

1st Berlin Conference on Asian Security (Berlin Group)

Berlin, 14/15 September 2006

A conference jointly organised by Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik (SWP), Berlin, and the Federal Ministry of Defence, Berlin

Discussion Paper

Do Not Cite or Quote without Author's Permission

Outlook for a Larger East Asian Community

Shin-wha Lee¹
Korea University

September 2006

¹ Shin-wha Lee is Associate Professor and Chair of the Department of Political Science and International Relations, Korea University, Seoul, Korea.

SWP

Ludwigkirchplatz 3-4
10719 Berlin
Phone +49 30 880 07-0
Fax +49 30 880 07-100
www.swp-berlin.org

During the last few decades, East Asia² has become one of the most dynamic regions in the world and is expected to be the place for the most active growth in the new millennium. East Asia's emergence in the world economy has been achieved without the aid or benefit of any formal institutions for cooperation. The level of cooperation in the East Asian region still remains primitive when compared to the level of cooperation in Europe or North America, which began in the late 1950s and early 1960s. In particular, Northeast Asia lacks a formal institution for cooperation, while recognized institutional arrangements are further progressing through the European Union (EU), the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), the Caribbean Community (CARICOM), and the Southern Common Market (Mercosur). Differences among East Asian countries have posed as obstacles to cooperation and, further, integration. These barriers have included economic, political, and security dimensions. Historical contentions, especially among Northeast Asian countries, have also been a major hindrance to constructing regional order.

Since the end of the cold war, there has been a broad consensus among states of the region on the need to promote deeper economic cooperation within the region and to collectively coordinate its economic relations internationally. Recognizing the need for the institutionalization of economic cooperation, Malaysian Prime Minister Mahathir Mohamed proposed a decade ago to establish an East Asia Economic Group (EAEG). While the proposal did not materialize into substantive actions, the concept has now been realized as in ASEAN Plus Three (ASEAN+3) meetings, involving the leaders of the 10 ASEAN countries, China, Japan and South Korea, for 11 consecutive years. The Asian financial crisis of 1997-98 served as a strong impetus to consolidate regional cooperation. It has given rise to the recognition that East Asia needs to institutionalize its cooperation to collectively pre-empt and manage regional problems.

Furthermore, the Track II East Asia Vision Group (EAVG) and Track I East Asian Study Group (EASG) were created in 1999 and 2000, respectively, to explore ways to expand cooperation in all sectors at all levels among the countries of East Asia. In their final reports submitted to the heads of ASEAN+3 countries, the EAVG recommended "the evolution of the annual summit meetings of ASEAN plus Three into an East Asian Summit"³ and the EASG assessed the recommendations of the EAVG and extensively explored the idea and implications of an East Asian Summit.⁴

Finally, the inaugural East Asian summit (EAS), held in December 2006 immediately following the ASEAN's 11th summit in Kuala Lumpur, widened the circle of regional cooperation represented by 13 ASEAN+3 members. This loosely united regional grouping, which includes three geographically distant and culturally distinct nations - Australia, New Zealand and India, has been controversial, while it marked an attempt to address Asia's economic, security and political problems. Some argue that it can be interpreted as a process which will facilitate the rise of China as a great economic (and political) power.⁵ Yet, it has

² East Asia is defined in the context of the 'ASEAN+3' framework as set forth by the Leaders of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), the People's Republic of China, Japan and the Republic of Korea at their Summit in November 1999 in Manila for enhancing cooperation between ASEAN and the three Northeast Asian countries. Accordingly, East Asia, in the context of this paper, is defined as the 10 member countries of ASEAN - Brunei Darussalam, Kingdom of Cambodia, Republic of Indonesia, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Malaysia, Union of Myanmar, Republic of the Philippines, Republic of Singapore, Kingdom of Thailand and Socialist Republic of Vietnam - and the Northeast Asian countries of the People's Republic of China, Japan and Republic of Korea.

³ EAVG, *Towards an East Asian Community: Region of peace, Prosperity and Progress*, East Asia Vision Group Report, 2001, p. 13.

⁴ EASG, *Final Report of the East Asia Study Group*, November 2002, p.4.

⁵ David Hale, "The East Asian Summit," *AsiaMedia*, 12 December 2005, <http://www.asiamedia.ucla.edu/>.

largely been considered as a “conviction among Asian leaders that their region requires a stronger independent voice in world affairs and a new forum without the leading role the United States has played since World War II.”⁶

Given these developments, there is a lively ongoing discussion on the need of institutionalizing regional multilateralism. The governments in the region have begun to expand network of webs that cross national borders and facilitate regional connectedness.⁷ Still, arguments on the ways of approach and the identification of regional scope of multilateralism are part of that debate. For instance, whether to consider the entire Asia-Pacific region in designing multilateral cooperation, to define the East Asian region without the inclusion of non-East Asian nations, or to limit the scope to Northeast/Southeast Asia and should emphasis put on the government-level cooperation only or include non-governmental cooperation are the issues of current discussion. There is also an energetic debate that what sorts of issues or means can facilitate a more comprehensive and sustainable regional cooperation or integration as economies grow and alliance shifts in the post-911 world.

The Processes of ASEAN, ASEAN+3 and ARF

The Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), which was established in 1967, could be seen as the first institutionalized effort to promote cooperation in Southeast Asia. However, ASEAN was unable to play any significant role in promoting regional cooperation during the first decade of its existence, as member states were often more preoccupied with addressing their domestic issues rather than issues of regional concern. Nevertheless, ASEAN became the focus of international attention in 1976 and 1977, when its member states reaffirmed their commitment to promoting peace, freedom and political independence in the Southeast Asian region at the ASEAN summit meetings held in Indonesia and Malaysia. Though cooperation efforts since then had mostly been focused on addressing economic issues, there have been recent efforts to increase security cooperation within the frameworks of ASEAN and the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF). However, these efforts have mostly remained at the level of exchanging information or ideas on issues of common concern, and have been insufficient in the development of any specific regulations and enforcement authority aimed at promoting regional security.⁸

The level of inter-state cooperation in Northeast Asia lags further behind that in Southeast Asia. The region does not only lack an institutional mechanism for inter-governmental multilateral cooperation, but also does not have a regional power with the legitimacy to assume a leading and responsible role in regional collaboration. The greatest obstacle to establishing a multilateral cooperation regime in the region would be the historical legacy of mutual distrust and confrontation that was left by the vestiges of colonial domination and war. While economic regionalism has developed to some extent in post-Cold War Northeast Asia, there has been little progress on political or security regionalism.⁹ Moreover,

⁶ Seth Mydans, “New Group for ‘Asian Century’ Shuns U.S.” *International Herald Tribune*, 12 December 2005, <http://www.iht.com/articles/2005/12/12/news/summit.php>.

⁷ T.J. Pempel, “Introduction: Emerging Webs of Regional Connectedness,” *Remapping East Asia: The Construction of a Region*, (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 2005).

⁸ Shin-wha Lee and Helen Je, “Building a Northeast Asian Community: A Multilateral Security Approach” in Melissa G. Curley and Nicholas Thomas eds., *Advancing East Asian Regionalism* (London: Routledge, 2006, in press).

⁹ S.S. Kim, “Northeast Asia in the Local-Regional-Global Nexus: Multiple Challenges and Contending Explanations,” in S.S. Kim (ed.) *The International Relations of Northeast Asia*, (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2004), Ch. 1.

since traditional military issues are still regarded as matters of diplomatic and political competition rather than that of cooperation by the general public and academia, as well as by many policy decision-makers, there is little public awareness or political will for cooperation on regional security issues.

The regional financial crisis and the contagion effect of the economic shock gave big momentum to transcend the geographical difference between Northeast and Southeast Asia and advance East Asian cooperation. ASEAN countries initiated regular meetings at the cabinet and head-of-government levels with their counterparts from Japan, China, and Korea. These meetings take place both on a "10 + 3" as well as a "10 + 1" basis.¹⁰

Since its inception in 1997, the ASEAN+3 process has taken up various measures to expand and deepen cooperation between the two sub-regions, and East Asian countries are now taking concrete steps toward achieving the goals of closer integration and overcoming commonly-held challenges. In 1999, the leaders of ASEAN+3 adopted the Joint Statement on East Asia Cooperation. Although the financial crisis weakened not only the individual affected countries but also ASEAN as a collective entity, the ASEAN's initiative to forge cooperation with big East Asian "three," namely Japan, China, and South Korea, enabled ASEAN to reinforce itself.¹¹ That is, an outward looking and open attitude did not weaken the relevance of ASEAN, but rather consolidate it. Such ASEAN's initiative also proved instrumental for the Northeast Asian countries that never had an opportunity to "develop the habit and practice of thinking as a collective 'three'."¹² That is, the "ASEAN+3" summit has served as the "glue" that binds the three countries together to a certain degree.

It was worth noting that ASEAN has attempted to widen regional cooperation arrangements on the basis of a "concentric circles approach." By consolidating cooperation among ASEAN countries, they can participate more effectively in the larger regional grouping, which would in turn strengthen their engagement at the global level.¹³ Therefore, ASEAN member states would want to maintain their leadership in managing the ASEAN+3 process, not only because the establishment of the ASEAN+3 summit was the result of an ASEAN initiative, but because they are concerned that the agendas and interests of ASEAN would be prevailed by the broader regional arrangements. Accordingly, the primary *raison d'être* of the ASEAN and the ASEAN+3 is to cope with the China challenge in the Southeast Asian and South China Seas settings, not the Northeast Asia issues. ASEAN countries are very apprehensive about its three partners from the north playing a leadership role in the process of institutionalizing East Asian regional cooperation. ASEAN countries have been strongly motivated to ensure that they remain as the "hub" not only in the ASEAN+3 process but also in the evolution of an East Asian community.

In a nutshell, the ASEAN+3 is an exclusive East Asian regional entity that former Prime Minister Mahathir has been advocating for years. This is distinct from the inclusive regionalism of Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) which integrates the United States and other Western states.¹⁴

¹⁰ US-ASEAN Business Council, "ASEAN+3 (China, Japan, and South Korea)," <http://www.us-asean.org/ASEANOverview/asean+3.asp>.

¹¹ Hadi Soesasto, "An ASEAN Economic Community and ASEAN+3: how do they fit together?" <http://apseg.anu.edu.au/pdf/pep/pep-.338.pdf#search='why%20ASEAN%20and%20northeast%20Asia%20get%20together%2C%20ASEAN3'>.

¹² R.M. Marty and M. Natalegawa, "ASEAN+3 versus the East Asia Summit, The Jakarta Post, 8 February, 2005, <http://www.thejakartapost.com/yesterdaydetail.asp?fileid=20050208.E03>.

¹³ Hadi Soesasto, *ibid*.

¹⁴ Anthony Milner, "'Asia' Consciousness and Asian Values," Australian National University, http://www.anu.edu.au/asianstudies/cons_vals.html.

In comparison, the ARF, which was established by the ASEAN Post Ministerial Conference in 1994, is a forum representing security cooperation among Asia-Pacific countries including the United States, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand. It aimed to enhance dialogue and cooperation for peace and stability, as well as facilitate confidence-building and preventive diplomacy, in the Asia-Pacific region.¹⁵

The founding of ARF symbolizes a transition from a Cold War security order to a Post Cold War security order. In the cold war era, East Asian regional security has been maintained based on bilateral alliances. A bilateral alliance is an effective measure when there exists common threat among allies. Since there was a conspicuous threat of expansion of socialist power, bilateral alliance was the most appropriate. However, as the cold war ended and threat diminished, the concept of security expanded to include the non-traditional aspects of security, and thus introduced the concept of comprehensive security. Particularly in Southeast Asia, environmental issues have become one of crucial factors which threaten regional security. Consensus was made to pursue preventive diplomacy, in lieu de military confrontation, through regularizing dialogue of multilateral and comprehensive security oriented ARF.¹⁶

The role of ARF as a regional security organization has not reached the level of Europe's Organization of Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) by far. ARF merely sustains its image as an East Asian security mechanism. Moreover, security perspectives of countries in East Asia have not yet overcome "individual state centric" thinking. Even as any discussion or proposals on the institutionalization of regional cooperation efforts would first require a concrete examination of how to coordinate respective national interests and different policy directions, the task of establishing a regional security cooperation regime that would satisfy all the countries involved will be a tall order.¹⁷

In addition, just like the ASEAN+3 process, ASEAN member states want to remain at the core of undertaking in the ARF which was the result of an ASEAN initiative. It is unlikely that security issues in the Northeast Asian region like the Korean question will be the priority security concerns of the ARF, though it had been emphasized that peace and stability on the Korean peninsula would be vital to promoting security and economic growth in the Asia-Pacific region during the 2003 ARF meeting. There is increasing claims within the Northeast Asian region to develop an independent cooperation forum or a separate framework for dialogue within the ARF and/or ASEAN+3 process, which would address the security issues unique to the Northeast Asian region.¹⁸

Concerning the North Korean questions, there still remain several thorny issues to be resolved on a bilateral basis with the United States, rather than within the ARF or other multilateral frameworks. For instance, ARF was held in Malaysia in July 2006 when the North Korean missile launch had vexed the international current. Countries involved placed focus on the ways to approach North Korean issues such as five, six and eight-party talks rather than discussing the functions of ARF regarding regional security. In this context, the role the ARF can play in

¹⁵ ASEAN Regional Forum, <http://www.aseansec.org/arf.htm>

¹⁶ At the non-governmental level, the Council for Security Cooperation in the Asia-Pacific (CSCAP), established in June 1993, a multilateral Track II security organization that analyzes security issues in the Asia Pacific, provides support to the governmental level dialogues at the ARF. Lee and Je, *ibid*.

¹⁷ Shin-wha Lee and Hyun Myoung Jae, "Building a Northeast Asian Community: A Multilateral Security Approach," in Melissa G. Curley & Nick Thomas (eds.), *Advancing East Asian Regionalism* (London: Routledge, 2006).

¹⁸ P.M. Cronin and E.T. Metzgar, 'ASEAN and Regional Security', no. 85, 1996, <http://www.ndu.edu/inss/strforum/SF_85/forum85.html>.

addressing the Korean Peninsula security issues will be limited with little of substance to discuss.

Nonetheless, on the map of East Asian regional security in post-cold war era, the ARF process is the new milestone and challenge. It is more so in that it is a beginning of institutional instrument for providing regional security. The mere gathering of high-level officials in Asia's foremost security forum is significant as a first step for regional confidence building as delegates from each member states express their respective positions and promote mutual understanding through direct contacts that would otherwise be difficult to arrange.¹⁹ For example, such confidence-building approaches are crucial in facilitating North Korea's integration into the international arena, as ARF members declared North Korea's admission to the ARF to be the "beginning of the end of North Korea's isolation."²⁰ Recently, South Korean vice minister, Lee Kyu-hyung, has acknowledged that "the high level of mutual trust and confidence fostered by the ARF will serve as fertile ground for the sowing of the seeds of security cooperation in Northeast Asia,"²¹

Toward a larger East Asian community? EAVG, EASG, and EAS

Discussions on the future establishment of an East Asian community (EAC) became lively with the release of the report of the East Asia Vision Group (EAVG) in 2001. The report referred to the evolution of the ASEAN+3 Summit Meeting into an EAS as a means of realizing the EAC.

The EAVG, a two-year project in operation between 1999 and 2001, was initiated by the proposal of Korean President Kim Dae-jung at the ASEAN+3 Summit of Hanoi in 1998. Its mandate was to formulate a common vision reflecting the rapidly changing regional and global environment and to provide the direction for future cooperation among East Asian countries. The EAVG members, composed of two (non-governmental) experts from each member country of ASEAN+3, were submitted their vision report to the ASEAN+3 summit in Brunei in November 2001, which envisioned East Asia as evolving from a region of nations to a *bona fide* regional community and emphasized the necessity of regional cooperation in all aspects of society including economic, political, security, environmental, social, cultural and educational areas. The members deliberated on such key questions as what the ultimate goals of East Asian cooperation should be, how such goals can be achieved, and what institutional framework is required. They also recognized that the East Asian cooperation process should move beyond government efforts to involve the broader society and the people of the region.²²

Referring to the EAVG, with the suggestion of President Kim Dae-jung at the 2000 ASEAN+3 summit meeting in Singapore, the East Asian Study Group (EASG) was established for the two year period to review the modalities of cooperation in East Asia by both government and the private sector.²³ While EAVG is a Track II approach, the EASG was composed of the existing ASEAN+3 Senior Officials' Meeting (SOM) members at the Vice Foreign Ministerial level and working-level officials. It was launched in March 2001 with two major tasks – to assess the recommendation contained in the final report of EAVG and sort out concrete measures for East Asian

¹⁹ ARF is based on a gradual three-stage process of evolution – starting from confidence-building to preventive diplomacy and eventually, in the long term, reaching to conflict resolution.

²⁰ Mahesh Uniyal, "South-east Asia: Regional Meeting Thaws North Korea's Isolation," *World News*, 27 July 2000, at http://www.oneworld.org/ips2/july00/18_07_062.html.

²¹ Kyu-hyung Lee, "The ASEAN Regional Forum and Northeast Asia," *IFANS Review*, Vol. 14, no. 1, July 2006, p.24.

²² EAVG report, *ibid*.

²³ This information was based on the author's experience as Chair's advisor to EAVG.

regional cooperation; and to explore the implications of an East Asian summit.²⁴ The EASG report, proposed 17 short-term and 9 mid- and long-term measures, with a view to establishing a future EAc, was submitted to the 2002 ASEAN + 3 Summit Meeting.

Both EAVG and EASG reports consider concrete implementation measures for further regional cooperation. Included in the reports are the proposals for the evolution of the annual summit meetings of ASEAN+3 into the East Asian Summit (EAS) and for the establishment of an East Asian community. In particular, the EASG stresses that the ASEAN+3 framework would remain the only credible and realistic vehicle to advance the form and substance of regional cooperation in East Asia. But the discussions revealed concerns that ASEAN may be marginalized if the transition towards an EAS moves too fast and noted the practical issue of whether an EAS would be encumbered with too many meetings. In addition, steps will be necessary to nurture a greater sense of ownership among all members in striving towards greater East Asian cooperation.²⁵ It was thus agreed that the EAS should be part of an evolutionary and step-by-step process.²⁶

After the official decision to launch an EAS was made at the ASEAN + 3 Summit Meeting in 2004, a first EAS was held in December 2005 in Kuala Lumpur. Taking a political rather than a geographical classification, the ASEAN leaders brought Australia, New Zealand and India together with ASEAN + 3 member states. Even Russian President Vladimir Vladimirovich Putin participated as an observer.

The formation of this new grouping has brought about controversy. As for Australia, it accepted the ASEAN's demand to sign a "Treaty of Amity and Cooperation" as a precondition for the membership of the group. India has also been eager to engage with East Asia as it actively pursues the market opening policy.²⁷ Yet, former Prime Minister Mahathir Mohamad of Malaysia criticized the EAS as a "useless" club, though this new regional entity brought to fruition his idea of an East Asian Economic Grouping (EAEG) proposed in the late 1980s. He argued that the inclusion of Australia and New Zealand would dampen East Asia's voice.²⁸

The dispute over who would drive the EAS should also be settled. The incumbent Malaysian Prime Minister Abdullah stressed that the ASEAN + 3 and the EAS should exist in parallel, but the ASEAN+ 3 (particularly ASEAN) would be in the "driver's seat" to build an East Asian community, emphasizing that the EAS "would neither replace nor be an alternative to the ASEAN + 3."²⁹ Together with China, Malaysia wanted the ASEAN + 3 to play a leading role for a future East Asian community building process. All other ASEAN member states, just like in the processes of ASEAN+3 and ARF, stressed that "the driving force was neither the EAS nor the ASEAN+3 but ASEAN itself," in the Kuala Lumpur Declaration made at the EAS.³⁰

On the contrary, although the EAS still represents a big leap from ASEAN+3 exercise, Japan and Indonesia wanted the EAS to be the principal means for regional cooperation. The inclusion of Australia and New Zealand (and subsequently India)

²⁴ EASG report, *ibid*.

²⁵ This information was based on the author's interview with Korean senior official of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, who joined in EASG meetings.

²⁶ EASG report, *ibid*.

²⁷ Hadi Soesasto, *ibid*; David Hale, *ibid*.

²⁸ Mohan Malik, "The East Asia Summit: More Discord than Accord: Is the new East Asian Community (EAC) the first step towards a united region, or an irritant to old rivalries? *YaleGlobal*, 20 December 2005, <http://yaleglobal.yale.edu/article.print?id=6645>.

²⁹ "The Rise of East Asia?" *Asian News Network*, 6 January 2006, <http://www.aseannewsnetwork.com/2006/01/rise-of-east-asia.html>.

³⁰ "We should visualize ASEAN occupying the 'hub', with three 'spokes', namely the "+ 3" countries to its north, India to its west and Australia and New Zealand to its southeast."

was part of an endeavor by Japan, Indonesia and Singapore who want to counterbalance the possible dominance of China in the evolving regional order and security architecture.³¹ How to settle this dispute over the leadership will be a vital issue in the new balancing game in the East Asian region building process.

Another salient component in the EAC is the exclusion of the United States as neither a member nor an observer. Washington is concerned that China would play a regional hegemonic role if this largest association of Asian countries (representing almost half the world's population) nurtures East Asia into a single community of cooperation.³² Unlike in the case of its strong opposition to Mahathir's proposal for EAEG, the United States this time had to accept the new economic and political reality which is developing in East Asia. Washington seems to have no choice but to promote strategic partnership with China, the world's fast growing market, as other Asian countries will not join an anti-Chinese alliance even if the United States attempts to recreate the cold war rivalry with China. In turn, China wishes to maintain a good relations with the United States not only because the latter is China's most important trade partner, but also China needs Washington to overcome challenges and vulnerabilities in its increasing inter-dependence with the world economy.³³ Whether the rise of China in the EAC and other region building processes is regarded as an opportunity for cooperation or a threat to regional peace will be a crucial point in projecting the future of an East Asian community.

[Table 1: ASEAN, ASEAN+3, ARF, EAS]

	Objectives	Scope of Work	Structure
ASEAN	-Southeast Asian political and economic integration. -Social progress and cultural development promoting regional peace and stability.	Political and security, economic, functional and development cooperation.	-Summit held every year -19 Sectors of Ministerial Meeting -29 Committees of Senior Officials' -Committee in third countries -Specialized bodies -122 Technical working groups
ASEAN+3	-Further strengthen and deepen East Asia cooperation in economic, social and political areas.	Economic, monetary and finance, political and security, tourism, agriculture, environment, energy, and ICT cooperation.	-ASEAN Plus Three Unit is established under the ASEAN Secretariat -Heads of Government Summits -Finance Ministers' Meeting -Trade Ministers' Meeting
ARF	-Foster constructive dialogue and consultation on political and security issues of common interest and concern.	Current regional security issues and cooperative measures (confidence building measures and	-No formal structure -Chaired by the Chairman of the ASEAN Standing Committee

³¹ Bae Kungchan, "Je 1cha dongasis jungsanghwoi(EAS) gyulkwa bunseok (The Analysis of the first EAS's outcome)" Mirae Strategic Institute, January 2006; Thomas J. Christensen, "China, the US-Japan Alliance, and the Security Dilemma in East Asia," in G.J. Ikenberry & Mastanduno, eds. *International Relations Theory and the Asia-Pacific* (New York: Columbia University, 2003).

³² Seth Mydans, "New Group for 'Asian Century' shuns U.S.," *International Herald Tribune*, 12 December 2005, <http://www.iht.com/articles/2005/12/12/news/summit.php>.

³³ David Hale, *ibid*; Barry Buzan, "The Post-Cold War Asia-Pacific Security Order: Conflict or Cooperation," in Andrew Mack and John Ravenhill eds, *Pacific Cooperation: Building Economic and Security Regimes in the Asia-Pacific Region* (Boulder: Westview Press, 1995).

	-Make significant contributions to efforts towards confidence-building and preventive diplomacy in the Asia-Pacific region.	transparency).	-A unit to aid the Chair
EAS	-Enhance peace, stability and economic prosperity of the East Asia region.	Unspecified	-No formal structure -Annual Summit hosted by ASEAN chair state

Source: www.aseansec.org, www.us-asean.org, www.aseansec.org

To conclude, the struggle over building an East Asian community must be faced first in the process of coping with confusion about regional identity. Each time we begin to talk about regional integration or community, we are faced with the dilemma or the question if we are talking about the larger Asia-Pacific region or more limited East Asian (or even Northeast Asian) region? Even as APEC continues to hold its annual summit meetings, the East Asian countries of ASEAN plus Three Northeast Asian countries have been having their own summit gatherings, first in that name (ASEAN Plus Three) and from December 2005 as the East Asian Summit.

As mentioned earlier, those who advocate the Asia Pacific as one regional unit, observe the East Asian community movement with reservation if not regard it as an obstacle to a broader regional cooperation process. On the other hand, voices have been raised for the establishment of a “NEA-specific” institution. In the case of Europe, the region was fairly well defined compared to Asia. There was, until lately at least, much less debates and argument over defining whether an European community or an Atlantic community.³⁴

Second, none of the existing cooperative mechanisms, i.e. ASEAN, ASEAN+3, ARF, and EAS, have taken on a central coordinating responsibility. In most cases, the level of regional multilateral collaboration over regional ills has not progressed beyond the exchange of information or agenda setting for regional cooperation, with few concrete regional regulatory policies or measures. This reflects the nature and limitations of the international institutions, including regional ones, where member states merely remain spectators in the crises of other nations unless their own national interests and security are directly threatened. Furthermore, in October 2003 in Bali, ASEAN leaders declared ASEAN Concord II (Bali Concord) with aims to the establishment of an “ASEAN Community” which constitutes ASEAN Economic Community (AEC), ASEAN Security Community (ASC), and the ASEAN Socio-Cultural Community. ASEAN’s plan for an ASEAN Community indicates that ASEAN countries intends to deepen their own economic, social and security integration, while they continue to widen their cooperation through the ASEAN+3 process.³⁵ How these seemingly divergent paths, i.e. deepening and widening of regional integration, can be reconciled remains a thorny issue.³⁶ From ASEAN perspectives, whichever the vehicle, ASEAN should be at the core of an East Asian community building. This will bring about unavoidable dispute with its neighbors in the north.

Notwithstanding the limitation and frustration of these regional cooperative mechanisms, current staggering regional security in East Asia (such as North Korean nuclear and missile threats and historical and nationalist disputes between Korea,

³⁴ Han Sung-Joo, “East Asia in the 21st Century: Trending Toward Community – or Disunity? Paper presented to Trilateral Commission Plenary Session, Washington, DC, April 17, 2005.

³⁵ Mely Caballero-Anthony, “Recalibrating the ASEAN Security Community,” *IDSS Commentaries*, 55/2006, 21 June 2006, <http://www.diss.edu.sg>.

³⁶ Hong, Hyoun-ik, Lee, Dae-woo, 『Dongbuka Dajaanbohyubryuk-gua Jubyun Sagang(Northeast Asian Multilateral cooperation and four powers)』 (Seoul: Sejong Institute, 2001), pp. 90-93

Japan, and China) provides impetus to pay attention to the being and the role of an East Asian institution. In international relations, institution works as a provider of 'code of conduct' and norms to countries and also decreases uncertainties by sharing information. In short, institution is one of instruments that can resolve anarchy problem of international relations. Once established, an institution has tendency to reinforce its own authority to coordinate and expand its functions and it provides an occasion to build another follow-up institution. In this light, the ASEAN+3 and EAS holds significance as a seed for East Asian security and cooperation.

Finally, efforts will continue to develop a regional community for cooperation, however it is defined. It is likely that these efforts will develop into a "bi-multilateral cooperation framework," which will be a multilateral mechanism to complement existing bilateral relations and alliances. In order to increase the synergy effects of this mechanism, governments in the region need to make a systematic and concerted effort to devise a security policy that would reflect increasing public awareness of changing international and regional security environments,³⁷ while at the same time accommodating various views on security issues. Track II level cooperation efforts could also be utilized. While the general public take part in forming public opinion to utilize "pressure and support" to encourage an inter-governmental security cooperation, scholars and experts could present norms, ethics, and concrete guidelines and recommendations on how to address and solve on-going transnational issues.³⁸ For this the role of epistemic community is especially important and relevant in moving toward a more viable and sustainable East Asian community.

³⁷ Education is very important to understand other cultures and history. In this sense, East Asian universities can create a program like the Erasmus Mundus programme. It is a co-operation and mobility programme in the field of higher education which promotes the European Union as a centre of excellence in learning around the world. It supports European top-quality Masters Courses and enhances the visibility and attractiveness of European higher education in third countries. It also provides EU-funded scholarships for third country nationals participating in these Masters Courses, as well as scholarships for EU-nationals studying in third countries.

³⁸ Sihh-wha Lee, "Northeast Asian Security Community: From Concepts to Practices," UNU University Press (forthcoming).

Appendix:

[Current Status of Regional Cooperation Regime in Northeast Asia, East Asia, and the Asia-Pacific]

Region	Cooperation Regime	Level	Participating Countries (Observer States)	Characteristics	Process
Northeast Asia	Northeast Asia Cooperation Dialogue (NEACD)	Track II	DPRK, Japan, PRC, ROK, Russia and USA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Dialogue for the promotion of the regional security situation, military transparency and confidence building. - Delegations composed of foreign and defense ministers, military officials, and academics (in their individual capacity) 	1993 (Jul) San Diego ⁱ 1993 (Oct) San Diego 1994 Tokyo 1995 (Russia) ⁱⁱ 1996 (Jan) Beijing 1996 (Sep) Seoul 1997 (Apr) New York 1997 (Dec) Tokyo 1998 Moscow 1999 Beijing 2000 Seoul 2001 Hawaii 2002 (Apr) Tokyo 2002 (Sep) Moscow 2003 Qingdao 2004 Washington DC 2005 Seoul 2006 Tokyo
Northeast Asia	Limited Nuclear Weapons-Free Zone for Northeast Asia	Track II	Japan, Mongolia PRC, ROK, Russia and USA (Finland, France, Argentina)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Assess regional nuclear threats. - Participation is at the semi-governmental level. 	1995 Preparatory Meeting in Atlanta 1996 Buenos Aires 1996 Bordeaux 1997 Moscow 1998 Helsinki 1999 Tokyo 2000 Beijing 2001 Seoul 2002 Ulaanbaatar 2004 Jeju Island 2006 Shanghai
East Asia	Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN)	Track I	Brunei, Cambodia, Indonesia, Laos, Malaysia, Myanmar, Philippines, Singapore, Thailand and Vietnam (Papua New Guinea)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Annual Summit meeting, aimed to foster cooperation, (esp. economic integration) and mutual assistance among members. 	1967 Bangkok (1 st ASEAN Ministerial Meeting) 1976 Bali (1 st ASEAN Summit) 1977 Kuala Lumpur (2 nd Summit) 1987 Manila (3 rd ASEAN Summit) 1992 Singapore (4 th ASEAN Summit) 1995 Bangkok (5 th ASEAN Summit) 1996 Jakarta (1 st informal Summit) 1997 Kuala Lumpur (2 nd informal Summit) 1998 Hanoi (6 th ASEAN Summit) 1999 Manila (3 rd informal Summit) 2000 Singapore (4 th informal Summit) 2001 Bandar Seri Begawan (7 th ASEAN Summit) 2002 Phnom Penh (8 th ASEAN Summit) 2003 Bali (9 th ASEAN Summit)

					2004 Vientiane (10 th ASEAN Summit) 2005 Kuala Lumpur (11 th ASEAN Summit)
East Asia	ASEAN+3	Track I	ASEAN states + Japan, PRC and ROK	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Expanded from ASEAN since 1997. - Japan, PRC and ROK were invited to discuss regional issues but they have no voting rights in ASEAN decision making process. - Since ASEAN+3 structure was basically an ASEAN initiative, it could not give the three NEA states strong sense of ownership 	1997-2005 See ASEAN
East Asia	East Asian Summit	Track I	ASEAN states, Japan, PRC, ROK, India, Australia and New Zealand	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - EAS is one of the 9 mid and long term cooperation programs of EASG Final Report which was adopted in the ASEAN+3 Summit, held in Cambodia, 2002. - Japan, PRC and ROK proposed EAS as a new framework for East Asian summitry in which the three NEA states can participate on an equal footing. - In the 8th ASEAN+3 Summit, participants decided to launch EAS with the inauguration of the next meeting in Kuala Lumpur - Presence of non-East Asian states is still a controversial issue to be resolved. - Agreed to be held in conjunction with the annual ASEAN meetings 	2005 Kuala Lumpur, 1 st Summit 2006 (Dec) 2 nd Summit planned to be held in Philippines
East Asia	ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF)	Track I, Track II	DPRK, Japan, PRC, ROK, Russia, USA, Australia, Canada, Malaysia, New Zealand, Thailand, Brunei, Myanmar, Indonesia, Singapore, Laos, Vietnam, Philippines, Laos, Cambodia, Mongolia, India, Pakistan, EU and Papua New Guinea	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Informal multilateral dialogue of 23 members that seeks to address security issues in the Asia-Pacific region. 	1994 Bangkok 1995 Manila 1996 Jakarta 1997 Subangjaya 1998 Manila 1999 Singapore 2000 Bangkok 2001 Hanoi 2002 Bandar Seri Begawan 2003 Phnom Penh 2004 Jakarta 2005 Vientiane 2006 Kuala Lumpur
East Asia	East Asia Vision Group (EAVG)	Track II	ASEAN states +	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Drafted a report on moving towards 	1998 First proposed at the ASEAN+3

			Japan, PRC and ROK	building an East Asian community. Report included recommendations on how to promote economic, political, environmental, social, cultural, educational cooperation in the long term.	Summit in Hanoi 1999 EAVG launched 2001 Submitted the final report at the ASEAN+3 Summit in Bandar Seri Begawan
East Asia	East Asia Study Group (EASG)	Track I	ASEAN states + Japan, PRC and ROK	- Drafted report on how to implement EAVG recommendations at the governmental level.	2000 First proposed at the ASEAN+3 Summit in Singapore 2001 EASG launched 2002 Final report submitted at the ASEAN+3 Summit in Phnom Penh
Asia Pacific	Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC)	Track I	Australia, Brunei, Canada, Chile, PRC, Hong Kong, Japan, Indonesia, ROK, Malaysia, Mexico, New Zealand, Peru, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Chinese Taipei, Thailand, Vietnam, Russia and USA	-Intergovernmental forum for facilitating economic growth, cooperation, trade and investment in the Asia-Pacific region. - No treaty obligations required of its participants. Decisions made within APEC are reached by consensus	1989 - Canberra 1990 - Singapore 1991 - Seoul 1992 - Bangkok 1993 - Blake Island 1994 - Bogor, Indonesia 1995 - Osaka 1996 Manila 1997 Vancouver 1998 Kuala Lumpur 1999 Auckland 2000 Bandar Seri Begawan, 2001 Shanghai 2002 Los Cabos, Mexico 2003 Bangkok 2004 Santiago, et. al, Chile 2005 Busan
Asia Pacific	Council for Security Cooperation in the Asia-Pacific (CSCAP)	Track II	Australia, Brunei, Cambodia, Canada, China, EU, India, Indonesia, Japan, DPRK, ROK, Malaysia, Mongolia, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Russia, Singapore, Thailand, USA and Vietnam	- Discussion and research on various security issues in the region, which is led by strategic studies institutes from ten countries in the Asia-Pacific region.	1993 Lombok (Adoption of Charter) - Since June 1994, Steering Committee meeting is held twice a year (In June in Kuala Lumpur and in December in one of the other member countries) - General Conference is held irregularly: Singapore(1997), Seoul(1999), Sidney(2001), Jakarta(2003 and 2005)
Asia Pacific	Asia Security Conference (ASC)	Track II	Japan, ROK, USA, PRC, Russia, UK, France, Australia, Thailand, Indonesia, Cambodia, Mongolia, Philippines, Brunei, Malaysia, Myanmar, Singapore, East Timor, India and New Zealand	- Non-governmental high-level defense management conference hosted by the IISS.	Since 2002, annually held in Singapore.

Asia	Conference on Interaction and Confidence-Building Measures in Asia (CICA)	Track I	Afghanistan, Azerbaijan, China, Egypt, Iran, India, Israel, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Mongolia, Pakistan, Palestine, Russia, Tajikistan, Thailand, Turkey, Uzbekistan and ROK (USA, Japan, Ukraine, Indonesia, Vietnam, Thailand and Malaysia)	- Inter-governmental multilateral security cooperation regime created with the aim to promote confidence-building and prevent conflict among countries in the Central Asian region. - Member states occupy leading positions in world oil reserves.	1993 1 st Experts Meeting 1993 2 nd Experts Meeting 1994 Senior Officials Meeting 1996 Deputy Foreign Ministers' Meeting 1997 Special Working Group Meeting 1997 Deputy Foreign Ministers' Meeting 1999 Foreign Ministers' Meeting (formally launched) 2000 Preparatory Meeting 2002 Almaty, 1 st Summit 2004 Foreign Ministers' Meeting 2006 Almaty, 2 nd Summit
Asia	Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO)	Track I	PRC, Russia, Kazakhstan, Tajikistan, Kyrgyzstan and Uzbekistan (India, Iran, Mongolia and Pakistan)	- Established with the aim to counter terrorist, separatist, and fundamentalist activities in Central Asia and to promote security and economic cooperation.	2001 First Summit of the six member states held at Shanghai. Proclaimed as a permanent intergovernmental organization by the six member states 2002 SCO Charter was established as a result of an agreement by the heads of states in its 2 nd Summit at St. Petersburg. 2003 Moscow, 3 rd annual Summit 2004 SCO secretariat was established. 2004 (June) Tashkent, 4 th annual Summit 2005 Astana, 5 th annual Summit 2006 Shanghai, 6 th annual Summit
Asia-Europe	Asia-Europe Meeting (ASEM)	Track II	25 EU member states, EU Commission, ASEAN+3 member states, ASEAN Secretariat, Bulgaria, Romania, India, Mongolia and Pakistan	- Promote mutual recognition and build a partnership between the two regions, which would reflect the new global context of the 1990s and the perspectives of the new century	1996 Bangkok (ASEM I) 1998 London(ASEM II) 2000 Seoul (ASEM III) 2002 Copenhagen (ASEM IV) 2004 Hanoi (ASEM V) 2006 Helsinki (ASEM VI)
Asia-Latin America	The Forum for East Asia Latin America Cooperation (FEALAC)	Track I	Australia, Brunei, Cambodia, China, Indonesia, Japan, ROK, Laos, Malaysia, Myanmar, New Zealand, Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, Vietnam, Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Chile, Ecuador, Mexico, El Salvador, Guatemala, Nicaragua,	-Annual Ministerial meeting between the two regions to establish a closer working relationship and to promote further collaboration in key areas of education and science & technology for mutual benefit. - Australia and Costa Rica are co-chairs of a working group on e	1999 Singapore, 1 st Senior Officials' Meeting(SOM) 2000 Santiago, 2 nd SOM 2001 (Mar) Santiago, 3 rd SOM 2001 (Mar) Santiago, 1 st Foreign ministers meeting(FMM) 2002 Bogota, 4 th SOM 2003 San Jose, 5 th SOM 2004 (Jan) Manila, 6 th SOM

			Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay and Venezuela.	ducation, and science and technology	2004 (Jan) Manila, 2 nd FMM 2005 Seoul, 7 th SOM
--	--	--	--	--------------------------------------	---

* Cooperation regime proposals that have never been realized.

1. All-Asian Security Forum (May 1985) Former Soviet General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev
2. ASEAN-PMC (Post Ministerial Conference) (Jul 1990) Former Australian Foreign Minister Gareth Evans
3. North Pacific Cooperative Security Dialogue (Jul 1991) Former Canadian Foreign Minister Cecil Clarke.

* Proposals that are currently being pursued.

1. Northeast Asian Security Dialogue (NEASD) (May 1994) Korean proposal at the ARF-SOM (still being pursued).

ⁱ This was a preparatory meeting.

ⁱⁱ The city in Russia