EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. The 5th Asia-Europe Editors’ Roundtable was organised in partnership with London-based Chatham House (Royal Institute of International Affairs), with support from the Federal Public Service Foreign Affairs, Belgium, and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Japan. It was held within the framework of 4th Connecting Civil Societies of Asia and Europe Conference (CCS4). As a curtain-raiser for the 8th ASEM Leaders’ Summit (ASEM8), the Roundtable provided an appropriate platform for 17 eminent Editors from Asia and Europe to participate in a focused discussion on the necessary international mechanisms and institutions for credible and effective global governance. Participants also published articles in their respective media, thus raising the visibility for Asia-Europe relations, the ASEM process, and the work of ASEF. The Roundtable also gave inputs for recommendations by CCS4 participants in “Eight Points for ASEM 8”. ASEF maintained high visibility throughout the Summit by staffing an ASEF Information Booth at the ASEM8 media centre. The Statement by the ASEM8 Chair issued at the end of the Summit acknowledged ASEF’s contributions.

I) PROCEEDINGS

Programme [see Annex A]

2. A background discussion paper prepared by Chatham House, with inputs from ASEF Public Affairs, was circulated prior to the Roundtable to all participants [see Annex B]. The paper provided an academic underpinning and geo-political context for the one-day discussion and was well-received by participants.

3. On 2 Oct, as part of the welcome dinner reception for CCS4, Roundtable participants joined other CCS4 participants on a guided tour of the exhibition “A Passage to Asia: 25 Centuries of Exchanges between Asia and Europe” at BOZAR. The exhibition, which was curated by members of the Asia-Europe Museum Network (ASEMUS), was an excellent opportunity to profile one of ASEF flagship programmes to the participating media. The participating editors were very impressed by the range of the exhibits and the success of ASEMUS. ASEF visibility was raised considerably especially in India and Indonesia with their reports tracing the history of Asia-Europe relations through these fine arts exhibits. Of particular note is the two-page spread in the leading Indonesian news
weekly magazine Tempo, which underscored the high quality of the exhibits and the richness of the cooperation between participating museums in Asia and Europe.

4. The Roundtable opened on 3 Oct with a keynote speech by Mr Vanackere, Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs, Belgium. He invited the group of editors “to play their role fully”, adding that “they should not only act as an ASEM observers (but) also behave as ASEM actors.” [see Annex C for a recollection of Mr Vanackere’s introductory remarks] The participants appreciated his candid assertions that the economic and financial crisis remained the main narrative of the day and the important and fundamental question that needed to be addressed was whether Asia and Europe had the capacity to work together. A lively discussion ensued. Mr Vanackere also stayed on during the coffee break to engage in one-on-one discussions with the participating editors.

5. Dr Gareth Price, Head of Asia Programme, Chatham House, moderated Session One, “Is there a crisis of global leadership?” while Dr Kerry Brown, Senior Fellow, Chatham House, moderated Session Two, “An Asian Century?” Dr Pradumna B. Rana was the discussant who led Session Three on “Future Global Economic Architecture – What shape of things to come?” The majority of participants expressed their appreciation of the two moderators and the discussant [See Annex D for feedback and Annex E for profiles of keynote Speaker, Rapporteur, Moderators, Discussant and Participants]

2) ASSESSMENT

6. In general, the Roundtable met its objectives as stated at Annex A. The quality of discussion was very high. Feedback from participants was also very good [see Annex F for details].

Relevance

7. Following the international financial and economic crisis, and with lessons drawn from UNFCCC COP15 in Copenhagen, there is widespread recognition that there are serious shortcomings in the present global architecture for responding to these new challenges. There is hence an urgent need for a re-think of necessary international mechanisms and institutions for credible and effective global governance. Co-organisers and participants agreed that it was a timely and pertinent discussion which was directly relevant to their professional interest.

8. The Roundtable targeted participation of leading media representatives who are influential opinion-multipliers in their own countries. Participation was balanced between Asia and Europe. Additionally, with a view to the enlargement of ASEM membership at ASEM8, the Roundtable included Mr Fyodor Lukyanov, Editor-in-Chief of the journal, Russia in Global Affairs. Other notable participants included Ms Sylvie Kauffmann, Executive Editor, Le Monde (France); Mr Kim Chang-gi, CEO, Publisher and Executive Editor, The Chosun Weekly (Korea); Ms Yuli Ismartono, Deputy Chief Editor, TEMPO (Indonesia); Mr Simon Long, Asia Editor/Banyan Columnist, The Economist (UK); Mr Qu Yingpu, Deputy Editor-in-Chief, China Daily (China); Mr Klaus Dieter Frankenberger, Foreign Editor, Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung (Germany); and Mr Prem Shankar Jha, Editor, The Financial World of India [see Annex E for full list of participants].
Efficiency

9. The partnership between ASEF and Chatham House was unproblematic. ASEF took the lead on developing the programme and content structure as well as securing the discussant. Chatham House, which provided the rapporteur and moderator, prepared the discussion paper and will also produce the first draft of the post-event monograph. Logistical requirements and general administration prior to and during the event were handled by ASEF PA staff working within the ASEF Task Force that organised the CCS4. The participating editors gave very positive feedback on the conceptual elements of the discussion as well as on the administrative and logistical aspects of the meeting. One observation for future reference was to tap more on the local host for better on-site logistical support. There should also be better anticipation for transportation arrangements to and from the hotel to the venue. Heightened security checks and road closures had not been anticipated.

Effectiveness and Impact

10. The meeting’s stated objectives [see Annex A] were fully achieved. The one-day discussion took stock of recent trends in global governance as well as attempted to establish shared ground between Asia and Europe. The majority of participants (12 out of 16 respondents) welcomed future cooperation/collaboration between their respective media organisations through exchanges of articles. They included the positive respondents from France (Le Monde), India (Financial World), Vietnam (VietnamPlus) and Italy (Heartland).

 Visibility

11. ASEF received very good visibility with HE Vanackere presenting keynote addresses at the opening of the CCS4 and the Roundtable. As the Roundtable programme included extended hospitality for participants to cover the proceedings of ASEM8 Summit on 4-5 Oct, over half of the Roundtable participants stayed to report on the Summit. In doing so, they helped to raise international interest in the Summit. The Roundtable and ASEM8 also enjoyed good press coverage through the Roundtable participants and others. Articles were published in Tempo (Indonesia), the Straits Times (Singapore), La Vanguardia (Spain), the Telegraph and the Business Standard (India) as well as in the Economist (UK). [See Annex G for a list of published reports to date by Roundtable participants]

12. The Roundtable also made a contribution to the “Eight Points for ASEM 8” by CCS4 participants. This was circulated to the delegations at the ASEM8 Summit [see paragraph VIII of Annex H].

Sustainability

13. A monograph based on the Roundtable discussions will be jointly produced by Chatham House and ASEF. The cost of production of 700 copies will be shared equally between Chatham House and ASEF. Distribution of this monograph to other media, scholars and policy makers in ASEM countries will further extend the discussion held at the 5th Editors’ Roundtable. In particular, the issue of whether Europe and Asia can
develop more shared interests in the on-going evolution of the international political and economic architecture will be further examined in the context of a rising China and India.

14. The Asian participants underscored that the political union which had given birth to the European Union (EU) could not be a relevant ‘template’ for Asian countries. The EU had also thus far focussed on institution-building according to established political and social norms. This had little or no relevance in Asia. Nevertheless, an issue-based leadership, e.g. counter-terrorism efforts, immigration problems, etc could be more relevant to a dialogue between Asian and European countries. The European participants acknowledged that there was an urgent need for their political leaders to articulate a longer-term vision, especially one that took into account the increasingly fast-paced evolution of the global economy.

15. Participants noted that issues such as the under-representation of Asia in the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and energy and climate change mitigation efforts could also be considered as future discussion topics for such Asia-Europe media encounters.

Conclusion

16. In terms of content and organisation, this Roundtable received very positive feedback from participants. Many said they enjoyed the Roundtable both professionally and socially. One suggestion for future consideration was the introduction of smaller breakout discussion groups to accommodate more detailed discussion on themes.

18. It is recommended that ASEF continues to organise high-level Editors’ Roundtables. There is a need to bring top-level editors to exchange their insights on global issues of interest to Asia and Europe. As noted by Ms Yuli Ismartono, Deputy Chief Editor of Tempo, “This event has been a very interesting eye-opener but more exchanges are needed for better understanding between both sides, even for journalists.”

Prepared by:
Kristine Lucero, Project Officer, Public Affairs
Soh Lai Yee, Assistant Director, Public Affairs

Amended and approved by:
Tan Lian Choo, Director, Public Affairs

ANNEXES
A. Outline and Programme of Roundtable
B. Discussion Paper
C. Recollection of the Introduction by Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs Steven Vanackere
D. Presentation by Dr Pradumna B. Rana
E. Profiles
F. Summary and Evaluation of Feedback from Participants
G. Overview of Press Coverage by Roundtable Participants
H. Report of the 4th Connecting Civil Societies of Asia and Europe Conference, ‘Eight Points for ASEM8’
OUTLINE AND PROGRAMME OF 5th EDITORS’ ROUNDTABLE

Introduction
We live in an era of profound transition. Change is occurring rapidly and unpredictably. Challenges and risks are increasingly inter-connected across borders as well as across sectors. In the aftermath of the international financial and economic crisis, and with lessons drawn from UNFCCC COP15 in Copenhagen, there is widespread recognition that there are serious shortcomings in the present global architecture for responding to these new challenges. There is an urgent need for a re-think of necessary international mechanisms and institutions for credible and effective global governance.

Aims and Objectives
- To take stock of recent trends in global governance
- To examine and find shared ground between Asia and Europe for building consensus on the desired evolution of a new global architecture
- To raise awareness among European participants of the implications of Asia’s dynamic growth and relevance in the evolving new world order
- To raise awareness among Asian participants of the continued relevance of Europe

Issues to be discussed
- Existing mechanisms such as the UN and other multilateral institutions appear to be facing a crisis of confidence. Are they falling short of expectations? Is the status quo inadequate for engaging emerging powers in the common interests of all? What is the significance of replacing the G-8 with G-20?
- Are new initiatives for global leadership, such as the G-20, meant to be permanent? If so, how should such global mechanisms evolve to provide international stability?
- What is the shape of future international financial architecture? Are there lessons from the Eurozone crisis for Asia and Europe? Is there room for more Asia-Europe cooperation for stabilising international financial markets?

Chairperson
Ambassador Dominique Girard, Executive Director, Asia-Europe Foundation

Rapporteur/Moderator
Dr Gareth Price, Head of Asia Programme, Chatham House

Moderator
Dr Kerry Brown, Senior Fellow, Asia Programme, Chatham House

Outcomes
- Summary of discussions to be included as inputs for the report of the 4th Connecting Civil Societies of Asia and Europe which will be submitted by ASEF to ASEM Leaders on the occasion of the 8th ASEM Summit
- Monograph jointly-published by Chatham House and the Asia-Europe Foundation
**SATURDAY, 2 OCTOBER 2010**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All day</td>
<td>Arrival of participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:15</td>
<td>Bus departs from hotel for BOZAR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 18:30 - 21:00 | Cocktail Reception/Visit to the Exhibition:  
**A Passage to Asia, 25 Centuries of Exchange between Asia and Europe**  
Venue: Centre for Fine Arts (BOZAR), Brussels |

**SUNDAY, 3 OCTOBER 2010**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09:10</td>
<td>Bus departs for The Square</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 10:00 - 10:30 | Opening Keynote Speech:  
**H.E. Steven Vanackere**  
Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs, Belgium  
Introduced by:  
**Ambassador Dominique Girard**  
Executive Director, Asia-Europe Foundation |
| 10:30 - 10:45 | Coffee break |
| 10:45 - 12:15 | **Asia and Europe: Engaging for a Post-Crisis World**  
Introductory Remarks by Rapportuer/Moderator:  
**Dr Gareth Price**  
Head, Asia Programme, Chatham House  
Session One: “Is there a crisis of global leadership?”  
- Inter-connected crises: Attitudes towards shared challenges, including global financial system; migration; climate change; security and terrorism.  
- How effective are current institutions dealing with these challenges? Is there a continued role for the UN? Who sets the global agenda?  
- The G-20 constitutes 80% of world GDP. Does power confer legitimacy? How can the G-20 be more inclusive and transparent? |
| 12:15 - 13:45 | Lunch |
14:00 – 15:15 (open only to Editors’ Roundtable participants and observers)

Moderator:  
**Dr Kerry Brown**  
Senior Fellow, Asia Programme, Chatham House

Session Two: “An Asian Century?”
- How can Asia and Europe engage in this post-crisis world?
- Is Asia becoming an economic entity?
- Will growing economic integration lead to growing political integration in Asia?
- How will Europe and Asia work with the US, which remains a dominant global power?

15:15 – 16:30 (open only to Editors’ Roundtable participants and observers)

Discussant:  
**Dr Pradumna B. Rana**  
Associate Professor, S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (Singapore)

Session Three: “Future Global Economic Architecture (GEA) - What shape of things to come?”
- Shortcomings of the GEA before the global economic crisis of 2007/2008 and how the G-20 led GEA had addressed some of them.
- How can the inclusiveness and legitimacy of the G-20 be enhanced?
- How could the GEA evolve in the future?
- How can Asia and Europe engage and contribute to the evolving GEA?

16:30 – 17:00 (open only to Editors’ Roundtable participants and observers)

Wrap-Up and Conclusion

17:15 – 17:45 (open to all Connecting Civil Societies Conference participants)  
[Open for media coverage]

**Plenary, Closing Remarks by the Organisers**  
Venue: The Arc, The Square

* See Discussion Paper on Asia-Europe: Engaging for a Post-Crisis World circulated on 24 Sep 2010.

** Following the 5th Asia-Europe Editors’ Roundtable, participants are invited to stay on in Brussels to cover the 8th ASEM Summit which takes place on 4 to 5 Oct 2010. For more information on the Summit, please see [www.asem8.be](http://www.asem8.be)
DISCUSSION PAPER

Asia and Europe: Engaging for a Post-Crisis World

Despite long-established engagement between Europe and Asia, there is a widespread sense that the relationship has started to lose momentum. This paper is intended as background for discussion to explore the extent to which the recent financial crisis has created in Asia and Europe a sense of the need to better respond to shared challenges. The paper is in five parts, each setting out a different perspective on the relationship between Asia and Europe. The first puts forward the argument that greater coordination between Asia and Europe is essential. The paper then suggests that European integration offers a valuable template for the countries of Asia. The third section puts forward the case, often heard within Asia, that lack of purpose from Europe limits the potential for deeper engagement. The next section explores the lack of single institution within Asia capable of representing “Asia” in dialogue with Europe. The final section sets out the arguments that Asia increasingly wants to “go its own way”, and that the Asian Century will see Europe left behind and increasingly sidelined.

I. Global challenges need global solutions

The arguments for better engagement between Europe and Asia are clear-cut. Shared global challenges require cooperation, and a coordinated response. In response to the global financial crisis, European Commission President José Manuel Barroso noted that “we have to face serious challenges which don't respect any borders because they are global... no one in Europe or Asia can seriously pretend to be immune”. Europe and Asia must ‘swim together’, in Barroso’s words, during times when ‘unprecedented problems’ create a need for ‘unprecedented cooperation’. Along with economic crises, issues such as climate change and disease require a collective global response. Demographic changes and migration similarly require coordinated action and resource scarcity will affect both Asia and Europe.

Yet while there is significant interaction in some fields between Europe and Asia, it is not institutionalised and frequently occurs on a case-by-case basis, in response to crises (avian flu, global financial etc) or in an ad hoc manner. The Aceh peace process, for instance, was implemented by the EU, Norway, Switzerland and five countries from ASEAN. The EU and Indonesia have recently concluded their partnership and cooperation agreement; in May 2010, a number of European and Asian countries signed their first declaration focusing uniquely on climate change; and there are potential free trade deals between the EU and India, Singapore, Malaysia and Vietnam in the pipeline.

There is clearly plenty of scope to strengthen these interactions and the need to do so is increasingly self-evident. Globalisation exposes the world to new types of problems that require globally integrated responses. The relatively recent arrival of these challenges, however, means the existing global architecture is often insufficiently geared to deal with them. Consequently, Asia and Europe must not only work together, but must implement new ways of doing so.

The failure of 2009’s Copenhagen climate change summit to deliver a deal reflected some of these infrastructural failings. The summit made clear that better cooperation is needed to ensure future climate security. If efforts to keep global warming within the IPCC’s limits of two degrees are to succeed, the level of trust between Europe and Asia must improve and more coordinated climate change reduction efforts must begin. Many countries in Asia are already suffering from

1 http://www.guardian.co.uk/business/2008/oct/23/globaleconomy-creditcrunch

2 New Europe. 2010. Europe and Asia as global security actors. New Europe (11 July 2010)
volatile climatic conditions. For rapidly industrialising nations within Asia, the IPCC’s limits represent a huge challenge that cannot be overcome without international support. At the same time, it is in the interest of industrialised nations to help these nations to decarbonise, if only to ensure climate security for their own citizens. The level of coordinated efforts currently being made by industrialising nations in Asia and industrialised European states are too small and dispersed to hold sufficient political and environmental impact.

A Chatham House report has argued that Low Carbon Zones (LCZs) are a potential means through which current modes of climate security cooperation between Asia and Europe may be transformed. The implementation of these zones would take responsibility for carbon emissions down to the regional level within China, where particular regions would set and manage their own carbon limits, below the national average, and provide examples of practical models of sustainable industrial growth. Europe’s role would be to encourage the development of the LCZs by offering enhanced support for them – support that would come in the form of institutions and governance, high technology FDI and carbon finance. The Chinese government has expressed an interest in the creation of these zones (with a roadmap for one particular region – Jilin City – having already been created4) and the creation of several pilot areas has been discussed. The widespread implementation of such strategies across Asia would help to decentralise its climate change reduction policy while also ensuring external support from Europe.

Past global financial crises have highlighted the need for a more integrated response. The Asian financial crisis broke out in 1997, the year after ASEM was launched. This proved a trigger for enhancing cooperation within the region, and highlighted the failed response of several key multilateral institutions – in particular, the way in which the IMF dealt with the crisis and the delay of the WTO’s Doha Round5. In contrast to the reactions of these institutions, the crisis was able to demonstrate how Asia and Europe could successfully cope together. For example, the coordinated efforts of the two regions enabled the creation of an ASEM Trust Fund to serve as a safety net for affected countries in Asia. With the most recent financial crisis, Asia and Europe have once again proved the value of cooperation. The shared response by leaders at the ASEM7 Summit in Beijing in November 2008 gave Asia and Europe the opportunity to build up a common position on tackling the financial crisis6, as well as providing the impetus for convening the G20 Summit in the UK in 2009. The success of past Asia-Europe initiatives serves only to highlight why better cooperation between Asia and Europe in the future is necessary, particularly as we are likely to see more problems that are global in nature.

II. The European model offers a template for Asia

The European project – binding together countries with a recent history of conflict – holds lessons for Asia. Like Asia, Europe is marked by contrasting languages and cultures. But definitions of Asia (whether in think-tanks or government departments) vary. The broader the definition of Asia, the greater will be the diversity of opinion. The admission of Australia, New Zealand and Russia to the ASEM8 Summit in Brussels in October 2010 is a case in point.7

---


4 Chatham House, Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, Energy Research Institute, Jilin University, E3G. 2010. Low Carbon Development Roadmap for Jilin City


And there are dramatic changes within Asia. Over the past decade, China and India have emerged as key global actors. Countries like Vietnam have benefitted from China’s growth. But other countries, such as Burma and East Timor, have been left behind. Not unlike Europe in the 1950s and 60s, Asia’s economic disparities make it appear more like a patchwork of contrasting nations than a unified and coherent whole.

For China and India, recent economic success has brought with it a new sense of rivalry. Their need for resources affects other countries in Asia and beyond. The global ambitions of both nations have created a number of overlapping regional interests that have increased competition between the two. Both countries face domestic social pressures. This, in turn, has encouraged rising nationalism making peaceful cooperation increasingly challenging. Several commentators believe that competition for markets, resources and influence will intensify these challenges.\(^8\)

In economic terms, China and Japan cooperate. But deep-rooted tensions exist, despite efforts to build a mutually-beneficial relationship. Mutual mistrust, both in policy and practice, remains strong.\(^9\) China blocked Japan’s application for a permanent seat on the UN Security Council in 2005, and disputes in the South China Sea, affecting a number of countries, persist. With China now having replaced Japan as the world’s second-largest economy, efforts to balance mutual dependence and competition will remain difficult.

Political stability in Asia is not a given: Relations between Pakistan and India are strained, and complicated by Indian concern over perceived Chinese “ambitions” in South Asia. Taiwan and Mainland China are currently enjoying a rapprochement, but this relationship continues to oscillate. And North Korea remains a concern. As the recent hostilities between Thailand and Cambodia demonstrated, long-standing border disputes have the potential to erupt.

The European “project” has overcome similar tension within the member states of the European Union. The European experience – transforming war-torn Europe to one of the world’s most stable regions in a matter of decades - can work as a model for better Asian integration. Despite criticism of the sluggish nature of European decision-making and its lack of unity, the ratification of the Lisbon Treaty allows the EU to better articulate a clear voice. This ability to promote a stronger self-image and more readily implement intra-regional coordination should enable it to deepen its relationship with Asia.

The European Union already provides inspiration to a number of Asian governments advocating greater regional cooperation. Former Japanese Prime Minister Yukio Hatoyama spoke of his vision for an East Asian Community. China, too, has called for greater regional cooperation.

Although inter-Asian relations have been marked by deep cultural divides and competing ambitions, these new regional aspirations reflect a new vision of regional politics, characterised by greater pragmatism. Asia can look to Europe for lessons regarding its own method of integration. It could look to internalise some of the EU’s governance principles, including subsidiarity, its engagement with smaller member states, the use of both majority rule and consensus and a more open method of coordination.\(^10\) ASEAN’s commitment to establish a free trade zone by 2015 will undoubtedly have lessons to learn from European monetary union.

Globalisation has not benefited all of Asia equally. But in parts of Asia, a new generation has grown up knowing only growth. Whether subsequent triumphalism is expressed through “Asian-ness” or through national identity varies between countries. Asia is “still being shaped by the push

---


and pull of politics and economics and rivalries among Asians”. The emergence of an “Asia” will stem from this internal interaction; increased engagement and cooperation between Asia and Europe will be of mutual benefit.

III. European weaknesses hinder engagement with Asia

European weakness further limits its impact on, and relevance to, Asia. The notion of Europe and, in particular, the EU, continues to baffle Asian policy makers; for many Asians, the EU is regarded as little more than a ‘free trade zone’. Those who recognise the political aspects of EU often view it as a ‘stagnant’ entity – increasingly marginalised by a persistent failure to create common positions on behalf of all of its member states. The air traffic chaos from the Icelandic volcanic eruption and the Eurozone crisis following the collapse of the Greek economy demonstrate the inability of EU institutions to coordinate the most crucial policies and policy-making of the lowest common denominator.

The EU’s common defence policy further adds to Asian disregard: without a coordinated military power, many find it hard to comprehend Europe’s global significance. Despite some recent advances, European security and defence policy remains predominantly characterised by conflicting national policies and persistent allusions to national sovereignty. If the EU is to escape from its stigma as a non-military power and become more influential in Asia, it will need to form a clearer sense of its security priorities. “Europe will remain unable to represent its interests on the global stage if it continues to follow its [current] approach of selective cooperation.”

Although European integration is frequently referenced as a prime example of regional integration, the European experience is not necessarily compatible with that of Asia. European and Asian histories enjoy fundamental differences: in Asia, the colonial legacy has created nations that are still in the process of building national identities. This, rather than regionalism, is their prime focus. Another difference lies with the lack of rules that govern Asian institutional membership. While the EU requires its members to be democratic and to abide by EU law in relation, for instance, to market economies and movement of peoples, the standard approach to decision-making within Asia is rather more ad hoc and the process is often as important as the outcome. While Asia may wish to mimic the political stability and prosperity of Western Europe, at present its approach to regionalism is far removed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional cooperation triggers</th>
<th>Asia</th>
<th>Europe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cold war (external)</td>
<td>World Wars I and II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regionalism elsewhere and failure of multilateral approach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership</th>
<th>Asia</th>
<th>Europe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No single hegemonic power</td>
<td>Initially based on the German-Franco alliance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central role to be played by ASEAN</td>
<td>Functional role of small states</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing role of China and India</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Institutions</th>
<th>Asia</th>
<th>Europe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Institution-lite”</td>
<td>Deep and wide</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for deepening and widening</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pillars</th>
<th>Asia</th>
<th>Europe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional production networks</td>
<td>European communities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance sector and</td>
<td>Foreign and Security policies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


12 Lisbonne-de Vergeron, K. 2006. Contemporary Indian Views of Europe. London: the Royal Institute of International Affairs


In recent years, the EU has started strategic dialogues with the largest Asian countries, Japan, China and India. These bilateral relationships seem to overshadow a more generic EU-Asia relationship. The primacy of the EU-China relationship is particularly evident (and demonstrates that no single European country is strong enough to influence China). But China’s economic weight ensures that it is able to hold sway over the EU. Its readiness to disregard the EU was illustrated in 2008 when it cancelled the EU-China summit at the last minute, in response to French President Nicolas Sarkozy’s plan to meet with the Dalai Lama.

Where China has been influenced by Europe in the past – for example, regarding nuclear proliferation – it has been in reaction to coordinated efforts which have brought together both the EU and its most influential members. If Europe’s political weight is to match its economic standing, it will have to start showing a more coherent front. And Europe must recognise its own imperfections. Many in Asia are baffled by Europeans’ criticism when Europe still has its own problems to address. It is imperative for Europe to recognise both its own failings and the determination of other countries to resist European attempts at influence.

For many in Asia, the EU’s power is declining. The rise of Asia in recent years means that the West faces genuine competition for global economic and political supremacy. If Europe wishes to remain a significant player, it needs to adapt. It must speak with a more united voice to increase its legitimacy within Asia and provide a counter-perspective to emerging Asian power-houses. The ratification of the Lisbon Treaty may well leave the EU better equipped to do this, although this will not eliminate all of the weaknesses in its political and economic structure. Similarly, remodeling the European monetary union and creating a more coherent common defence policy would provide Europe with greater leverage on Asia. But progress is likely to be slow. Considering Asia’s economic growth, it is likely to take more decisions regardless of Europe’s input.

IV. An alphabet soup of regional institutions in Asia

In part, the lack of a single over-arching regional institution within Asia is a key impediment to engagement. While Europe may appear to lack direction, Asia lacks the necessary strong institutions to manage external shocks, internalise regional spillovers or provide effective regional public goods as the EU is successfully able to do and is far from being a homogenous unit itself.

The rise of the G20 adds yet another alternative to a host of pre-existing institutions as a means of dialogue and policy response.

How does the emergence of the G20, rather than the G7, as the pre-eminent forum to address global challenges affect the broader relationship between Asia and Europe? While six “Asian” countries are represented in the G20 (including Australia), Indonesia is the only member of ASEAN represented in the forum. Europe has four individual members, and the EU is itself the 20th member of the G20. While ASEAN has been invited as a representative of a regional grouping to several meetings, it is yet to gain a permanent presence. The G20 members represent 80% of global GDP, and if it continues to grow in importance, it may start to challenge other global governance bodies, such as the UN.22

There is clear concern about the implications of the G20 in smaller countries. Speaking at APEC in 2009, the Prime Minister of New Zealand, John Key, suggested that the G20 might establish a regional outreach mechanism for those within the Asia-Pacific region not already represented.23 These concerns are reflected in the establishment of the informal 3G grouping (the acronym stemming from its alternative title, the Global Governance Group). Its 28 members include Singapore, Malaysia, Brunei, the Philippines, New Zealand and Vietnam, and the grouping is intended to channel the voices of smaller states into issues being addressed within the G20. Whether Asian support for the 3G grouping would decline in the event that ASEAN secured regular participation in the G20 is unclear.

The G20 is but the latest in a plethora of regional organisations and fora, each with different strengths and weaknesses both of themselves, and in relation to dialogue with Europe. The most important pillar of Asian regional architecture is clearly ASEAN. ASEAN has an advanced security dialogue with several Asian and non-Asian partners; its mandate covers social and cultural pillars in addition to economic cooperation and its smaller member states play a role in agenda setting.24

In 2007, the EU and ASEAN established a partnership and joint plan of action to enhance the relationship between the two organisations. However, divergent attitudes towards Myanmar (Burma) continue to undermine the relationship. The emergence of China and India as multi-polar pillars has also diverted European attention. ASEAN in turn is increasingly concerned with maintaining the region’s distinct identity rather than be submerged into the story of China’s economic growth.

Nonetheless, ASEAN clearly has greater impetus than some of the other regional groupings. APEC has been criticised for lacking mid- to long- term growth strategies; its decisions are not legally binding and some criticise it for being overly-dominated by the US.25 The ARF brings together the EU and a number of Asian countries but, 15 years after its creation, still lacks a vision statement.26 Some observers argue that the EAS, which includes all major regional players, has the potential to provide a strong integration impetus beyond economic issues.27 Its top-down

---

22 ‘Global Governance: the G20 and the UN’ by Ambassador Vanu Gopala Manon, Permanent Representative of Singapore to the United Nations


approach (heads of state meet with no prior preparatory meetings) makes it distinct from other regional meetings.28

The Shanghai Cooperation Organization plays an increasingly important role within Asia, but as a forum for interaction with the EU faces challenges. It rejects the European norms of human rights, political liberties, good governance, and the right of international intervention when a state engages in internal abuses, 29 and is geared toward the interplay of its own members’ interests rather than seeking external input. 30

If there is a single representative of “Asia”, it is probably ASEAN, China, Japan and South Korea, or ASEAN+3. This forum has discussed a range of issues, including South China Sea disputes, though in that case without success. ASEAN+3 stems from the vision of an East Asian community, and while thus far the grouping represents a talking shop, this talk of itself is working, gradually, towards the promotion of a new consciousness of (East) Asia.

Other groupings exist, but each has specific concerns. In South Asia, the progress of SAARC is constantly undermined by tension between India and Pakistan. The Six Party Talks may encourage the emergence of a broader arrangement of regional security cooperation from the initial shared goal of a non-nuclearised Korean peninsula. But the talks highlight the continued pre-eminence of the US, rather than Europe, in Asia.

V. Asia wants to go its own way

As global economic growth has shifted towards Asia, Europe’s role on the world stage has been increasingly questioned. The recent financial crisis has enhanced this feeling: the swift economic recoveries in Asia have pushed the economic balance of power even further away from Europe. The severity of the crises experienced by numerous European countries has led to questions over the supremacy of Western economic models. Debate over an “Asian century”, and calls for Asian to “go it alone” are likely to increase.

The West has dominated the international system both politically and economically over the past two centuries. However, this hold has declined over the past two decades, with a gradual shift of strategic and economic influence towards Asia. Since 1995, Asia’s GDP has grown twice as fast as that of Western Europe and the United States. In terms of purchasing power parity, Asia’s share of global GDP grew from 18% in 1980 to 34% in 2009. 31 Asia’s financial weight has also grown steadily and the region’s stock markets now account for 34% of market capitalisation – compared with 33% for the US and 27% for Europe. Asian banks now hold two-thirds of foreign exchange reserves and, in 2009, China overtook Germany to become the world’s largest exporter. Furthermore, with Asian nations having demonstrated the most resilience to the global financial crisis, recovering from recession much faster than countries in the West, this trend will continue.

These advances are fully reflected in intra-Asia economic activity. The sharp rise in Asia’s proportion of world trade from 21% in 1990 to 34% in 2006 32 can largely be accounted for by


increased intra-regional trade, which grew almost nine times over the same period. The lesson many Asian countries have taken from the global financial crisis has been that they should not over-rely on external demand from Europe and the US for domestic economic growth. The unprecedented 12% drop in the volume of global trade in goods in 2009 had a severe impact on the export-oriented economies of Japan, Malaysia and Thailand, all of whom suffered recession. China, India and South Korea also experienced major, if temporary, slowdowns.

Over the past decade, Asian economies have also become more reliant on exporting to China, which is now the region’s largest export market (displacing the US). Asia is consequently relying more and more on China for sustained growth and prosperity, and, although European markets remain important to Asia, their significance is weakening. As the fastest growing global markets, Asia is increasingly important to Europe. Claims that Europe has more to learn from Asia (in particular its pragmatic and flexible pattern of industrial development) than vice versa are growing. The role of research and development within Asia has brought with it greater productivity and competitiveness, as well as the idea of ‘open regionalism’ – a type of regionalism that promotes the least discriminatory impact for non-members.

As Asia continues to come together as an inter-connected economic bloc, these trends will continue. Asia is shifting from a belief that “the region has no single, strong and enduring history of unity and accepted commonality, whether in polity, culture, language or religion”. Whereas the United States has dominated a disunited Asia since World War II, the region is now coming together on its own. Asia has seen the creation of a number of regional institutions in recent years, all of which are growing in weight. The meetings of APEC, SAARC and the EAS are seen as important global events, although it is perhaps ASEAN and its affiliate groups that have come to dominate global interest in Asian affairs.

Through ASEAN, Asia has started to develop its own distinct security architecture to ensure peace within the region and it now also has plans to implement a free trade area by 2015. Unlike the EU, ASEAN has strongly upheld the principle of state sovereignty and non-interference among its member states. While countries in Europe have taken the lead condemning Myanmar’s military regime and forthcoming ‘elections’, ASEAN has called for “constructive engagement” with Myanmar. This demonstrates the stronger role that Asian institutions have started to play in the world and the increasingly independent track they have started to take.

If Europe wishes to maintain its global influence, it must recognise its weakened position in future relationships with Asia. Europe and the EU must also learn to speak with a more united voice if they are to maintain a sense of legitimacy within Asian policy circles.

__________
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Recollection of the introduction by Vice-Prime Minister & Minister of Foreign Affairs Steven VANACKERE
Brussels - 3 October 2010

Vice-Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs Steven VANACKERE opened the 5th Editor’s Roundtable as follows: “Words can change the future, but only if the narrative sticks to the readers”. The Minister chose to depart from his prepared speech and preferred to engage on a more personal base with the editors, journalists, and other participants from the media. Underneath are a few of the lines he used:

- True to this mandate, ASEM 8 is proving to be much more than the Summit of the leaders alone. The 6th Asia-Europe Parliamentary Partnership Meeting took place earlier in the week on Monday and Tuesday September 27-28. From 2 to 5 October, the 8th People’s Forum is bringing together non-governmental organizations, including trade unions, from both regions, 300 people in all. The 12th Business Forum will meet on the side on October 4, with a focus on the integration of the respective financial sectors.

- One should not forget that over the last twenty years enormous progress has been achieved in raising the quality of life of Europeans and Asians alike, most notably by lifting millions of people out of poverty. This is often passed under silence – you know – bad news sells better than good news.

- Still, this is not the time for complacency. We face important challenges and they top the agenda of the ASEM 8 Summit. The first priority for ASEM 8 is to join forces in favour of strong, sustainable and balanced growth, with safeguards that prevent the kind of excesses that were seen on the financial markets in the recent past and with the clear objective of producing more inclusive economies. The economic and financial crisis, which is not over yet, may still be the narrative of the day. The important, fundamental question is about our capacity to work together. Zero-sum games approaches are not useful when considering exchange rates and debt deficits.

- Considering that 12 ASEM members are simultaneously members of the G-20, ASEM 8 seems a good opportunity for Asia and Europe, in view of the Seoul G-20 Summit in November, to show leadership and promote the kind of measured and balanced responses to which both are historically inclined. Instead of focussing on the ‘´Fall of Yesterday’s Powers´´, one should pay attention to ´The Rise of the Rest´.

- The impact of declarations and decisions depend on their implementation. There is a clear role for the press, as a guardian for such implementation and for day-to-day accountability.
Media people are from within society: they contribute to shape perceptions, they enjoy natural attention and visibility.

- Sustainable development concerns the livelihood of millions of Europeans and Asians. Indeed, present patterns of production and consumption appear not sustainable in the long run. In addition, under the present difficult economic conditions, the sheer preservation of social safety nets and of mechanisms for social solidarity has become an uphill battle of its own. Besides, the recent floods in Pakistan highlight how people can be affected by natural disasters, amplified as a consequence of deforestation and ill guided habitat.

- Europe is fascinated by Asia and vice-versa. Europe envies the growth rates achieved by the Asian economies. It understands that the future of its own economic and social model depends on major structural reforms, unleashing entrepreneurship and competitiveness. Conversely, Asia understands that economic growth alone does not produce stable and harmonious societies. It is interested in the European practice of shared prosperity through the combination of income redistribution and public services. Also, the management of conflicting economic, social and environmental demands in Europe's pluralistic societies through webs of consultation and participatory mechanisms catches attention in Asia.

- Ageing societies in Europe and Asia are often presented solely as a problem. Yet, longevity, the fact that average life now typically extends far beyond productive life, should also be considered a cherished gift.

- ‘Constructive ambiguity’ is often found in official documents. Let us not fool ourselves. At times, lucid or rational ambiguity can be beneficial but at times it may also have the effect of postponing the solution to the issues at stake. This would appear to be the case for the respect for human rights and the rule of law. These are not impediments to economic development. These are beneficial to it. Hopefully, one day, an ASEM Summit will clearly state that human rights do matter, also on economic grounds.

- Media are invited to play their role fully. They should not only act as an ASEM observer. They should also behave as ASEM actors.

The intervention of the Vice-Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs Steven VANACKERE at the 5th Editor’s Roundtable was followed by a lively questions and answers session.
Whither Global Economic Architecture?

Pradumna B Rana
Associate Professor
S Rajaratnam School of International Studies
Nanyang Technological University

Prepared for the 5th Asia-Europe Editors’ Roundtable on “Asia and Europe: Engaging for a Post-Crisis World”
2-3 October 2010, Brussels, Belgium

Outline

I. Pre-GEC G7-led GEA
II. Post-GEC G20-led GEA
III. Future GEA: Likely Scenario

I. Pre-GEC G7-led GEA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>G7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Macroeconomic stability</td>
<td>IMF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development finance and poverty reduction</td>
<td>WB and ADB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open trading system</td>
<td>WTO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial stability</td>
<td>FSF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I. Pre-GEC G7-led GEA (cont)

- Similar to the architecture created in BW except that
  - WTO had replaced GATT (in 1995)
  - FSF was created only in 1999 in response to the Asian Financial Crisis
  - In the 1980s and 1990s, the Washington Consensus was dominant

Weaknesses:
- Did not reflect the economic rise and political power of emerging markets, particularly those in Asia (China and India) and therefore lacked legitimacy
- Inflexibility (Theory of clubs): charters, quotas, and voting rights of IEIs were designed in the interest of like-minded original core members and place strict limits on change as membership expanded (44 to 186)
- IEI operations had been “dwarfed” by private capital

II. Post-GEC G20-led GEA

- G20 Summit set up by upgrading the G20 finance and central bank officials forum started since 1999 under the shadow of G7
- G20 appointed itself as “premier forum for our international cooperation” and President Obama categorically announced that G20 would replace G7 (Sept 2009)
- FSF also upgraded to FSB
- GEC also eroded the legitimacy of Washington Consensus
II. Post-GEC G20-led GEA (cont)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G20: “premier forum for economic cooperation”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Macroeconomic stability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development finance and poverty reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open trading system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Stability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. Post-GEC G20-led GEA (cont)

- G20 has addressed the legitimacy issue partially by including systemically important emerging markets: Historic!
- But reform of “Chairs and Shares” at the IMF and has been limited and slow
- April 2008 package has been small and yet to be implemented: 5% shift noted in Pittsburgh will take time
- 10 out of 24 Chairs directly or indirectly occupied by EU
- Emerging markets still aloof in reform proposals
- BRICs were initially reluctant to contribute to the NAB at the IMF

II. Post-GEC G20-led GEA (cont)

- Some other weaknesses of G20
  - Its approach is incremental and informal network-based unlike BW which was rules-based
    - G20 is a loose network with a huge mandate but no permanent secretariat
    - FSB is a network of supervisors and regulators with a small secretariat international
II. Post-GEC G20-led GEA (cont)

- It is not inclusive and lacks legitimacy
  - Stiglitz: Bring G20 under the UN umbrella and set up a more inclusive process: Will this increase effectiveness?
- It has a huge agenda that needs prioritization, so far only stimulus/exit strategies and financial regulatory reforms

III. Future GEA: Likely Scenario

- **Likely Scenario**: Move to a more decentralized GEA
  - Decentralization means a "senior" global organization working together with regional institutions linked together by rules and regulation
  - Governance reforms of IEIs could continue but flexible regional institutions could complement
  - Perhaps more compatible with the political realities of today: emergence of multi-polar world
  - Perhaps also more flexible to membership and agenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>III. Future GEA: Likely Scenario</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Global Economic Coordination Council (3G)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macroeconomic stability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development and poverty reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open trading system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial stability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III. Future GEA: Likely Scenario (cont.)

- Other regions are also building regional institutions to complement global ones
  - Arab Monetary Fund and the Latin American Reserve Fund
  - European Systemic Risk Board and 3 European bodies for banking, insurance, and securities market
  - European Monetary Fund / European Financial Stability Facility (?)

- Decentralized GEA need not lead to closed economic blocs of the 1930s given the integrated nature of the global economic process (Heilleiner)
- Regional monetary funds could be effective in preventing crisis in one country affecting others in the region (Stiglitz)

- What are the other advantages of a decentralized GEA?
  - Public good relevant to a region would be supplied by a regional entity (principle of subsidiarity)
  - Large regional countries may be willing to take lead in regional bodies before global bodies
III. Future GEA: Likely Scenario
(cont.)

• If incidence of financial crises increases and political will increases G20 and FSB may move towards a more rules-based system
  - Strengthen G20, perhaps establish a Global Economic Coordination Council (Stiglitz)
  - Strengthen FSB, perhaps establish WFO like WTO for finance (Eichengreen)

III. Future GEA: Likely Scenario
(cont.)

• If IEI reform is slow, then civil society and media could help sensitize issues and prod governments into action (Paul Collier at the recent Singapore Global Dialogue)

III. Future GEA: Likely Scenario
(cont.)

• How can Asia contribute to the future GEA? IMF MD: Asia’s time has come to play a lead role in the global economy
  - By developing new institutions like Asian Monetary Fund, AFSD, and Asia-wide free trade area
  - By making sure that regional institutions are complementary to global ones
III. Future GEA: Likely Scenario (cont.)

• By helping to enhance the inclusiveness and legitimacy of the G20: Singapore-led Global Governance Group (G3)
  ➢ G20 to hold consultations with the non-G20 members before and after their Summits
  ➢ Participation of UN Sec Gen and his Sherpa at the G20 be formalized
  ➢ Participation of various Chairs of regional groupings to be regularized
  ➢ For other countries (not members of a regional grouping) use a “variable geometry” approach

III. Future GEA: Likely Scenario (cont.)

• How can Asia and Europe engage?
  - Europe can provide lessons for Asia from its rich experience with integration
  - Both Asia and Europe can work together to (i) improve governance of IEIs and (ii) make sure that regional efforts are complementary to global ones
  - Europe could cooperate with Asia and others to reach a consensus in Seoul to implement the Singapore-led G3 ideas
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**Fabrizio MARONTA, Heartland (Italy)** · fmaronta@gmail.com
Fabrizio Maronta is the Managing Editor of Heartland – Eurasian Review of Geopolitics. He concurrently serves as the resident editorial advisor and staff writer of Limes – Italian Review of Geopolitics. He served in the academe as an Assistant Professor in Geopolitics at the Roma Tre University in Rome from 2006 to 2009, and is one of the organisers and host of the television programme, Macrosfera, agenda geopolitica, a cooperation between Limes and Italian TV station,
RAI News24. He is occasionally invited to comment on geopolitical issues in various Italian television and radio shows. Maronta graduated summa cum laude with a degree in Political Science in 2003, and also holds a master’s degree in “International Cooperation, Human Rights and EU Politics”, both from Roma Tre University.

John McBeth, The Straits Times (Singapore) • thane.cawdor@gmail.com
John McBeth has been Senior Writer on Indonesian affairs for The Straits Times since 2004. Prior to this, he was with the Far Eastern Economic Review for 25 years starting as a Correspondent and Bangkok Bureau Chief, and moving to head the Bureau offices in Seoul, Manila and Jakarta. From 1970 to 1979, he was the Deputy Chief Sub-Editor for the Bangkok Post and a freelance correspondent covering Thailand, Laos, Cambodia and Myanmar for the London Daily Telegraph, Asiaweek and United Press International. From 1966 to 1970, he was the Defence Correspondent and Sub-Editor for the Auckland Star. He started his journalism career in New Zealand as a reporter for the Taranaki Herald.

Qu Yingpu, China Daily (China) • c/o fujing08@gmail.com (Fu Jing, Brussels Bureau Chief)
Qu Yingpu is the Deputy Editor-in-Chief of China Daily. He is in charge of the editorial management of the China Daily and chinadaily.com.cn. He joined the newspaper in 1987, and has held various positions, including Deputy Business Editor, Director of the Editor’s Office, Assistant Editor-in-Chief and member of the editorial board before assuming his present position in 2006. He was also the spokesman for the Beijing 2008 Olympic Torch Relay. Qu graduated from Shanghai International Studies University in 1987 with bachelor degrees in English Language and Literature, and in International Journalism. He also obtained his MPA at Harvard University’s Kennedy School of Government in 2005.

Rik Van Cauwelaert, KNACK (Belgium) • rik.van.cauwelaert@knack.be
Rik Van Cauwelaert is the Director of KNACK since 2001. He was the Editor-in-Chief for four years prior to this appointment and was its political reporter since 1986. He had worked for various publications in Paris and was a journalist for the Associated Press in Belgium. He is currently also a political commentator for a television programme on Channel Z. He graduated from St Lukas Institute in fine arts.
SUMMARY AND EVALUATION OF FEEDBACK FROM PARTICIPANTS

Feedback is collated from the feedback forms (16 respondents) and a number of email correspondence. Feedback by participants was generally positive. Most participants appreciate the preparatory work for the Roundtable in particular the discussion paper. The openness as well as the quality of discussion have all met or exceeded their expectations. Through the discussions, participants gained insights from their Asian and European counterparts.

1) How did you first hear about this Editors' Roundtable? (you may tick more than one)
   2 From the ASEF Website/Newsletter
   2 From an ASEF Governor
   5 From my organisation
   3 From the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of my country
   1 From someone who has participated in a previous ASEF event/project
   4 From my previous participation in an ASEF project (please specify):
      - conference in Singapore, August 2010
      - participated in past Roundtable
   3 Others, please specify:
      - direct invitation from ASEF
      - from Gareth Price, Chatham House
      - from Tan Lian Choo, D/PA of ASEF

2a) What attracted you to attend this event? (You may tick more than one)
   13 Professional interest, direct relevance to my work on Asia-Europe Relations
   6 Opportunity to network with participants from other ASEM countries
   5 To learn more about ASEM, the Asia-Europe Foundation and their activities
   0 Opportunity to visit Brussels
   3 On the recommendation of colleagues / I was nominated by:
      - Editor-in-Chief
      - Tan Lian Choo
   0 Others, please specify.

2b) On the whole, were your expectations met?
   6 Strongly Agree
   10 Agree
   0 Disagree
   0 Strongly Disagree
   0 Not Sure

2c) From which areas of the programme did you gain most?
   6 The presentation/s by:
      - HE Vanackere
      - Dr Rana
      - Dr Brown
   11 Interaction with speakers
   13 Meeting and interacting with the other participants
   1 The ability to network/ observe official proceedings/ cover developments outside the Roundtable
   1 Others, please elaborate:
      - discovering the lack of knowledge on Asia among Europeans
      - I expected to have a productive and enriching exchange with my colleagues (especially Asians) and I did – That was the most valuable part of the experience.
2d) My other expectations were / I gained least from:
- The talk on financial architecture
- Some more discussion of the obstacles and threats in the relationship. More discussion needed of Western and Asia.

2e) In terms of the value added to the discussion during the Roundtable, how would you rate:

i. The moderator for the morning session (Dr Gareth Price)
   9 Excellent  7 Good  0 Average  0 Poor

ii. The moderator for the afternoon session (Dr Kerry Brown)
    10 Excellent  5 Good  0 Average  0 Poor

iii. The speaker (Dr Pradumna Rana)
     9 Excellent  7 Good  0 Average  0 Poor

iv. Your fellow participants:
   7 Excellent  9 Good  0 Average  0 Poor

iv. The keynote speaker (HE Steven Vanackere)
   6 Excellent  8 Good  2 Average  0 Poor

2j) My comments on particular moderators/panelists/speakers are:
- Most participants (panellists) were very frank in speaking out what they have in mind, including some sensitive matters
- Criticism: too many generalities. Might have split into working groups to focus on particular subjects
- I thought both Chinese participants, the Russian, and Klaus Frankenberger are excellent. Also Sunanda.

Administration

3a) Please rate the administrative support from the organisers:
   11 Excellent  5 Good  0 Average  0 Poor
- Tan Lian Choo and Lai Yee were superb
- They worked hard to contact and communicate with participants as often as necessary and possible.

3b) Did you encounter any difficulties registering for the Roundtable?
   16 No  0 Yes

3c) Were you provided sufficient background / preparatory information about the event?
   0 No  16 Yes
- Good discussion paper, we could have 1 or 2 more.

3d) For subsidised participants: was the travel subsidy provided by the organisers reasonable?
   1 No  8 Yes
- It doesn’t cover my ticket from Moscow and back
- From India and further, premier economy tickets or an extra night to recover from stress of travel was needed
3d) For subsidised participants: had your trip not been subsidised by the organisers, would you have attended the event?

8 No
- No institutional support from India
- Independent columnist
- Long way to come
- Other appointments
- Too far and too costly

2 Yes
- As it was very close to Paris

Suggestions

4a) Suggestions for improvement on logistics:
- None, logistics fine
- If I had good advice, I should have taken train from Paris to Brussels, not plane, so I did not have to spend too much time at the airport
- Difficult to improve (bus driver perhaps)
- More smooth transportation; transport should be well prepared; anticipating problems in getting to venue

4b) Suggestions for improvement on programme / format:
- [Break out into] smaller groups
- Broader range of topics that go beyond China and India
- Have the moderator be more alert to those who get less chance to speak out and urge them to speak

4c) Suggestions of topics for upcoming Editors’ Roundtable:
- Engaging small but rising economies into the decision making process; digital strategies for efficient cooperation between Asia and Europe
- Beyond Economic Architecture
- Europe and Asia in Improved Global Governance
- More people-oriented issues; we are journalists after all, not bureaucrats
- Whether it is fair enough or not for Europe to ask developing countries including China for example to reduce carbon dioxide drastically
- Energy in Europe and Asia

Future Plans

5) Would you be interested in a co-operation between your media organisation and an Asian/European organisation (e.g. in form of article exchanges or collaborations)?

1 No
- Exchanges between newspapers’ columns [Le Monde, France]
- Would like to publish columns and receive inputs on Asia-Europe, for use in my paper [Financial World, Tehelka Group, India]
- Setting up some kind of network so participants can keep in touch later [VietnamPlus, Vietnam]
- Exchanges of articles and analyses; organise common events such as debates and presentations [Heartland, Italy]

12 Yes
- Exchanges between newspapers’ columns [Le Monde, France]
- Would like to publish columns and receive inputs on Asia-Europe, for use in my paper [Financial World, Tehelka Group, India]
- Setting up some kind of network so participants can keep in touch later [VietnamPlus, Vietnam]
- Exchanges of articles and analyses; organise common events such as debates and presentations [Heartland, Italy]

6a) Other comments not covered by the questions above:
- Enjoyable, socially and professionally
- The booklet distributed this time titled, Asia-Europe Journal was very interesting with so many helpful papers
6b) Please provide us with a one or two-sentence "quotable quote" about your participation in this event (we may use this in our reports and future promotional material about the Editors’ Roundtable programme):

[Some comments below are edited for clarity]

- Kim Changgi: “I got valuable insights from both the European and Asian participants which I would otherwise not have experienced.”

- Sunanda Datta-Ray: “East and West have much to learn from each other. The ‘Passage to Asia’ exhibition was splendid and the right antidote to politics and economics.”

- Simon Long: “An illuminating exchange of views that highlighted some differences in Asian and European perspectives and some surprising areas of anonymity.”

- John McBeth: “A fascinating first encounter with colleagues from Europe in their own environment.”

- Sylvie Kauffmann: “This Roundtable allowed very open exchanges between journalists who are usually more inclined to be frank than politicians.”

- Fabrizio Marona: “The Editors’ Roundtable is a precious opportunity to exchange views in a lively and frank environment.”

- Xavier Batalla: “It has been a good opportunity to learn about the new to inform on the challenges that Asia and Europe share.”

- Fyodor Lukyanov: “This framework is invaluable for me, both as an opportunity to establish contacts with colleagues in other countries and as a source of information about current debates between Asia and Europe.”

- Yuli Ismartono: “This event has been a very interesting eye-opener but more exchanges are needed for better understanding between both sides, even for journalists.”

- Liu Jiang: “The Roundtable makes closer the ties between Asia and Europe, and more meaningful the work of the media.”

- Qu Yingpu: “Very rich interaction, which helps participants understand each other. Looking forward to participate in the next Roundtable.”

- Klaus Dieter Frankenberger: “It was an honour to be invited, to attend this Roundtable, which was highly valuable to me. I am looking forward to meeting again in the not too distant future and hope to be able to join you (ASEF) for another Asia-Europe event.”
Overview of Press Coverage by Roundtable Participants

As at 28 October 2010

Articles on ASEF:

“A Passage to Asia” Exhibition
2 October 2010

An East-West Dialogue and Interchange
(Yuli Ismartono, Tempo, 26 October 2010)

Lessons of Asia’s past - Celebrating 2,500 years of Asia-Europe exchanges in Brussels
(Sunanda Datta-Ray, The Telegraph, 16 October 2010)
http://www.telegraphindia.com/1101016/jsp/opinion/story_13061162.jsp

5th Asia-Europe Editors’ Roundtable
3 October 2010

The fall of Europe: What rising Asian States think about the “Old World”?
(Klaus Dieter Frankenberger, Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung, 25 Oct 2010)

A Bright Future, South Korea and the Upcoming G20 Summit
(Klaus Dieter Frankenberger, Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung, 20 Oct 2010)

A World without heart (in Spanish: Un mundo sin centro)
(Xavier Batalla, La Vanguardia, 16 October 2010)
http://www.lavanguardia.es/internacional/noticias/20101016/54024341248/un-mundo-sin-centro.html

Rights (in Spanish: Derechos)
(Xavier Batalla, La Vanguardia, 10 October 2010)

Articles on ASEM:

EU model not wanted in Asia
(Kerry Brown and Amy Studdart, The Straits Times, 12 October 2010)
http://admpreview.straitstimes.com:90/vgn-ext-templating/v/index.jsp?vgnextoid=0416df124cb9b210VgnVCM100000430a0a0aRCRD&vgnextchannel=0162758920e39010VgnVCM1000000a35010aRCRD

Wen Kan we talk?
(Sunanda Datta-Ray, The Business Standard, 9 October 2010)

And never the twain?
(The Economist, 7 October 2010)
http://www.economist.com/node/17199884?story_id=17199884
VN makes practical contributions to ASEAN-EU ties
(Le Quoc Minh, VietnamPlus.vn, 6 October 2010)

VN backs reforms of global economic governance
(Le Quoc Minh, VietnamPlus.vn, 5 October 2010)

Vietnam seeks stronger wide-ranging ties with others
(Le Quoc Minh, VietnamPlus.vn, 5 October 2010)

ASEM looks to establish strategic partnership
(Le Quoc Minh, VietnamPlus.vn, 3 October 2010)

ASEM8 highlights life improvement
(Le Quoc Minh, VietnamPlus.vn, 29 September 2010)
http://en.vietnamplus.vn/Home/ASEM-8-highlights-life-improvement/20109/12600.vnplus
Eight Points for ASEM 8

Belgian Deputy Prime Minister and Foreign Minister Steven Vanackere opened the 4th Connecting Civil Societies Conference to an audience of more than 150 leading representatives from diverse sectors in ASEM countries. The Asia-Europe Foundation and the Europe-Asia Policy Forum organised the event in cooperation with 15 Asian and European institutions across a wide field of expertise. The conference also featured the 5th Asia-Europe Editors’ Roundtable, which brought 17 eminent editors and commentators to examine recent trends in global governance.

I. Advance Interculturalism and Regional Integration

Asia and Europe need more knowledge about each other and about their inter-regional relations. ASEM should therefore mobilise civil society organisations, higher education institutions and think-tanks in order to facilitate the creation of an ASEM knowledge community that enhances mutual understanding. Three concrete avenues for this are proposed:

- ASEM should create more space for mutual learning by facilitating civil society exchanges between Europe and Asia and by increasing the civil society participation to ASEM processes.

- ASEM should put Higher Education and Research cooperation as one of its top priorities and take measures to stimulate long-term research cooperation between young researchers on topics of common interest.

- ASEM should contribute to strengthen the capacity of academic research institutes and think-tanks in Europe and Asia to understand each other's societies by facilitating exchanges, mobility and collaboration, as well as by facilitating the set-up of an ASEM network of think tanks.

II. Mobilise Resources for Higher Education

- Higher education is a public good and a fundamental element of economic, social and cultural development. Governments need to provide continued support to ensure continuity, quality, diversity, equity and access.

- Governments need to facilitate an effective and efficient degree of autonomy in higher education institutions. Higher education institutions should actively involve other stakeholders, including students, in the management of their resources, in defining strategic priorities and in evaluating outcomes.

---

The 4th Connecting Civil Societies Conference was jointly organised by the Asia-Europe Foundation and the Europe-Asia Policy Forum consortium: the European Policy Centre (EPC), the International Institute for Asian Studies (IIAS) and the Singapore Institute of International Affairs (SIIA). The content of this Briefing is derived from the workshop discussions and does not reflect the official position of the conference organisers, nor their sponsors.
• Costs and funding models should be defined by the needs and expectations of students as well as employers and the wider society. In the ASEM context, an effort should be made to explore supra-national and cross-regional strategies.

III. Harness Voluntary Service for Lifelong Learning

Living and working in the ASEM area increasingly demands new and more complex skills and competences. To develop these skills and to measure the impacts of voluntary work in creating skills and competences for living and working in ASEM area, any work on lifelong learning must realise that:

• The development and maintenance of professional and social skills and competences through lifelong learning is required to build and enhance constructive and closer cooperation in the ASEM region.

• Through the redesigning of relations between education and working activities the development of a sustainable and participatory learning society is possible. This can be done through lifelong learning.

• By encompassing formal and informal learning and by recognising prior learning and voluntary activities, lifelong learning can strengthen civil society.

IV. Build Regional Communities for Post-Conflict Reconciliation

Civil society organisations urge ASEM leaders to identify a common regional vision founded on common goals, affirmed by historical recognition, and supported by trans-regional and multi-stakeholder cooperation. There is a critical and urgent need for Northeast Asia in particular, and East Asia as a whole, to develop a mechanism for, at minimum, dialogue and confidence-building in order to guard against violent conflict. The region remains divided, with the Korean peninsula divide one of the most dangerous flashpoints in the world. There remain many other points of potential conflict, including unresolved territorial disputes linked to natural resources such as those over the Diaoyu/Senkaku Islands and the Spratly Islands. ASEM governments are urged to:

• Set up an independent, multi-stakeholder grouping (comprising educators, education ministries, media and NGOs) to address issues of historical recognition based on or connected to existing mechanisms in Northeast Asia and the European Union.

• Strengthen the ASEAN+3 dialogue specifically at an informal working level, for example, amongst mid-level government officials.

• Critically assess the successes and failures of both Asian and European post-war reconciliation experiences, like the European Coal and Steel Commission and Article 9 of the Japanese Constitution, with a view to building strategies for regional stability and trust building.

V. Guarantee the Right to Information

The right of individuals to access information which is held by public authorities is essential for civic engagement, to make governments accountable and ensure sustainable development – including the fight against poverty and corruption. ASEM governments are urged to:
• Recognise and respect the right of the public to seek, receive and impart information by adopting and implementing comprehensive national rights to information legislation based on international standards; and to ensure the fullest transparency and citizen’s access to information in all bilateral and multilateral negotiations leading to treaties and agreements.

• Accede to and extend their commitment to international treaties and conventions which advance the right to information, in particular the UNECE Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters (Aarhus Convention). Furthermore, they should require that the international institutions (to which they are a party) adopt transparency policies. In particular, they should proactively provide information needed by the public, especially vulnerable groups, to hold these institutions accountable.

• ASEM leaders should enable and encourage civil society initiatives that promote the right to information and facilitate the exchange of experiences and resources across ASEM countries to effectuate this right.

VI. Promote Public Health through "Young" Ideas

• Relevant government ministries, in cooperation with civil society, are called upon to develop and address greater inter-regional mechanisms for sharing knowledge on the development and delivery of school curricula on Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights (SRHR) and on healthy lifestyles including nutrition, sports and avoiding drug abuse. Similar financial and policy support can also be extended to informal and non-formal education as well as to strengthen web-based access to youth-friendly health information and services.

• Considering that the current level of engagement of both governmental and non-governmental actors in the promotion of public health for the youth is still insufficient, equal weight must be accorded to the youth sector as a valued partner in policy-making, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of public health programmes for young people in both regions.

• ASEM governments should empower and mobilise young people in public health promotion by strengthening Asian regional youth structures as a partner to their existing European counterparts. Governments, in cooperation with civil society, are called upon to enable capacity development such as inter-regional youth camps and leadership trainings. Particular support to encourage social entrepreneurship is needed. Examples include training young people in social entrepreneurial skills as well as providing incentives to young entrepreneurs active in public health promotion.

VII. Apply the Arts in Sustainable Urban Development

To meet the demands of living well together in the future, the art of “city-making” must embrace ecological growth to mean social, environmental, cultural and economic diversity. Inter-sectoral, transversal and sensitive approaches to urban development are needed, e.g. creating common spaces for shared use in cities. Governance must involve transparent forms of dialogue, mutual learning as well as genuine and effective participation. The arts can serve these processes as a dynamic catalyst and generate imagination among all other disciplines. To this end, it is recommended that:

• ASEM governments need to integrate the significant contributions of artwork and art-creating processes in urban development. They are urged to establish an enabling environment for the active involvement of artists and other creative practitioners in urban
development policies. In particular, they should create enabling environments for the development of greater numbers of small arts organisations/initiatives. These initiatives must be engaged in participatory and trans-disciplinary processes that respond to the needs of diverse communities.

- ASEM governments should actively consider looking beyond arts education towards a deeper role for art-in-education. This should include artistic ways of learning (such as experiential learning, question-based learning and non-linear problem-solving skills). The arts have a relevant role to play in formal, informal and non-formal education as well as in lifelong learning. Artists and other creative practitioners should be included in consultative bodies on education policies.

VIII. Asia and Europe: Engaging for a Post-Crisis World
The 5th Asia-Europe Editors’ Roundtable

The ASEM 8 Summit is occurring at a critical moment of profound global transition. There is an urgent need for Asia and Europe to learn from each other as challenges and risks are increasingly inter-connected across borders as well as across sectors. The issue of global governance reflects the impact of a shift in power from the West to the East. Europe is over-represented in global institutions and growing focus on the legitimacy of institutions has led to a questioning of this over-representation. However, it is difficult to conceive of EU member states willingly giving up global political power. Consequently, a flourishing of ad hoc G20-like institutions (or indeed the entrenchment of the G20) seems more plausible than the adaptation of existing institutions.

- European engagement with Asia therefore needs to recognise widespread Asian distrust of the EU’s perceived morally superior agenda predicated on human rights; this agenda is undermined by, for instance, the treatment of immigrants to the EU. In short, Europe-Asia engagement should focus on institutional processes, issues of governance enabling Asia to learn practical lessons from the EU; projects need to be constructive, and Europe needs to recognise its own limitations.

- More than this, the EU needs vision. A serious intra-EU dialogue on over-representation in global institutions would allow for a more serious, deeper partnership with the rising powers of Asia and a concrete acceptance of the importance of Asia. ASEM Leaders are aware of the real challenges posed by a rising Asia. However, Leaders should also persuade the public that this development provides a good opportunity for both regions to engage each other and to work towards international mechanisms that will facilitate cooperation and minimise friction.

Full information about the conference is available on the ASEF website: http://asef.org/index.php?option=com_project&task=view&id=630