted to academic deliberations as there is also a wide range of political

activities including a deep commitment to democratization in Burma. In addition to emphasizing that Asia has a rich tradition in and has made great strides towards democracy, Dr. Kim Dae-jung repeatedly stressed that "Asia has no practical alternative to democracy; it is a matter of survival in an age of intensifying global economic competition."

The prospectus served as a broad guideline for those who participated in the conference. They also received a volume with the summaries of the papers. It is planned to publish all revised manuscripts by the end of 1996 in Korean and English.

More than 50 papers were presented in Seoul and discussed by about 140 officially nominated guests plus countless valuable contributions from the floor. This provided for a comprehensive, fundamental and penetrating treatment of the complex topic. Without the superb organization it would not have been possible to handle such an ambitious programme. In order to achieve this within two days, the subject was dealt with in three sections: 1. Asian identity, culture and democracy, 2. Industrialization and democratization, 3. Regional cooperation. There were papers that analyzed the historical background, others presented "Western" views, and general ideas were supplemented by specific case studies. Good coordination, lively discussion as well as excellent organization were the characteristics of a conference which was a very rewarding and stimulating event.

Most of the participants came from the Asia-Pacific region. The organizers had purposely looked for European scholars – quite a contrast to the usual predominance of Americans at such conferences. The nomination of Prof. Dr. Gerhard Lehbruch as keynote speaker reflected the interest in European studies in democracy and democratization. He spoke about consensus democracy in the age of globalization and used the European Community as an example for different processes of consensus building under the pressure to achieve unanimity. This resulted in a strong need for bargaining processes so necessary for the development of European solidarity and for the consolidation of the authority of the EC. All this cultivated a degree of mutual understanding and a readiness for mutual accommodation. In his welcome address, Dr. Kim Dae-jung also mentioned global aspects and touching on his own personal political activities stressed again that features inherent in Asian cultures and values are conducive to and supportive of democracy.

Contrasting Eastern with Western values in most cases tends to be controversial and confrontative. Such disputes often do not sufficiently reflect inner-Asian discussions as they are dominated by the question of transferability and the problem of the relationship between democratization and economic development. Positions are frequently irreconcilable. Asian par-

ticularities are stressed excessively, accompanied by the flat simplistic declaration that Asian values and Western-liberal democracy are incompatible. It was one of the many assets of the conference that such unproductive confrontation did not take place; on the contrary, the richness and diversity of positions within Asia were presented and discussed. The headline of the *Korea Times* of May 3, 1996: "FDL-AP Seminar on Asian Culture Versus Democracy" was thus quite misleading although the actual report on the conference was accurate. The heading is wrong because the emphasis was not on confrontation and irreconcilability, but on openness, diversity and receptiveness. This of course was no hindrance to most lively discussions.

Participants from Southeast Asia brooded about how to describe accurately their countries' systems, quasi-democracy, semi-democracy, democratic authoritarianism or other hybrids. To Christine Loh this was not acceptable. The courageous legislator from Hong Kong stated: democracy is democracy. If it is quasi, semi or whatever additive, then it's not democracy! Sulak Sivaraksa, eloquent social critic and Buddhist from Thailand, argued that whatever brand of democracy, it is all based on Western assumptions and thinking. To him the point of departure makes the difference evident: *cogito ergo sum*, so they say in the West, i.e. I think, therefore I am; the Buddha said: I breathe, thus I am. Sulak challenged disbelievers to hold their breath for just five minutes. The contrast, he said, is between an individualistic intellectual approach and egocentricity on the one hand, spiritual growth that synchronizes the head and the heart and leads to harmony with nature on the other. He made reference to fundamental democratic relations within the traditional *sangha* and described the adaptation of the teaching of Buddhism to our more complex modern times as a central task. If and when Buddhism becomes state religion, it loses its vitality, and Sulak readily admitted that Buddhism is in crisis, especially in Thailand.

In their selection of topics and prospective participants for the conference Prof. Dr. Ra and Dr. Park attached great importance to a diversity of views, approaches and convictions. Furthermore, the whole conference benefited enormously from the fact that Dr. Kim Dae-jung not only presented a paper but frequently participated actively in the discussion. The very fact that the organizers had invited a great number of discussants provided for most lively sessions. No matter what the topic was, an assessment of elements in Confucianism conducive to democracy (Peter Ferdinand) or developments in North Korea, always a multitude of opinions was voiced. Sometimes the competent translators had difficulty in following the controversial exchanges between Korean colleagues.

Constantly efforts were made to make views clearer and to make definitions more precise. Ulf Sundhaussen summarized all that had been listed under the rubric "middle class" and concluded that all groups mentioned had nothing to do with the majority of the population. Consequently he posed the question: what good is a middle class that as promoter of democracy pursues its vested interests and neglects those of the people? Professor Sundhaussen proposed the continued, detailed study of earlier forms of village democracy in Asia and he recommended his audience to read – or to read again – works by Alexander Hamilton and Friedrich List because here one finds important conclusions about the interplay between economic activities of the private sector and instruments applied by the state to regulate the economy and how both have repercussions on the democratic shape of a given polity.

The section on regional cooperation dealt with principles, forms and methods of cooperation, with the interplay between governmental and private levels and also between civil societies. Different types of cooperation were examined especially in the field of economy, technology, resources, labour and environment. Other papers dealt with science, culture and criminality. The role of gender, for example, was analysed by Ahn Lee-whan from Kyunghee University (Seoul) in a paper on the role of women toward the 21st century: "Transition from women of knowledge to women who lead social change."

Special attention was given to the relationship between industrialization and democratization. Sound overviews were complemented with detailed case studies, e. g. on Bangladesh, Laos, Sri Lanka and Cambodia, the co-author of the latter paper being Son Soubert, 2nd vice-president of the National Assembly in Phnom-Penh.

In April 1996 Wolf Lepenies published an article in a German daily in which he concluded that European societies had remained cultures of instruction (*Belehrungskulturen*), their future, however, would largely depend on their ability and willingness to transform themselves into cultures of learning (*Lernkulturen*). The conference in Seoul briefly summarized above provided an excellent opportunity to exchange information and views; it was in the best sense a learning experience.

Werner Pfennig