

The Asia-Europe Meeting: The Catalyst of Formulating the East Asian Community

RENNE A. KAWILARANG
Journalist

Abstrak

Sejak dibentuk pada 1996, forum Asia-Europe Meeting (ASEM) telah sukses menjembatani hubungan antara negara-negara anggota Uni Eropa dengan Asia Timur. Kendati demikian, tulisan ini menunjukkan bahwa peran ASEM tidak sekadar sebagai forum dialog antarkawasan. Forum ini secara potensial membawa dampak-dampak yang positif bagi negara-negara partisipan dari Asia Timur untuk membentuk suatu kelompok kawasan baru, yaitu Masyarakat Asia Timur (East Asian Community). Sebenarnya sudah ada ambisi yang luar biasa di Asia Timur untuk membentuk kelompok masyarakat tersebut. Namun belum ada suatu rancangan yang kuat untuk membangunnya oleh karena masih adanya perbedaan diantara negara-negara di kawasan tersebut. Oleh karena itu, ASEM dapat membawa dukungan yang berarti dalam merumuskan pembentukan East Asian Community melalui tiga pendekatan. Yaitu mengintensifkan dialog antarkawasan antara Uni Eropa dan Asia Timur dalam proses ASEM, mendukung Kemitraan Uni Eropa - ASEAN dan ASEAN+3 dan melibatkan partisipasi aktor-aktor non-negara.

Keywords: inter-regionalism, ASEM, East Asian Community, ASEAN+3

Introduction

The Asia-Europe Meeting (ASEM) is known as a dialogue forum between the members of European Union and the countries in East Asia region, comprising ten members of ASEAN plus China, Japan, and South Korea. Having been established ten years ago, ASEM remains to be regarded as

an inter-regional forum of mutual understanding and confidence building between the two different regions. It could be understood if there is a skeptical view that over the last ten years since its inception ASEM is difficult to upgrade as an institutionalized and legal-binding forum. The study conducted by the University of

Helsinki, for example, found that ASEM aimed to be "an informal, non-binding dialogue forum based on equality and consensus" and as a result it has neither been able to take the rationalizing role pertaining to key processes dealt with by the UN nor by organizations in the field of economy and trade such as the WTO or OECD."¹

Despite its status as a mere informal inter-regional dialogue, this paper however argues that ASEM could inspire East Asian countries to formulate the establishment of a new and broader cooperation in the region: the East Asian Community (EAC). That argumentation is based on the fact that there has been a tremendous enthusiasm from scholars to politicians to head of states in East Asian countries to establish a more integrated and comprehensive and, ultimately, an institutionalized cooperation in the region that can be implemented by establishing the EAC.² The creation of ASEAN+3, for example, expressed greater resolve and confidence in further strengthening and deepening East Asia cooperation at various levels and in various areas, particularly in economic and social, political, and other fields. Since then the leaders of ASEAN+3 always give attention to

the efforts of formulating regional cooperation in East Asia. According to the Kuala Lumpur Declaration on the ASEAN+3 Summit in 1998, the head of government of East Asian countries reiterated their common resolve to realise East Asian community as a long-term goal that would contribute to the maintenance of regional and global peace and security.³ In addition, a number of key documents have been adopted to set the direction for ASEAN+3. These include the Report of the East Asia Vision Group (EAVG) of 2001 and the Report of the East Asia Study Group (EASG) of 2002.

Nevertheless, the establishment of East Asian Community remains to be a mere concept. A Singaporean scholar, Yeo Lay Hwee, for example, notified that until now there is still no blueprint for East Asia to deepen cooperation and integrate further into a strong East Asia Community. It because there are still a number of competing views between the East Asian countries about the ultimate goal of the cooperation and the nature and model of the community.⁴ Yeo therefore presented several examples to illustrate the different perceptions in the region regarding the formulation of East Asian Community. In terms of membership, for example, Japan's view of an East Asian

¹ University of Helsinki Network for European Studies 2006, p.8

² See Kondo (2005), pp. 36-39; Ong (2004), website

³ ASEAN (1998), website

⁴ Yeo (2005), website

community would like to include Australia and New Zealand, but this not the case for countries like Malaysia and China. In addition, there is continued reluctance of several Southeast Asians —such as Vietnam and Indonesia— to fold them into a larger East Asia where they might be overshadowed by China and Japan.⁵

Such differences illustrate the difficulty of East Asian countries to formulate the platform of East Asian Community. This difficulty is possibly caused by the fact that, unlike its European counterparts, East Asia is a complex group of economies and regimes, without the common legal system and standards. Bernhard Zepter —the ambassador of the European Union to Japan— once said that, on the other hand, the European unification process is closely linked to the history, the geography and the cultural foundation of the European continent so —unlike the Asian community in ASEM - the EU is able to form more or less unitary “region” in the ASEM process with clearly coordinated goals and interests.⁶

This is a challenging task for East Asian countries because they are still seeking a model for community building.⁷ However European Union is also keen to support and to facilitate the more integrated cooperation in

East Asia region through interregional collaboration within the overall framework of ASEM process.⁸ Such a regional cooperation could be materialized by acquiring some important lessons from the European integration process that has been successfully established the European Union.⁹ Therefore some elements of the European integration — which has been widely know as the most successful regional integration in the world — could be transferred to East Asia region through the cooperation in ASEM as the only high-level forum that bridging the European and East Asian countries inter-regional relationship. In other words, ASEM could be a mediating structure not only connecting the two regions with each other, but also providing a link between both regions and the organizing principles and goals of the wider global system.¹⁰ The study conducted by the University of Helsinki identified that ASEM has even stimulated a process of policy-coordination among its Asian partners that could be applied to identity-building, where the EU’s model — offered through ASEM — has nourished the construction of common Asian values and interests.¹¹ In fact,

⁵ Ibid

⁶ Zepter (2006), website

⁷ Yeo (2005) website

⁸ Bersick (2006), p.3

⁹ Zepter (2006), website

¹⁰ University of Helsinki Network for European Studies 2006, p.9

¹¹ Ibid, p.11

Julie Gilson argued that "ASEM has helped to construct the notion of an East Asian region through a series of coordinating mechanism and the fact that the East Asian countries are dealing with a much more defined regional entity like EU."¹²

The role of ASEM in inspiring the formulation of the East Asian Community would therefore be explored based on two critical questions. On what basis that ASEM could give significant role for its Asian participants to establish the EAC? The answer of that question is related to the enthusiasm of East Asian countries to create the EAC as their long-term objective as well as the historical background that initiated those countries for establishing such a community. It also explores the contribution of the European Union in championing the creation of ASEM as the only inter-regional dialogue that bridging the European and the East Asian bloc of states with the absence of the United States. Another important question is how to utilize ASEM as an instrument of transforming some substantial elements of the European integration process to its East Asian counterparts in formulating the EAC? That is a main challenging question because ASEM consists of two different regional groups with different characteristics.

Comparing Regionalism in Europe and East Asia

Accordingly, it is important to initially present the theoretical perspective on regionalism and inter-regionalism before exploring the role of ASEM in inspiring the formulation of EAC. The essence of regionalism is that every nation-state collaborates with each other at the regional scale in order to generate relationships with other countries as well as maximizing the interests and the welfare of their people.¹³ According to Yeo, regionalism is not only a geographical concept but also a dynamic process encompassing a concentration of economic, political, and socio-cultural linkages.¹⁴ This sort of collaboration is in line with the perspective of neo-institutionalism that cooperation among states in order to achieve common interests is more effective and less costly rather than conducting unilateral actions.¹⁵

The increased cooperation between states may therefore result the increasing of interdependence. The perspective of neo-liberal institutionalism therefore assumes that the increasing economic interdependence supported by the advance of modern communications made many countries become more cooperative with each other for mutual benefits through the establishment of regional colla-

¹² Gilson (2002), p.7

¹³ Dicken, 2003, p. 145

¹⁴ Yeo (2005), website

¹⁵ Ravenhill, 1998, p. 253

borations. The increasing of interdependence might results a sense of solidarity in which nation-states could be encouraged 'to concern on partners' welfare that goes beyond narrow conceptions of domestic self-interests'¹⁶. Thus regionalism could preserve the interests of participant countries—especially for small and medium economies—from the instability of global economy and a supporting foundation to be more competitive within their own region.¹⁷ When participant nation-states collaborate to produce more than *ad hoc* arrangements, regionalism is then associated with the concept of international regimes as 'the principles, norms, rules, and decision-making procedures around which actor expectations converge in a given-issue area.'¹⁸ According to Yeo, regionalism today is emerging as a potent force in the globalisation process – as one important component of globalisation. It is not only a chapter of globalisation, but can also be seen as a response or challenge to globalisation.¹⁹

Nevertheless, the characteristic of European regional integration is different with the regionalism in East Asia. Regionalism in Europe is much institutionalised and emphasizing a

gradual and steady institutional designing and building.²⁰ Over more than fifty years, the European regional integration process has developed from European Coal and Steel Union, to European Common market, European Economic Community, and European Community and finally European Union. Zepter pointed out that the regionalism in Europe is basically built on three pillars:

1. Integrated policies (community policies), which represent areas where national sovereignty has been shifted towards common EU institution (first pillar);
2. The common foreign and security. This is intergovernmental, but with highly elaborate rules aimed at establishing common ground through close cooperation (second pillar);
3. Police and judicial cooperation. This is partly integrated (wherever the functioning of the internal market is concerned) and partly intergovernmental in nature (third pillar).²¹

Those three pillars give significant contribution for designing regionalism in Europe. The Secretary-General of ASEAN, Ong Keng Yong, noted that the manifestation of this sort of regionalism is that all European countries have been gradually absorbed into a united and highly

¹⁶ Ravenhill, 2001: 13

¹⁷ Brook, 1998: 231

¹⁸ Ravenhill, 1998: 251

¹⁹ Yeo (2005), website

²⁰ Ong, (2004), website

²⁰ Ong, (2004), website

²¹ Zepter (2006), website.

integrated "Grand Europe" – by a single market, a single currency, as well as a single political system.²² The key factor of regionalism in Europe, according to Zepter, is the readiness of EU member states to transfer part of their national sovereignty to a supra-national authority entitled to act on their behalf. Furthermore the member states of EU agree on a structure to manage their collective problems – such as national security, market economy, or the protection of the environment – in common.²³

On the other hand, in East Asia there was almost no institutionalisation in the region before the establishment of regional dialogue in ASEAN+3 in the late 1990s.²⁴ The states in the region lack a record of regional consciousness whereas the relationship between countries in the region is mostly based on market-driven integration instead of institutional integration.²⁵ In other words the inter-state cooperation in the region is based on informal regional networking rather than institutional building.²⁶ According to Yeo the lack of regional consciousness is caused by the following interlocking factors: the diversity of the

region; the different historical backgrounds; the existence of strong extra-regional ties; the different threat perceptions; and political fragility and transition.²⁷ In the post Cold War era the intra-regional relationship in East Asia was marred of hostilities and suspicious acts between some countries. For example, suspicion towards Japan because of its part militarism and its continued distortion of war history; confrontations between South and North Korea leading to violent crashes; regional rivalry on economy and security; the lack of effective leadership for regional cooperation and the lack of the leadership by the USA and Japan in the field of economics.²⁸ Those sorts of conflict overwhelmed the cooperation and constructive relationship – as generated by Southeast Asian countries in ASEAN – in the region.

The implementation regionalism in East Asia was introduced by ASEAN. Established in 1967, the cooperation of ASEAN – which now comprises ten nations in Southeast Asia – is premised on political commitments and formed a mechanism of cooperation that is different from European Union. It is called 'the ASEAN way'. It subscribes to the fundamental principles of non-interference and respect for

²² Op cit

²³ Zepter (2006), website

²⁴ Buzan (1998), p.82

²⁵ Drysdale et al (1998), p.105

²⁶ Liu (2003), p. 221

²⁷ Yeo (2005), website

²⁸ Letta (2002), p.68

sovereignty and territorial integrity of member countries, with consensus building playing an important part.²⁹ By "ASEAN way," ASEAN could easily make new relations and expand their external cooperation either with another bloc or with countries from different region, including countries in Northeast Asia. However until the mid 1990s, institutionalized-regional cooperation developed by ASEAN was only limited in Southeast Asia without engaging countries in outer side of the region.

However, the financial crisis in East Asia in 1997-1998 played a significant contribution for East Asians to develop a new way of thinking of regionalism. The crisis was a turning point for East Asian countries to think about a regional cooperation by establishing ASEAN+3 in 1998. Since then it facilitates frequent meetings between Southeast Asian countries and Northeast Asian countries in order to develop a new and broader cooperation and finding ways to avoid the repeat of the financial crisis. Given the complexity of economic, political, and socio-cultural condition in East Asia this sort of regional cooperation is different with that in Europe because it is based on the concept of open regionalism.³⁰ According to Bergsten, one of the elements of this

concept is open membership in a regional arrangement whereas any country that indicates a credible willingness to accept the rules of the institution would be invited to join. This approach would convert a "regional" arrangement into something much broader and thereby at some point give up its regional character — which is often viewed as having merits of its own, political as well as economic.³¹

Inter-regionalism in Europe and East Asia

Despite the different pattern of regionalism in Europe and East Asia, the establishment of ASEM demonstrates that those two regional blocs could make collaboration. This could be explained by the conception of inter-regionalism. Inter-regionalism sets one region in a dialogue based on equal partnership with an 'other'.³² It means that none of one side, either European or East Asian countries, dominates that sort of cooperation. In fact, one of the characteristics of ASEM is emphasis on equal partnership, eschewing any "aid-based" relationship in favour of a more general process of dialogue and cooperation.³³

²⁹ Ong (2004), website

³⁰ Zepter (2006), website

³¹ Bergsten (1997), website

³² Gilson (2002), p.3

³³ European Commission (2006), website

According to Chen Zhimin, there are three types of inter-regionalism. The first one is inter-group relation that is formed between regional groups, such as EU-ASEAN dialogue. The second one is bi-regional relation that is established if multiple countries in each of the two distinct regions set up cooperation. Chen put ASEM into that category because Europe and East Asia are two distinct regions, and ASEM is an inter-regional dialogue mechanism, yet to develop a sense of common trans-regionalism, which is the third pattern of inter-regionalism.³⁴ It means that ASEM is different with APEC (Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation) that is perceived by Gilson as an example of trans-regionalism, which is a structural attempt to combine a range of states within a coherent unified framework.³⁵ In other words, as reiterated by Chen, ASEM is a bi-regional or inter-regional process, a dialogue mechanism between Europe and East Asia, with the aim to strengthen the comprehensive and long-awaited cooperation between the two core regions in the world.³⁶

More comprehensively, Gilson argued that inter-regionalism may not 'create' the region in the case of ASEM, but it may act as an "intra-regional mobilizing agent", both in

advancing the EU's external regional profile and in advancing the development of an East Asian regional consciousness.³⁷ In other words, inter-regionalism has the additional potential to affect the development of the intra-regional identity of one of its participating actors.³⁸ That argumentation provokes an assumption that ASEM may gradually affects the East Asian countries to strengthen their intra-regional cooperation and ultimately generates the community building in the region.

Regarding ASEM's role in formulating the East Asian community, the question is how the inter-regionalism initiates a bloc of countries to construct a more integrated cooperation? That could be happened by three approaches: intensify inter-regional dialogue in ASEM, developing partnership with ASEAN and empowering non-state actors. Those approaches are explored in the following sections.

Intensify Inter-regional Process in ASEM

To some scholars, generating a frequent dialogue in the ASEM process stimulates the members from East Asia to consolidate for achieving common position or perception that could be an essential phase for

³⁴ Chen (2004), p. 6

³⁵ Opcit

³⁶ Chen (2004), p. 11

³⁷ Gilson (2005), p.310

³⁸ Ibid, p.322

community building in the region. Since 1996 five Summit Meetings were held in Bangkok, London, Seoul, Copenhagen, and Hanoi and this year summit will be held in Helsinki. In addition, several Ministers and Senior Officials Meetings produced programs and projects at an official level to enhance political, economic and cultural co-operation between Asia and Europe.

Chen Zhimin noted that, intentionally or not, East Asian countries would have to coordinate their positions collectively prior to every ASEM meetings.³⁹ For the participating states of East Asia, such a process offers a means of dealing collectively with twenty-five states of Europe, which looks more solid and integrated. The East Asian countries frequently have to allocate at least three times in the form of senior official meetings (SOM) and ministerial meeting in order to decide on the format and the agenda for every ASEM Leaders Summit, which holds every two years. To ensure the continuation of the ASEM process between the key ministerial and senior official meetings, two coordinators —representing North-east Asia and Southeast Asia respectively— were appointed to keep track of the dialogue process, signal new

initiatives, table new proposals and in general help prepare for the various key meetings.⁴⁰

According to Julie Gilson, this inter-regional dialogue approach provides a first-hand examination of the practices of regional integration and establishes a framework in which East Asia can present itself as a regional political and economic entity.⁴¹ By holding regular meetings in ASEM process representatives of ASEM's Asian members would need both to get together every so often to coordinate their positions on the various issues to be put on the agenda and participate regularly together in various ASEM meetings.⁴² Therefore, ASEM process intentionally or unintentionally set off a process within East Asia for intra-regional cooperation, helping define and encourage an "Asian" identity and producing collective position when meeting their European counterparts in every ASEM meetings.⁴³ This has been shown by East Asia, for example when championing the accession of Myanmar to ASEM membership in the summit of 2004 despite heavy criticism by EU based on serious human rights abuses in that country.

**PERPUSTAKAAN PUSAT
UNIVERSITAS INDONESIA**

⁴⁰ Gilson (2002), pp.4-5

⁴¹ Gilson (2005), p. 308

⁴² Stubbs (2002), p.442

⁴³ op cit

³⁹ Chen (2004), p.16

Supporting EU-ASEAN Partnership and ASEAN+3

It is beyond doubt that on the broader political and diplomatic level ASEAN has been successful in promoting itself as the bridge to wider relations between Europe and Asia, as well as the gateway to the wider Asia-Pacific region, and a facilitator in the wider Asia-Europe dialogue.⁴⁴ Long before the creation of ASEM, the Association of Southeast Asian Nations have launched the inter-regional relationship with Europe. Ong Keng Yong noted that ASEAN-EU relations started in 1972 when the European Economic Community (the embryonic form of EU) established informal relations with ASEAN through the Special Coordinating Committee of ASEAN.⁴⁵ Since then relationship was developed to a higher level with the convening of the first ASEAN-ECC Ministerial Meeting in 1978, and institutionalized in 1980 with the signing of the EC-ASEAN Cooperation Agreement as the first formal agreement between two regional organizations.⁴⁶

Contrary to the rivalry and disharmony among Northeast Asian countries that still exists, the Southeast Asian countries have build confidence and peaceful relationship within ASEAN process through a set of

commitment, for example by introducing the Treaty of Amity and Cooperation in 1976. Furthermore, given the relatively stable situation as well as abundant production resources in Southeast Asia many countries including Japan and South Korea regarded ASEAN countries as their strategic economic and business partners. This situation inspired some ASEAN leaders to initiate visionary ideas of East Asian cooperation by engaging Japan, Korea, and China — for example, the idea of East Asian Economic Grouping proposed by the then Malaysian Prime Minister Mahathir Mohamad in 1991.

Not surprisingly, ASEAN is perceived as the driving force of initiating the East Asian Community.⁴⁷ According to Richard Stubbs, the regional financial crisis in 1997-1998 inspired ASEAN to establish formal economic links to the more developed economies of Japan and South Korea and the dynamic market of China as a means of averting any possible future crisis.⁴⁸ As a result, the association of ten Southeast Asian countries embraced those major countries of Northeast Asia to form ASEAN+3. It means that ASEAN has been successful in transforming the regional financial crisis into an enticing opportunity to arouse the process of regional integration in East Asia.

⁴⁴ University of Helsinki Network for European Studies (2006), p.16

⁴⁵ Ong (2004), website

⁴⁶ Ibid

⁴⁷ Yeo (2005), p.10

⁴⁸ Stubbs (2002), p.449

However, to date, ASEAN+3 apparently has not constructed collective vision of formulating East Asian Community due to different perceptions and persisting rivalries between the "+3" countries. On the other hand, ASEAN countries have expressed strong commitment to develop their intra-regional cooperation by proposing ASEAN Community that will be more institutionalised and rule-based as being done by the EU. As a result, ASEAN is keen to learn some of regional process that was introduced by EU. For example, when presenting an international conference in Brussels 2004, the Secretary-General of ASEAN, Ong Keng Yong, once stated: "The EU's experience in forming the EU's legal framework and coping with community rules over national laws can be instructive."⁴⁹ Furthermore in another speech, Ong revealed that during the first East Asia Summit in Kuala Lumpur 2005 the leaders expressed the confidence that "East Asia could build on the momentum of an emerging ASEAN Community that would serve as a foundation for our common peace and prosperity."⁵⁰ In other words, the great commitments of ASEAN to strengthen their intra-regional building could encourage the forum of ASEAN+3 to develop East Asian community building

Engaging Non-State Actors

Since its inception in 1996, ASEM facilitates greater participation of civil society or non-state actors. This is paralleled with the leaders' commitment in the Asia-Europe Cooperation Framework at the summit of 2000. It stated that ASEM process "should go beyond governments in order to promote dialogue and cooperation between the business/private sectors from the two regions and, no less importantly, between the peoples of the two regions. ASEM should also encourage the cooperative activities of think tanks and research groups of both regions."⁵¹ The statement implied that business sectors, academics, and non-governmental organizations are the strategic elements to link non-state representatives from Europe and East Asia.

In business sectors, ASEM facilitated the creation of Asia-Europe Business Forum (AEBF). Since holding the first meeting in 1996, AEBF has contributed significantly to laying a solid foundation for economic cooperation among the members of the ASEM. Julie Gilson noted several significant achievement of AEBF. The forum established Trade Facilitation Action Plan (TFAP) and the Investment Promotion Action Plan (IPAP). In addition, several working groups have been created to examine particular aspects of trade relations,

⁴⁹ Ong (2004), website

⁵⁰ Ong (2006), website

⁵¹ European Union (2000), website

such as intellectual property rights or investment.⁵²

In addition, in 1997 ASEM founded the Asia-Europe Foundation (ASEF). Located in Singapore, ASEF is the only institution of ASEM process that promotes intellectual, cultural, and people-to-people exchanges between two regions and coordinate seminars, conferences, and forums on economic, political, and any other issues participated by non-state actors.⁵³ To date, ASEF is funded by voluntary contributions from the governments of ASEM countries and the European Commission. Partner institutions and private enterprises also support most of the ASEF projects financially. Given such a huge contribution, ASEF has been successfully conducting 300 projects that engage a wide-range of actors from different sectors of society, outside the business community, in the Asia-Europe dialogue by bringing together students, intellectuals, parliamentarians, NGO-representatives, youth leaders, entrepreneurs, artists and journalist from Asia and Europe to express their view on improving the inter-regional relationship between the two regions.⁵⁴

Conclusion

In the last ten years ASEM has been developing the inter-regional

relationship between Europe and East Asia. As a result, this forum cannot only be regarded as a region-to-region dialogue but can bring additional benefit for East Asian participants in establishing East Asian Community, as they are still formulating the regional community building. Over the last ten years the desire to establish a comprehensive and integrated regional community has been increasing in the East Asian countries as a result of major crisis in the era of globalisation, such as regional financial crisis, trans-national communicable diseases, cross-border conflicts, etc. Through ASEM, East Asia can take precious lessons and adopt experiences from their European counterparts about EU's integration process—which has been regarded by many scholar and politicians as the most successful regional integration in the world.

Since its inception in 1996, intentionally or not, ASEM has implementing some measures that supports the formulation of East Asian Community. The regular summits as well as ministerial and senior official meetings held in the ASEM process demonstrate that the forum has been successfully motivate East Asian participants to have a collective coordination and form a common position regarding particular issues before dealing with their European counterparts in every meeting. This is an essential start for East Asian countries to formulate

⁵² Gilson (2005), p. 316

⁵³ Bersick, (2003), p. 57

⁵⁴ University of Helsinki (2006), p.115

a platform to build a regional community.

In addition, ASEM could intensify its support to ASEAN as the driving force of the East Asian regionalism. Given its success effort in engaging the major Northeast Asian countries to have a collective cooperation and dialogue by establishing the ASEAN+3, ASEAN could be a right trigger to initiate the East Asia community as the association is formulating ASEAN Community in Southeast Asia, which potentially could engage their partner countries in Northeast Asia. It is possible that the establishment of ASEAN community would accelerate the creation of East Asia community. This logic might explain why in the last two summit meetings the leaders of ASEM always welcomed ASEAN's efforts to build an ASEAN⁵⁵ Community in 2020.

Furthermore, East Asian cooperation is still depends on informal and semi-formal consensus building mechanism because there is still no vision and consensus about the content and model of an East Asian community. This is why ASEM could be a good source for East Asia to formulate the community. In ASEM process there are numerous projects and institution that engage non-state participants that can offer inputs for East Asian countries in the process of community building through informal way.

Overall, it is beyond doubt that, as an inter-regional forum, ASEM brings significant supports for East Asia in constructing the community building in the region. Nevertheless, despite the tremendous supports from their European counterparts within the ASEM process, it requires more political will and compromise between East Asian countries to formulate the common platform for the East Asian Community. □

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Buzan, B. (1998); 'The Asia Pacific: What Sort of Region in What Sort of World?' in McGrew, A. & Brook, C. (eds) (1998); *Asia Pacific in the New World Order*; London; Routledge, chapter 4, pp. 68-87
- Brook, C. (1998); 'Regionalism and Globalism' in McGrew, A. & Brook, C. (eds) (1998); *Asia Pacific in the New World Order*; London; Routledge, chapter 11, pp. 230-246
- Dicken, P. (2003); *Global Shift: Reshaping the Global Economic Map in the 21st Century (4th edition)*; London; Sage Publications Ltd
- Drysdale, P., Elek, A., Soesastro H. (1998); 'Open Regionalism: The Nature of Asia Pacific Integration' in Drysdale, P. & Vines, D. (eds) (1998) *Europe, East Asia and APEC: A Shared Global Agenda?*; Cambridge; Cambridge University Press, chapter 5, pp. 103-135
- Letta, Corrado G.M. (2002); *ASEM's Future: Asia-Europe Partnership (Volume 1)*; Bologna; Lo Scarabeo Editrice

⁵⁵ Yeo (2005), p. 13

- Liu, F. (2003); 'Conclusion: The Renewal of Regionalism and an East Asian New Order' in Liu, F. & Reigner, P. (2003) *Regionalism in East Asia: Paradigm Shifting?*; New York; RoutledgeCurzon; chapter 12, pp. 220-230
- Ravenhill, J. (1998); 'The Growth of Intergovernmental Collaboration in the Asia-Pacific Region' in McGrew, A. & Brook, C. (eds) (1998); *Asia Pacific in the New World Order*; London; Routledge, chapter 12, pp. 247-270
- Ravenhill, J. (2001); *APEC and the Construction of Pacific Rim Regionalism*; Cambridge; Cambridge University Press
- Journals**
- Bersick, S. (2003); 'The Role of Civil Society in the Asia-Europe Meeting: The ASEM Process' in *Dialogue + Cooperation*, Vol. 3/2003, pp.55-60
- Gilson, J. (2005); 'New Inter-Regionalism? The EU and East Asia' in *European Integration*, Vol. 27 No. 3 September 2005, pp.307-326
- Stubbs, R. (2002); 'ASEAN Plus Three: Emerging East Asian Regionalism?' in *Asian Survey*, Vol. 42:3, pp. 440-455
- Papers**
- University of Helsinki Network for European Studies (2006); *ASEM in its Tenth Year: Looking Back, Looking Forward*; University of Helsinki; Helsinki.
- Bersick, S. (2006); *Making Euro-Asian Soft Power in the 21st Century: Concepts, Constraints and Consequences*; Presentation at the
- Centre for Strategic and International Studies Indonesia Jakarta, 27th July 2006
- Chen, Z (2004); *NATO, APEC and ASEM: Triadic Inter-regionalism and Global Order*; Shanghai; Fudan University
- Gilson, J. (2002); *Defining Inter-Regionalism: The Asia-Europe Meeting (ASEM)*; SEAS Electronic Working Papers Volume1, Number 1
- Websites**
- ASEAN (1998); *Kuala Lumpur Declaration on the ASEAN Plus Three Summit*; Jakarta; ASEAN Secretariat. www.aseansec.org/18036.htm. Accessed on July 24th, 2006
- Bergsten, C. F.(1997); *Open Regionalism*; Working Paper 97-3; www.iie.com/publications/wp/wp.cfm?ResearchID=152. Accessed on July 25th 2006
- European Union (2000); AECF; http://ec.europa.eu/comm/external_relations/asem/asem_process/aecf_2000.htm. Accessed on July 28th 2006
- Ong, K.Y.(2004); *Advancing ASEAN-EU Relations in the 21st Century*; Jakarta; ASEAN Secretariat. www.aseansec.org/16535.htm. Accessed on July 24th, 2006
- Zepter, B. (2006); *East Asian Integration as seen from the European Point of View*; website of Delegation of the European Commission in Japan; http://jpn.cec.eu.int/home/speech_en_SPEECH%2002/2006.php#; Tokyo; Accessed July 24th 2006.
- Yeo, L.H. (2005); *Realism and Reactive Regionalism: Where is East Asian Regionalism Heading?* In UNISCI Journal-8 May 2005, UNISCI website; <http://www.ucm.es/info/unisci/UNISCI-Review8.htm>; Madrid; Accessed July 24th 2006.
- Magazine**
- Kondo, H. (2005); 'Interview with Makoto Taniguchi' in *Asia Pacific Perspective*; August 2005, pp 36-39