

## **CHAPTER 4**

### **COMPARING REGIONALISM IN EUROPE AND EAST ASIA: EUROPEAN CONTEXT AND ASIAN CONTEXT**

The European Union is significant because it represents a successful regional grouping in the world. There is no question that countries in other regions have viewed developments in Europe as a potential model to follow. Experiences from the EU could serve as a lesson learned for attempts to promote regional grouping in other regions, particularly in East Asia. Nevertheless, the circumstances that supported the development of European regional governance, and particularly European integration from the ECSC to the EU, are unlikely to be duplicated elsewhere. It must be aware that a lesson learned is not a ready-made solution or well-proven formula. Each particular region has its own characteristics that are different from others.

Lessons learned from European cooperation and integration can be summarized into three main concepts: intergovernmental cooperation, intergovernmentalism, and supranationalism. For European cooperation, intergovernmental cooperation has widely been used in many organizations such as COE, NATO, WEU, Benelux, OEEC, OECD, CSCE, and OSCE. In smaller Europe, the EU has introduced the concepts of intergovernmentalism and supranationalism to regional cooperation studies. Still, the international cooperation has prevailed in some dimension of the EU's activities.

In East Asia, regional cooperation seems to be able to apply only to intergovernmental co-operations. East Asian states prefer to collaborate by informal cooperation, using consensus as a decision-making process, reserving their commitment to any single organization. Loose institutional structures tend to be the preferred method for East Asian cooperation than high degree of institutionalization.

The objective of this research paper is to review the experience of the European cooperation and integration, and to compare it with East Asia, particularly the EAC. This chapter attempts to evaluate the cooperative experiences in three areas: the concepts of the region, the processes, and the institutions.

### **A. Regional Cooperation: The Concept of the Region**

Regions, like nations, can be created and destroyed. The concept of 'region' is obviously fundamental to regional analysis. The main task of identifying regions implies making judgements about the degree to which a particular area that could constitute a distinct entity. Also, regional identity has become ever more central to the analysis of contemporary regionalism.

#### **1. Regionness - Regionalization**

Björn Hettne and Fredrik Söderbaum refer to the New Regional Theory which describes the process of regionalization in terms of levels of 'regionness'.<sup>1</sup> Regionness implies that a region can be a region 'more or less'. Regionness can be understood in analogy with concepts such as 'stateness' and 'nationness'. A higher degree of regionness implies a higher degree of economic independence, communication, cultural homogeneity, coherence, capacity to act, and in particular, capacity to resolve conflicts. Regionalization is the process of increasing regionness. There are five levels of regionness: regional space, regional complex, regional society, regional community, and region-state.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Regionness is the process whereby a geographical area is transformed from a passive object to an active subject, capable of articulating the transnational interests of the emerging region.

<sup>2</sup> See more details in Björn Hettne and Fredrik Söderbaum, "Theorising the rise of regionness," in *New Regionalisms in the Global Political Economy*, eds. by Shaun Breslin, et al. (London and New York: Routledge, 2002), pp. 33-47; Björn Hettne, "Neo-mercantilism: the pursuit of regionness," *Cooperation & Conflict* 28, no. 3 (1993); Björn Hettne, "Globalization and the new regionalism: the second great transformation," in *Globalism and the New Regionalism*, eds. Björn Hettne, A. Inotai, and O. Sunkel (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1999); Björn Hettne and Fredrik Söderbaum, "The new regionalism approach," *Polite* 17, no. 3 (1998). It should be noted that Bruce Russett proposed three criteria for the definition of regions; physical proximity and separateness, interdependence, and homogeneity. See more details in Bruce Russett, *International Regions and the International System: A study in Political Ecology* (Chicago: Rand-McNally, 1998). See also Young Jong Choi and James A. Caporaso, "Comparative Regional Integration," in *Handbook of International Relations*, eds. Walter Carlsnaes, Thomas Risse, and Beth A. Simmons (London: SAGE Publications, 2001), pp. 481-482.

**Table 4.1 Comparative ‘regionness’ in EC/EU, Southeast Asia and ASEAN, and East Asia/ASEAN+3/EAC<sup>3</sup>**

<b>Regional Cooperation Level of regionness</b>	<b>EC/EU</b>	<b>Southeast Asia and ASEAN</b>	<b>East Asia/ASEAN+3/EAC</b>
1. Regional Space (geographical and ecological unit)	Regional boundary within EU (27 members)	Fragmentation (mainland and maritime) (10 members)	Fragmentation (mainland and maritime) (10+3+(3) members)
2. Regional Complex (social system)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Political similarity (democracy)</li> <li>- Low economic gap (before the 2007 enlargement)</li> <li>- Socio-cultural (Western World)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Political diversity ( absolute monarchy, constitutional monarchies, representative republics, socialist, and a military junta)</li> <li>- High gap of economic development</li> <li>- Socio-cultural diversity (Buddhism, Islam, Christ, etc.)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Political diversity ( absolute monarchy, constitutional monarchies, representative republics, socialist, and a military junta)</li> <li>- High gap of economic development</li> <li>- Socio-cultural diversity (Buddhism, Islam, Christ, etc.)</li> </ul>
3. Regional society (organized cooperation)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- COE, WEU, NATO, Benelux, OEEC (OECD, CSCE (OSCE) (regional cooperation in Cold War era)</li> <li>- ECSC/EEC/Euratom/EC/EU (supranationalism and intergovernmentalism since Cold War)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- SEATO, ASA, MAPHILINDO, ASPAC (regional cooperation in Cold War era)</li> <li>- ASEAN (regional cooperation since Cold War)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- EAEC (EAEG)</li> <li>- APT</li> <li>- EAS</li> <li>- EAC</li> </ul>
4. Regional community (regional civil society)	Strong civil society; parliamentary decision-making, a democratic culture, human rights inheritance	Minimal roles	Minimal roles
5. Region-state (acting subject)	Europeanization of Europe	Priority to nation-state	Priority to nation-state

<sup>3</sup> This table is based on the author’s interpretation in accordance to the concept of ‘regionness’. See Hettne and Söderbaum.

From a geographical perspective, Europe constitutes the westernmost part of the large Eurasian landmass from the Atlantic to the Urals. Since the breakdown of the Soviet Union, the European border as defined by the West has been moving eastward. As the prototype of the Westphalian state system, Europe is now showing the way beyond Westphalia. Europe represents the most advanced supranational regional arrangement. The content of 'European' can be defined by a strong role for civil society, reflected in various institutionalized forms such as parliamentary decision-making, and a democratic culture stressing above all individualism and human rights inherent in the individual human being. The end of Cold War transformed Europe from object to subject, in the sense that through increasing regionness, it became an actor in its own right. The development of a more autonomous and homogeneous Greater Europe, a process often referred to as the 'Europeanization' of Europe (See Table 4.1).<sup>4</sup>

Southeast Asia lies in the space roughly bounded in the north by China, the east by the Pacific Ocean, the southeast by Australia, the south by the Indian Ocean, and the southwest by the Bay of Bengal and India. Nesting inside the Southeast Asian geographic box are two smaller boxes: continental or mainland, and maritime or island. Each of these boxes has distinctly different ethnic and cultural foundations. Diversity rather than homogeneity is the compelling characteristic of Southeast Asia. It can be conceived of as an aggregation of overlapping geographic, ethnic, cultural, political, and economic sub-regions.<sup>5</sup> The decolonization process was a challenge to any vision of regional cooperation. However, currently a number of processes may be working in the direction of increased regional cooperation. The driving forces for regionalization are commonly found in security and economics, confined within a cultural context, and often in a complex combination. ASEAN is project well rooted

---

<sup>4</sup> Björn Hettne, "Europe: Paradigm and Paradox," in *Regionalization in a Globalizing World: A Comparative Perspective on Forms, Actors and Processes*, eds. Michael Schulz, Fredrik Söderbaum, and Joakim Öjendal (London and New York: Zed Books, 2001), pp. 22-41. See also G. Delanty, *Inventing Europe – Idea, Identity, Reality* (London: Macmillan, 1995); Tariq Madood and Pnina Werbner, eds., *The Politics of Multiculturalism in the New Europe: Racism, Identity and Community* (London: Zed Books, 1997); Robert Bartlett, *The Making of Europe: Conquest, Colonization and Cultural Change 950-1350* (London: Penguin Books, 1993).

<sup>5</sup> Donald E. Weatherbee, *International Relations in Southeast Asia: the struggle for autonomy* (Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc, 2005), pp. 1-21.

in the region, taking place on the members' conditions, and taking care of the members' problems. It no longer serves Cold War interests. Instead, it has a proven capacity to act as a political subject. However, the region is far from being a people's project. Nation-state building is still the priority in most Southeast Asian states, and to this extent, regionalization is a contradictory development in the foreseeable future (See Table 4.1).<sup>6</sup>

An overarching ambiguity characterizes East Asia. No single map of the East is as inherently self-evident and logical as to preclude the consideration of equally plausible alternatives. Different geographical configurations are used explicitly to advance specific political goals. The region has a century-long history of internal divisiveness, war, and conflict. It also remains the site of several nettlesome territorial disputes. The region, furthermore, is exceptionally diverse culturally, linguistically, and religiously. It is a pastiche of Sinic, Japanese, Islamic, Buddhist, Muslim, and Christian traditions. None provides a significantly unifying cultural-religious cohesiveness across the region. Population differences in East Asia are also dramatic. Widely varied political systems can be found throughout East Asia. The region is composed of exceptionally diverse national economies.<sup>7</sup> East Asian regionalism is far less deep, less powerful, less internally cohesive, and less formally institutionalized than its counterparts in many other parts of the world. The 1997 economic crisis revealed the feckless nature of the few regional bodies that link East Asian countries. Therefore, the APT process and later the EAS has been proposed and established. Governments in East Asia have been key agents driving certain regional integrative activities. A neglected group of actors in the emergent East Asian regionalization are

---

<sup>6</sup> Joakim Öjendal, "South East Asia at a Constant Crossroads: An Ambiguous 'New Region'," in *Regionalization in a Globalizing World: A Comparative Perspective on Forms, Actors and Processes*, eds. Michael Schulz, Fredrik Söderbaum, and Joakim Öjendal (London and New York: Zed Books, 2001), pp. 147-172. See also Amitav Acharya, "A New Regional Order in South-East Asia: ASEAN in the Post-Cold War Era," *Adelphi Paper* (August 1993); B. Buzan, "The Southeast Asian Security Complex," *Contemporary Southeast Asia* 10, no. 1 (1988): 1-16; Jonathan Rigg, *Southeast Asia-The Human Landscape of Modernization and Development* (London: Routledge, 1997); Donald Palmer, *The New Regionalism in Asia and the Pacific* (Massachusetts: Lexington, 1991); H. A. Habib, "Defining the "Asia-Pacific region," in *Indonesian Quarterly* 23 (1995): 302-312.

<sup>7</sup> Claes G. Alvstam, "East Asia: Regionalization still Waiting to happen?" in *Regionalization in a Globalizing World: A Comparative Perspective on Forms, Actors and Processes*, eds. Michael Schulz, Fredrik Söderbaum, and Joakim Öjendal (London and New York: Zed Books, 2001), pp. 173-197.

the private companies operating across borders, thus implementing regional cooperation and interdependence irrespective of political and ideological differences (See Table 4.1).<sup>8</sup>

## **2. Regionalism and Identity**

As mentioned above, regionalism involves primarily the process of institution creation. It occurs most conspicuously when nation-states come together through top-down activities. Regionalism occurs when national governments conclude that their interests are sufficiently congruent with one another before they would subordinate elements of their nominal national autonomy. In other word, they agree to be bound by a collective set of agreements that are only partly in accord with national preferences.<sup>9</sup> Regional identity<sup>10</sup> refers to political activities where actors have involved in the world affairs.

---

<sup>8</sup> T. J. Pempel, ed., "Introduction: Emerging Webs of Regional Connectedness," in *Remapping East Asia: The Construction of a Region* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 2005), pp. 1-30; Etal Solingen, "East Asian Regional Institutions: Characteristics, Sources, Distinctiveness," in *Remapping East Asia: The Construction of a Region*, ed. T. J. Pempel (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 2005), pp. 31-53; Geoffrey Mcnicoll, "Demographic Future of East Asian Regional Integration," in *Remapping East Asia: The Construction of a Region*, ed. T. J. Pempel (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 2005), pp. 54-76. See also Lee Poh Ping, "Small States in the European Community and ASEAN in Asian Regional Groupings Compared," in *The Emerging East Asian Community: Security & Economic Issues*, eds. Lee Poh Ping, Tham Siew Yean, and George T. Yu (Bangi: Penerbit Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, 2006), pp. 125-141; Peter J. Kazenstein, "Introduction: Asian regionalism in comparative perspective," in *Network Power: Japan and Asia* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1997); Peter J. Kazenstein et al., *Asian Regionalism* (Ithaca, NY: East Asian Program, Cornell University, 2000); Fu-Kuo Liu and Philippe Regnier, *Regionalism in East Asia: Paradigm shifting?* (London: RoutledgeCurzon, 2003).

<sup>9</sup> See Robert Keohane, *After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984).

<sup>10</sup> 'Regional awareness', 'regional identity', and 'regional consciousness' are inherent imprecise and fuzzy notions. Regional awareness, the shared perception of belonging to a particular community can rest on internal factors, often defined in terms of common culture, history, or religious traditions. It can also be defined against some external 'other' which may be understood primarily in terms of a security threat; or an external cultural challenge. Discussions of regional awareness lay great emphasis on language and rhetoric; on the discourse of regionalism and regional identity are constantly defined and redefined; and on the shared understandings and the meanings given to political activity by the actors involved. See Andrew Hurrell, "Regionalism in Theoretical Perspective," in *Regionalism in World Politics: Regional Organization and International Order*, eds. Louise Fawcett and Andrew Hurrell (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), pp. 37-73.

**Table 4.2 Comparative (major) Timeline of European, EC/EU, Southeast Asia and ASEAN, and East Asia/ASEAN+3/EAC<sup>11</sup>**

Year	European	EC/EU	Southeast Asia and ASEAN	East Asia/ASEAN+3/EAC
1948	- Benelux - OEEC/OECD (1961)			
1949	- NATO - COE			
1951		ECSC (6 members)		
1954	WEU		SEATO	
1958		EEC and Euratom		
1959			ASA	
1963			MAPHILINDO	
1966			ASPAC	
1967		ECSC, EEC, and Euratom → EC	ASEAN	PBEC
1968				PAFTAD
1973		1 <sup>st</sup> enlargement to 9		
1975	CSCE/OSCE (1990)			
1980				PECC
1981		2 <sup>nd</sup> enlargement to 10		
1986		3 <sup>rd</sup> enlargement to 12		
1989				-EAEG/ EAEC -APEC (including the Pacific)
1992			AFTA	
1993		- TEU - Single Market		CSCAP
1994				ARF (including the Pacific)
1995		4 <sup>th</sup> enlargement to 15		
1997		Treaty of Amsterdam		
1999				East Asia Cooperation Summit
2000				Chiang Mai Initiative
2001		Treaty of Nice		Proposed of EAC
2002		Replacement of 12 national currencies with the euro		
2003			ASEAN Community (by 2020)	
2004		-5 <sup>th</sup> enlargement to 25 -European Constitution		
2005			ASEAN Community (by 2015)	1 <sup>st</sup> East Asia Summit
2007		6 <sup>th</sup> enlargement to 27	ASEAN Charter (drafting)	2 <sup>nd</sup> East Asia Summit

<sup>11</sup> This table is based on the timeline of this paper's presentation about regional cooperation in Europe and Asia. See chapter 2 for more details.

While there may have been various regional groupings in Europe in the first few decades after the Second World War (such as Benelux, OEEC [OECD], NATO, COE), it became evident that the regional grouping that mattered was the EC which later developed from ECSC, EEC, and Euratom (See Table 4.2). The EU developed by the Maastricht Treaty comprised of three pillars. While the first pillar (the EC, Euratom, and the ECSC) is supranational activities by nature, the second and third pillars (CFSP and JHA) have decided by intergovernmental cooperation.<sup>12</sup> The EU's activities in the first pillar can possess certain formal roles in world politics. It has a common voice in international trade negotiations and has the makings of a foreign and security policy.

The situation in Southeast and East Asia is quite different. There is a plethora of regional groupings: proposed such as EAEG (EAEC); in existence such as ASEAN, ARF, APEC; or aborted such as SEATO, ASA, MAPHILINDO. Some scholars argue that ASEAN can negotiate and bargain with developing countries. ASEAN as a collective actor has managed to gain industrial nations' attention through its well-established dialogue mechanisms.<sup>13</sup>

Regional arrangements that claim or have ASEAN members such as APT, EAS, and EAC are extremely diverse in term of their memberships. They range from the narrowest based group like the APT grouping to the widest like the ARF. Given such heterogeneity, ASEAN will take East Asian regionalism less seriously than the small European states take European regionalism.<sup>14</sup>

National interest and national identity continue to be powerful forces throughout East Asia. A century of social, cultural, and political fragmentations long impeded any sense of common identity. Absent is a deeply rooted Asian identity that is lacking an agreed-upon regional project; East Asian regional linkages have remained less deeply institutionalized and more fluid than those in the EU. However,

---

<sup>12</sup> See more details in Chapter 2.

<sup>13</sup> Jörn Dosch, "Southeast Asia and the Asia-Pacific: ASEAN," in *The New Global Politics of the Asia-Pacific*, eds. Michael K. Connors, Remy Davison, and Jörn Dosch (London and NY: RoutledgeCurzon, 2004), pp. 71-87. See also N. Sophe, "ASEAN and Indo-China after a Cambodian settlement," in *Change, Interdependence and Security in the Pacific Basin. The 19<sup>th</sup> Pacific Symposium*, ed. D. Alves (Washington, DC: National Defense University Press, 1991).

<sup>14</sup> Lee Poh Ping, p. 132.



links across Asia are being forged by multiple actors and on multiple levels (such as business-led PBEC and PECC, and the second track process of CSCAP), so that the most overt and explicitly political institutions of East Asian regionalism are but a small part of the cumulative linkages that have developed across the region.<sup>15</sup> Regional identity in East Asia, therefore, is fragmented. There is only commonality among them such as the feeling of humiliation after the economic crisis.<sup>16</sup>

### **B. Regional Cooperation: The Concept of the Processes**

This section compares processes of regional cooperation in Europe and East Asia. Regional arrangements can range from a loose form of regional cooperation to regional integration. Also, the concepts of association – the loose ties between states, and community a consciousness of common interests, will be used to compare regional cooperation processes in Europe and East Asia.

#### **1. Intergovernmental Cooperation and Integration**

According to Thomas Christiansen, regional integration in Europe has supranational institutions that initiate and enforce common policies. Most decision-making uses qualified majority voting which binds member states to implement such decisions (even some still use consensus). The level of integration encompasses not only political union among states, but also economic, social and political rights for citizens. Competences of issues range from politics to single currency and environments, etc. It tends to be multidimensional rather than for specific purpose. As

---

<sup>15</sup> T. J. Pempel, ed., “Conclusion: Tentativeness and Tensions in the Construction of an Asian Region,” in *Remapping East Asia: The Construction of a Region* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 2005), pp. 256-275; Paul Evans, “Between Regionalism and Regionalization: Policy Networks and the Nascent East Asian Institutional Identity,” in *Remapping East Asia: The Construction of a Region*, ed. T. J. Pempel (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 2005), pp. 195-215. See also Fu-Kuo Liu, “East Asian regionalism and the evolution of a fragmented region: A conceptual approach towards the political sector of security,” in *Regionalism in East Asia: Paradigm shifting?* eds. Fu-Kuo Liu and Philippe Regnier (London: RoutledgeCurzon, 2003), pp. 71-84.

<sup>16</sup> See Tsutomu Kukuchi, “East Asian Regionalism: A Look at the ‘ASEAN plus Three’ Framework,” *Japan Review of International Affairs* (Spring 2002): 1-23.

integration means forming parts into a whole, they can collaborate (not integrate) in a common foreign, security, and defense policy, even though there is no supranational policy upon this issue (See Table 4.3).<sup>17</sup>

In East Asia, regional cooperation is in the form of intergovernmental cooperation only. Many of these characteristics are frequently traced to informality, incrementalism, consensus-oriented, building on personal and political relations, saving face, avoiding arbitration mechanism in dispute resolution, and emphasizing process over substance.<sup>18</sup> Most East Asian countries prefer informal dialogues with regional issues collectively. Under the context of East Asian regionalism, regional cooperation has taken informal approaches to begin the process, which would leave some flexibility for policy coordination among them. ASEAN developed several informal mechanisms known as the “ASEAN way,” emphasizing consultation, accommodation, reciprocity, and informal diplomacy.<sup>19</sup>

East Asian institutions are also consensus oriented. All existing regional arrangements in the region seem to be in accord with the ASEAN experiment of regional cooperation with special regard to their decision-making process, and the consultative nature of their decisions. The concrete features of ASEAN regionalism are implanted in the general framework of East Asian regional cooperation. No formal decision-making institutions have been established, and no majority voting has been added to the decision-making process of regional mechanisms. Much of the existing regional cooperation relies on the pattern of dialogue structure, especially in the security field. There is no political will to integrate into regional cooperation.

---

<sup>17</sup> Thomas Christiansen, “European integration and regional cooperation,” in *The Globalization of World Politics: An introduction to international relations*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. eds. John Baylis and Steve Smith (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), p.593. See also H. Wallace and W. Wallace, eds., *Policy-Making in the European Union* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000); T. Christiansen, K. E. Jørgensen, and A. Wiener, *The Social Construction of Europe* (London: Sage, 2001); S. Hix, *The Political System of the European Union* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1999); and B. Laffan, R. O'Donnell, and M. Smith, *Europe's Experimental Union* (London: Routledge, 1999).

<sup>18</sup> Solingen, pp. 31-53. See also Amitav Acharya, “Culture, Security, Multilateralism: The ‘ASEAN Way’ and Regional Order,” in *Culture and Security: Multilateralism, Arms Control, and Security Building*, ed. Keith R. Krause (London: Routledge, 1999), pp. 55-84; Michael Leifer, *ASEAN and the Security of South-East Asia* (London: Routledge, 1989); Andrew Mack and John Ravenhill, eds., *Pacific Cooperation: Building Economic and Security Regimes in the Asia-Pacific Region* (Boulder, CO: Westview, 1995).

<sup>19</sup> Solingen, pp. 31-53.

Therefore, East Asian cooperation concentrates in economic issues such as the establishment of AFTA, the idea of EAFTA.<sup>20</sup>

Incrementalism tends to develop a remarkable process of regional cooperation along with official channels, and has even survived in the region for several decades. Because the region is so diverse in so many ways, any proposal by a particular country to promote sudden changes to new structures will be considered unsuitable, unacceptable, and in danger of threatening another's national interest. Due to the tight preservation of sovereignty, coordination of external relations is limited to participation in multilateral trade negotiations.<sup>21</sup>

**Table 4.3 Differences between regional integration in Europe and regional cooperation in other continents<sup>22</sup>**

<b>Parameters</b>	<b>European integration</b>	<b>Regional cooperation</b>
<b>Institutional characteristics</b>	Presence of autonomous supranational institutions that initiate and enforce common policies	Reliance on purely intergovernmental forms of decision making
<b>Forms of decision making</b>	Extensive use of qualified majority voting (i.e. states have no veto over decisions)	Consensual decision making (i.e. states have veto over decisions)
<b>Degree of legal integration</b>	Permanent court system developing a supranational legal order	Arbitration and dispute settlement of individual cases
<b>Extent of political integration</b>	Development of a political union with a system of economic, social, and political rights for citizens	Concentration on economic cooperation among states
<b>Range of issues covered</b>	Expansion of competences into much wider areas (single currency, environments, culture, etc.)	Emphasis on trade, investment, and related economic issues
<b>Presence of democratic procedures</b>	Establishment of a democratic process, based on a directly elected parliament	Minimal, if any, involvement of parliaments
<b>Foreign policy cooperation</b>	Development of a common foreign, security, and defense policy	Coordination of external relations limited to participation in multilateral trade negotiations

<sup>20</sup> Solingen, pp. 31-53.

<sup>21</sup> Ibid.

<sup>22</sup> Christiansen, p. 593.

## **2. Association and Community**

Association is generally the formation of a society, and is often used to distinguish between loose ties between states. On the other hand, community is a social group having a sense of common identity, self-awareness, and shared interests. Generally, members of a community reside in a specific geographical area, utilizing common institutional machinery and conduct a volume of social transactions large enough to create a consciousness of common interests.

Despite obvious national differences, European states are homogeneous in many respects. Most of them have Caucasian and Christian roots. They are industrialized nations that put human rights above individual as the fundamental value. Political regime largely accepts democracy. Economic disparity among European countries is much lower than many other regions in the world. There are many co-operations between states in loose structures. They act together for mutual benefit in certain fields such as political and security in WEU and NATO; economic cooperation in OSCE and OECD; stability concerns in COE. For deeper integration, the community of Europe has been represented by the EU. Member states share common identity and strong consciousness of common interests enough to share national sovereignty with supranational institutions. There is a high degree of institutionalization such as the ECSC, Euratom, EEC, and EU. In this sense, the EU represents the community of the Europe (See Table 4.4).<sup>23</sup>

---

<sup>23</sup> Dosch, pp. 71-87.

**Table 4.4 Europe, Southeast Asian, and East Asian Regional Cooperation:  
Possible Lessons Learned Between Association and Community<sup>24</sup>**

Names of Organizations Forms of International Institutions	European Cooperation [European Union (EU) and others] (1952)	Southeast Asia [ASEAN] (1967)	East Asian Community (EAC) (2005)
“Association” (of common interests)	<p><u>Common Denominators (Push Factors)</u></p> <p>1.Religion: Christianity 2.Ethnicity: Caucasians 3.Economic liberalism 4.Democracy 5.Human rights 6.Political regime 7.Security (Cold War period)</p> <p>Examples:</p> <p>1. Council of Europe(<b>Organization</b>)</p> <p>2. WEU (<b>Organization</b>)</p> <p>3. NATO (<b>Organization</b>)</p> <p>4. CSCE (OSCE) (<b>Organization</b>)</p> <p>5. Benelux (<b>Organization</b>)</p> <p>6. OEEC (OECD) (<b>Organization</b>)</p>	<p><u>Common Denominators (Push / Pull factors)</u></p> <p>1.Common colonial experiences (Western domination) 2.Security (Cold War period) 3.Economic cooperation 4.Developing countries (economic and politics) 5.Extra-regional threats 6.Global threats: non-traditional issues (terrorism, Radical Islam, epidemics, natural disaster, etc.)</p> <p>Examples:</p> <p>1. ASEAN (<b>Organization</b>)</p> <p>2. EAEC (<b>Idea</b>)</p> <p>3. ARF (<b>Forum</b>)</p> <p>4. ASEAN+3 (<b>Dialogue</b>)</p>	<p><u>Common Denominators (Push / Pull factors)</u></p> <p><u>Economic factors</u>: 1.Free Trade Area (FTA) 2.1997 Asian Economic Crisis</p> <p><u>Security factors</u>: 1.Traditional security issues (different perception on threats) 2.New security issues (energy security, terrorism, epidemics, natural disaster, transnational crimes, etc.)</p> <p><u>Political factors</u>: 1.Conformity to UN Charter and international obligation</p> <p>Examples:</p> <p>1. East Asian Economic Community (<b>Idea</b>)</p> <p>2. East Asian Political Community (<b>Idea</b>)</p> <p>3. East Asian Socio-Cultural Community (<b>Idea</b>)</p>

<sup>24</sup> This table is based on the author’s interpretation in accordance to the concept of ‘association and community’. See Kajit Jittasevi, องค์การระหว่างประเทศ (International Organizations), Faculty of Political Science, Thammasat University, Textbook Project, forthcoming.

**Table 4.4 Europe, Southeast Asian, and East Asian Regional Cooperation:  
Possible Lessons Learned Between Association and Community<sup>25</sup>**

Names of Organizations Forms of International Institutions	European Cooperation [European Union (EU) and others] (1952)	Southeast Asia ASEAN (1967)	East Asian Community (EAC) (2005)
<b>“Community” (integrated)</b>	<u>Common Denominators (Push Factors)</u> 1.Religion: Christianity 2.Etnicity: Caucasians 3.Economic liberalism 4.Democracy 5.Human rights 6.Political regime 7.Security (Cold War Period) 8.New security (Post) Examples: 1. ECSC-Euratom-EEC <b>(Organization)</b> 2. EC <b>(Organization)</b> 3. EU <b>(Organization)</b>	<u>Common Denominators (Push / Pull factors)</u> 1.Common colonial experiences (Western domination) 2.Security (Cold War Period) 3.Economic cooperation 4.Developing countries (economic and politics) 5.Extra-regional threats 6.Global threats: non-traditional issues (terrorism, Radical Islam, epidemics, natural disaster, etc.) Examples: 1. ASEAN Political Community <b>(Plan)</b> 2. ASEAN Economic Community <b>(Plan)</b> 3. ASEAN Social and Cultural Community <b>(Plan)</b>	<u>Common Denominators (Push / Pull factors)</u> 1.Common colonial experiences (Western domination) 2.Security (Cold War period) 3.Developing countries (economic and politics) 4.Extra-regional threats 5.Global threats: non-traditional issues (terrorism, Radical Islam, Epidemics, natural disaster, transnational crimes, etc.) Examples: 1. East Asian Economic Community <b>(Idea)</b> 2. East Asian Political Community <b>(Idea)</b> 3. East Asian Socio-Cultural Community <b>(Idea)</b>

<sup>25</sup> This table is based on the author’s interpretation in accordance to the concept of ‘association and community’. See Jittasevi.

Southeast Asia has common legacy of Western colonization. The awareness of a Southeast Asian region at the early point was primarily a product of its geo-strategic position in the Cold War. Later on, it re-focuses to national sovereignty. There are differences in political system, economic disparity, and socio-cultural heritage. However, global threats such as terrorism, natural disaster, and epidemics can bind Southeast Asian countries together. ASEAN is the only loose organization in the region. Others are forums which provide places for member states to share dialogues. Since the 2003 Bali Concord II, there is a goal to create ASEAN Community by the year 2020. However, it is still a plan. Consciousness of common interests among members is weak and specific to national interests. Therefore, Southeast Asia and ASEAN can be counted only as an association of common interests (See Table 4.4).<sup>26</sup>

The EAC has been proposed to establish community among East Asian countries. However, they share fewer common denominators to move towards a community in the foreseeable future. At this stage, it is the only forum created through APT and EAS and the idea of formation of East Asian Economic, Political, and Socio-cultural Communities. Nevertheless, significant economic events such as 1997 financial crisis, along with the new security threats such as energy security, terrorism, epidemics, and natural disaster stimulate East Asian countries to recognize the necessity of regional cooperation (See Table 4.4).<sup>27</sup>

---

<sup>26</sup> See more details in E.D. Solidum, *Towards a Southeast Asia Community* (Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press, 1974); J. Haacke, *ASEAN's Diplomatic and Security Culture. Origins, Development and Prospects* (London: RoutledgeCurzon, 2003); and C. L. Gates and M. Than, eds., *ASEAN Enlargement: Impacts and Implications* (Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, 2001), pp. 45-79.

<sup>27</sup> See more details in J. Ravenhill, "A three bloc world? The new East Asian regionalism," *International Relations of the Asia-Pacific* 2 (2002): 167-195; D. McDougall, "Asia-Pacific security regionalism: the impact of post-1997 developments," *Contemporary Security Policy* 23 (2002): 113-134; and Chung-si Ahn, "Forces of nationalism and economics in Asian regional cooperation," *Asia Pacific Community* 7 (1980): 106-118.

### **C. Regional Cooperation: The Concept of the Institutions**

This section tries to compare regional cooperation by using the concept of international organization. According to David Armstrong et al, intergovernmental organizations (IGOs) are organizational structures set up by any number of sovereign states to deal with any kind of issues.<sup>28</sup> The three categories which organizations are divided into are parties, purpose, and powers.

**Table 4.5 Comparative types of IGOs in Europe and East Asia<sup>29</sup>**

Organizations Classified by	Europe		East Asia	
	Intergovernmental cooperation (COE)	Integration (EU)	Intergovernmental cooperation (ASEAN)	Intergovernmental cooperation (EAC)
1. Parties	Multilateral and regional (46 members)	Multilateral and regional (27 members)	Multilateral and regional (10 members)	Multilateral and regional (10 + 3 + (3)) members)
2. Purpose	Multipurpose, promotional, and consultative	Multipurpose, promotional, regulatory, and consultative	Multipurpose, promotional, and consultative	Multipurpose, promotional, and consultative
3. Powers	Debating	Supranational	Debating and decentralized	Debating

#### **1. Parties**

Classified by parties, there are five categories: universal, global, regional, multilateral, and bilateral. Universal refers to an organization whose membership includes all sovereign states. Global refers to worldwide membership; regional organization refers to organizations whose membership is based on geographical propinquity. Bilateral covers only two members whereas multilateral organization is those whose members are more than two.<sup>30</sup>

<sup>28</sup> David Armstrong, Lorna Lloyd, and John Redmond, *International Organization in World Politics*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004), particularly Table 1.1 Types of international organizations, pp. 8-9.

<sup>29</sup> This table is based on the author's interpretation in accordance to Armstrong et al. classification. See Armstrong et al., pp. 8-9.

<sup>30</sup> Ibid.



European cooperation pertaining to COE can be classified as a multilateral and a regional organization. The COE enjoyed a surprising resurgence after the end of the Cold War, when its membership grew to include almost every European country. At present, it comprises forty-six democratic countries of Europe. The EU is also a multilateral and a regional organization. The EU began with only six states, but now it has twenty-seven members. Clearly, European integration began with six states that are geographically close to one another and has gradually expanded outward. The EU includes much deeper integration but narrower scope of member states (See Table 4.5).<sup>31</sup>

East Asian intergovernmental cooperation can be categorized to a multilateral and a regional organization. For ASEAN, it began with five members, but has proceeded much more slowly in reaching its present membership of ten Southeast Asian nations. For EAC, there are two important processes towards establishing the APT and the EAS. The APT formulation includes ten ASEAN countries and three Northeast Asian countries, namely China, Japan, and South Korea (See figure 2.10 Map of East Asia in chapter 2). These countries are geographically proximate. It is the core of East Asian region. The EAS, on the contrary, also includes Australia, New Zealand and India. Russia also expressed a desire to be treated as parts of East Asia, which is far beyond East Asian geographical proximity.<sup>32</sup>

## **2. Purposes**

In classifying by purpose, IGOs can be divided into six categories: multipurpose (or general), specific, promotional, allocative, regulatory, and consultative. Multipurpose engages in a range of activities, whereas specific devotes to a particular activity. Promotional dedicates to promoting certain goals. Allocative refers to an organization that distributes certain goods. Regulatory organization regulates the operation of certain inter-state activities. Consultative refers to an

---

<sup>31</sup> Paul F. Diehl, "Can East Asia be Like Europe? Exploring Selected Conditions for Regional Integration," in *The Emerging East Asian Community: Security & Economic Issues*, eds. Lee Poh Ping, Tham Siew Yean, and George T. Yu (Bangi: Penerbit Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, 2006), pp.33-57. See also Ernst Haas, *The Uniting of Europe* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1958).

<sup>32</sup> Diehl. See also Pemple, p. 24-28.

organization that discusses issues that bind the members in their extra-organizational behavior.<sup>33</sup>

European cooperation in COE can be categorized as multipurpose (or general) organization, which is stated in the Article 1, Chapter 1 of the Statute of the COE. It can also dedicate to promotional organization as it emphasizes on the common concern of economic and social progress, particularly human rights and fundamental freedoms. As stated in the Statute, COE pursues through the Council which consists of a committee of representatives of governments and the Consultative Assembly. It can also be categorized as a consultative organization as well.<sup>34</sup> For the EU, it is a multipurpose organization since it is a multidimensional organization that concerns political, economic, and socio-cultural aspects. It is also a promotional organization as indicated in the Treaty of European Union to promote economic and social progress parallel with other fields such as environmental protection.<sup>35</sup> The EU is also a regulatory organization because it encompasses the EP, the Commission, the Council of the European Union, and ECJ. Those can regulate the EU's operations.<sup>36</sup> Moreover, EU also uses international conferences as one of its methods.

For ASEAN, it is a multipurpose organization as stated in the ASEAN Declaration.<sup>37</sup> It is also a promotional organization as stated in the Bangkok declaration that establishes regional cooperation in South-East Asia in the spirit of equality and partnership in order to contribute towards peace, progress and prosperity in the region.<sup>38</sup> ASEAN is based upon the consultative model than a regulatory one. As mentioned in TAC and Bali Concord II, ASEAN reaffirms the principle of non-interference and consensus, which enables it to be an advice-giving association for member states.<sup>39</sup>

Speaking of East Asian intergovernmental cooperation, it is the consultative and cooperative process as stated in the Joint Statement on East Asia Cooperation. It

---

<sup>33</sup> Armstrong et al.

<sup>34</sup> See chapter 2.

<sup>35</sup> See chapter 2 and Appendix V for more details.

<sup>36</sup> See chapter 3.

<sup>37</sup> See Appendix XI (ASEAN Declaration).

<sup>38</sup> Ibid.

<sup>39</sup> See Appendix XIII (Treaty of Amity and Cooperation in Southeast Asia) and Appendix XXIII (Declaration of ASEAN Concord II).

agrees to promote dialogue and to deepen and consolidate collective efforts with a view to advancing mutual understanding and trust in East Asia and the world.<sup>40</sup> In the Kuala Lumpur Declaration on the East Asia Summit, it emphasizes the principles of partnership, consultation and consensus.<sup>41</sup> Moreover, there is a goal to promote a regional financing arrangement through the Chiang Mai Initiative in order to strengthen financial stability in the East Asian region.<sup>42</sup> Furthermore, EAS agreed on the Declaration on Avian Influenza Prevention, Control and Response recognizes the active cooperation and various initiatives to prevent and control avian influenza.<sup>43</sup> Energy security is also the collaborative goal among East Asian countries.<sup>44</sup>

### **3. Powers**

Classified by powers, IGOs can be divided into four types: debating, decentralized, deciding, and supranational. In debating organization, the membership does not accept legal obligations so far as extra-organizational behavior is concerned. For decentralized organization, membership involves accepting certain legal obligations regarding extra-organizational behavior, but it depends on individual members to decide when circumstances activate such obligations. While deciding organization places legal obligation on members regarding extra-organizational behavior, supranational organization has legal power to place legal obligations directly upon natural and legal persons within member states.<sup>45</sup>

European intergovernmental cooperation of COE is only a debating organization. There is no binding power towards member states. The Council comprises of representative of governments and the Consultative Assembly, which is the forum for discussions. On the contrary, the EU has supranational institutions that

---

<sup>40</sup> See Appendix XXX (Joint Statement on East Asia Cooperation).

<sup>41</sup> See Appendix XXXV (Kuala Lumpur Declaration on the East Asia Summit).

<sup>42</sup> See Appendix XXXI (The Joint Ministerial Statement of the ASEAN+3 Finance Ministers Meeting).

<sup>43</sup> See Appendix XXXVI (East Asia Summit Declaration on Avian Influenza Prevention, Control and Response).

<sup>44</sup> See Appendix XXXVII (Cebu Declaration on East Asian Energy Security).

<sup>45</sup> Armstrong et al.

can implement common policies, with the exception of foreign and defense policies, as well as justice and home affairs.<sup>46</sup>

For ASEAN, some scholars argue that it is restricted to the principle of non-interference and the necessity of reaching consensus on every single issue, no matter how marginal it may be.<sup>47</sup> Member states can preserve their authority in every matter by claiming the principle of non-interference. It therefore is only a debating organization with no commitment to central obligations. However, in some cases, member states may accept some legal obligations which do not dilute national interests.

The concept of EAC has been established under two processes: APT and EAS. Both of them can be classified as a forum for discussion. They are only debating forums where member states agree to promote dialogue and strengthen cooperation in priority areas of shared interest and concern.<sup>48</sup> As mentioned above, there are many specific areas such as finance, epidemic, security, etc. There is no structural framework for community building in East Asia. Only a meeting of the heads of government (formally once a year) has been established.

\*\*\*\*\*

From these three areas of the region, the processes, and the institutions, East Asia is more fragmented than Europe. Despite obvious national differences, Europe, particularly the EU, is homogeneous in many respects. There are similarities in political systems, common cultural traditions, and shared historic experiences. They are mostly industrialized nations. East Asia, on the contrary, are mostly young nation states in different stages of nation building. They are very heterogeneous. They are divergent in economic development, political systems, ethnicities, and religions. Therefore, unlike the EU where foreign policy cooperation has developed, there is no common identity in East Asia.

---

<sup>46</sup> See chapter 2 and 3. See also Dosch.

<sup>47</sup> See Dosch.

<sup>48</sup> See Appendix XXX (Joint Statement on East Asia Cooperation).

While European cooperation can divide into two important scopes – cooperation and integration, East Asian cooperation is available only in terms of regional cooperation such as ASEAN, APT, EAS, etc. European integration has supranational institutions (i.e. the EU) that initiate and enforce common policies. Decision-making mainly uses qualified majority votes. It is the community of Europe. It shares many common denominators that enable them to have strong consciousness of common interests to transfer national sovereignty to supranational institutions. In contrast, East Asian cooperation relies on purely intergovernmental forms. Consensus for example in ASEAN's decision-making which states can veto over decision prevails in every issue. Only loose organizations and forums for discussion are present in this region. It is only an association which member states can share some of common interests.

In terms of institutions, the same characteristic of European cooperation and integration and East Asian cooperation is that they are multilateral organizations based on regional propinquity. They are also multipurpose organizations whose objectives are multidimensional including politics, economics, and socio-cultural aspects. However, the EU can play more regulative role upon member states. It is a supranational organization which legal obligations commit member states. On the contrary, others such as COE, ASEAN, and EAC can only be consultative arrangements which organizations can only play debating forums for countries.