“Re-thinking European Integration and East Asia Co-operation”

Conference Summary

Background

In order to explore the rapidly changing situation in Europe and Asia and to highlight the latest developments in regional integration in Asia and Europe, the Asia-Europe Foundation (ASEF) and the China Foreign Affairs University (CFAU) together with the China National Association for International Studies (CNAIS) organised a 2-day conference involving more than 80 academic scholars, researchers, government officials and journalists of the 39 ASEM partners. The meeting took place at the Xinhai Jinjiang Hotel, Beijing, People’s Republic of China on 13-14 November 2006.

The conference was opened by Prof. Qin Yaqing, Executive Vice President of the China Foreign Affairs University, Mr. Wu Hailong, Director General, Department of International Organisations and Conferences in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China and HE Ambassador Wonil Cho, Executive Director of the Asia-Europe Foundation.

The conference started with a keynote speech by HE Serge Abou, Head of Delegation of the European Commission in China who spoke about the political and institutional dimension of the European regional integration.
This part was followed by four sessions dealing with:

- The progress of regional integration in Asia and Europe since the end of the Cold War.
- Reconciling historical tensions within the two regions.
- The impact of functional co-operation on the process of regional integration.
- Inter-regional co-operation between Asia and Europe and its implications for regional integration

The progress of regional integration in Asia and Europe since the end of the Cold War

The geopolitical changes in the late 1980s confronted both regions with a range of challenges. Five such challenges were presented: the changing distribution of power; the democratisation and liberalisation pressures; the accelerated economic and financial globalisation; the enlargement with necessary institutional reforms and the US-led unipolarity.

The Asian perspective:

Regionalism surfaced in East Asia only recently. The idea was first proposed in the early 1990s, but not really launched until the 1997 Asian Financial Crisis. Presently the momentum is strong. And the growing integration of East Asia’s economies has become one of the defining realities of the early 21st century.

In the political field, ASEAN has embarked on the building of a security community. It is very unlikely that its member states would ever go into war with each other despite the many existing disputes among them. ASEAN has become more institutionalised, serving as the legitimate hub and chair of ARF, ASEAN+3 and the East Asia Summit. ASEAN has been recognised as the driving force of East Asian community-building. However there exists also the opinion that the ASEAN+3 co-operation should be carried out on a more equal footing in terms of leadership or chairmanship. ASEAN+3 processes have become considerably well institutionalised and recognised as the main
vehicle of East Asian community building. East Asian Summit is defined as a forum for
dialog on broad strategic issues. In addition to the ASEAN+3, it includes India,
Australia and New Zealand as dialogue partners. There are strong political
commitments to regional co-operation and integration from nation-states, such as
China’s accession to WTO.

In the economic field a rapid growth in intra-regional trade and greater interdependence
can be observed. China is now Japan’s leading trading partner; ASEAN and China are
each other’s fourth-largest trading partner; China’s share in the total exports of the six
older ASEAN countries rose from 2.4% in 1993 to 3 percent in 1998 to 6.6% in 2003.
Furthermore, the Chiang Mai Initiative on financial cooperation has made significant
progress.¹

In social-cultural field, there has been more networking among civil societies in East
Asia. People-to-people exchanges have been expanded.

Asia is definitely on a steady path of regionalization and community building. An East
Asian community has been recognized as the long-term goal of regional cooperation by
all ASEAN+3 governments.

The European perspective:

As far as Europe is concerned, the end of the Cold War was definitely a starting point
for a new chapter in European integration.

The introduction of the single currency as an example for the event-driven changes in
Europe: The post-World War II division of Germany had facilitated West European
integration by reducing the German Federal Republic to roughly the same size as other

¹ Finance ministers of ASEAN, China, Japan, and South Korea (ASEAN+3) agreed on May 6 2000 in Chiang Mai,
Thailand to establish a system of bilateral swap arrangements among the ASEAN+3 countries, also known as the
Chiang Mai Initiative (CMI). Together with the swaps, the CMI has also institutionalised meetings of finance ministers
(AFMM+3) and deputy ministers (AFDM+3) for policy dialogue and coordination and also the annual summit for
ASEAN+3. As second phase of the CMI for regional financial integration, ASEAN+3 has launched the Asian bond
market initiative (ABMI) for the development of regional bond markets in Asia. The CMI network of swap arrangements
is designed to provide liquidity support for member countries that experience short-run balance of payment deficits in
order to prevent an extreme crisis or systemic failure in those countries and subsequent regional contagion. Emergency
support facilities such as the CMI are similar in nature to other regional and international “lender of last resort” facilities.
big West European powers such as France, UK and Italy. However the rapid process of German reunification raised strong fears among other EU member states as to whether the new united Germany would remain committed to the goal of closer European integration and/or aspire to becoming a hegemonial regional power. Under intense pressure to make a concrete gesture to underline the Federal German Government’s continuing commitment to the European cause, and knowing that France retained the power to veto German’s unification, the German government signed up to the single currency at the European Council meeting in December 1989. The Euro could thus be seen as a product of at least implicit Franco-German bargaining whereby France consented to German unification in exchange for Germany’s agreement to give up the strong German Mark. Several speakers saw the balancing of interests between France and Germany as a decisive key to the successful European integration, which eventually contributed significantly to the unification of Germany and Europe as a whole.

The end of the Cold War triggered as well a powerful democratisation and liberalisation process in Central and Eastern Europe. It accelerated the globalisation process especially in trade and finance. Due to the fact that Europe is or was incapable of handling regional security crises on its own, e.g. in the former Yugoslavia, Europe unintentionally contributed to the growing US unipolarity. Furthermore the Iraq conflict split the Union mainly between older members, objecting, the war, and new members joining the so-called coalition of the willing.

The mentioned globalisation process eventually led to a growing popular anti-European and anti-globalisation backlash. So, soon after the accession of the CEE states plus Malta and Cyprus in 2004, an enlargement fatigue emerged especially in the ‘old’ EU member states which finally resulted in an identity crises and the rejection of the constitution treaty in two referendums in France and the Netherlands.

However, the participants of the conference agreed that Europe has managed the period following the end of the Cold War and the rapid expansion of the Union rather well, the Maastricht Treaty and the introduction of the Euro are proof enough. The problems in the ratification of the constitution treaty do not necessarily mean a set-back for Europe’s further integration as the Union falls back on strong and solid institutions, the Council, the Commission, the Parliament and the court of justice. However there seems to be no
time-frame for re-introducing the constitutional treaty. And it would be seen by all speakers as a great mistake not to refer the final decision again to the people.

In this context, the question was also raised: What positive role was the US playing in the founding of the EU after the 2nd World War and the ASEAN in the 60s? Would a similar role of the US be possible in getting the East Asian Community of the ground?

**Reconciling historical tensions within the two regions**

The importance of reconciling historical tensions in Asia and Europe was the second major issue discussed during the first day, starting with European experiences and finally leading to the still ongoing deeply rooted conflict between Japan and its Northeast Asian neighbours. Despite the fact that reconciliation is still an ongoing process even in Europe, the German reconciliation efforts toward its western neighbours first e.g. France and later towards the East especially with Poland were seen by many Asian participants as an important reference point.

During the deliberations it became quite clear, that a reconciliation process is on one hand a pre-condition for starting an integration process, but on the other hand can also be a positive and fruitful outcome of integration. A regional institution can as well provide a kind of platform for promoting reconciliation processes. Reconciliation and integration are therefore paralleled processes.

Every nation should address its own history and wrongdoings in an adequate way. German-Franco reconciliation was largely due to Germany’s sincere apologies for its wrong-doings in WWII and the courage of its state leaders to shoulder the responsibilities of their predecessors. The new Japanese Prime Minister Abe’s recent visit to China and ROK was seen as a turning point in the development of Japan’s bilateral relations with these two countries.

Several participants stressed repeatedly their doubts that East Asian co-operation will move forward as long as there is no genuine China-Japan reconciliation.
Four stabilisers were identified as helpful to overcome the political difficulties in Sino-Japanese relations: 1. Both peoples are convinced of the need for cooperation rather than confrontation; 2. China and Japan are economically linked and interdependent; 3. the two peoples share long-lasting culture, civilisation, way of life, etc; 4. Both countries have embarked on the process of East Asian community-building.

A comparison of the regional co-operation in the two regions

The participants of the conference saw the two regions share some common traits in integration processes:

- Economic integration process precedes that of political and security domains;
- FTA (Free Trade Agreements) play an important role for deeper and broader regional economic integration;
- Both EU and ASEAN enlarged after the Cold War. Both have managed enlargement without losing cohesion;
- Both regions subscribe to open regionalism.

Some European experiences are quite relevant to East Asia, for instance, in the cases of Chiang Mai Initiative and Asian Currency Unit.

However, the European integration was a political project from the very beginning, whereas regional integration in East Asia is pushed forward by market forces and corporate decisions. The imminent need for East Asian regionalism is attributable to the end of the Cold War, the Asian Financial Crisis, and the diminishing role of the WTO and the APEC. But the European integration was initiated for fear of another devastating war and the threat from the Soviet Block. Somehow, the East Asian co-operation is still in its embryonic stage, while the EU could be compared to a grown-up child.

- Institutionalisation in East Asia is still very weak, while that in Europe is well established.
- East Asia is characterised by diversity in ideologies, cultures, religions, political systems and development levels. Europe, in comparison, is far more homogeneous.
- East Asian integration is led by a group of smaller states, while the EU has traditionally been largely driven by two major European powers, Germany and France.
- The East Asian political and security co-operation is far behind that of the EU.

Concluding the generally positive assessment on the progress made in regional integration in East Asia and Europe, some similarities in the weaknesses should not be ignored: there are still problems to generate sufficient common political will in both regions; there is a diverging understanding about the role of the major powers in the region; there are ongoing disputes about allocating resources for common tasks; there is still dissent over how deep and how wide integration should go and Europeans as well as East Asians are split over which commonly shared values should serve as a binding premise for a more institutionalised integration.

**The impact of functional co-operation on the process of regional integration**

Functional co-operation in investment, trade, monetary-, security- and educational co-operation have all a profound impact on processes of regional integration and were seen as a very positive trend.

**Investment**

Flow of Foreign Direct Investment definitely promotes regional integration and vice-versa. It is as well linked to the question of reconciliation. The paper presented at the conference stressed the need to drop the very minimalist view which bases FDI just on three factors ‘labour, capital and technology’, but to accept that FDI includes concepts and practice of economics, finance, international trade and rate of exchange and to a wide spectrum of structural variables ranging from institutional building to technology transfer, to security and integration processes at the regional level.

Important is a pragmatic approach, accompanied by confidence measures, reciprocal acceptance of pluralistic cultural and religious values, international openness and human capital accumulation.

There is a strong interest to further invest in China. In the paper presented it was stated...
that the five major growth centres until 2020 will be India, Malaysia, China, Thailand, and Turkey; and among the OECD member countries, the growth centres will be Ireland, USA, Spain, Canada, and France.

**Monetary Co-operation**

The development of an European single market and especially the European single currency is considered the major breakthrough in deepening the European integration process. So it is no surprise that following the Asia Finance and Economic crises the East Asian leaders considered the setting up of a Regional Monetary Co-operation and Regional Monetary Units in East Asia based on two initiatives for regional monetary and financial co-operation: The Chiang Mai Initiative and the Asian Bond Market Initiative.

One of the key current problems in East Asia is the missing coordination in the exchange rate system. There exists a variety of exchange rate systems among East Asian countries. And misalignments of intra-regional exchange rates among East Asian currencies caused by US$ depreciation is possible.

The European experience with the European Monetary System (EMS) in the period from 1979 to 1998 could serve as a model for East Asia.

**Trade**

For Europe, trade integration was robust since 1952, a pragmatic but indirect way to progress towards political integration. In Asia, in general, the political agenda for trade integration is more an effort to stabilise intra-regional political relations, to secure economic transactions and to advance in the coordination of various issues such as maritime transportation, telecommunication, emergency rescue efforts in case of natural disasters etc..

As regional institutions in East Asia are still weak, there are as many bi-lateral agreements negotiated as there are partners. The degree of binding of those FTA agreements is not clear. But progress made in the last three years is very impressive.
Participants saw two possible scenarios for East Asia. One is a hub-and-spoke structure with ASEAN in the centre, which is preferred by ASEAN; and the other is an Asian Single Market preferred by Japan.

**Security co-operation**

Security co-operation is one of the driving forces for further European integration. The European security community does not exist in the framework of a single organisation. NATO, OSCE and EU have during the past 15 years become more elusive, more dynamic, more comprehensive, more operational, more open for co-operation and last but not least less regional, looking at the EU Missions worldwide. Since the War on the Balkans Europe has gone through a number of experiences in security co-operation learning its lessons the ‘hard way’, which led eventually to a common EU security strategy with three major goals: prevention, partnership and multilateralism. Five major threats were identified, namely: international terrorism, the proliferation of WMD, regional threats, failing states and organised crime.

Asian participants appreciated Europe’s ‘soft power’ and civilian-led approach in EU peace keeping missions in Asia versus the ‘hard power’ preferred by the US.

Security today has evolved into a comprehensive concept to include much boarder issues. Common security concepts can be a driving force for furthering regional integration.

Despite a large number of remaining difficulties and challenges the EU is considered as the model of a security community, although the EU did not have any protective functions as regard to external threats until recently. The critical factor enabling meaningful security co-operation is that the EU is a union of citizens based on the rule of law, combined with economic prosperity, political stability and peaceful settlement of conflicts.

**Education**

Finally in this session the participants were informed of various attempts and initiatives for example by UNESCO to promote regional co-operation in the field of education.
Especially worth mentioning are the ‘Asia Pacific Centre of Education for International Understanding’ and the ‘Southeast Asian Ministers of Education Organisation’ (SEAMEO).

All participants agreed that suspicion and mistrust resulted from ignorance and are often the causes of war. The prevalence of peace and justice in this world can only be realised through education.

During the discussion on functional co-operation, two important points were added: First, from a European point of view functional co-operation is definitely not enough to deepen regional integration; it also needs functioning institutions, common rules and laws as well as a common political identity. Second, when talking about economic integration in East Asia one should not underestimate the role of the so called ‘Bamboo-capitalism’, referring to production and investment networks of Chinese people all over East Asia.

**Inter-regional co-operation between Asia and Europe and its implications for regional integration**

Over the last 15 years, East Asian countries have bonded together to cooperate among themselves and to establish mechanisms with other countries or organizations, examples are APEC, ASEM, ARF, ASEAN+3, the Forum for East Asia and Latin America Cooperation, the Asian-African Summit, the Asia-Middle East Dialog, etc.

Inter-regional dialogue and co-operation can boost business confidence, promote international understanding, and make globalisation seem more manageable and potentially beneficial. For many nations and peoples of East Asia being represented in inter-regional dialogue and co-operation with such groups as the EU is a catalyst for re-discovery and a boost to greater self-confidence, particularly for those burdened by history of colonial- or conflictual relationship. But the benefits are mutual. EU’s relationship with ASEAN and its participation in the ARF is also creating a stimulus for EU members to get their act together. The acceding to ASEAN’s Treaty of Amity and Co-operation (TAC) in the face of France’s decision to sign first is just one example.
Some of the experiences and best practices being shared by EU in the ARF have been instructive. The EU Troika system has been an inspiration for the evolution of the concept of the ARF Friends of the Chair to be convened in times of emergency, crises and situations likely to disturb regional peace and stability.

The ASEM, to which ASEAN and the EU are affiliated, was launched in 1996, celebrating its 10th anniversary at the 6th summit in Helsinki recently with 35 of the 39 ASEM partners participates on the highest state level.

The Helsinki Declaration on the Future of ASEM draws up the direction of the Forum; delineates focal areas of co-operation; stresses the co-ordination and introduces the ASEM virtual secretariat as a new co-ordination mechanism.

With the latest enlargement of ASEM especially on the Asian side with India, Pakistan and Mongolia ASEM represents now about 60% of the world’s population. This enormous size of the Forum bears both opportunities and challenges. The risk of a two-speed ASEM process had been mentioned as well as the risk of the missing link with the people who should develop a sense of ownership in this inter-regional forum.

Positively seen was also the membership of the ASEAN Secretariat in ASEM. It is another proof of the ongoing institutionalisation process within the ASEAN, challenging the old ASEAN model of ‘soft regionalism’.

In this context, it was highly appreciated that the summit was accompanied by meetings of the peoples’ forum and business forum as well as meetings of top journalists and young leaders, organised by the Asia-Europe Foundation, stressing the importance of networking between Asia and Europe at all levels and the inclusion of civil society in the ASEM process.

**East Asian Regional Integration: Prospects**

The future of an East Asian community can be viewed with a mix of pessimism and optimism. Pessimism is due to lack of mutual political trust. The obstacles include
historical issues; Sino-Japan rivalry/competition; tensions surrounding the Korean Peninsula and the South China Sea; the rise of nationalism in some countries.

The optimism is based upon the following factors: the process is kept going; East Asian countries do not only have common interests but also share a lot in tradition, culture, way of life, family values, etc., which lay a good foundation for people-to-people exchange; the existence of differences and disputes in one region would not deny the need for the strengthening of regional co-operation or the establishment of a community in the region; the strengthened regional co-operation should help soothe the antagonism, create a favourable environment, and even provide an institution or mechanisms to settle conflicts.

**Policy Recommendations**

As a result of the discussions the following key recommendations were made:

- Efforts in institutionalisation for regional co-operation should be made in broader and more comprehensive areas. Legal institutions could constitute the “pillars and beams” in East Asian community building. The governments of the region must step in and agree on common norms and rules to govern, to guide and to accelerate the integration process.

- The community builders in East Asia should solve disputes through community structures. Forums could be set up to help manage disputes, prevent conflicts and dissipate mutual suspicions.

- In the economic aspects, the movement of goods within the region should be facilitated by lowering and removing technical barriers to trade. Twin deficits of the United States could not be resisted in the near future. Alternatives should be looked for. Regional integration or alliances is the strategic policy to mitigate potential risks in finance. And openness is connected with this regional approach.

- There are 2 options to co-ordinate exchange rate systems in East Asia. One is to stabilise both the exchange rates among the intra-regional currencies and their exchange rates against outside currencies. The other is to stabilise an intra-regional exchange rate against a common regional monetary unit. A multi-step approach should be adopted:
Phase 1: Institutional Development -- the Chiang Mai Initiative (CMI) and Asia Bond Market Initiative (ABMI) (and the Asian Bond Fund (ABF))
Phase 2: Common Exchange Rate Policy Objectives
Phase 3: Common Exchange Policy Regimes
Phase 4: Implementation of Regional Monetary Arrangement
- Regional Monetary Unit should be created with Official RMU and Private RMU.
- Co-operation in social and security areas should be strengthened.
- International education is to be promoted at all levels of society across inter-related fields such as peace, human rights, democracy, sustainable development, etc.
- “Big powers” in the region should devote themselves to the building of an East Asia community rather than their own versions of East Asia.
- To further inter-regional dialogue and co-operation, there should be sustained political will supported by practical cooperative activities and sufficient resources. As to ASEM in particular, ASEAN may try to co-ordinate the Asian side of the ASEM. Social cultural exchanges may rely very much on ASEF.
- Track II and Track III exchanges do play an important role in community building and therefore should be emphasised and further promoted.

During the various plenary discussion more questions than answers were given, many of them applying to both regions and could serve for future European-East Asian dialogues:
- What is the relationship between bilateral and multilateral schemes, will a network of bilateral agreements e.g. FTAs lead eventually to a stronger regional integration?
- What kinds of values are guiding European or East Asian integration? Is there a difference between the values of member and non-member states within a specific region? Apparently the pacifist mood of European people and their rather low sensitivity in regard to sharing sovereignty eased the way towards sovereign regional integration in Europe. Do values change in the course of integration? Are common values essential to embark on regional integration or can they be formed during the integration process?
- Was Europe’s deep and most serious crisis in the period of 1914 – 1946, with two World Wars, crucial for the successful European integration?
- Does the enlargement of a regional institution weaken the organisation, does enlargement import instability? Is it possible to export stability to new members? What is more crucial, the deepening or the widening of an integration process? Who defines the membership of the region, especially if there are no clear cut borders as it is the case in Europe and East Asia (e.g. Turkey in Europe and India or Australia/New Zealand in East Asia)? Does the sheer size of a region/market already limit the chances for deeper regional co-operation?
- How to enforce regional regulations, translating regional decisions into national regulations?
- What is the role of the general public, the people in regional integration? Are the European Union and the East Asia co-operation largely elite-driven and as a result people are rejecting the newly formed institutions (without necessarily rejecting the integration process as a whole)?
- Who should lead, be in the driver’s seat of a regional grouping? Should a major power be leading? To what extent is the growing nationalism which can be observed both in Europe and East Asia an obstacle to further regional integration? What are the instruments available to counter this development?
- What is the role of big powers in regional integration?
- To what extent could the EU be a model for other regional institutions?

**Conclusion:**

One lesson East Asia can learn from Europe: statesman’s visions are fine and essential; so are the practical steps to the realisation of those visions. The European Union, in dialogue and co-operation with East Asia, will also enrich its integration process and improve its competitiveness on a global stage.

Beijing 14 November 2006

The Rapporteurs:

Wei Ling, P.R.China

Norbert von Hofmann, Germany
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ANNEX 1: CONFERENCE AGENDA

Conference Venue:
Shanghai Hall, 2nd Floor
Xinhai Jinjiang Hotel
61 Jinbao Street
Dongcheng District
Beijing, China 100005

Day 0 – Sunday 12 November 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ARRIVAL OF PARTICIPANTS, REGISTRATION AND WELCOME RECEPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09:00 - 18:00 Arrival of Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:00 - 18:00 Registration of Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venue: Hotel Lobby</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>19:00 - 21:00 WELCOME RECEPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hosts:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China Foreign Affairs University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China National Association for International Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia-Europe Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venue: Cuilanxuan Restaurant 1st Floor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Day 1 – Monday 13 November 2006

- Opening Session
- Session I
- Session II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>08:30 - 10:00 Registration of Participants (continued)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Venue: In front of Shanghai Hall 2nd Floor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OPENING SESSION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10:00 - 10:20 WELCOME REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chair:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof Qin Yaqing (China)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Vice President, China Foreign Affairs University &amp;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President, China National Association for International Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welcome Remarks:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Wu Hailong (China)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director-General, Department of International Organisations and Conferences, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HE Ambassador Wonil Cho (Korea)
Executive Director, Asia-Europe Foundation

**10:20 - 11:20**  
**KEYNOTE SPEECHES**

The keynote speakers will present the broad topic of Asian and European identity in the context of region building.

**HE Serge Abou** (EC)  
Head of Delegation, European Commission in China  

**HE Rodolfo Severino** (the Philippines)  
Former ASEAN Secretary General & Visiting Senior Research Fellow, Institute of Southeast Asian Studies

11:20 - 12:00  
Open Discussion

12:00 - 13:30  
Lunch

Venue: Four Season Coffee Shop  
1st Floor

**SESSION I**  
**HOW HAVE THE DYNAMICS OF REGIONALISM (POLITICAL, ECONOMICAL, SOCIAL AND CULTURAL RELATIONS) IN ASIA AND EUROPE CHANGED IN THE LAST 10 YEARS?**

13:30 - 14:10  
Speakers will provide the landscape on how regionalisation proceeded in Asia and Europe, focussing more on new developments rather than compare past experiences between Asia and Europe.

Chair:  
**Mr Geoffrey Barrett** (EC)  
Adviser, DG External Relations, European Commission

Speakers:  
**Dr Makio Miyagawa** (Japan)  
Director, Japan Institute for International Affairs

**Dr Douglas Webber** (UK)  
Professor of Political Science, INSEAD

Discussant:  
**Mr Dan O’Brien** (Ireland)  
Senior Editor, The Economist Intelligence Unit

14:15 - 15:00  
Open Discussion

15:00 - 15:30  
Coffee/Tea Break

Venue: In front of Shanghai Hall  
2nd Floor
The presentation will focus on how large powers of Europe were able to reconcile their historical differences and pave the way for the kind of regional integration Europe enjoys today. Furthermore the liaison and current tensions between China, Japan and Korea could be analysed and possible recommendations presented.

Chair:
Prof Young-Kwan Yoon (Korea)
Former Minister of the Republic of Korea & Professor, Seoul National University

Speaker:
Mr Paweł Świeboda (Poland)
Former Director, European Integration Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Poland & Director demosEuropa

Discussant:
Dr Makio Miyagawa (Japan)
Director, Japan Institute for International Affairs

HE Ma Zhengang (China)
President, China Institute of International Studies

16:15 - 17:00
Open Discussion

17:00 - 19:30
Free Time

Dinner hosted by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China

Address:
Mr Chen Xu (China)
ASEF Governor for the People's Republic of China & Deputy Director-General, Department of International Organisations and Conferences, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China

Venue: Cuiianxuan Restaurant
1st Floor

Day 2 – Tuesday 14 November 2006

- Session III
- Session IV
- Session V
- Closing Remarks
Topics to be discussed:

09:00 - 10:00
- Investment
- Monetary Co-operation
- Economic Integration (e.g. common market EU, free trade area Asia)

Chair:

Prof Dermot McAleese (Ireland)
Chairman of the Consultative Board, Institute for International Integration Studies & Emeritus Whately Professor of Political Economy, Trinity College, University of Dublin

Speakers:
On Investment:
Prof Giorgio Dominese (Italy)
Co-ordinator Central Eastern European University Network & Professor Economy and Policy of Transition, Luiss University

On Monetary Co-operation:
Prof Eiji Ogawa (Japan)
Lecturer, Graduate School of Commerce and Management, Hitotsubashi University & Deputy Director of EU Institute in Japan Tokyo Consortium

On Trade:
Mr Michel Fouquin (France)
Deputy Director, Institute of Research on the International Economy - CEPII

Question & Answer

10:00 - 10:40
- Security and soft-security co-operation
- Educational Co-operation

On Security:
Ms May-Britt Stumbaum
Resident Fellow, European Foreign and Security Policy Programme, German Council for Foreign Affairs - DGAP

On Education:
Mr Kang Dai-Geun (Korea)
Director, Asia-Pacific Centre of Education for International Understanding

Question & Answer

10:40 - 11:00
Coffee/Tea Break

Venue: In front of Shanghai Hall
2nd Floor

11:00 - 11:20
SESSION III CONTINUED

Chair:
Dr Zhou Hong (China)
Director, Institute of European Studies, Chinese Academy of Social Science
SESSION IV
HOW CAN CROSS-REGIONAL PLATFORMS BETWEEN ASIA AND EUROPE STIMULATE THE PROCESS OF REGIONAL INTEGRATION WITHIN EACH REGION?

13:30 - 14:10 (E.g. ASEM, EU-ASEAN, ARF)

Chair:
Prof Dr Dewi Fortuna Anwar (Indonesia)
Deputy Chairman for Social Sciences and Humanities, Indonesian Institute of Sciences

Speakers:
Mr Medardo C Abad (the Philippines)
ASEAN Regional Forum Unit Director, ASEAN Secretariat

HE Hanna Lehtinen (Finland)
Ambassador & Head of ASEM 6 Secretariat, Ministry for Foreign Affairs, Finland

Discussant:
Mr Peter Ryan (Ireland)
Director, Intellectual Exchange
Asia-Europe Foundation

14:15 - 15:00 Open Discussion
15:00 - 15:30 Coffee/Tea Break

Venue: In front of Shanghai Hall
2nd Floor

SESSION V
WHAT POSSIBLE FUTURE SCENARIOS CAN BE AUGURED FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL INTEGRATION OF ASIA AND EUROPE?

15:30 - 16:10 Two appointed rapporteurs will synthesise the outcomes of the conference and discuss future scenarios.
Chair:
**Dr Edy Prasetyono** (Indonesia)
Head, Department of International Relations, Centre for Strategic and International Studies

Rapporteurs:
**Assoc Prof Wei Ling** (China)
Deputy Director, East Asian Studies Center, China Foreign Affairs University (20 min)

**Mr Norbert von Hofmann** (Germany)
Consultant & Former Head of Office, Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung Office for Regional Cooperation in Southeast Asia (20 min)

16:10 - 16:40
Open Discussion

---

**CLOSING REMARKS**

16:40 - 17:10
Closing Remarks:

**Mr Bertrand Fort** (France)
Deputy Executive Director, Asia-Europe Foundation (10 min)

**Prof Qin Yaqing** (China)
Executive Vice President, China Foreign Affairs University & Vice President, China National Association for International Studies (10 min)

17:30
Free Time

**Closing-dinner hosted by Prof Qin Yaqing**
19:00 - 21:00
Executive Vice President, China Foreign Affairs University & Vice President, China National Association for International Studies

Venue: Xinjiulong Restaurant
2nd Floor, 26 Zhanlan Road
Xicheng District, Beijing 00037

---

**Day 3 – Wednesday 15 November 2006**

**DEPARTURE**

Whole Day
Departure of Participants
## ANNEX 2: PARTICIPANTS’ DETAILS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Phone Number</th>
<th>Email Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr Medardo ABAD</td>
<td>ARF Unit Director</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>(62) 21 7262991</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mcabad@aseansec.org">mcabad@aseansec.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE Serge ABOU</td>
<td>Head of Delegation</td>
<td>EC</td>
<td>(86) 10 6532 44 43</td>
<td><a href="mailto:serge.abou@ec.europa.eu">serge.abou@ec.europa.eu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof Dr Claes Goran ALVSTAM</td>
<td>Vice-Dean for International Affairs</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>(46) 31-773 1385</td>
<td><a href="mailto:claes.alvstam@handels.gu.se">claes.alvstam@handels.gu.se</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof Dr Dewi Fortuna ANWAR</td>
<td>Deputy Chairman</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>(62) 21 525 2085</td>
<td><a href="mailto:fortuna@lipi.go.id">fortuna@lipi.go.id</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Geoffrey BARRETT</td>
<td>Advisor - Adviser</td>
<td>EC</td>
<td>(32) 2 29 66 309</td>
<td><a href="mailto:geoffrey.barrett@ec.europa.eu">geoffrey.barrett@ec.europa.eu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE Rokas BERNOTAS</td>
<td>Ambassador</td>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>(86) 10 845 185 20</td>
<td><a href="mailto:amb.cn@urm.lt">amb.cn@urm.lt</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Sophie BOISSEAU DU ROCHER</td>
<td>Senior Researcher</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>(33) 1 45 51 10 03</td>
<td><a href="mailto:s.boisseau@centreasia.org">s.boisseau@centreasia.org</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Prof Gianni BONVICINI
Director
Instituto Affari Internazionali
Italy
P:  (39) 06 3224360
E:  g.bonvicini@iai.it

Mr Rafael BUENO MARTINEZ
Director
Lectures Seminars and Studies
Casa Asia
Spain
P:  (34) 93 66 80 329
E:  rbueno@casaasia.es

Prof Giorgio DOMINESE
Co-ordinator CEEUN - Transition Studies
World Applied Research &
Central Eastern European University Network
Professor Economy and Policy of Transition
Luiss University
Italy
P:  (39) 335 5714344
E:  giorgio.dominese@ceeun.org

Mr Roland FEICHT
Resident Representative for China
Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung
Germany
P:  (86) 10 6532 4813
E:  feicht@fesbj.com

Prof FENG Zhongping
Professor and Director
European Studies, China Institutes of
Contemporary International Relations
China
P:  (86) 10-8854 7682
E:  zhongping3@yahoo.com

Mr Michel FOUQUIN
Deputy Director
Institute for Research on the International Economy CEPIII
France
P:  (33) 153685544
E:  michel.fouquin@cepii.fr

Assoc Prof Dr Nantana GAJASENI
Associate Professor and
Deputy Executive Director
ASEAN University Network
Thailand
P:  (66) 2 2153248
E:  aun@chula.ac.th
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Prof Dr Gustaaf GEERAERTS</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Brussels Institute of Contemporary China Studies, Vrije Universiteit Brussel</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>(32) 2 6291324</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gustaaf.geeraerts@vub.ac.be">gustaaf.geeraerts@vub.ac.be</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Ms Dorothy Grace GUERRERO</td>
<td>China Programme Coordinator</td>
<td>Focus on the Global South</td>
<td>Phillipines</td>
<td>(66) 2 2187363</td>
<td><a href="mailto:d.guerrero@focusweb.org">d.guerrero@focusweb.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Mr KANG Dai-Geun</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Asia Pacific Center of Education and International Understanding</td>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>(82) 2 774 3985 / Ext. 101</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dgkang@unescoapceiu.org">dgkang@unescoapceiu.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Prof KIM Sung-Han</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>American Affairs Department Institute of Foreign Affairs and National Security</td>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>(82) 23497 7644</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ksunghan@chol.com">ksunghan@chol.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>HE Youngmin KWON</td>
<td>Ambassador &amp; Acting Chancellor</td>
<td>Jeju Peace Institute</td>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>(82) 64-735-6500</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ambkwon@yahoo.com">ambkwon@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>HE Hanna LEHTINEN</td>
<td>Ambassador and Head of ASEM 6 Secretariat</td>
<td>Ministry for Foreign Affairs, Finland</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>(358) 9 160 56358</td>
<td><a href="mailto:hanna.lehtinen@formin.fi">hanna.lehtinen@formin.fi</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Prof LUAN Thuy Duong</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Centre for Southeast Asian Studies Institute for International Relations</td>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>(84) 48344540, ext.134</td>
<td><a href="mailto:luanthuyduong@yahoo.com">luanthuyduong@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
22. HE MA Zhengang
President
China Institute of International Studies
China
P: (86) 10 85119501
E: mazhengang@ciis.org.cn

23. Prof Dermot McAleeSE
Chairman of the Consultative board, Institute for International Integration Studies & Professor, Department of Economics
University of Dublin, Trinity College
Ireland
P: (353) 1 896 2490
E: dermot.mcaleese@tcd.ie

24. Dr Makio MIYAGAWA
Director
Japan Institute of International Affairs
Japan
P: (81) 3 35037744
E: yagi@jiia.or.jp

25. Assoc Prof Dr NGUYEN Thi My
Associate Professor
Institute for Southeast Asian Studies
Vietnamese Academy of Social Sciences
Vietnam
P: (84) 42730418
E: nguyenmy@fpt.vn

26. Mr Ekke NOMM
Director
Estonian School of Diplomacy
International Capacity Building Expert
Georgian-European Policy and Legal Advice Centre
Estonia
P: (995) 32 921371
E: nomm@geplac.ge

27. Mr Dan O'BRIEN
Senior Editor
The Economist Intelligence Unit
Ireland
P: (44) 20 7576 8309
E: danobrien@eiu.com

28. Prof Eiji OGAWA
Professor
Graduate School of Commerce and Management, Hitotsubashi University & Deputy Director, EU Institute in Japan Tokyo Consortium
Japan
P: (81) 42 580 8859
E: ogawa.eiji@srv.cc.hit-u.ac.jp
29. Dr Edy PRASETYONO
   Head, Department of International Relations
   Centre for Strategic and International Studies
   Indonesia
   P: (62) 21 386 5532 35
   E: edy_p@csis.or.id

30. Ms Liga SONDORE
   Lecturer
   Faculty of Economics and Management,
   University of Latvia &
   Project coordinator
   Centre for European and Transition Studies
   Latvia
   P: (371) 29167300
   E: liga.sondore@inbox.lv

31. Prof SONG Xinning
   Professor
   School of International Studies
   Renmin University of China
   China
   P: (86) 10 6251 2824
   E: xnsong@cesruc.org

32. Prof Dr Manfred STRAUBE
   Jean Monnet Professor
   University of Vienna
   Austria
   P: (43) 1427735205
   E: manfred.straube@univie.ac.at

33. Ms May-Britt STUMBAUM
   Resident Fellow
   European Foreign and Security Policy
   Programme
   German Council for Foreign Affairs - DGAP
   Germany
   P: (49) 30 25 42 31-44
   E: stumbaum@dgap.org

34. Ms Sanae SUZUKI
   Research Fellow
   Institute of Developing Economies
   Japan
   P: (62) 21 5707555
   E: sanaes@ide.go.jp

35. Mr Paweł ŚWIEBODA
   Director
demosEUROPA &
   Former Director
   European Integration Department
   Polish Ministry of Foreign Affairs
   Poland
   P: (48) 601 888 929
   E: pawelswieboda@demoseuropa.eu
36. Dr Eric TEO Chu Cheow  
Council Member  
Singapore Institute of International Affairs  
Singapore  
P: (65) 9633 6085  
E: sldeet@mbox3.singnet.com.sg

37. Mr WU Hailong  
Director-General  
Department of International Organisations and Conferences  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China  
China

38. Mr Norbert VON HOFMANN  
Former Head of Office  
Friedrich Ebert Stiftung Office for Regional Co-operation in Southeast Asia  
Germany  
P: (49) 7634 504628  
E: cunvh@t-online.de

39. Dr Douglas WEBBER  
Professor of Political Science  
INSEAD  
United Kingdom  
P: (33) 1 60 72 49 79  
E: douglas.webber@insead.edu

40. Assoc Prof WEI Ling  
Deputy Director  
East Asian Studies Centre  
China Foreign Affairs University  
China  
P: (86) 10 68323169  
E: wei@cfau.edu.cn

41. Mr YIP Wei Kiat  
Deputy Chief of Mission in Beijing  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Singapore  
Singapore  
E: yip_wei_kiat@mfa.gov.sg

42. Prof Young-kwan YOON  
Professor, International Relations  
Seoul National University  
Korea  
P: (82) 2 880-6349  
E: ykyoon@plaza.snu.ac.kr
43. ZHANG Zlixiu  
China

Dr ZHOU Hong  
Director  
44. Institute of European Studies  
Chinese Academy of Social Science  
China  
P: (86) 10 6513-8428  
E: zhou-hong@cass.org

OBSEVERS’ DETAILS

Mr Laurent BEDUNEAU-WANG  
1. Founding President  
Europe-Asia Finance  
France  
P: (84) 135 2192 2718  
E: lbeduneauwang@yahoo.fr

Dr Li Weiwei  
2. Research Fellow  
China Institute of International Studies  
China  
P: (86) 10 58119532  
E: liweiwei@ciis.org.cn

Ms Lena LINDBERG  
3. Ph.D. Candidate  
Department of Human and Economic Geography School of Business Economics and Law Göteborg University  
Sweden  
P: (46) 31 773 1382  
E: lena.lindberg@handels.gu.se

Mr Filomeno III Sta. Ana  
4. Coordinator  
Action for Economic Reforms  
Philippines  
P: (63) 2 426 5626  
E: filomenoiii@yahoo.com
5. Dr VU Tuyet Loan  
   Director, Center for Australian Studies  
   Institute for Southeast Asian Studies  
   Vietnam  
   E: loantuyetvu@yahoo.com

6. Dr WANG Fan  
   Director and Associate Professor  
   Institute of International Relations  
   China Foreign Affairs University  
   China  
   P: (86) 10 68323685  
   E: wf8873@sina.com

7. Ms WANG Wei  
   International News Correspondent  
   Xinhua News Agency of China  
   China  
   P: (86) 1063074011  
   E: shellywangwei@yahoo.com.cn

8. Assoc Prof WANG Yan  
   Director, Foreign Affairs Office  
   China Foreign Affairs University  
   China  
   P: (86) 10 68323117  
   E: yanwang@cfau.edu.cn

9. Mr Mikael Weissmann  
   Researcher & Lecturer  
   Silk Road Studies Program  
   Uppsala University  
   Sweden

10. Mr WU Wencheng  
    China

11. Dr ZHANG Jun  
    Research Fellow  
    Institute of European Studies  
    China Academy of Social Sciences  
    China  
    P: (86) 10 85195746  
    E: zhang.jun@cass.org.cn
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journalists’ Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ms Bina BEKTIATI</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tempo News Magazine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dr Markus BERNATH</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Editor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Der Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mr Rui BOAVIDA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Correspondent (Beijing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lusa- Portuguese News Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mr Eric JOHNSTON</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Editor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Japan Times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mr Shin-Who KANG</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Korea Times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mr Saritdet MARUKATAT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy News Editor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangkok Post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ms NGUYEN Thi Huong Giang  
Deputy Chief of Society-Culture Service  
Le Courrier du Vietnam  
Vietnam

Mr Jes Randrup NIELSEN  
Greater China Correspondent  
Morgenavisen Jyllands-Posten  
Denmark

PAN Ying  
China

Mr Petros PAPAKONSTANTINOUID  
Editor in Chief for Foreign Affairs  
Kathimerini  
Greece

Ms Piyarat SETTHASIRIPHAIBOON  
Finance Reporter  
The Nation newspaper  
Thailand

Mr WANG Nan  
Senior Reporter  
People’s Daily  
China

Mr Bartosz WEGLARCZYK  
Deputy Foreign Editor  
Gazeta Wyborcza  
Poland

WU Chang Liang  
China

WU Wei Liang  
China
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>XU Chap Qing</td>
<td>China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>XU Na</td>
<td>China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>YANG Liang Qing</td>
<td>China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Mr ZHANG Wen</td>
<td>China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Editor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Globe Magazine</td>
<td>China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>ZHOU Zhao Jun</td>
<td>China</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX 3: CONFERENCE CO-ORGANISERS

Asia-Europe Foundation

The Asia-Europe Foundation was created by the Asia Europe Meeting (ASEM) heads of state in 1997 and acts as its manifestation toward Civil Society. ASEF works for intellectual, cultural, and people-to-people exchange among ASEM member in Asia and Europe. In particular, Intellectual Exchange aims to contribute to policy debate and strategic thinking on themes of current and future inter-regional importance between Asia and Europe. For more information on ASEF programmes, please visit our website http://www.asef.org.

China Foreign Affairs University (CFAU)

The China Foreign Affairs University is the only institution of higher learning which operates under the guidance of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China, and aims at preparing high calibre personnel able to discharge their duties in fluent foreign languages for foreign services, international studies, and international business and law. At the suggestion of Premier Zhou Enlai, China Foreign Affairs University was founded in September 1955.

China National Association for International Studies (CNAIS)

The China National Association for International Studies was established in December 1980 and is an academic association, performing various functions in the fields of teaching, research and consultation. CNAIS has 66 institutional members, setting up a nation-wide network of scholars and experts in International Relations and covering all the major universities and research institutes in China. The Secretariat is at China Foreign Affairs University in Beijing. Over the past two decades, CNAIS has been playing an important role in the development of the IR discipline in China. It has also carried out activities to encourage joint research, enlarge international exchange programs, and provide consultative service for various institutions. Its annual conference is a most important event for academic exchange among IR scholars in China. Besides, it holds seminars on special topics so as to improve the theoretical research on international relations and facilitate the application of research achievements.