

Culture and academic cooperation play a central role in this process. A culture is a valuable tool for advancing on the road to integration. It can make a decisive contribution to strengthening cohesion, dialogue, and social understanding among the countries, which is an intrinsic factor to counter common global threats. In this aspect, academic/intellectual facilitation is needed among countries to promote peace, dialogue, and accept cultural and civilizational diversities.

Collaboration in the academic and educational sectors would do wonders to foster the process of regional integration. In this aspect, Eurasian countries and Pakistan can devise relevant policy mechanisms to provide opportunities for joint ventures and student exchange programs. These tremendous educational chances would increase people-to-people connectivity, and soft power projection, cultural exchanges, tourism, and countries can learn from each other in a better way.

Furthermore, countries can identify grounds for mutual interests to increase their efforts to strengthen multilateral ties. Awareness programs, teacher-students exchange programs, scholarships, international summits, webinars, seminars, and relevant literature can help these regional countries to collaborate.

The cooperation that began with economic assistance can lead to strategic partnership and collaboration in many other fields. Therefore, exploring grounds for joint ventures and enhanced academic networks in the region would benefit all states. In this context, operationalization of practical policy options could pave the way for new avenues of economic cooperation, political integration, harmony, peaceful coexistence, respect, and lead towards multilateral regional alliance to an unprecedented level.

CHINA—JAPAN—SOUTH KOREA’S TRILATERAL DISASTER MANAGEMENT COOPERATION WITHIN ASEAN-CENTERED INSTITUTIONS (2009-2019)

M. V. Galimov

*National Research University Higher School of Economics
Myasniitskaya Street, 20, 101000, Moscow, Russia, mvgalimov@yandex.ru*

In the article the of role ASEAN-centered institutions for China-Japan-South Korea interaction and cooperation on disaster management is analyzed. Based on official secondary data and the method of forecasting by analogy the author presents evidence of ASEAN providing the three countries with a testing ground for interaction as well as with a possible example to imitate. In turn, ASEAN institutions benefit from the trilateral

disaster management development because they receive financial and other kind of assistance from the wealthy China, South Korea, and especially Japan.

Keywords: disaster management; China; Japan; Korea; ASEAN.

In October 2009, United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction produced the Terminology in English, Chinese¹, Japanese and Korean on the occasion of the first trilateral meeting on disaster management by China, Japan and the Republic of Korea. According to the terminology, disaster (risk) management is defined as “the systematic process of using administrative directives, organizations, and operational skills and capacities to implement strategies, policies and improved coping capacities in order to lessen the adverse impacts of hazards and the possibility of disaster” [1]. Coincidentally, this marked the beginning of trilateral cooperation on disaster management, so my **research timeline** is limited to 2009–2019 before the COVID-19 pandemic/disaster in 2020 provided a new challenge for three countries to overcome. China–Japan–South Korea (CJK) engagement was later institutionalized with the establishment of the Trilateral Cooperation Secretariat (TCS) – an intergovernmentally-sponsored CJK organization in which three countries’ officials discuss economic, environmental, and sometimes political issues, including disaster management [2]. However, it is not the first institution in Asia that addresses this issue. There are various ASEAN-centered mechanisms involved in the regional disaster management since at least 2005 (an effort prompted by the 2004 Indian Ocean earthquake and tsunami [3]). Consequently, I **hypothesize** that ASEAN is a possible example of cooperation on disaster management for CJK to emulate. My **goal** is to determine what role ASEAN-centered institutions might be playing in CJK interaction and cooperation on disaster management. For this, I formulate the following **objectives**: 1) to find how CJK relate to ASEAN disaster management initiatives; 2) to establish the reason ASEAN might need CJK for its disaster management initiatives. To solve these problems, I utilize two **analytical methods**: secondary analysis as well as forecasting by analogy.

The Association of Southeast Asian Nations was created in 1967 and was a product of Cold War mentality with the aim to contain communist states like the People’s Republic of China. However, after the collapse of Berlin Wall in 1989 ASEAN became less ideological and more open [4, p.122]. Not only did it include new members, like a communist Vietnam, but also produced various multilateral free-to-join institutions, like security-focused ASEAN Regional Forum (since 1994), ASEAN Defense Ministers’ Meeting Plus (since 2010), or mostly economically focused ASEAN+3 (since

¹ Terminology in English and Chinese, two of the five official UN languages, was produced beforehand, in May 2009.

1997), East Asia Summit (since 2005). In addition, ASEAN's priorities shifted from traditional security (primarily concerned with military threats) to the area of non-traditional security (counterterrorism and trans-national crimes; maritime security; and non-proliferation and disarmament etc.), like disaster relief. As in all the above-mentioned associations CJK are present, I would now examine their trilateral interaction with ASEAN in detail.

One of the ASEAN-centered mechanisms deserving the attention is ASEAN Regional Forum Disaster Relief Exercise or ARF DiREx for short [5]. In general, this format has evolved from Inter-sessional Meetings on Disaster relief and ARF Disaster Relief Exercise Table Top Exercises. It takes place every two years and is co-hosted by one ASEAN member state and co-sponsored by one non-ASEAN ARF member. Table top exercises are simulations resembling a board game of strategy, often used by emergency agencies to save money and trouble when testing a hypothetical disaster scenario. The first one, then called "ARF Voluntary Demonstration of Response", was jointly held by the Philippines and the United States in May 2009 [6].

Quite ironically, the second DiREx was conducted in March 15-19, 2011, co-sponsored by Japan, but held in the ASEAN co-chair country — Indonesia. The Second ARF DiREx consisted of a Table Top Exercise (TTX), Field Training Exercise (FTX) and Humanitarian Civic Action (HCA) [7]. Although this exercise was pre-planned, one cannot help but point out that had it been conducted on the co-sponsor country's territory, Japan's 3/11 disaster¹ might have been mitigated more promptly with the help of the DiREx participants. Regardless, when the Triple disaster occurred three non-ASEAN member states — the US, South Korea, Japan — left the DiREx to support the latter (which also served as good publicity). In a month, the Republic of Korea provided a search and rescue team of 102 rescue workers and 5 staff members to control two rescue dogs [8, p.146], and donated various relief supplies in the months following [Ibid, p.149]. Moreover, immediately after the 3/11 disaster Korean Red Cross officially launched a fund raiser for helping the victims in Japan. According to 2011 Korean Red Cross Annual Report 44.5 billion won or 37,430,710 US dollars were raised for the cause [9, p.22-23]. Also, only a small portion (around 2,189,188 US dollars) originated from Korean businesses [10] while the rest of the sum was from concerned individuals in South Korea. In comparison, Chinese government sent only 15 rescue workers whereas, quantitatively speaking, even from Taiwan with its 23.5 million population and smaller nominal GDP, 28 ambulance workers were dispatched [8, p.144–145]. Therefore, when

¹ Triple Disaster or 3/11 — a combination of three disasters, namely, The Great East Japan Earthquake on March 11, 2011, which caused two other serious disasters: a tsunami and a nuclear power plant accident.

disaster stroke one of CJK the other two acted independently (though there is scattered evidence that the ROK government coordinated its response with the US side to some extent [11]) to support Japan to the extent practicable, not to the extent fully possible.

The third DiREx was co-chaired by the ROK and co-hosted by Thailand on 7-11 May 2013. As usual, the participants conducted exercises to promptly undertake relief activities in a simulated large-scale disaster. Apart from CJK participating in the DiREx as ARF members, the newly established Trilateral Cooperation Secretariat also contributed personnel to the exercise [12]. Since ASEAN is one of the oldest existing institutions in Asia-Pacific it provides an exemplary framework for other Asian organizations, like TCS, to emulate. However, first CJK table-top exercise was conducted on March 14, 2013 [13], two months prior to the actual ARF exercise, so I cannot establish any connection, only correlation. Still, any of CJK states could have introduced ASEAN practices into the TCS (like Japan [14, p.82]). Thus, it is far from improbable that CJK table-top exercises will eventually evolve into full-scale real-life exercises by analogy with the ARF DiREx.

The fourth DiREx co-chaired by the PRC and co-hosted by Malaysia happened on 7–11 May 2015, and no ARF DiREx has been conducted since. Most likely, it was eventually downgraded to separate thematic trainings, table-top exercises, meetings, workshops, and seminars which have been ongoing at least until 2020 [15]. Also, I find it plausible that the focus could have shifted to a more inclusive ASEAN Defense Ministers' Meeting Plus which convenes annually and conducts various types of exercises [16].

Unlike in the case of CJK, Southeast Asian governments have recognized the common threat of natural disasters long ago, so whereas CJK governments only created the first common institution, ASEAN members established a special ASEAN Coordinating Centre for Humanitarian Assistance on disaster management or AHA center for short in Jakarta, Indonesia. Therefore, when one of ASEAN member-states is affected by disaster they can request for AHA Centre's assistance. For instance, deployment of the ASEAN Emergency Response and Assessment Team who are trained in emergency assessments and are rapidly deployable experts (within 24 hours); or ASEAN's relief items managed by the AHA Centre under the Disaster Emergency Logistics System for ASEAN; or assistance from the other Member States through the AHA Centre (or it could itself make an offer of assistance or facilitate assistance from the other ASEAN Member States) [17]. However, I leave open the possibility that the TCS will one day establish a similar institution for disaster management. For example, Japan is very actively involved in supporting the AHA Center with the needed

human and financial resources [14, p.82], so it could eventually introduce some of ASEAN practices to TCS.

Speaking about the financial part of CJK involvement in the mechanisms of ASEAN-centered institutions I should place a special attention on ASEAN+3 as it has been closely intertwined with CJK cooperation processes long before the TCS appeared. There is even a notion that CJK web-secretariat in 2009 was created just to store information about ASEAN+3 meetings [18]. As primarily a financial grouping, ASEAN+3 involvement in disaster management is mainly concerned with post-disaster recovery during which big sums of money are poured into reconstruction, insurance reimbursements etc. Then again, Southeast Asian economies, Singapore excluded, could not boast great cash holdings so they put effort into disaster preparedness for the sake of less costly post-disaster recovery. That is where CJK economies' involvement is needed. For example, since 2013 ASEAN+3 rice reserve is functioning in Thailand. In case of disaster a portion of voluntarily donated rice will be distributed to the country facing an emergency or when it needs aid. As expected, from 787,000 tons of rice – 700,000 are contributed by CJK economies [19].

In addition, ASEAN+3 is to some extent involved in organizing emergency insurance. In partnership with the World Bank ASEAN and CJK Finance Ministers and Central Bank Governors it created the Southeast Asia Disaster Risk Insurance Facility (SEADRIF). SEADRIF has a catastrophe risk insurance pool (initially for Laos, Myanmar, and Cambodia). The pool, however, is reserved only for ASEAN member-states but not for donors and potential donors, such as Japan, and China, South Korea. However, it is up for debate whether Japan and Korea which strive for staple self-sufficiency would have exchanged rice within CJK even when facing a disaster [20]. Originally, Singapore and Japan are the primary financial sponsors whereas World Bank is focused on technical support. It is worth noting that the place for other sponsors “within and beyond ASEAN+3” [21] is reserved. This project should be viewed as complementary to the 2010 Chiang Mai Initiative Multilateralization. This multilateral currency swap arrangement between ASEAN+3 members [22] aims not to alleviate natural disaster consequences but rather the aftereffects of financial calamities.

All in all, ASEAN is an old and rather institutionalized association with many ASEAN-centered mechanisms in which CJK are also represented. From the ARF Disaster Relief Exercise case I found that ASEAN is a possible example for CJK to emulate, although this copying is not an immediate or clearly sequential process. Also, in most of the mechanisms CJK do not act in unison as is evident from their response to 3/11 disaster. Besides, within ASEAN+3 format they usually play a role of passive donors or involved

financial sponsors, especially Japan. Therefore, ASEAN–CJK interaction on disaster management is mutually beneficial with the former acting as an incubator and a possible inspiration for the fledgling trilateral cooperation and the latter functioning as resource providers for developing and least developed economies of Southeast Asia.

REFERENCES

1. 2009 UNISDR terminology on disaster risk reduction (Chinese, Japanese and Korean) // UNDRR. URL: <https://www.undrr.org/publication/2009-unisdr-terminology-disaster-risk-reduction-chinese-japanese-and-korean> (date of access: 17.04.2021).
2. ABOUT TCS Structure // Trilateral Cooperation Secretariat. URL: <https://tcs-asia.org/en/about/structure.php> (date of access: 17.04.2021).
3. Natural disaster management and the future of ASEAN cohesion // East Asia Forum URL: <https://www.eastasiaforum.org/2016/09/23/natural-disaster-management-and-the-future-of-asean-cohesion/> (date of access: 17.04.2021).
4. John Ravenhill, Rosemary Foot, Saadia M. Pekkanen (eds.) OXFORD HANDBOOK OF THE INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS OF ASIA. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.
5. Disaster Response in Asia and the Pacific - A Guide to International Tools and Services, 2nd Edition // ReliefWeb. URL: <https://reliefweb.int/report/world/disaster-response-asia-and-pacific-guide-international-tools-and-services-2nd-edition> (date of access: 17.04.2021).
6. ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF) // Ministry of External Affairs, Government of India. URL: https://www.mea.gov.in/Portal/ForeignRelation/ARF_May_2016.pdf (date of access: 17.04.2021).
7. ASEAN Regional Forum Disaster Relief Exercise (ARF DiREx) 2011 After Action Review (AAR) Executive Summary & Conclusions Manado, Indonesia, 19 March 2011 // ASEAN Regional Forum URL: <https://aseanregionalforum.asean.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/Annex-12-ARF-DiREx-After-Action-Review-Executive-Summary-ARF-DiREx-2011.pdf> (date of access: 17.04.2021).
8. 平成 23 年(2011 年)東北地方太平洋沖地震(東日本大震災)について [About the 2011(Heisei Era 23) Tohoku Pacific Ocean Earthquake (Great East Japan Earthquake)] // Disaster Management – Cabinet Office. URL: <http://www.bousai.go.jp/2011daishinsai/pdf/torimatome20180305.pdf> (date of access: 17.04.2021).
9. 2011 Annual Report // Eng Korean Redcross Main Page URL: https://www.redcross.or.kr/eng/eng_introduce/introduce_publication_annualreport.do?acton=detail&brdctsn=66919&pagenum=2 (date of access: 17.04.2021).
10. Corporate Aid Tracker - Japanese Earthquake and Tsunami, March 2011 // U.S. Chamber of Commerce Foundation. URL: <https://www.uschamberfoundation.org/corporate-citizenship-center/corporate-aid-tracker-japanese-earthquake-and-tsunami-march-2011> (date of access: 17.04.2021).
11. Timeline of Operation Tomodachi // The National Bureau of Asian Research (NBR). URL: <https://www.nbr.org/publication/timeline-of-operation-tomodachi/> (date of access: 17.04.2021).
12. CO-CHAIRS' SUMMARY REPORT OF THE ASEAN REGIONAL FORUM DISASTER RELIEF EXERCISE (ARF DiREx) 2013 CHA-AM, THAILAND, 7-11 MAY

2013 // ASEAN Regional Forum. URL: <https://aseanregionalforum.asean.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/Annex-14-Co-Chairs-Summary-Report-ARF-DiREx-2013-Cham-20th-ARF.pdf> (date of access: 17.04.2021).

13. Trilateral Table-Top Exercise (TTX) on Disaster Management // Trilateral Cooperation Secretariat. URL: <https://tcs-asia.org/en/cooperation/mechanism.php?topics=6> (date of access: 17.04.2021).

14. ASEAN Regional Forum Annual Security Outlook 2013 // ASEAN Regional Forum. URL: <https://aseanregionalforum.asean.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/ARF-Annual-Security-Outlook-2013.pdf> (date of access: 17.04.2021).

15. ASEAN REGIONAL FORUM LIST OF TRACK I ACTIVITIES (By inter-sessional year from 1994 to 2020) // ASEAN Regional Forum. URL: <https://aseanregionalforum.asean.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/List-of-ARF-Track-I-Activities-by-Inter-Sessional-Year-as-of-September-2020.pdf> (date of access: 17.04.2021).

16. About the ASEAN Defence Ministers' Meeting Plus (ADMM-Plus) // ADMM, ASEAN Defence Ministers Meeting URL: <https://admm.asean.org/index.php/about-admm/about-admm-plus.html> (date of access: 17.04.2021).

17. Frequently Asked Questions // AHA Centre URL: <https://ahacentre.org/frequently-asked-question/> (date of access: 17.04.2021).

18. Sakaki, A. China – Japan – South Korea A Tense Ménage à Trois (Research Paper) / A. Sakaki, G. Wacker. Text: digital // Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik (SWP). URL: <https://www.swp-berlin.org/en/publication/china-japan-south-korea-a-tense-menage-a-trois/> (date of access: 17.04.2021).

19. Members of ASEAN Plus Three // Asean Plus Three Emergency Rice Reserve (APTERR). URL: <https://apterr.org/what-is-apterr> (date of access: 17.04.2021).

20. Lee B-O Agricultural cooperation among the North-East Asian countries // Korean Journal of Agricultural Science. 2013. Tome 40. №1.

21. Joint Statement of the 21stASEAN+3 Finance Ministers' and Central Bank Governors' Meeting // ASEAN. URL: <https://asean.org/storage/2018/05/Final-Draft-Joint-Statement-of-the-21st-AFMGM-3-00000002.pdf> (date of access: 17.04.2021).

22. Overview of The Chiang Mai Initiative Multilateralization (CMIM) // ASEAN+3 Macroeconomic Research Office – AMRO ASIA. URL: <https://www.amro-asia.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/02/For-website-updating-Overview-of-CMIM.pdf> (date of access: 17.04.2021).

SYRIAN REFUGEES IN TURKEY AND THEIR SOCIAL PROBLEMS

A. Kara

*Minsk State Linguistic University,
Zakharova Avenue, 21, Minsk, Belarus, ayfer.kara44@yahoo.com*

With the Bashar Assad government's strict control of religious activities and the spread of the Arab Spring very effectively, the demands of the Syrian people such as equality, democracy and sectarian freedom caused a civil war in Syria. Kurds, Turkmen and Arab batches consisting of Syrians escaped to Turkey not wanting to get involved and pressured by the Assad regime. With the arrival of the Syrian refugees, economic and