



CRITICAL STUDIES OF
THE ASIA-PACIFIC

**THINK TANKS AND
NON-TRADITIONAL
SECURITY**

**GOVERNANCE
ENTREPRENEURS
IN ASIA**

Erin Zimmerman



Critical Studies of the Asia-Pacific

Series Editor: **Mark Beeson**, Professor of International Politics, Murdoch University, Australia

Critical Studies of the Asia-Pacific showcases new research and scholarship on what is arguably the most important region in the world in the twenty-first century. The rise of China and the continuing strategic importance of this dynamic economic area to the United States mean that the Asia-Pacific will remain crucially important to policymakers and scholars alike. The unifying theme of the series is a desire to publish the best theoretically informed, original research on the region. Titles in the series cover the politics, economics and security of the region, as well as focussing on its institutional processes, individual countries, issues and leaders.

Titles include:

Thomas Birtchnell

INNOVATION

Innovation and a Global Knowledge Economy in India

Lindsay Black

JAPAN'S MARITIME SECURITY STRATEGY

The Japan Coast Guard and Maritime Outlaws

Aurel Croissant, David Kühn, Philip Lorenz and Paul W. Chambers

DEMOCRATIZATION AND CIVILIAN CONTROL IN ASIA

Giovanna Maria Dora Dore, Jae H. Ku and Karl Jackson (*editors*)

INCOMPLETE DEMOCRACIES IN THE ASIA-PACIFIC

Evidence from Indonesia, Korea, the Philippines and Thailand

Kelly Gerard

ASEAN'S ENGAGEMENT OF CIVIL SOCIETY

Regulating Dissent

Felix Heiduk (*editor*)

SECURITY SECTOR REFORM IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

From Policy to Practice

Brendan Howe

THE PROTECTION AND PROMOTION OF HUMAN SECURITY IN EAST ASIA

Jane Hutchison, Wil Hout, Caroline Hughes and Richard Robison

POLITICAL ECONOMY AND THE AID INDUSTRY IN ASIA

Eun Mee Kim and Pil Ho Kim (*editors*)

THE SOUTH KOREAN DEVELOPMENT EXPERIENCE

Beyond Aid

Jikon Lai

FINANCIAL CRISIS AND INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE IN EAST ASIA

Jonathan London (*editor*)

POLITICS IN CONTEMPORARY VIETNAM

Party, State, and Authority Relations

Arndt Michael

INDIA'S FOREIGN POLICY AND REGIONAL MULTILATERALISM

Christopher B. Roberts, Ahmad D. Habir and Leonard C. Sebastian (*editors*)

INDONESIA'S ASCENT

Power, Leadership, and the Regional Order

Mohammad Zulfan Tadjoeddin
EXPLAINING COLLECTIVE VIOLENCE IN CONTEMPORARY INDONESIA

Claudia Tazreiter and Siew Yean Tham (*editors*)
GLOBALIZATION AND SOCIAL TRANSFORMATION IN THE ASIA-PACIFIC
The Australian and Malaysian Experience

Sow Keat Tok
MANAGING CHINA'S SOVEREIGNTY IN HONG KONG AND TAIWAN

William Tow and Rikki Kersten (*editors*)
BILATERAL PERSPECTIVES ON REGIONAL SECURITY
Australia, Japan and the Asia-Pacific Region

Barry Wain
MALAYSIAN MAVERICK
Mahathir Mohamad in Turbulent Times

Mikael Weissmann
THE EAST ASIAN PEACE
Conflict Prevention and Informal Peacebuilding

Robert G. Wirsing, Christopher Jasparro and Daniel C. Stoll
INTERNATIONAL CONFLICT OVER WATER RESOURCES
IN HIMALAYAN ASIA

Hidetaka Yoshimatsu
COMPARING INSTITUTION-BUILDING IN EAST ASIA
Power Politics, Governance, and Critical Junctures

Erin Zimmerman
THINK TANKS AND NON-TRADITIONAL SECURITY
Governance Entrepreneurs in Asia

Critical Studies of the Asia-Pacific
Series Standing Order ISBN 978-0-230-22896-2 (Hardback)
978-0-230-22897-9 (Paperback)
(outside North America only)

You can receive future titles in this series as they are published by placing a standing order. Please contact your bookseller or, in case of difficulty, write to us at the address below with your name and address, the title of the series and the ISBNs quoted above.

Customer Services Department, Macmillan Distribution Ltd, Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire RG21 6XS, England

Think Tanks and Non-Traditional Security

Governance Entrepreneurs in Asia

Erin Zimmerman

University of Adelaide, Australia

palgrave
macmillan



© Erin Zimmerman 2016

All rights reserved. No reproduction, copy or transmission of this publication may be made without written permission.

No portion of this publication may be reproduced, copied or transmitted save with written permission or in accordance with the provisions of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988, or under the terms of any licence permitting limited copying issued by the Copyright Licensing Agency, Saffron House, 6–10 Kirby Street, London EC1N 8TS.

Any person who does any unauthorized act in relation to this publication may be liable to criminal prosecution and civil claims for damages.

The author has asserted her right to be identified as the author of this work in accordance with the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

First published 2016 by
PALGRAVE MACMILLAN

Palgrave Macmillan in the UK is an imprint of Macmillan Publishers Limited, registered in England, company number 785998, of Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire RG21 6XS.

Palgrave Macmillan in the US is a division of St Martin's Press LLC, 175 Fifth Avenue, New York, NY 10010.

Palgrave Macmillan is the global academic imprint of the above companies and has companies and representatives throughout the world.

Palgrave® and Macmillan® are registered trademarks in the United States, the United Kingdom, Europe and other countries.

ISBN 978-1-349-57892-4 ISBN 978-1-137-48825-1 (eBook)
DOI 10.1057/9781137488251

This book is printed on paper suitable for recycling and made from fully managed and sustained forest sources. Logging, pulping and manufacturing processes are expected to conform to the environmental regulations of the country of origin.

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

A catalog record for this book is available from the Library of Congress.

Contents

<i>List of Figures and Tables</i>	viii
<i>List of Abbreviations</i>	ix
1 Introduction	1
Contemporary security in Asia	4
Order of exposition	11
2 Discursive Institutionalism and Institutional Change	16
Introduction	16
Think tanks as ideational actors	17
Discursive institutionalism	22
Discursive institutionalism and think tanks	23
Types of discourse	25
Discursive strategies	29
Problem framing/agenda setting	30
Networks	33
Institutionalisation	37
Conclusion	40
3 Think Tanks and Non-Traditional Security	41
Introduction	41
Non-traditional security in Asia	42
Think tanks as political actors	50
Track II diplomacy: Creating political space	55
Conclusion	59
Methodology	60
Rationale	60
Research design	62
Justification of case studies	63
Sources of data for illustrative cases	64
Semi-structured interviews	64
Author observations	65
Limitations	65
Conclusion	66

4 Association of Southeast Asian Nations: Institutes of Strategic and International Studies	68
Introduction	68
AI as a political actor	72
AI and discursive space	75
AI and the non-traditional security agenda	78
Problem framing and agenda setting	79
Networking	82
Institutionalisation	85
Conclusion	93
5 Expanding Beyond ASEAN: Council for Security Cooperation in the Asia Pacific	95
Introduction	95
CSCAP and AI	97
CSCAP as a political actor	101
CSCAP and discursive space	104
CSCAP and the NTS agenda	107
Problem framing and agenda setting	109
Networks and epistemic communities	112
Localisation	116
Institutionalisation	117
Conclusion	121
6 The International Institute for Strategic Studies and the Shangri-La Dialogue	123
Introduction	123
The Shangri-La Dialogue as a political actor	126
The Shangri-La Dialogue and discursive space	129
The Shangri-La Dialogue and the non-traditional security agenda	134
Problem framing and agenda setting	136
Networks	139
Institutionalisation	141
Conclusion	148
7 The MacArthur Foundation's Asia Security Initiative	151
Introduction	151
Background	152
The Asia Security Initiative as an ideational actor	155
The Asia Security Initiative and discursive space	161

The Asia Security Initiative and the non-traditional security agenda	163
Problem framing and agenda setting	166
Networks	168
Institutionalisation	170
Conclusion	173
8 Think Tanks as Governance Entrepreneurs	175
Think tanks as political actors	177
The importance of discourse and discursive space	180
Ideas and institutional change	182
Where to from here?	184
Think tanks and the future of security governance	185
Conclusion	187
<i>Appendix A: List of Institutes in the Asia Security Initiative</i>	189
<i>List of Interviews</i>	192
<i>Bibliography</i>	193
<i>Index</i>	208

Figures and Tables

Figures

2.1	Cycle of ideational influence, adapted from Blyth (2002)	19
5.1	Locations of discursive space provided by the CSCAP network	106

Tables

3.1	The non-traditional security agenda	46
5.1	List of all current and recently concluded CSCAP Study Groups (CSCAP 2015)	106

Abbreviations

ADMM	ASEAN Defence Ministers' Meeting
ADMM Plus	ASEAN Defence Ministers' Meeting Plus
AEF	ASEAN Economic Forum
AI	ASEAN-Institutes for Strategic and International Studies (also abbreviated as ASEAN-ISIS)
AICOHR	ASEAN-ISIS Colloquium on Human Rights
AMM	ASEAN Ministers' Meeting
APA	ASEAN People's Assembly
APC	Asia Pacific Community
APEC	Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation
APR	Asia-Pacific Roundtable (organised by ASEAN-ISIS)
ARF	ASEAN Regional Forum
ARF-DOD	ASEAN Regional Forum Defence Officials' Dialogue
ARF-DOM	ASEAN Regional Forum Defence Officials' Meeting
ARF-ISG	ASEAN Regional Forum Inter-Sessional Support Group
ARF-ISG/CBM	ASEAN Regional Forum Inter-Sessional Support Group on Confidence Building Measures
ARF-SOM	ASEAN Regional Forum Senior Officials' Meeting
ARF-SPC	ASEAN Regional Forum Security Policy Conference
ASC	ASEAN Security Community
ASEAN	Association of Southeast Asian Nations
ASEAN-ISIS	ASEAN-Institutes for Strategic and International Studies (also abbreviated as AI)
ASI	Asia Security Initiative
BDIPSS	Brunei Darussalam Institute of Policy and Strategic Studies
BIPSS	Bangladesh Institute of Peace and Security Studies
CBMs	Confidence Building Measures
CICP	Cambodian Institute for Cooperation and Peace
CISS	Centre for International Security Studies (Sydney)
CRSO	CSCAP Regional Security Outlook
CSBMs	Confidence and Security Building Measures
CSCAP	Council for Security Cooperation in the Asia Pacific

CSIS	Centre for Strategic and International Studies (Indonesia)
CSO	Civil Society Organisations
DI	Discursive Institutionalism
EAI	East Asia Institute (South Korea)
EAS	East Asia Summit
EPG	Eminent Persons' Group
HI	Historical Institutionalism
IDSS	Institute of Defence and Strategic Studies (later the S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies in Singapore)
IFA	Institute of Foreign Affairs (Laos)
IIA	Institute of International Affairs (now the Diplomatic Academy of Vietnam)
IISS	International Institute for Strategic Studies (London, Singapore, Washington D.C. and Bahrain)
ISDS	Institute for Strategic and Development Studies, Inc. (Philippines)
ISEAS	Institute of Southeast Asian Studies (Singapore)
ISG	Intersessional Support Group Meeting (ASEAN)
ISIS	Institute for Strategic and International Studies (Malaysia)
ISM	Inter-sessional Meeting (ASEAN)
JCIE	Japan Center for International Exchange
MASI	MacArthur Asia Security Initiative (also known as the ASI)
NADI	Network of ASEAN Defence Institutions
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organisation
NBR	National Bureau of Asian Research
NEAT	Network of East Asian Think-tanks
NTS	Non-Traditional Security
NTS-Asia	Consortium of Non-Traditional Security Studies in Asia
NTU	Nanyang Technological University (Singapore)
PAFTAD	Pacific Asia Free Trade and Development Conference
PBEC	Pacific Basin Economic Council
PD	Preventative Diplomacy
PECC	Pacific Economic Cooperation Council
PIF	Pacific Islands Forum
PMC	Post Ministerial Conference

RI	Rational Choice Institutionalism
RSIS	S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (Singapore)
RtoP	Responsibility to Protect
SAARC	South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation
SCO	Shanghai Cooperation Organisation
SI	Social Institutionalism
SIIA	Singapore Institute of International Affairs
SLD	Shangri-La Dialogue
SOM	Senior Officials Meeting (ASEAN Regional Forum)
SPC	Security Policy Conference (ASEAN Regional Forum)
TAC	Treaty of Amity and Cooperation in Southeast Asia
VAP	Vientiane Action Programme
WMD	Weapons of Mass Destruction
ZOPFAN	Zone of Peace, Freedom and Neutrality

1

Introduction

This book is the product of several years of research into the changing nature of security in Asia. It examines the new modes of security governance that have emerged in the face of progressing globalisation (and regionalisation), new sources of insecurity and the liberalisation and democratisation of many Asian states. More to the point, it hones in on the growing influence of non-state actors who have begun injecting themselves into regional and international politics. While the conclusions in this book are necessarily discrete, its implications are vast. What this research demonstrates is that the responsibility for security governance is increasingly being rescaled away from state-centric forums upwards into regional venues and outwards into the hands of non-state actors. The state still retains primacy; however, the increasingly transboundary nature of security in Asia has made cross-regional cooperation a necessity. The realisation that new threats are overwhelmingly transboundary has encouraged a region with limited practice in regional solidarity to look for new avenues of cooperation – and when states have been slow to provide these avenues, non-state actors have filled in the resultant gaps in governance.

Non-state actors, in general, and think tanks, in particular, have been important ideational entrepreneurs of new modes of security governance in Asia. Either by providing the ideas upon which new governing regimes are based, offering a safe testing location for new institutions and approaches, or by becoming institutions in their own right, think tanks and their networks have embedded themselves in Asian governing processes at previously unseen levels. In deference to the importance of these developments, this book is devoted to answering, through the use of case studies, four important questions: How have think tanks used their abilities as ideational actors to change understandings of security in Asia? What historical and political circumstances led to this? What

does this say about the influence of think tanks and think tank networks in the region? And, finally, what does this mean for the future of security governance in Asia? In answering these questions, this book adds to existing literature on the political influence of think tanks, in particular it contributes to the study of Asian think tanks in three discrete ways.

First, it updates and goes beyond the previous literature published on think tanks in the 1990s and early 2000s. Globalisation and rapid political changes in Asian domestic and regional politics have rendered these works largely out of date. Earlier literature, while important and insightful, largely examined the role and influence of think tanks that were often governmentally authorised and functioning in non-democratic states and contexts (Abelson 2006 provides a good overview). While, for some countries, this is still the case, for others the political landscape has changed. Foremost, there has been a general trend towards democratisation and countries that were not democratic now are (Indonesia), though others have lost ground (Thailand). As a general rule, political opportunities for Asian think tanks have opened up as the growing demand for policy advice has surpassed domestic government's internal institutional capacities for research (Rüland 2002). Globalisation and the development of increasingly crowded international fora mean that think tanks have more opportunities than ever before to interact with political decision-makers. As such, previous scholarship focusing on *if* think tanks have any political relevance in Asia has to (or needs to) give way to literature examining *how* to quantify the intangible influence that they have.

Asian think tanks themselves have also changed. Their numbers have expanded at an astonishing rate, and a landscape once dominated by governmentally controlled policy institutes has been transformed into an increasingly diverse policy community. Many emerging think tanks enjoy high levels of autonomy and are largely free of governmental influence. While not commensurate to their contemporaries in Europe and North America, Asian think tanks are also benefiting from increasingly active civil and philanthropic cultures. Even governmentally affiliated think tanks are hedging political boundaries and becoming more critical of governmental policies, a change driven by their need to demonstrate continued policy relevance and bolstered by their ability to secure outside funding.

Most interestingly, Asian think tanks are progressively moving towards network-centric structures. Networks have been vital for the dissemination of think tank ideas, and pseudo-institutionalised networks have become increasingly influential as globalisation and

democratisation alter the political landscape in Asia. Current manifestations of think tank networks are distant cousins to those that existed in the 1980s and 1990s. Having evolved beyond their initial identity as advisors and legitimisers of government policy, contemporary Asian think tanks have become active developers and promoters of new forms of security governance. While the first two case studies provided in this book still fall into the category of 'informal' or Track II political actors, the last two case studies focusing on the International Institute for Strategic Studies (IISS) and the MacArthur Foundation's Asia Security Initiative (ASI) are arguably so far outside of the traditional conceptualisations of 'Track II' to be something else entirely. However, examining the differences and similarities among these think tank networks offers a fascinating glimpse into the growing prevalence and power of these unique networks in Asian foreign policy.

Second, this book adds discursive institutionalism (DI) to the repertoire of tools available for think tank analysis. All of the case studies offered in this book, with one exception, have not yet been examined using this innovative theoretical lens. Yet, DI offers valuable tools to examine the connections between the ideas promoted by think tanks and their potential influence on regional governing institutions. Additionally, this is the only study that addresses the creation of discursive space by non-state actors and examines it as a political tool used to influence regional security paradigms. Think tanks are not only providing political locations for discussion, as identified in earlier literature, but are also controlling these locations and the ideas introduced in order to alter regional security paradigms and elicit desired policy responses.

Last, this book provides the only comparative evaluation of think tank networks in Asia to date. Certain networks such as the ASEAN-Institutes for Strategic and International Studies (AI) and the Council for Security Cooperation in the Asia Pacific (CSCAP) have been around for decades, and new networks are continuously emerging; yet no comparative analysis of these networks has occurred. For the sake of clarity and political relevance, this book focuses on Asian think tank promotion of the non-traditional security (NTS) agenda. The NTS agenda has become a fixture of network dialogues, and all large networks have promoted it in some form or another. These concurrent efforts give credence to the assertion that many think tank networks are operating as part of a larger epistemic community, a community with the power to determine what ideas and norms will shape the future security culture of the region. As this book will show, think tanks are influential players in this new landscape and, through their judicious endorsement of certain

ideas, have helped determine the future structure of regional security governance.

Contemporary security in Asia

At the end of the Cold War, Asia faced a strategic security situation characterised by previously suppressed, unrecognised or emerging sources of insecurity. Despite the lingering salience of military, balance of power and deterrence concerns, states in the region increasingly found their attention drawn to transboundary sources of insecurity stemming from economic, political, social or environmental factors. Soon labelled NTS issues, their growing relevance has been underlined by the instability resulting from the Asian financial collapse of 1997–98, the outbreak of SARS and Avian influenza, illegal migration, terrorism and the political consequences of accelerating environmental degradation. For the majority of Asian states, “non-military threats to regime survival are more likely to materialize than traditional military threats” (Arase 2010: 810). However, most of these issues are incompatible with traditional concepts of security and thus challenge the appropriateness and utility of state and military-centric security paradigms. NTS issues defy traditional state-based security structures by manifesting across state borders. Further complicating their governance, NTS issues often appear with little warning (natural disasters, pandemic diseases, terrorism) or so subtly (illegal migration, financial instability, environmental degradation) that their security implications are initially overlooked. As a result, states have been forced to re-evaluate their approaches to regional security governance.

A multitude of actors have assumed active roles in identifying, framing and providing advice on NTS threats – Asian think tanks being one of the most dominant. These think tanks have pushed for the acknowledgement of NTS issues as threats to security and emphasised the importance of effective security governance. Think tank voices have also called attention to the failure of existing modes of Asian security governance to effectively address NTS issues at the regional level. However, the region has historically shied away from developing strong security institutions, and this is evident in the inability of current institutions to deal with the complicated and transboundary nature of most NTS threats.

Regional institutions are a reflection of the norms defining Asian governance and diplomacy (Ba 2009), and incorporating the NTS agenda into institutions is vastly more complex than ‘securitising’ them and

adding them to the list of problems under the scope of traditional security paradigms (Hameiri and Jones 2011a). The NTS agenda necessitates a re-definition of security, including a re-evaluation of how security is to be achieved, who is being secured and against what (Tan and Boutin 2001). Foremost, it widens the concept of security beyond military threats to include instability stemming from economic, political, environmental or social sources (these four categories were articulated by Buzan *et al.* in 1998). It also highlights the transboundary and complex origins of emerging security problems and acknowledges that domestic circumstances in one state can negatively impact neighbouring states or the region as a whole (Acharya 2009a). Last, NTS removes the state as the sole referent object of security and replaces it within a “framework that encompasses the security of individuals, societies and groups” (Caballero-Anthony and Cook 2013: 3).

NTS challenges have profound consequences for state stability; however, they often defy management at the state level. Because of this, state-centric security governance has failed to adequately accommodate these issues; and existing security mechanisms based on this type of governance are increasingly viewed as outdated and ineffective. Thus, NTS issues undermine existing security mechanisms, challenge the validity of state-centric models of security governance and problematise the acceptability of the state as the sole provider and object of security (Hameiri and Jones 2011a).

Re-evaluating security in this way threatens entrenched and long-held norms of Asian diplomacy (Hameiri and Jones 2011a). Since the formation of ASEAN, regional institutions have favoured informal processes characterised by weak institutionalisation, preferences for dialogue, consensus-based forms of decision-making and conflict avoidance rather than resolution (Caballero-Anthony 2005). The NTS agenda, however, demands a direct engagement with the politically awkward and sensitive security issues threatening the region – much to the discomfort of regional actors. It also calls for collective and cooperative security governance backed by strong forms of regional governance, an approach that is divergent from the traditional norms of Asian regionalism that emphasise the centrality of the state (Morada 2010). Asia as a region is suspicious of collective or cooperative security arrangements and has taken pains to avoid the institutionalisation of regional security structures. Traditional norms of diplomacy favour non-confrontational and gradual approaches when dealing with security issues. These drawn-out methods have quickly been outpaced by the rapidly changing security environment in Asia.

The conflict between traditional security norms (and the institutions based upon these norms) with the growing demands for more flexible forms of NTS governance has resulted in a unique paradox for Asian governing actors. The most pressing security issues in the region are the very same issues that are precluded from discussion because of their sensitive and transboundary natures. This paradox is incontrovertibly intertwined with the deeply contested transition from traditional to non-traditional understandings of security occurring in Asia (Hameiri and Jones 2012). State and non-state actors alike are struggling to reconcile existing governing structures with the practical security realities of the region. In general, states have settled for persevering with the status quo, while non-state actors (in particular, think tanks) have emerged as advocates of new forms of security governance.

It is due to a quirk of Asian political history that think tanks have taken up the unusual role of NTS champions. Think tanks first emerged in Asia in response to a growing need for policy analysis in the region. Think tanks were a way for governing regimes to get the policy advice they needed without having to share authority (Rüland 2002). Many Asian governments lacked the capacity and expertise to respond to NTS issues and utilised think tank knowledge to meet their policy analysis needs (Rüland 2002). Over time, states grew accustomed to turning to think tanks for policy advice and it became the norm for regional institutions to intentionally divert divisive security issues to think tanks for analysis and discussion. In 1994, the first Chairman's Statement from the ASEAN Regional Forum articulated what was already common practice in the region. It stated that "[g]iven the delicate nature of many of the subjects being considered by the ARF, there is merit in moving, [sic] the ARF process along two tracks" (ASEAN Regional Forum 1994). In this context, Track II refers specifically to the networks of think tanks and policy research institutes in Asia that were believed to contribute "greatly to confidence-building measures in the region" (ASEAN Regional Forum 1994). There is a long history of Track II involvement in regional diplomacy, and it was a logical progression for states to turn to think tanks to address emerging security issues, including NTS issues. As a consequence, think tank organised dialogues and networks have been the primary venues for the discussion and debate of many types of problems in Asia.

The paradox keeping formal processes from engaging with and governing NTS issues has seemingly opened up governing opportunities to non-state actors. Any analysis of security that focuses solely on states misses half of the governing picture. In the absence of state leadership,

it is apparent that think tanks have been active in managing and shaping the political processes around the NTS agenda. Think tanks have articulated NTS threats, set agendas for their management and devised political solutions. This raises important questions concerning the exact function of think tanks in Asian security governance. Can we think of think tank processes as new forms of security governance? After all, Hameiri and Jones articulate important aspects of governance as “defining the nature and sources of security problems” as well as “devising plans and policies to ameliorate them” (Hameiri and Jones 2011a: 7), and think tanks have done both regarding NTS issues.

Using the authority granted to Track II processes, think tanks have championed to regional decision-makers a comprehensive political agenda based upon NTS issues. And they appear to have met with a notable degree of success. The agendas of both formal and informal governing processes are beginning to reflect a shift towards NTS issues and a commensurate acknowledgement of the complex political and governing changes necessary to address them. Think tanks have been very active in this process, and there is evidence that the promotion of NTS ideas is, at least in part, contributing to institutional changes in regional security governance.

In light of their success in cultivating new understandings of security, the function of think tanks as governance entrepreneurs deserves a closer look. Foremost, think tanks hold relatively little political authority and work on the periphery of the political process. How is it that they have seemingly exercised such a high degree of ideational influence? Second, the political environment in Asia is inhospitable both to informal political actors, such as think tanks, and to structural or ideational change. This is particularly true of actors promoting ideas that so strongly conflict with current norms and can be interpreted as challenging state sovereignty. Yet, somehow think tanks have managed to successfully introduce and promote such an agenda. Their success in redefining security and pushing for new forms of governance implies that the influence of think tanks on governance is deeper than is suggested in previous literature. Thus, it may be more appropriate to conceptualise think tanks as active political actors pursuing their own political agendas rather than as passive producers of policy advice following political goals set by states.

This book explores how think tanks and their networks have approached the promotion of the NTS agenda, particularly in light of their overt lack of political power. Asian think tanks appear to have attained political and institutional influence via their expertise

as ideational actors; despite their informal and non-governmental positions, they have come to wield political influence through their promotion of ideas. Previous research has noted that think tanks are adept at moving ideas across political space and acting as the “intermediary or interlocutor between knowledge and power, science and the state” (Stone 2007: 259). They have also been labelled as ‘policy entrepreneurs’ who through their “advocacy of certain preferred policy positions... have played a key part in policy thinking in national and international affairs” (Stone and Nesadurai 1999: 2). However, how exactly they have mobilised in the role of policy entrepreneurs, or even as governance entrepreneurs (Avant *et al.* 2010), is unclear in the contexts of NTS issues. The terms ‘policy entrepreneurs’, ‘policy brokers’ and ‘idea brokers’ are commonly applied to think tanks and their networks (for discrete examples, see Kingdon 2003; Stone 2000a, 2004 and 2011).

Asian think tanks appear to have adapted specific strategies to augment and expand their ideational influence. Foremost, they have formed a series of transregional networks. The first such networks manifested alongside regional governing organisations, such as the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) and the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF), with the intent of providing timely and relevant policy analysis to regional governing structures. Over time, these networks, and others that have subsequently developed, have been subsumed into governing processes and now provide important mechanisms for introducing and disseminating policy ideas.

Second, think tanks have gone out of their way to create region-spanning and non-governmental political spaces (forums and dialogues). These spaces are neutral venues where new and innovative ideas can be introduced into policy processes, and where state and non-state actors can meet to communicate, discuss and workshop ideas. Regional policymakers have shown a growing preference for these venues as they offer sources of novel policy solutions.

Think tanks control the discourse that occurs in these ‘discursive spaces’, and they have used this authority to influence ideational processes. Discourse, as it is described by DI, is the “interactive process of conveying ideas” and encompasses not only what is said but also other variables, such as the speaker and the context of the ideational exchange (Schmidt 2008: 303). Think tanks have used their control over these political spaces to influence what ideas are introduced and how they are perceived (framed) to privilege NTS ideas over other interpretations and directions for security governance. In doing so, they have

used non-traditional security ideas as catalysts to promote new forms of security governance in Asia.

Constructivism excels in accounting for the influence of ideas and beliefs on political processes; however, it struggles to acknowledge the influence of institutions on ideas. This is especially true when focusing on the influence of non-state actors using ideas to instigate institutional change. Think tank ideational transmission and promotion is still constrained by the institutions in which they are embedded or with which they interact. The following chapters contribute to constructivist literature by bringing constructivism into a dialogue with institutionalism and seek to discern the influence of ideas on institutions in a real-world context. DI has been selected as the interpretative lens for this analysis precisely because it gives equal weight to the ideational and material circumstances generating institutional change (Schmidt 2011). It also adequately accounts for the influence of non-state actors by acknowledging their ability to engage in discourse to propel certain sets of ideas into political processes. DI offers the means to further explore Stone's observation that

while ideational policy entrepreneurs may be independently effective in disseminating ideas, the political dynamics of networks entail that negotiation, compromise and persuasion are unavoidable and these actors are dependent upon decision-makers and other power holders to see ideas selected for transfer and institutionalised in policy.

(2000b: 37)

Thus, to fully understand think tank impact on governance, this book couples constructivism's emphasis on the social construction of institutions and the power of ideas with an acknowledgement of the constraining and enabling power of institutions. It then applies this dual perspective to four case studies to analyse how ideas have been used to influence and guide institutional transformations.

Four think tank organisations dominate Track II processes in Asia: the AI, the CSCAP, the IISS and the ASI. These four networks constitute the bulk of informal diplomatic processes occurring in Southeast Asia and the Asia-Pacific, and all of them, in some capacity, have links with regional governing structures. In their own ways, each has played an integral part in the introduction and promotion of NTS ideas in Asian security discussions. As such, they are the logical starting point for an investigation of think tank approaches and strategies as agents of institutional change.

The first two case studies (AI and CSCAP) have already received scholarly attention; however, there is value in re-evaluating their activities through the lens of DI. Doing so will tease out the specifics of how each network responds to their unique political contexts and uses discourse to translate discrete sets of ideas into institutional change. These first two case studies also provide a 'benchmark' against which to compare the last two networks (IISS and ASI), which have emerged more recently and under vastly different political environments. There is much to be learned by evaluating the similarities and differences among networks and explaining the advantages and disadvantages of these on each network's promotion of the non-traditional security agenda.

Each network will be examined in turn, with an eye towards how it engages in the interactive process of conveying ideas (discourse) at state and regional levels. In particular, special attention will be paid to how each network has created unique discursive spaces within political processes and used these spaces to advocate NTS interpretations of security issues. When looked at together, these four networks provide a more nuanced analysis of think tank activity in Asia than could be achieved if only one or two individual networks were examined.

Think tanks have functioned as architects and guides for institutional innovation. They have provided justification for the establishment of new institutions or the alteration of old ones. Further, they have vigorously contributed policy templates and recommendations to act as road maps, focal points and frameworks to guide institutional change (see Goldstein and Keohane 1993). In this sense, they have become governing actors "who exercise power across borders for the purpose of affecting policy" (Avant *et al.* 2010: 356). What is more, they have used their ideational authority as leverage to gain access into existing or emerging governing structures or institutions – arguably ensuring themselves greater access to future political opportunities. Their integration into governing processes and their dual personas as formal/informal, state/non-state actors are important aspects in understanding how think tanks have pursued institutional change. Consequently, this book provides an analysis of two important types of political integration. First, it examines how think tank networks have successfully integrated themselves into existing formal security processes and also the benefits and consequences of their assimilation. Second, it queries how think tanks have successfully embedded the NTS agenda into both old and new forms of governance, including their strategies for accommodating the inherent paradox between NTS issues and traditional governing norms.

The shift from traditional to non-traditional security calls for profound structural changes in the architecture of Asian governance. Think tanks have convincingly argued that regional institutions must change in order to address NTS issues; however, regional institutions have been unable to respond quickly enough to meet growing governance demands. As a consequence, governing authority is gradually moving from ineffective regional mechanisms into other, more flexible, political spaces. The paradox that has prevented regional governing structures from addressing NTS issues has pushed responsibility for NTS governance into the hands of non-state actors, who in turn exercise authority on behalf of regional organisations. Unsurprisingly, think tanks have been attractive repositories for governing authority given their governmental connections, acknowledged expertise and fertile discursive spaces. In certain instances, officials have used think tank networks as transitional locations for security governance until formal processes can 'catch up' with governing demands. In these circumstances, think tanks potentially wield significant influence as the providers and controllers of this governing space.

The inconsistencies between demands for security governance and dominant governing structures have also contributed to the rise of a different kind of think tank: those not affiliated with any regional state or governing structure. These networks most often exercise authority in the absence of state alternatives for governance. In these cases, such processes have become the *de facto* governing options for certain types of security and are gaining legitimacy by hosting formal dialogues, setting security agendas and serving as locations for formal political announcements. The growing influence and acceptability of non-state governing actors challenges the validity of the state/non-state and formal/informal distinctions typical of contemporary political analysis.

Order of exposition

The following chapters explore how think tanks have become governance entrepreneurs by occupying the governing gaps arising between the capabilities of formal processes and demands for practical NTS governance. This book follows three main themes. First, it explores if and how think tanks are significant political actors in Asia. Second, it scrutinises how they have used discourse and the creation of discursive space to promote the non-traditional security agenda. Third, it seeks to link think tank ideational influence to institutional changes and the restructuring of security governance in Asia. Important aspects of institutional change