

Co-sponsored by
The Global Forum of Japan (GFJ)
ASEAN Institutes of Strategic and International Studies (ASEAN-ISIS)

Report of

**The 4th JAPAN-ASEAN DIALOGUE
BY GFJ / ASEAN-ISIS**

on

**“The Prospect for East Asian Community and
Regional Cooperation”**

June 12-13, 2005 / Toranomom Pastoral

Tokyo, Japan

Supported by

Japan-ASEAN Exchange Projects (JAEP)

In Cooperation with

The Council on East Asian Community (CEAC)



Clara JOEWONO, Deputy Executive Director, CSIS, chairing the Session I (third from right)



Hank LIM, Director of Research, SIIA, giving the keynote speech in the Session II (third from left)



Participants lively exchanging views in the session III

Preface

The Global Forum of Japan (GFJ) aims to promote a policy-oriented exchange of views between business, opinion and political leaders of Japan and their counterparts in the rest of the world and to contribute to the deepening of mutual understanding and the formation of the consensus. For this purpose, GFJ has been actively engaged for the past 23 years in organizing policy-oriented bilateral and/or multilateral “Dialogues” every year between Japan and the rest of the world.

It is against this background that GFJ held the 4th Japan-ASEAN Dialogue “The Prospect for East Asian Community and Regional Cooperation” in Tokyo on 12-13 June 2005. This report intends to summarize the achievements of these discussions between Japanese and their ASEAN counterparts. The full text of the report will be available at the website of GFJ (<http://www.gfj.jp/>) as well.

The 4th Japan-ASEAN Dialogue “The Prospect for East Asian Community and Regional Cooperation” was held under the joint auspices of GFJ and ASEAN-ISIS, in cooperation with the Council on East Asian Community (CEAC), and was attended by 104 participants including 11 panelists representing ASEAN. Participants exchanged opinions on matters of significance related to the future of Japan-ASEAN relations towards East Asian Community. We would like to take this opportunity to express our gratitude to the Japan-ASEAN Exchange Projects, which generously supported this 4th Japan-ASEAN Dialogue.

August 1, 2005

Ito Kenichi
President
The Global Forum of Japan

Table of Contents

1. Program.....	1
2. Participants List	3
3. Biographies of Mediators and Panelists	5
4. Outlines of Discussions	12
5. Policy Recommendations	14
6. Keynote Papers	16
Session I: “An Open Community Based on Universal Values”	
by Carolina G.HERNANDEZ	16
by ITO Kenichi	19
Session II: “Promoting Functional Approaches”	
by TAKEUCHI Yukio	22
by Hank LIM	29
Session III: “The Role of ASEAN Towards Community Building”	
by Hadi SOEASTRO	37
by OE Hiroshi	44
7. Appendix	46
(1) “The Role of ASEAN Towards Community Building” by Termsak Chalermphanupap.....	46
(2) “Asia and Its Diversity” by Kai Noritake	52
8. An Introduction to GFJ	65
9. An Introduction to ASEAN-ISIS	68

1. Program

	THE 4th JAPAN-ASEAN DIALOGUE 第4回目・ASEAN対話	
The Prospect for East Asian Community and Regional Cooperation 「東アジア共同体への展望と地域協調」		
June 12-13, 2005 Toranomom Pastoral / 2005年6月12-13日 虎ノ門パストラル Tokyo, Japan / 東京		
Supported by / 助成 Japan-ASEAN Exchange Projects (JAEP) / 日・ASEAN学術交流基金		
Co-sponsored by / 共催 The Global Forum of Japan (GFJ) / グローバル・フォーラム ASEAN Institutes of Strategic and International Studies (ASEAN-ISIS) / ASEAN戦略国際問題研究所連合		
	In Cooperation with / 協力 The Council on East Asian Community (CEAC) / 東アジア共同体評議会	

Sunday, June 12, 2005 / 2005年6月12日(日)

"Pêche", Toranomom Pastoral, 6th Floor

Welcome Dinner * Invitation Only / 開幕夕食会 * 特別招待者のみ

18:00-20:00 Welcome Dinner hosted by ITO Kenichi, President, CEAC
 伊藤憲一東アジア共同体評議会議長主催開幕夕食会

Monday, June 13, 2005 / 2005年6月13日(月)

"Rosé", Toranomom Pastoral, 6th Floor / 虎ノ門パストラル6階「ロゼ」

Session I / 本会議

9:30-11:40 "An Open Community Based on Universal Values"
「普遍的価値に基づいた開かれた共同体」

Opening Remarks (5 min.) 開会挨拶 (5分間)	KAI Noritake, Governor, GFJ 甲斐 紀武 グローバル・フォーラム世話人
Co-chairpersons 共同議長	FUKUSHIMA Akiko, Director of Policy Studies and Senior Fellow, National Institute for Research Advancement / Individual Member, CEAC 福島 安紀子 総合研究開発機構主席研究員 / CEAC有識者議員 Clara JOEWONO, Deputy Executive Director, Centre for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) (Republic of Indonesia) クララ・ユウォノ 戦略国際問題研究所副所長(インドネシア)
Opening Speech (5 min.) 開会挨拶	OKAWARA Yoshio, Chairman, GFJ / Vice-President, CEAC 大河原 良雄 グローバルフォーラム代表世話人 / CEAC副議長
Paper Presenter (15min.) 基調報告 (15分間)	Carolina G. HERNANDEZ, President, Institute for Strategic and Development Studies(ISDS) (Republic of Philippines) カロリナ・G・ヘルナンデス 戦略開発問題研究所理事長(フィリピン)
Paper Presenter (15min.) 基調報告 (15分間)	ITO Kenichi, President, GFJ / President, CEAC 伊藤 憲一 グローバル・フォーラム執行世話人 / CEAC議長
Lead Discussant A (5 min.) コメントA (5分間)	Stephen LEONG, Assistant Director General, Institute of Strategic and International Studies Malaysia (Malaysia) スティーブン・レオン 戦略国際問題研究所副部長(マレーシア)
Lead Discussant B (5 min.) コメントB (5分間)	TERADA Takashi, Assistant Professor, National University of Singapore 寺田 貴 シンガポール国立大学助教授
Lead Discussant C (5 min.) コメントC (5分間)	Chap SOTHARITH, Executive Director, The Cambodian Institute for Cooperation and Peace(CICP) (Kingdom of Cambodia) チャップ・ソティラット カンボディア平和協力研究所所長(カンボディア)
Free Discussions (70min.) 自由討議 (70分間)	All Participants 出席者全員

11:40-12:45 Break / 休憩

Session / 本会議	
12:45-14:35 "Promoting Functional Approaches" 「機能的なアプローチの推進」	
Co-chairpersons 共同議長	KAI Noritake, Governor, GFJ 甲斐 紀武 グローバル・フォーラム世話人 Clara JOEWONO, Deputy Executive Director, Centre for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) (Republic of Indonesia) クララ・ユウォノ 戦略国際問題研究所副所長(インドネシア)
Paper Presenter (15min.) 基調報告 (15分間)	TAKEUCHI Yukio, former Vice Minister for Foreign Affairs of Japan 竹内 行夫 前外務次官
Paper Presenter (15min.) 基調報告 (15分間)	Hank LIM, Director of Research, Singapore Institute of International Affairs (SIIA) (Republic of Singapore) ハンク・リム シンガポール国際問題研究所研究部長(シンガポール)
Lead Discussant A (5 min.) コメントA (5分間)	KINOSHITA Toshihiko, Professor, Waseda University / Individual Member, CEAC 木下 俊彦 早稲田大学教授 / CEAC有識者議員
Lead Discussant B (5 min.) コメントB (5分間)	Nyunt TIN, Secretary, Myanmar Institute of Strategic and International Studies (MISIS) (Union of Myanmar) ニュン・ティン ミャンマー戦略国際問題研究所書記(ミャンマー)
Lead Discussant C (5 min.) コメントC (5分間)	MATSUDA Iwao, Member of the House of Councilors / Individual Member, CEAC 松田 岩夫 参議院議員 / CEAC有識者議員
Free Discussions (60min.) 自由討議 (60分間)	All Participants 出席者全員
14:35-14:40 Break / 休憩	
Session / 本会議	
14:40-16:30 "The Role of ASEAN Towards Community Building" 「共同体形成へのASEANの役割」	
Co-chairpersons 共同議長	KAKIZAWA Koji, former Minister for Foreign Affairs of Japan / Opinion Leader Member GFJ / Vice Chairman, CEAC 柿澤 弘治 元外務大臣 / GFJ有識者メンバー / CEAC副会長 Bounnheuang SONGNAVONG, Deputy Director General, Institute of Foreign Affairs (IFA) (Lao People's Democratic Republic) ブンニョアン・ソンナボン 外交問題研究所副部長 (ラオス)
Paper Presenter (15min.) 基調報告 (15分間)	Hadi SOESASTRO, Executive Director, Centre for Strategic and International Studies(CSIS) (Republic of Indonesia) ハディ・ソエサストロ 戦略国際問題研究所所長(インドネシア)
Paper Presenter (15min.) 基調報告 (15分間)	OE Hiroshi, Professor, University of Tokyo / Individual Member, CEAC 大江 博 東京大学教授 / CEAC有識者議員
Lead Discussant A (5 min.) コメント A (5分間)	Termsak CHALERMPALANUPAP, Special Assistant to the Secretary-General of ASEAN (ASEAN Secretariat) タームサック・チャラーンバラヌバップ ASEAN事務総長特別補佐官(ASEAN事務局)
Lead Discussant B (5 min.) コメント B (5分間)	OGASAWARA Takayuki, Professor, Yamanashi Gakuin University 小笠原 高雪 山梨学院大学教授
Lead Discussant C (5 min.) コメント C (5分間)	HOANG Anh Tuan, Deputy Director General, The Institute for International Relations (IIR) (Socialist Republic of Viet Nam) ホアン・アン・トゥアン 外務省国際関係研究所所長(ヴェトナム)
Free Discussions (60min.) 自由討議 (60分間)	All Participants 出席者全員
Final Wrap-up Session / 総括	
16:30-17:00 "The Prospect for East Asian Community and Regional Cooperation" 「東アジア共同体への展望と地域協働」	
Co-chairpersons (30min.) 共同議長(30分間)	TANIGUCHI Makoto, President, Iwate Prefectural University / Individual Member, CEAC 谷口 誠 岩手県立大学長 / CEAC有識者議員 Suchit BUNBONGKARN, Senior Fellow, Institute of Strategic and International Studies (Kingdom of Thailand) スジット・ブンボンカーン 安全保障問題研究所初代所長(タイ)
Closing Remarks 閉会挨拶	KAI Noritake, Governor, GFJ 甲斐 紀武 グローバル・フォーラム世話人

2. Participants List

[ASEAN Panelists]

Suchit BUNBONGKARN	Senior Fellow, Institute of Strategic and International Studies (ISIS) (Kingdom of Thailand)
Termsak CHALERMPALANUPAP	Special Assistant to the Secretary-General of ASEAN (ASEAN Secretariat)
Carolina G. HERNANDEZ	President, The Institute for Strategic and Development Studies (ISDS) (Republic of Philippines)
HOANG Anh Tuan	Deputy Director-General, the Institute for International Relations (IIR) (Socialist Republic of Viet Nam)
Clara JOEWONO	Deputy Executive Director, Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) (Republic of Indonesia)
Stephen LEONG	Assistant Director-General, Institute of Strategic and International Studies (Malaysia)
Hank LIM	Director for Research, Singapore Institute of International Affairs (SIIA) (Republic of Singapore)
Hadi SOEASTRO	Executive Director, Centre for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) (Republic of Indonesia)
Bounneuang SONGNAVONG	Deputy Director General, Institute of Foreign Affairs (IFA) (Lao People's Democratic Republic)
Chap SOTHARITH	Executive Director, The Cambodian Institute for Cooperation and Peace (CICP) (Kingdom of Cambodia)
U Nyunt TIN	Secretary, Myanmar Institute of Strategic and International Studies (MISIS) (Union of Myanmar)

[Japanese Panelists]

FUKUSHIMA Akiko	Director of Policy Studies and Senior Fellow, National Institute for Research Advancement / Individual Member, CEAC
ITO Kenichi	President, GFJ / President, CEAC
KAI Noritake	Governor, GFJ
KAKIZAWA Koji	Former Minister for Foreign Affairs of Japan / Opinion Leader Member GFJ / Vice Chairman, CEAC
KINOSHITA Toshihiko	Professor, Waseda University / Individual Member, CEAC
MATSUDA Iwao	Member of the House of Councilors / Individual Member, CEAC
OE Hiroshi	Professor, the University of Tokyo / Individual Member, CEAC
OKAWARA Yoshio	Chairman, GFJ / Vice-President, CEAC
OGASAWARA Takayuki	Professor, Yamanashi Gakuin University
TAKEUCHI Yukio	Former Vice Minister for Foreign Affairs of Japan
TANIGUCHI Makoto	President, Iwate Prefectural University / Individual Member, CEAC
TERADA Takashi	Assistant Professor, National University of Singapore

[Participants]

Abdul IRSAN	Ambassador, Indonesian Embassy
ADACHI Jun	Editor in Chief, Japan Broadcast Publishing Co.,Ltd.
AKAO Nobutoshi	Secretary General, ASEAN-Japan Center
ARAI Hirofumi	Manager, General Affairs Division, Economic Research Institute for Northeast Asia
ARAIKE Katsuhiko	Regional Policy Division, Asian & Oceanian Affairs Bureau, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
ASAMI Tadahiro	Managing Director, Institute for International Monetary Affairs
ASOMURA Kuniaki	Visiting Professor, Reitaku University
CHHAU Sothira	Second Secretary, Royal Embassy of Cambodia
Daw Hmway Hmway KHYNE	1st Secretary, the Embassy of the Union of Myanmar
FUJITA Takashi	Senior Economist, Japan Center for International Finance Asia Department 2
FUKATA Yuko	Student, Chuo University
FUKUCHI Aki	Manager, Research Office, The Bank of Tokyo-Mitsubishi, Ltd
HASHIMOTO Hiroshi	Senior Advisor, ITOCHU Corporation
HIBINO Masaaki	Director, ST.Margaret's College
HIRONAKA Wakako	Member, House of Councilors
HIRONO Ryokichi	Professor Emeritus, Seikei University
HOSOKAWA Disuke	Professor, Osaka University of Economics
IMAGAWA Yukiko	President, Japan Cambodia Association
IKEO Aiko	Professor, Waseda University
ISHIGAKI Yasuji	vice president ,CEAC/Councilor, GFJ
ISHII Ichiji	President, Japan Center for Conflict Prevention
ISHIZUKA Yoshikazu	Editorial Adviser, Keizai Koho Center (Japan Institute for Social and Economic Affairs)

IWANAMI Michio

KAJI Yasuhiro

KAWAI Masao

KIMURA AYA

KIMURA Takayuki

Director for International Trade Policy Negotiations, International Affair
Department,
Business Division General Manager, Japan Credit Rating Agency
Senior Adviser, Infrastructure Development Institute Japan
Asian News Section, Foreign News Department, Asahi Shimbun
Visiting Professor, International Christian University

KOBAYASHI Toshio	Representative, Office in Japan, Inter American Development Bank
KOGURE Masayoshi	Former Professor of Toyo University
KONDO Seiichi	Director -General, Public Diplomacy Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
KONDO Tetsuo	President, INES
KUSAKA Sumio	Deputy Vice Minister for Internal Affairs, Ministry of Finance
MURAYAMA Hiroshi	Staff Writer, International Department, The Nikkei
Mireya SOLIS	Assistant Professor, American University, Visiting Professor, Waseda University
NAGAI Shigenobu	Councilor, FEC International Friendship Exchange Council
NAGANO Shigeto	President, Japan Forum Strategic Studies
NARITA Hironari	Professor, Ohkagakuen University
NISHIMURA Naomi	Student, ChuoUniversity
OIWA Takaaki	Special Assistant to Director General/ Senior Researcher, Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA)
OKAMOTO Yumiko	Professor, Faculty of Policy Studies, Doshisha University
POU Sothirak	Ambassador, Embassy of Kingdom of Cambodia
SAKAJIRI Kengo	Politics department, Asahi Shimbun
SAKAMOTO Masahiro	Chief Researcher, Japan Forum of International Relations
Sandora SAKIHARA	Mansfield Fellow, International Affairs Department, Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries
SAWAI Teruyuki	Former Ambassador to Norway
SHIBAMOTO Sho	Student, National University of Singapore
SHINDO Eiichi	Professor Emeritus, University of Tsukuba
SHIRAIISHI Eiko	Regional Policy Division, Asian & Oceanian Affairs Bureau, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
SHIRAIISHI Saya	Professor, the University of Tokyo, Graduate School
TAJIMA Takashi	Visiting Professor, Graduate School, ToyoEiwa University
TAKAGI Seiji	Director, Trade Policy Bureau, Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry
TAKAHASHI Katsuhide	Associate Professor, Kobe University
TAKEUCHI Kazumasa	Manager, Corporate Planning, Asahi Glass Co., Ltd.
TAKEUCHI Yukifumi	Staff Writer, Foreign News department, Asahi Shimbun
TANAKA Yasumasa	Emeritus Professor, Gakushuin University
TANIKAWA Hiroya	Director, Industrial Safety Division, METI
TOJO Yoshiaki	Director for International Economic Affairs Division, METI
URATA Shujiro	Professor, Waseda University
YAMADA Takio	Director, Regional Policy Division, Asian & Oceanian Affairs Bureau, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
YAMASHITA Eiji	Professor, Osaka City Univ.
YAMAZAWA Ippei	President, International University of Japan
YOSHITOMI Masaru	President & Chief Research Officer, Research Institute of Economy, Trade and Industry
YUSHITA Hiroyuki	Visiting Professor, Kyorin University
ZHANG Yan	Third Secretary, Embassy of the People's Republic of China

In Alphabetical Order

【The Secretariat: The Global Forum of Japan】

WATANABE Mayu	Executive Secretary
MURATA Aya	Executive Secretary
KOGA Kei	Assistant Executive Secretary
KIRIYAMA Ken	Officer in Charge
SANO Takeshi	Officer in Charge
FUJII Miyuki	Secretarial Staff
NAGAYAMA Daigo	Secretarial Staff
NORO Naoko	Secretarial Staff
SHIBUYA Momoyo	Secretarial Staff
HAYASHI Yuka	Secretarial Staff
LEE Sang soo	Secretarial Assistant
MATSUMOTO Akiko	Secretarial Assistant
NEZU Yukio	Secretarial Assistant
TAKAI Yusuke	Secretarial Assistant
TERUYA Aki	Secretarial Assistant
SANUKI Ayami	Secretarial Assistant
SEKI Nobuyasu	Secretarial Assistant

3. Biographies of Mediators and Panelists

[ASEAN Panelists]

Clara JOEWONO

Deputy Director, The Centre for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS)

(Republic of Indonesia)

Graduated from University of Indonesia. Received M.A. from the University of California, Berkeley. Served as visiting fellow at the George Washington University in 1981, Congressional Fellow U.S. Congress from 1981-82, Secretary of the ASEAN Institutes of Strategic Studies from 1984-2003, Chairperson of Bung Hatta Anti-Corruption Award from 2003-04.

Carolina G. HERNANDEZ

President, Institute for Strategic and Development Studies (ISDS)

(Republic of Philippines)

Graduated from the University of the Philippines. Received M.A. from the University of Karachi, and Ph.D. from the State University of New York at Buffalo. Served as Chairperson of the ASEAN Institutes of Strategic and International Studies, Visiting Professor at the University of Toronto, Kobe University, Professor of the University of the Philippines.

Stephen LEONG

Assistant Director-General, Institute of Strategic and International Studies

(Malaysia)

Graduated from University of Illinois in 1960. Received M.A. from University of California at Berkeley in 1962, and Ph.D. from University of California at Los Angeles in 1976. Involved in ISIS from 1984. Served as Senior Fellow and Director, Centre for Japan Studies in 1992. Serves also in other important positions.

Chap SOTHARITH

Executive Director, Cambodian Institute for Cooperation and Peace

(Kingdom of Cambodia)

Graduated from Institute of Economics, Phnom Penh in 1989. Received Master from Asian Institute of Technology, Bangkok in 1994, Ph.D. from the University of Sydney in 2002. Served as English Language lecturer at private schools from 1983-93, Director of ASEAN Department, the Office of Council of Ministers from 1996-98, World Bank Consultant as Training Coordinator from 2002-04.

Hank LIM

Director for Research, Singapore Institute of International Affairs

(Republic of Singapore)

Graduated from Gannon College in 1966. Received M.A. and Ph.D. from University of Pittsburgh in 1968 and 1975 respectively. Served as Senior Lecturer of National University of Singapore from 1982-96, Associate of National University of Singapore from 1996-2000, Associate Professional Fellow of National University of Singapore from 2000-03

Nyunt TIN

Secretary, Myanmar Institute of Strategic and International Studies

(Union of Myanmar)

Graduated from the Myanmar Defense Services Academy in 1965. Served various positions in the Myanmar Air Force as a pilot officer from 1965-89. Entered the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Appointed to Consul-General of the Myanmar Consulate General from 1990-92, the Myanmar Ambassador accredited to Indonesia, France, Canada from 1992-2003.

Bounnheuang SONGNAVONG

Deputy Director General, Institute of Foreign Affairs

(Lao People's Democratic Republic)

Graduated from the Institute of Law and Administration in Vientiane in 1975, and M.A. from the University of Wollongong in 1993. Served Deputy Director-General, the Lao Committee for Peace, Solidarity and Friendship with Foreign Countries, various positions in Ministry of Foreign Affairs including Counselor & DCM, Embassy of the Lao PDR to Japan.

Hadi SOEASTRO

Executive Director, The Centre for Strategic and International Studies

(Republic of Indonesia)

Graduated from RW-TH Aachen, Received Ph.D. from the Rand Graduate School, Served as Executive Director, CSIS from 1989 excluding 1997, a professor in various universities in Indonesia and USA including Lecturer, University of Indonesia from 1985-88, Visiting Professor, Columbia University from 1988-89.

Termsak CHALERMPALANUPAP

Special Assistant to the Secretary-General of the ASEAN Secretariat

(Kingdom of Thailand)

Graduated from Chulalongkorn University in 1977. Received M.A. and Ph.D. from University of New Orleans in 1982 and 1986 respectively. Served various positions in The Nation, an independent English-language daily in Bangkok from 1972-92, Assistant Director of the ASEAN Secretariat from 1999.

HOANG Anh Tuan

Deputy Director-General, The Institute for International Relations

(Socialist Republic of Viet Nam)

Graduated from the College of Foreign Affairs. Received M.A. and Ph.D. from Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University. Served as Visiting Fellow of the Institute of International Peace Research, Norway, the Nordic Institute of Asian Studies, and the Institute of Southeast Asian Studies.

Suchit BUNBONGKARN

Senior Fellow, The Institute for Security and International Studies

(Kingdom of Thailand)

Graduated from Chulalongkorn University. Received M.A., M.A.L.D. and Ph.D. from the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy. Served as an advisor to Prime Minister Prem Tinasulanonda, as a member of the Constitutional Drafting Assembly in 1997, Chairman of ISIS Thailand and as a Justice of the Constitutional Court from 2000-04, Professor Emeritus of Chulalongkorn University.

(In order of appearance)

【Japanese Panelists】

FUKUSHIMA Akiko

Director of Policy Studies / Senior Fellow, The National Institute for Research Advancement (NIRA)

Received M.A. from Johns Hopkins University in 1994, and Ph.D. from Osaka University in 1997. Served various positions including Adjunct Professor at Keio University from 2000-02, Visiting Professor at Center on International Relations, Visiting Professor at University of British Columbia from 2002-03. Concurrently, Individual Member, CEAC

OKAWARA Yoshio

Chairman, The Global Forum of Japan (GFJ)

B.A. from the University of Tokyo and entered the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in 1942. Served various positions including Director-General of the American Affairs Bureau, Deputy Vice-Minister for Administration, and Ambassador to Australia and the U.S. Served as President of the Institute for International Policy Studies since 1993. Chairman of the Global Forum of Japan since 1993.

ITO Kenichi

President, GFJ

Graduated from Hitotsubashi University. Entered the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in 1960. Studied at Harvard University from 1961-63. Served in the Japanese Foreign Service until 1977. Concurrently, President & CEO of the Japan Forum on International Relations (JFIR), President of CEAC, President & CEO of GFJ, and Professor at Aoyama Gakuin University.

TERADA Takashi

Assistant Professor, National University of Singapore

Received Ph.D from Australian National University in 1999. A co-editor, with Peter Drysdale, of *Asia-Pacific Economic Co-Operation: Critical Perspectives on the World Economy* (4 volumes), RoutledgeCurzon, 2006. His research interests include international relations in Asia and the Pacific, Japanese politics and foreign policy, and empirical and theoretical studies on regionalism.

KAI Noritake

Governor, GFJ

Graduated from Hitotsubashi University. Entered the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in 1964. Served various positions including Director of the First Africa Division, Deputy Chief of Protocol, Ambassador to Panama, Ambassador to Lebanon, Ambassador to Tunisia, Professor at Kagoshima Prefectural College in 2003. Concurrently, Councilor of the Japan Forum on International Relations.

TAKEUCHI Yukio

Advisor to the Minister for Foreign Affairs, Executive Advisor for Japan Business Federation

Graduated from Kyoto University in 1966 and Worcester College, Oxford University in 1969. Served various positions including Deputy Director-General of Asian Affairs Bureau from 1993-95, Director-General of North American Affairs Bureau from 1997-99, Deputy Vice-Minister for Foreign Policy at Ministry of Foreign Affairs from 1999-2000, Ambassador to Indonesia 2001-02, Vice-Minister for Foreign Affairs from 2002-05.

OE Hiroshi

Professor, The University of Tokyo

Graduated from the University of Tokyo in 1979. Entered Japanese Diplomatic Service in 1979. Served various positions including Deputy Director of China and Mongolia Division, Asia Affairs Bureau in 1993, Director of Treaties Division, Treaties Bureau from 2000-02, Minister of Japanese Embassy in Thailand from 2002-05. Concurrently, Individual Member of CEAC.

OGASAWARA Takayuki

Professor, Yamanashi Gakuin University

Graduated from Keio University. Served the Japan Institute of International Affairs. Held his visiting posts in Singapore from 1991-92 and Hanoi from 1994-95. His Research interests include politics and security of South East Asia.

KAKIZAWA Koji

former Minister for Foreign Affairs

Graduated from the University of Tokyo. Entered the Ministry of Finance in 1958. Elected to the House of Councilors in 1977, Member of the House Representatives from 1980-03. Served as Parliamentary Vice-Minister for Education, Parliamentary Vice-Minister for Transport, Parliamentary Vice Minister for Foreign Affairs, and Minister for Foreign Affairs of Japan. Concurrently, Professor of Tokai University, and from 2004 Vice Chairman of CEAC.

KINOSHITA Toshihiko

Professor, Waseda University

Professor, Graduate School of Commerce, Waseda University (2000-04). Graduated from Keio University in 1963. Served The Export-Import Bank of Japan (currently, Japan Bank for International Cooperation or JBIC) from 1963-96, Visiting Scholar, National Bureau of Economic Research and Harvard Institute for International Development, Special Advisor for Asia, A.T. Kearney from 1996-2000; Individual member of CEAC.

MATSUDA Iwao

Member of the House of Councilors

Graduated from the University of Tokyo in 1960. Served the Ministry of International Trade and Industry from 1960-81, Visiting professor at George Washington University in 1997, the first Senior Vice Minister of Economy, Trade and Industry in 2001. Concurrently, Chairman of Research Committee on International Affairs from 2004, Chief Secretary of Research Commission on Foreign Affairs from 2004 (LDP), Acting Chairman of Special Committee on External Economic Cooperation from 2004 (LDP), Individual member of CEAC.

TANIGUCHI Makoto

President, Iwate Prefectural University

Graduated from Hitotsubashi University in 1954. Received M.A. from Hitotsubashi University and Cambridge University in 1956 and 58 respectively. Entered the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in 1959. Served various positions including Ambassador of Japan to the United Nations,(1986-89) and Deputy Secretary-General of OECD from 1990-96, Professor at Waseda University from 1997-2000, Director of the Research Institute of Current Chinese Affairs at Waseda University from 2000-04. Concurrently, Individual member of CEAC.

(In order of appearance)

4. Outlines of Discussions

The Global Forum of Japan (GFJ) and the ASEAN Institutes of Strategic and International Studies (ASEAN-ISIS) with the cooperation of the Council on East Asian Community (CEAC), co-sponsored the 4th Japan-ASEAN Dialogue on the theme of "The Prospect for East Asian Community and Regional Cooperation" on June 12-13, 2005 in Tokyo. This Dialogue followed the "Japan-China Dialogue" in September, 2004 and the "Japan-Korea Dialogue" in April, 2005 and concluded a series of "Dialogues" regarding East Asian Community. There was a full day of lively discussions among the 104 participants from Japan and ASEAN countries.

Universal Values and an Open Community in East Asia

In Session I on the theme of "An Open Community Based on Universal Values," Prof. Carolina G. HERNANDEZ, President, the Institute of Strategic and Development Studies, presented her keynote speech, stating that "East Asian Community is committed to the universal values found in the Charter of the United Nations. Universal values being spread by economic prosperity, telecommunications and transportation technology is likely to permeate into East Asia. ASEAN should continue lying at the center of the East Asian Community building. After that, Prof. ITO Kenichi, President of the GFJ, made a second keynote speech, stating that "in order to create a region-wide community, it will be essential to foster common values which develop both Asian values rooted in the history of the region as well as the universal values shared by the modern world."

In response to the keynote speeches, commentators put forward their opinions for and/or against those speeches. "Our Asian values are important but most of all, trust is essential," said Dr. Stephen LEONG, Assistant Director General of the Institute of Strategic and International Studies of Malaysia. "Openness and universal values are important concepts when we discuss the East Asian community," said Prof. Takashi TERADA, Assistant Professor of National University of Singapore.

Promoting Functional Approaches in East Asia

In Session II on the theme of "Promoting Functional Approaches," Yukio TAKEUCHI, former Vice Minister of Foreign Affairs of Japan, gave the first keynote speech. He stated that Functional cooperation in various fields such as economy, culture, ethnicity, religion, politics, and security, should be promoted in order to establish regional community in East Asia. In order to carry out such joint efforts successfully, it is indispensable that national leaders demonstrate political leadership

and the people of each country express support.” Following that, Hank LIM, Director of Research, Singapore Institute of International Affairs, stated that “To have functional cooperation, countries in the region must have clear concept about the desired nature and characteristics of the community they intend to establish.”

In response to the keynote speeches, “functional approach should be put priority in the process of community building; however, we should not over-politicize the community building,” said KINOSHITA Toshihiko, Professor, Waseda University. “Functional approach is the most powerful approach in the East Asian community building, especially, in dealing with security issues,” commented Mr. MATSUDA Iwao, Member of the House of Councilors.

Community Building in East Asia and the Role of ASEAN

In Session III under the theme of “the Role of ASEAN towards Community Building,” Dr. Hadi SOEASTRO, Executive Director, the Centre for Strategic and International Studies of Indonesia, made a keynote speech and stated that “ASEAN has played a critical role in the development of ASEAN Plus Three. ASEAN experience and experiment should inspire community building in East Asia. China, Korea and Japan should not continue to quarrel and must come to settlement of the historical burden.” Subsequently, Prof. OE Hiroshi, the University of Tokyo, gave the second keynote speech. He stated that “Confidence building and preventive diplomacy will be increasingly emphasized in East Asia. In response, “The ASEAN way of community building in Southeast Asia, consisting of universally-recognized principles which can be inferred from the United Nation’s Charter and practical modalities, is very relevant to community building in East Asia” commented Mr. Termsak CHALERMPALANUPAP, Special Assistant to the Secretary-General of ASEAN, ASEAN Secretariat. Prof. OGASAWARA Takayuki, Yamanashi Gakuin University, said that “ASEAN should tackle Mekong project more actively, and Japan should encourage ASEAN in this direction.”

In the Final Wrap-Up Session, Mr. TANIGUCHI Makoto, President, Iwate Prefectural University, summarized, “It is indispensable for Japan and China to cooperate in order that the East Asian Community building is realized.” Mr. Suchit BUNBONGKARN, Senior Fellow, Institute of Strategic and International Studies of Thailand, added that “Japan looks at economy; however, it is hoped for Japan to be concerned more about politics.”

5. Policy Recommendations

1. The Prospect for East Asian Community (EAC)

- 1) Creation of a “Community of Willingness” is necessary for establishing EAC, where East Asian countries cooperate willingly in various fields such as socio-economy and political-security by emphasizing the “openness” of the community.
- 2) “Openness” is the key to establishing EAC, but it is necessary to further consider what kind of “openness” a community will be required to have.
- 3) Despite the fact that various obstacles still exist in East Asia, we should achieve “Peace, Prosperity, and Progress” through EAC in this region.

2. An Open Community Based on Universal Values

- 1) An East Asian Community should be an open community, as ASEAN+3 and the other participants in the EAC are all committed to open regionalism.
- 2) Universal values and Asian values are not mutually compatible, but they can be blended, and it is important to have Asian uniqueness, while promoting such universal values as democracy, human rights, and freedom.

3. Promoting Functional Approaches

- 1) A “functional approach” will be the core method of community building in East Asia; however, and through this approach, we should let East Asia as a whole progress.

- 2) Strengthening the functions of the secretariat to secure efficiency and avoiding unnecessary overlaps in functional cooperation is important for community building.

4. The Role of ASEAN Towards Community Building

- 1) ASEAN +3 must be the core to build an East Asian Community, and ASEAN should also play an important role as a core, for ASEAN+3 will be serving as a core for East Asian Community building.

- 2) With the “ASEAN Way”, ASEAN is able to set an agenda with the least number of objections from other countries, and for the time being, this method is useful for community building in East Asia.

6. Keynote Papers

Session I

AN OPEN COMMUNITY WITH UNIVERSAL VALUES¹

Carolina G. HERNANDEZ, PhD

**Founding President and Chair, Board of Directors
Institute for Strategic and Development Studies, Inc.**

The process of building a community in East Asia is well underway with numerous initiatives and activities taking place including the earlier efforts of the East Asia Vision Group and East Asia Study Group, followed by the ASEAN+3 process as a regional response to the Asian financial crisis of 1997. During the first decade of the 21st century, the process received a further boost with the forging of comprehensive economic agreements between ASEAN and China, ASEAN and Japan, ASEAN and South Korea, as well as numerous bilateral FTAs among many of them. In November 2003, ASEAN adopted the Bali Concord II seeking to establish an ASEAN Community with three pillars – an ASEAN Economic Community, an ASEAN Security Community, and an ASEAN Socio-Cultural Community – by 2020. And in December 2005, the first East Asia Summit (EAS) is scheduled to convene in Malaysia with more that ASEAN+3 countries participating.

ASEAN lies at the center of the East Asia community building process because it enjoys the trust and confidence of all the neighbors in the region as well as the broader Asia Pacific. Japan has had over 30 years of mutually beneficial and constructive relations with ASEAN member states whose physical and other infrastructures critical to

¹ Prepared for the 4th Japan-ASEAN Dialogue “The Prospect for East Asia Community and Regional Cooperation” hosted by the Global Forum of Japan, Tokyo, in cooperation with ASEAN ISIS, 13 June 2005.

their economic growth and development Japan helped tremendously to build through its ODA, trade, and investments in Southeast Asia. Japan-ASEAN relations also demonstrates that former adversaries can build trust and confidence over time through good neighborly relations and the sharing of common values that are necessary elements of reconciliation. China needs ASEAN to serve as its interlocutor with other powers while it is rising, and possibly to prevent ASEAN from becoming partners of a risen China's future strategic competitors. And South Korea needs ASEAN in a wider grouping so it is not left to face two major regional powers alone.

Since its founding, ASEAN has also developed a set of norms and values that proved helpful in forging stable relations among its member states on the one hand, and between them and their dialogue partners in and outside the region on the other. Not entirely enamored with formal institutional mechanisms and preferring flexibility, ASEAN norms and values are more informal codes of interstate behavior seen in its various declarations and two treaties. These declarations began with the Bangkok Declaration of 1967, followed by others such as the first Bali Concord adopted during its first summit in 1976, its Declaration on the Zone of Peace, Freedom, and Neutrality (ZOPFAN), the ASEAN Declaration on the South China Sea of 1992, the ASEAN Vision 2020, and the November 2003 Bali Concord II, among others. Its two treaties are the Treaty of Amity and Cooperation (TAC) and the Southeast Asia Nuclear Weapons Free Zone Treaty (SEANWFZ).

These documents consist of principles of interstate conduct based on the United Nations Charter, as well as the goals to make Southeast Asia a zone of peace, freedom, and neutrality, a nuclear weapons-free zone, and a three-pillared ASEAN community. As a claimant state to the South China Sea disputes, China has associated itself with the norms of interstate conduct adopted by ASEAN through bilateral memoranda of agreements with Malaysia, the Philippines and Vietnam, for example, and with ASEAN as a group in the Conduct of Parties in the South China Sea forged between them in 2002. The Plus 3 countries, India, and New Zealand (and Russia) have acceded to the TAC. As such they have bound themselves to the self-constraining rules of interstate conduct, including sovereign equality of states, respect for the territorial integrity and national sovereignty of other states, peaceful settlement of disputes, and non-interference in the domestic affairs of other states. These norms and principles – values in other words – are held by all the ASEAN+3 countries, as well as prospective participants in the East Asia Summit because the preconditions for participation in the EAS includes accession to

the TAC in addition to having substantive relations with ASEAN and being a full dialogue partner. Among the prospective participants of the EAS, only Australia has yet to accede to the TAC. In this regard, some Australian officials are optimistic of their government's accession prior to the EAS.

The East Asia community is also going to be an open community. ASEAN+3 and the likely participants to the EAS are all committed to open regionalism such as that in the Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) forum, and the ASEAN Vision 2020 where one of the elements is "an outward looking ASEAN". The East Asia community is unlikely to be a closed community because its members are interdependent with other regions, particularly North America and the European Union (EU). Not only are their economies highly integrated and interdependent, so are they also interdependent and increasingly being integrated with the economies of North America and the EU. Contemporary globalization will help ensure an open East Asia community in the future. Universal values in this open East Asia community consist in those already found in the U.N. Charter and the TAC. Beyond the norms and principles of interstate conduct found in these documents, East Asia is also in principle committed to the universal values of human rights found in the Universal Declaration on Human Rights by the sheer dint of the fact that the members of this emerging community are U.N. members obligated to observe U.N. values. Within ASEAN that I argued earlier is the core of this East Asia community, the elements of the ASEAN Security Community include political development, norms setting, conflict prevention, and conflict resolution with the end in view of creating within ASEAN a just, democratic, and harmonious community. In the pursuit of political development, the Vientiane Action Programme (VAP) to realize this ASEAN Security Community includes human rights promotion and observance as well as greater people's political participation, an ASEAN euphemism for democracy.

Finally, universal humanitarian values being spread by economic prosperity, telecommunications and transportation technology, and increasing education and mobility of peoples are likely to permeate these dynamic East Asian economies and societies within the foreseeable future and make this open East Asia community also one with universal values. In this process, the increasingly empowered and skillful citizens of the members of this community would be the likely sources of their government's eventual acceptance of these universal values, so that the principle of non-intervention in the domestic affairs of other countries would not have to remain a refuge of governments unwilling to share power with their citizens.

Kenichi ITO
President, Global Forum of Japan

East Asia stands at the historic crossroads today. In the economic aspect, East Asia is now a tremendous source of dynamism for the entire world, and the process toward de facto regional economic integration is in progress. Wide-ranging functional cooperation is moving forward in a variety of areas including FTAs, finance, and the transnational issues. Moreover, in social and cultural spheres, a new middle class—one which shares the same lifestyles and interests—is emerging in East Asian countries, and this class is shaping new cultural phenomena and values. On the other hand, from the political and security aspects, enormous diversity and disparities still exist among the countries in the region, particularly in the political principles and regimes as well as in recognitions of security threats. Various political problems cast shadows over the future of the region, for which the current state of Japan-China relations is just an example.

In order to achieve the creation of an East Asian community, we need to develop our own original approaches based on the actual situation in the region. The experiences of Europe and other regions may give us many valuable insights and lessons regarding the creation of a region-wide community, but we cannot just apply the same approaches to East Asia. Mr. Yasushi Akashi, former Under-Secretary-General of the United Nations who made great efforts for peace building in Cambodia and the former Yugoslavia, makes a very pertinent point when he says that “for peace building, a different methodology is necessary for each and every case, and each approach must be tailor-made.” In the same way, approaches for regional community-building must also be “tailor-made.” It would be a mistake to try to apply the same European methodology to East Asia. At the same time, just because the European methodology cannot be applied to East Asia, we should not be pessimistic about the prospects for the creation of an East Asian community.

Then, what kind of approach is appropriate for East Asia? Many people argue that a “functional approach” rather than an “institutional approach” is best suited to East Asia. I, too, share this view. Considering the situation in East Asia, it would be

very difficult to establish anytime soon political institutions similar to the EU's. A much more realistic approach is to start from promoting functional cooperation in various areas and sectors. But in order to create a region-wide community, it will be essential not only to promote functional cooperation but also to foster common values in the region, which could be called the ethos of the community. These common values provide the basis for the fostering of mutual trust and confidence as well as a shared sense of community among the countries in the region. They also serve as a catalyst for bringing together the different lines of cooperation in the various functional fields and integrating them into the comprehensive entirety of the community. In light of the diversity in East Asia, fostering common values in the region is by no means an easy task. But this makes it all the more incumbent on us to develop original and effective methods for doing so.

The origins of the common values in Europe can be traced both (a) to the shared historical roots reaching back to the early days of Christianity, Roman law, Latin, and so forth, and (b) to the more modern universal values represented by liberal democracy and market economy. We can, of course, theoretically consider taking a similar approach for East Asia. However, the problem is that Asia is far more diverse in cultures, religions and ethnicities than Europe, and it is not easy to identify common traditional values shared across the region. Rather we should try to find commonality in the region's tolerance in accepting this diversity of cultures, religions, and traditions. In either case, finding the true state of values and perceptions in East Asia is an increasingly important endeavor from now. We are placing high expectations on the results of projects in this area, such as the Promotion of East Asian Studies project, headed by Professor Akihiko Tanaka of Tokyo University, and the Asia Barometer Survey project, led by Professor Takashi Inoguchi of Chuo University.

With reference to the universal values like freedom, human rights, and democracy, although we call them "universal," they are clearly originated in modern Western societies. It is thus difficult to claim that these values have taken root in East Asia to a level comparable to that in the Western world. At the same time, in East Asia the process of democratization is progressing steadily, step by step, in the Philippines, Thailand, Malaysia, Indonesia, Cambodia, and other countries, and the importance of these universal values is increasingly well recognized. Moreover, references to universal values like democracy have come to be incorporated as an essential element in statements and documents issued by regional summit meetings, such as the Tokyo

Declaration issued by the Japan-ASEAN Commemorative Summit in 2003, the Declaration of ASEAN Concord II by the 2003 ASEAN Summit, and the Declaration of Strategic Partnership by the Asia-Africa Summit in April of this year. Moreover, the “new middle class,” which is expected to be the cadre for the creation of an East Asian community in the future, is a generation of globalization. When this generation comes to occupy the nucleus of East Asian societies, greater possibilities will open up for universal values to take root in a genuine sense.

Looked at in this way, I believe we should search for the origins of East Asian common values both in Asian values rooted in the history of the region as well as in the universal values shared by the modern world. The search for, and recognition of, Asian values will serve to clarify the identity of an East Asian community and contribute to the creation of prosperous societies and cultures that retain their own uniqueness and originality. On the other side, the genuine realization of the universal values will facilitate the establishment of more dynamic and mature social, economic, and political institutions. Moreover, the common values forged in this way will greatly contribute to the fostering of mutual trust and confidence among the countries in the region and to the enhancing of understanding of, and trust in, the creation of an East Asian community among countries outside of the region. I already alluded to the problems between Japan and China at the beginning of my remarks, but I believe that these problems currently bedeviling the Japan-China relationship have arisen largely because trust and confidence based on shared values has not been fostered between the two countries.

At the East Asia Summit to be held in December of this year, the leaders of the participating countries should agree to make the sharing of values—values both Asian and universal in nature—one of the important pillars underpinning the fundamental principles for regional cooperation with a view to creating a region-wide community in the future. They should then make clear their aspiration to realize an Asian-like East Asia, which is richly unique and diverse, as well as to build a new East Asia, in which respect for freedom, human rights, and democracy is genuinely rooted. Moreover, Japan, which has realized to a high degree both Asian and universal values, should demonstrate strong leadership in this endeavor.

Session II

PROMOTING FUNCTIONAL APPROACHES

Yukio TAKEUCHI
former Vice-Minister for Foreign Affairs

1. Background: The Dynamism of East Asia and the Deepening of Mutual Interdependence

With the economic development of countries in the region and advancing globalization since the latter half of the 1990s, common economic interests and mutual complementarities within the region have rapidly deepened. This development can be seen as the advancement toward de facto regional economic integration.

During the last 10 years, the trade volumes between Japan and China, China and South Korea, and China and ASEAN have increased by four, eight and six fold, respectively.

The intra-regional trade share in East Asia, i.e. Japan, China, NIEs and ASEAN countries, reached 53.3% in 2003, while it was only 33.6% in 1980. This is greater than the 44.5% ratio of NAFTA, which has regional arrangements for trade liberalization. In the case of the EU, the ratio is 60.3 %.

The Asian currency crisis in 1997 and the 9/11 terrorist attacks in the U.S. served as catalysts to awaken people in the region to the importance of regional cooperation. ASEAN has served as a hub of regional cooperation in East Asia.

Japan, China and Korea: Progress of ASEAN+3 cooperation; movements toward the conclusion of FTA/EPA agreements with ASEAN countries.

Australia and New Zealand: An ASEAN-CER Summit; efforts to reach an FTA agreement.

India: ASEAN-India Summits; efforts to reach an FTA agreement.

ARF: A forum concerned with security issues aiming at confidence-building,

preventive diplomacy, and, in the future, dispute settlement.

Set against the background described above, the creation of an East Asian community for the future is today becoming a shared region-wide goal in East Asia. In a speech delivered in Singapore in January 2002, Prime Minister Junichiro Koizumi called on the countries in the region to build a community that “acts together and advances together” and to pursue cooperation in a wide range of areas to ensure stability and prosperity in the region. Since then, Japan has expressed its commitment to the creation of an East Asian community in the future at various opportunities.

2. Progress of “Functional Cooperation” in East Asia

Accompanying the deepening interdependence mentioned above within East Asia, a wide array of functional cooperation is making progress in the region. Some specific examples are as follows:

- Trade and investment: Various types of FTAs are being developed.
- IT: Asia IT Initiative, Asia Broadband Initiative, etc.
- Finance: Chiang Mai Initiative, and Asian Bond Markets Initiative
- Transnational issues: terrorism, illegal drug trafficking, piracy, human trafficking, nuclear proliferation, etc.
- Development assistance: Initiative for ASEAN Integration (IAI); Mekong Region -Development; East ASEAN Growth Area (BIMP-EAGA); human resources development, etc.
- Energy: energy security
- Environmental preservation: Acid Deposition Monitoring Network in East Asia, and Asia Forest Partnership
- Disaster prevention and mitigation countermeasures against natural disasters such as tsunamis
- Food: food security
- Health care: SARS, avian influenza, and other infectious diseases

The ASEAN+3 frameworks have already been playing important roles for the promotion of functional cooperation. At present 48 consultative bodies covering 17 areas ranging from trade and finance to countermeasures against transnational crime exist within the ASEAN+3 frameworks. The East Asia Study Group (EASG), comprised of senior Foreign Ministry officials of all the ASEAN+3 countries, submitted its report to the

ASEAN+3 Summit in 2002 on the possibilities and means for promoting East Asian regional cooperation. The 17 short-term and 9 medium- and long-term measures proposed by the report cover a considerable part of the “functional cooperation” currently underway in the region.

On the other hand, the scope of participating countries in “functional cooperation” is decided flexibly and openly according to the characteristics of each area and the intentions of each country. As described below, countries outside of the ASEAN+3 frameworks, in particular Australia, New Zealand, India, the United States, etc., are also playing essential roles in various areas of “functional cooperation.”

-Various FTA networks are developing with the involvement of Australia, the U.S. and India, in addition to ASEAN, Japan, China and South Korea.

-16 countries, including India and Sri Lanka, participated in the negotiations on the Regional Co-operation Agreement on Anti-Piracy in Asia.

-Under the initiative proposed by Indonesia and Australia, 38 countries are participating in the Bali Process on the prevention of human trafficking and smuggling.

-A large number of countries and international organizations both inside and outside of the region have provided assistance and cooperation for relief and reconstruction efforts in the aftermath of the earthquake off of the Sumatra Island and the resulting devastating Indian Ocean tsunamis. A Special ASEAN Leaders’ Meeting on the Aftermath of the Earthquake and Tsunami to deal with the crisis was held in January, with the participation of 29 countries and international organizations. A core group mainly comprised of Japan, the United States, Australia, and India was formed after the disaster and played an active role in relief efforts.

-23 countries, including the ASEAN countries, Japan, China, South Korea, United States, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and North Korea, and the EU participate in the ASEAN Regional Forum.

3. “Functional Approach”

Two approaches

Approaches for the creation of a community can be theoretically categorized into two types: an “institutional approach” and a “functional approach.” An

“institutional approach” is one that attempts to form the community through the creation of comprehensive institutional and legal frameworks in the region from the outset. In contrast, the “functional approach” attempts to create a comprehensive community through the promotion of various types of functional cooperation in individual fields, rather than building comprehensive institutional and legal frameworks from the outset. The promotion of functional cooperation will facilitate the setting up of institutional and legal frameworks in each individual functional sector, which could, if combined closely with each other, constitute integral parts of a future region-wide comprehensive community.

Why is the “functional approach” appropriate to East Asia?

The “functional approach” is appropriate for the creation of a community in East Asia because of the following reasons.

(a) The concept of an East Asian community has surfaced within the backdrop of the rapid deepening of interdependence and the actual progress in various functional cooperation as described above.

(b) On the other hand, in East Asia, enormous diversity and disparities exist in levels of economic development, culture, ethnicity, religion, political principles, security policies, and so on. At present, objective conditions for building region-wide comprehensive institutional and legal frameworks have not emerged.

(c) Accordingly, under the current situation in East Asia, the most practical approach would be to further promote functional cooperation, and thereby to facilitate the creation of institutional and legal frameworks in each functional field. In parallel with this, efforts should also be made to rectify intra-regional disparities in development, to foster common values and principles, and to forge a shared sense of community. All of these efforts will lead to the creation of a region-wide community in East Asia in the future.

Progress of the European integration

From the beginning of the European integration process in the 1950s, Western European countries shared a common foundation of liberal democracy, security policies (NATO), and free market economies. Moreover, they were bound by many common ties related to history, culture, religion, and so on. This was the reason Europe was able to build comprehensive institutional and legal frameworks. At the same time, it should be

noted that even in the European context, the integration process began from cooperation in individual functional sectors, such as coal and steel (ECSC) and nuclear energy (EURATOM).

4. Promotion of a “Functional Approach” and an East Asian community

The creation of an “economic community” will precede.

It is important for East Asia to aspire to the creation of a comprehensive community that will contribute to the peace and prosperity of the region. However, under the present circumstances, although East Asia is rapidly deepening common economic interests and mutual complementarities within the region and advancing functional cooperation in many fields, from the security aspect, recognitions of security threats vary to a substantial extent and differences in policy remain among the countries. Hence in East Asia, the creation of an “economic community” will probably precede, in tandem with the creation of a “socio-cultural community”. It is highly likely that the establishment of a “security community” will require a considerable amount of time.

Traditional and non-traditional security issues

In East Asia, cooperation in so-called “non-traditional” security issues, such as terrorism, piracy, narcotics trafficking, and human trafficking, has already made a considerable progress. Hence it is an important task to promote regional cooperation in these areas under the “functional approach”. Moreover, as widely recognized in the region, the military presence of the United States plays an essential role for regional stability. Accordingly, it is more suitable at present to address issues related to “traditional” security at forums like ARF, in which countries outside of the region like the United States participate, and to promote dialogue and confidence-building measures through those channels. In addition, depending on the case, it can be effective to utilize frameworks like the Six-Party talks established to deal with North Korea’s nuclear development.

Institutional and legal frameworks for individual functional fields

Under the functional approach, institutional frameworks for individual functional fields will be set up before a comprehensive framework is established. In fact, the nine mid- and long-term measures proposed by the EASG report include the

following measures that presume the introduction of institutional and legal frameworks for each individual field: (a) establishment of an East Asian Free Trade Area, (b) establishment of an East Asia Investment Area, (c) establishment of a regional financing facility, and (d) pursuit of a more closely coordinated regional exchange rate mechanism. Among these measures, from April of this year, an ASEAN+3 experts' group began study on the East Asian Free Trade Area concept, and the establishment of a regional financing facility is already being realized to a certain extent through the Chiang Mai Initiative. These kinds of institutional and legal frameworks for specific fields could play important roles in fostering the conditions necessary for the creation of more comprehensive frameworks in the future. (As mentioned earlier, in Europe, the process of integration began from cooperation in specific fields like coal and steel [ECSC] and nuclear power [EURATOM].)

Political leadership

In order to promote the creation of a region-wide comprehensive community in East Asia, it will be essential for national leaders to express their commitment to the creation of such a community and to demonstrate their leadership for the deepening of cooperation in each field and the fostering of common values and a shared sense of community. Venues like the East Asia Summit (EAS), the ASEAN+3 Summit, and the APEC Summit will play an important role as opportunities for the demonstration of such leadership at the highest levels.

Strengthening regional coordinating functions

In order to create a comprehensive region-wide community that encompasses a wide range of areas through the "functional approach", it will be essential to strengthen the functions of the relevant secretariat to coordinate cooperation in each field. A measure that can be taken for the time being is to strengthen and expand the ASEAN+3 Unit in the ASEAN Secretariat. For the mid-term, another recommendation is to explore the possibility of the establishment of an independent organization (an East Asia version of the OECD), which would monitor the progress of all types of functional cooperation and offer advice if needed with its expertise.

Inclusiveness of participating countries

It is not appropriate to fix the scope of the participating countries of a future

East Asia community at this stage. If the creation of a region-wide community is advanced through the “functional approach,” it is highly likely that the ASEAN+3 countries would be the core of the community, while a high degree of inclusiveness will be achieved with the participation of relevant countries in addition to the thirteen countries of ASEAN+3. This is because the scope of participating countries cooperating in each field should be decided flexibly and openly depending on the characteristics of the particular field and the willingness and intention of each country. For example, regarding FTAs, highly inclusive networks have already been created, involving not only the ASEAN+3 countries but also India, Australia, New Zealand, and, to a certain extent, the United States and other countries. The Bali Process, which addresses human trafficking and smuggling, already has the participation of 38 countries. Although only ASEAN+3 countries participate in the Chiang Mai Initiative and the Asian Bond Markets Initiative of the Finance Ministers process, the EMEAP (Executives' Meeting of East Asia-Pacific Central Banks; see note) Group's Asian Bond Fund has included Australia, New Zealand, and Hong Kong among its participating members from its inception.

Note: EMEAP=Executives' Meeting of East Asia-Pacific Central Banks

EMEAP is comprised of central banks and monetary authorities of 11 countries: Japan, Australia, China, Hong Kong, Indonesia, South Korea, Malaysia, New Zealand, the Philippines, Singapore, and Thailand.

5. Conclusion

As explained above, it is most practical to adopt the “functional approach” to build a comprehensive region-wide community in East Asia in the future that spans the full range of the region's economic, socio-cultural, and security fields. In order to carry out such joint efforts successfully, it is indispensable that national leaders demonstrate political leadership and people of each country express support and enthusiasm. As functional cooperation can only be advanced through the voluntary efforts by each country, a community created through the “functional approach” could be called a “Community of Willingness,” one that is based on this spirit of voluntarism.

Hank LIM
Director of Research, Singapore Institute of International Affairs

The East Asia Vision Group (EAVG) submitted its Report to the 5th ASEAN + 3 Summit in 2001 entitled "Towards an East Asian Community: Region of Peace, Prosperity and Progress". In the Report, EAVG recommended the creation of East Asia Community, East Asia Free Trade Area, evolution of ASEAN + 3 Summit into East Asia Summit. The recommendations were studied by the East Asia Study Group (EASG). There are 17 short-term measures and 9 long-term measures for the establishment of East Asia Community (the details of the recommendations are attached in the annexure). Out of 17 short-term measures, there are 6 measures for business, investment and finance measures, 2 for information technology, 2 for intellectual exchange, 3 for human resources and human development, 1 for security and 3 for social and cultural. It is clear that the recommended measures have a strong bias for the development of regional trade and investment which can be implied to have stronger and favorable implications to developed members of East Asia, recognition of existing development gaps in the region and importance given to identity and values in the community building. Out of 9 long-term measures, there are 5 for trade, investment and finance measures, 1 for politics, 2 for energy and environment and 1 for social problems and civil society organization. As in the short-term measures, there is a strong bias for trade and investment, some recognition for environmental and energy problems, and the importance of NGO's role and partnership with states in dealing with social problems.

The findings and recommendations of the East Asia Study Group imply that diversity in ethnic, socio-cultural, political systems and stage of economic growth define its challenges for fulfilling its vision for a regional community, However, East Asia has the prerequisite and promising potential to be the most dynamic economic region in the world. It has huge potential market size, existing reservoir of technology and financial resources in terms of enormous official reserve of USD 2.5 trillion.

Having considered its diversity and propensity for regional fragmentation, East Asia must approach regional cooperation based on a comprehensive and broad approach to community building. East Asia should consider an integrated framework designed not only to enhance economic exchanges in trade and investment liberalization

but also to promote security, conflict-prevention measures and to promote social and cultural affinity. Such conscious measure would ultimately enhance a sense of regional identity and vested interests to developed as well as less-developed countries in the region.

As clearly recommended in the East Asia Study Group, trade and investment liberalization should be the prime mover of regional cooperation based on shared prosperity. This, in turn, would promote regional security and peace strengthened by bilateral and regional arrangements through confidence-building and community bonding. However, trade and investment liberalization are necessary but not sufficient conditions for the establishment of a sense of regional shared identity. Towards this objective, developed countries in the region must actively provide regional “public goods” which will disproportionately benefit the less developed members of the community. These “public goods” can be in the form of human resource development, technology transfer and maintaining regional peace and stability which is a prerequisite condition for economic growth.

Proliferation of regional and bilateral FTAs in the region is not harmful if they embody regional and multilateral elements. In other words, bilateral FTAs should not be pursued to serve national interests only but it should be built on a common regional framework in order to avoid or minimize duplication and overlapping and worst containing conflicting rules and regulations on trade and investment rules and regulations. It is therefore, urgently required that bilateral FTAs should be transparent and predictable for regional comparison and examination. Such action would reduce transaction costs and facilitate efficient allocation of scarce resources and the subsequent division of labour in East Asia. In order to have a seamless market, it is not enough just to reduce tariff but its is equally important to standardize custom procedures, harmonize technical standardization, rules and regulations of the movement of consumer and capital goods, services and skilled labour across East Asia.

East Asia Community vision should be driven by issues and functionality. Powerful as well as medium and small countries in the region can play important roles by initiating useful policy recommendations and acting in concert with other members to create a common synergy towards a prosperous, caring and peaceful East Asia Community.

Specifically, to have effective functional cooperation, countries in the region must have a clear concept about the desired nature and characteristics of the community

they intend to establish, as well as action plans and flexible and adaptive mechanism and process.

Liberalization, deregulation and harmonization of trade and investment rules, more vigorous efforts in promoting Asian Bond to finance Asian infrastructure, institutional building and human resource development should be given priority. At the same time, development agenda for less developed countries in the region should also be given high priority in order to close the development gap.

Political and security cooperation are much more difficult to achieve in the short-run. Countries must first cultivate a sense of confidence and trust through mutually beneficial economic exchanges. Over time, regional cultural identity and social affinity reinforced by strong, broad and multi-level trade and investment flows, political and security cooperation and institutional cooperation are more likely to emerge.

Increasingly, functional cooperation would take the form of establishing a regional mechanism and process to meet the challenges of natural disasters (like tsunami) and health problems (like SARS), maintaining of vital sea-lanes and combating of piracy and terrorism, environmental degradation and energy security. To complement and reinforce inter-governmental efforts, NGOs and civil organizations can play important roles in fostering regional functional cooperation. In fact, on certain sensitive issues such as regional security and other inherently divisive and long-term issues, the regional second-track organization such as ASEAN-Institute of Strategic and International Studies (ASEAN-ISIS) can play a useful strategic and pioneering role in initiating and soft-pedaling functional cooperation. ASEAN-ISIS has demonstrated its usefulness in initiating ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF), in advocating ASEAN Economic Community, ASEAN Security Community (ASC) and ASEAN Socio-Cultural Community (ASCC) as embodied in ASEAN Concord II. ASEAN-ISIS has also pioneered the establishment of the ASEAN People's Assembly (APA), a third-track of people-to-people annual assembly which aims to promote interactions and interfacing among ASEAN civil organizations and civil societies. The fourth APA was just convened in May 2005 in Manila.

ANNEXURE

East Asia Study Group (EASG) Short-term Measures for East Asia Community

- 1 Form and East Asia Business Council
- 2 Establish GSP status and preferential treatment for least developed countries

- 3 Foster an attractive investment environment for increased FDI
- 4 Establish an East Asian Investment Information Network
- 5 Develop resources and infrastructure jointly for growth areas and expand financial resources for development with active participation of the private sector
6. Provide assistance and cooperation in four priority areas: infrastructure, information technology, human resources development, and ASEAN regional economic integration
7. Cooperate through technology transfers and joint technology development
8. Develop information technology jointly to build telecommunications, infrastructure and to provide greater access to the internet
9. Build a network of East Asian think-tanks
10. Establish an East Asia Forum
11. Implement a comprehensive human resource development program for East Asia
12. Establish poverty alleviation programs
13. Take concerted steps to provide access to primary health care for the people
14. Strengthen mechanisms for cooperation on non-traditional security issues
15. Work together with cultural and educational institutions to promote a strong sense of identity and an East Asian consciousness
16. Promote networking and exchanges of experts in the conservation of the arts, artifacts, and culture heritage of East Asian countries
17. Promote East Asian studies in the region

East Asia Study Group's Long-term Measures for East Asia Community

1. Form an East Asia Free Trade Area (EAFTA)
2. Promote investment by small and medium enterprises
3. Establish an East Asia Investment Area by expanding the ASEAN Investment Area (AIA)
4. Establish a regional financing facility
5. Pursue a more closely coordinated regional exchange rate mechanism
6. Pursue the evolution of the ASEAN Plus Three (APT) Summit into an East Asia Summit
7. Promote closer regional marine environmental cooperation in the region
8. Build a regional network for energy policies, strategies and action plans
9. Work closely with NGOs in policy consultation and coordination to encourage civil participation and state-civil society partnership in tackling social problems.

The 4th Japan – ASEAN Dialogue

Promoting Functional Approaches

Professor Hank Lim
Director for Research,
Singapore Institute of International Affairs

1

Findings and Recommendations of the EAVG

- The diversity in ethnic, socio-cultural, political systems and stage of economic growth define its challenges for fulfilling its vision for a regional community.
- However, East Asia has a promising potential due to its huge market size, existing reservoir of technology and financial resources (official reserves of USD 2.5 trillion).

4

Framework for the East Asia Vision Group (EAVG)

- At the 5th ASEAN + 3 Summit, the EAVG submitted a report entitled "Towards an East Asian Community: Region of Peace, Prosperity and Progress".
- EAVG recommended the creation of
 1. East Asia Community
 2. East Asia Free Trade Area
 3. Evolution of ASEAN + 3 Summit into East Asia Summit

2

Findings and Recommendations of the EAVG

- East Asia must thus approach regional cooperation based on a comprehensive and broad approach to community building.
- East Asia should consider an integrated framework designed not only to enhance economic exchanges in trade and investment liberalization but also to promote security, conflict-prevention measures and the promotion of social and cultural affinity to enhance a sense of regional identity and interest.

5

Framework for the East Asia Vision Group (EAVG)

- There are 17 short-term measures and 9 long-term measures for the establishment of East Asia Community (See annexure)
- It is clear that the measures have a strong bias for the development of regional trade and investment, implying a stronger and more favorable implications to developed members of East Asia, recognition of existing development gaps in the region and importance given to identity and values in the community building.

3

Findings and Recommendations of the EAVG

- As recommended in the East Asia Study Group, trade and investment liberalization should be the prime mover of regional cooperation based on shared prosperity.
- This would in turn would promote regional security and peace strengthened by bilateral and regional arrangements through confidence-building and community bonding.

6

Findings and Recommendations of the EAVG

- ❏ However, trade and investment liberalization are necessary but not sufficient conditions for the establishment of a sense of regional shared identity.
- ❏ Developed countries must actively provide regional “public goods” which will benefit the less developed members of the community – these can be in the form of human resource development, technology transfer and the maintenance of peace and security.

7

Issues and Functionality

- ❏ East Asia Community should be driven by issues and functionality. Large and small countries can initiate useful policy recommendations and acting in concert with other members to create a common synergy towards a prosperous, caring and peaceful East Asia Community.

10

Premise of regional/bilateral FTAs

- ❏ Proliferation of regional and bilateral FTAs in the region is not harmful if they embody regional and multilateral elements.
- ❏ Bilateral FTAs should not be pursued to serve national interest but built on a common regional framework to minimize duplication and overlapping.

8

Issues and Functionality

- ❏ Specifically, to have effective functional cooperation, countries in the region must have a clear concept about the desired nature and characteristics of the community they intend to establish, the action plans, mechanism and process.
- ❏ Priority should be given to liberalization, deregulation, harmonization of trade rules, promoting Asian Bond, institutional building and human resource development.

11

Premise of regional/bilateral FTAs

- ❏ Bilateral FTAs should be transparent and predictable for regional comparison and examination – this would reduce transaction costs and allow efficient allocation of scarce resources
- ❏ Besides reducing tariff, it is equally important to standardize custom procedures and technical rules as well as the regulations of the movement of goods, services and skilled labour.

9

Issues and Functionality

Political and security cooperation are much more difficult to achieve in the short-run. Countries must first cultivate a sense of confidence and trust through mutually beneficial economic exchanges. Over time, regional cultural identity and social affinity reinforced by strong, broad and multi-level trade and investment flows, political and security cooperation and institutional cooperation are more likely to emerge.

12

Types of Functional Cooperation

- Increasingly, functional cooperation would take the form of establishing a regional mechanism and process to meet the challenges of natural disasters (tsunami) and health problems (SARS), maintaining vital sea-lanes and combating of piracy and terrorism, environmental degradation and energy security.

13

ANNEXURE

East Asian Study Group (EASG) Short-term Measures for East Asia Community

1. Form an East Asia Business Council
2. Establish GSP status and preferential treatment for least developed countries
3. Foster an attractive investment environment for increased FDI
4. Establish an East Asian Investment Information Network
5. Develop resources and infrastructure jointly for growth areas and expand financial resources for development with active participation of the private sector

16

Types of Functional Cooperation

- To complement and reinforce inter-governmental efforts, NGOs and civil organizations can play important roles.
- This includes the regional track 2 organization such as ASEAN-Institute of Strategic and International Studies (ASEAN-ISIS) which play a useful strategic and pioneering role in initiating and soft-pedaling functional cooperation.

14

ANNEXURE

6. Provide assistance and cooperation in four priority areas: infrastructure, information technology, human resources development, and ASEAN regional economic integration
7. Cooperate through technological transfers and joint technology development
8. Develop information technology jointly to build telecommunications infrastructure and to provide greater access to the internet
9. Build a network of East Asian think-tanks
10. Establish an East Asia Forum

17

Types of Functional Cooperation

ASEAN-ISIS has demonstrated its usefulness in initiating ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF), in advocating ASEAN Economic Community, ASEAN Security Community (ASC) and ASEAN Socio-Cultural Community (ASCC) as embodied in ASEAN Concord II. ASEAN-ISIS has also pioneered the establishment of the ASEAN People's Assembly (APA), a third-track of people-to-people annual assembly which aims to promote interactions and interfacing among ASEAN civil organizations and civil societies.

15

ANNEXURE

11. Implement a comprehensive human resource development program for East Asia
12. Establish poverty alleviation programs
13. Take concerted steps to provide access to primary health care for the people
14. Strengthen mechanisms for cooperation on non-traditional security issues
15. Work together with cultural and educational institutions to promote a strong sense of identity and an East Asian consciousness

18

ANNEXURE

16. Promote networking and exchanges of experts in the conservation of the arts, artifacts, and cultural heritage of East Asian countries
17. Promote East Asian studies in the region

19



ANNEXURE

East Asia Study Group's Long-term Measures for East Asia Community

1. Form an East Asia Free Trade Area (EAFTA)
2. Promote investment by small and medium enterprises
3. Establish an East Asia Investment Area by expanding the ASEAN Investment Area (AIA)
4. Establish a regional financing facility

20



ANNEXURE

5. Pursue a more closely coordinated regional exchange rate mechanism
6. Pursue the evolution of the ASEAN Plus Three (APT) Summit into an East Asia Summit
7. Promote a closer regional marine environment cooperation in the region
8. Build a regional network for energy policies, strategies and action plans
9. Work closely with NGOs in policy consultation and coordination to encourage civil participation and state-civil society partnership in tackling social problems

21



Session III

THE ROLE OF ASEAN TOWARDS COMMUNITY BUILDING

Hadi SOEASTRO

Executive Director, Centre for Strategic and International Studies

Introduction

In East Asia, ASEAN is the first attempt at regional community building. ASEAN is an on-going experiment in community building. It began in 1967 as a regional cooperation arrangement to promote welfare and peace in Southeast Asia. In that sense, it was based on some vision of regional order and regional community. Building this regional community began with some modesty. The regional arrangement sought to promote cooperation in the economic and social fields. This was understandable. The region had just opened up a new page in its history. Having gained independence and having experienced continued internal turmoil for about two decades, and more importantly, having made an end to political animosities, the five original members of ASEAN embarked on the path of community building by taking steps to learn more about each other and to learn to live together in harmony and peace.

It took these countries almost a decade to bring their leaders together for the first Summit meeting. That happened in 1976 in Bali. From then on, several concrete cooperation programs were introduced. They included the ASEAN Industrial Projects (AIP), the ASEAN Preferential Trading Arrangement (PTA), ASEAN Industrial Joint Venture (AIJV), and ASEAN Industrial Cooperation (AICO), to name some of the more important programs. ASEAN members began to learn how to cooperate and work together to achieve some common objectives. They were prepared to pool their resources, but they were unprepared to share their markets. Therefore, there were continuing tensions between “resource pooling” and “market sharing” in implementing and up-grading the cooperation programs. As a result, not much progress was achieved in

the field of economic cooperation.

ASEAN founding fathers did not envision the economic integration of the region. In their view, that was a remote possibility, perhaps even an impossibility. However, gradually the regional economies became more integrated. It was the remarkable economic growth of regional countries and the gradual economic reform and opening up that greatly increased their economic interactions. This was not a direct result of ASEAN economic cooperation programs. Rather, the region saw the working of “market-driven” integration.

This paper argues that this market-driven integration was not independent of developments in the political field and the intensification of ASEAN external relations. As the region turned into an ocean of stability and peace, thanks to the establishment of the regional forum, national governments were able to concentrate on national economic development. In the two decades until the middle of 1990, the region was growing at an average rate of 7 percent or more. This made the region even more attractive for trade relations with and investment from other parts of the world. The wave of Japanese foreign direct investment following the Plaza Accord in 1985 further deepened the development of regional production networks.

ASEAN has established dialogues with its main trading partners since the late 1970s. These dialogues helped shape trade, aid and investment policies of ASEAN’s main dialogue partners in enhancing cooperation with ASEAN. In turn they also contributed to ASEAN’s increased diplomatic clout in the international arena.

Increased political cooperation amongst ASEAN members was a manifestation of the growing need amongst them to coordinate their views and policies in regard to international and regional strategic and political developments. The fall of Saigon changed the region’s political map, but the wave of “boat people” from Vietnam and the subsequent invasion of Cambodia by Vietnamese forces created potential sources of instability for Southeast Asia. ASEAN’s determination to help resolve the conflict in Indochina provided a strong glue for ASEAN’s cohesion. ASEAN’s efforts were supported by the international community. Its international standing was at its height and signified ASEAN’s success.

It was felt, however, that the region needed to step up its economic cooperation to be able to effectively respond to economic globalization. There was much talk about

the need to take “bold” decisions in the economic field. Eventually these led to the decision in 1992 to establish the ASEAN Free Trade Area (AFTA). Its boldness was the agreement to promote regional economic integration through resource pooling *and* market sharing. The ASEAN leaders produced a new kind of community building, namely one that stresses more on openness to each other, economically, socially as well as politically. ASEAN, it was argued, should have reached a state of maturity that allows them to be more open to each other. Due to growing interdependence, developments in one member country are likely to have a greater effect on the neighbors and the region as a whole. Thus came about the calls for “enhanced interaction” that allows for greater openness to comments and suggestions from fellow members on internal developments.

Another major move was the expansion of membership to finally complete the “One Southeast Asia” project. It was remarkable that in the middle of the 1990s ASEAN accepted the membership of Vietnam, its erstwhile enemy. A few years later, Laos and Myanmar were also brought in. Cambodia’s membership was delayed because of its internal development. By the late 1990s, all Southeast Asian countries have become a member of ASEAN, realizing the founding fathers’ dream. The broadening of ASEAN has become a challenge to ASEAN’s deepening. The new members have to take part in AFTA, but they are each given a longer time to implement the trade liberalization program. In reality, a two-tier ASEAN has emerged. This should not be a problem so long as they share a common goal.

ASEAN Vision 2020 was formulated to provide such a common goal. Its implementation was guided by the Hanoi Action Plan (HAP). At the mid-term review of the HAP, it was felt that ASEAN members must have stronger commitments to realize the ASEAN Vision 2020. This led to the proposal to deepen ASEAN economic integration towards an ASEAN Economic Community (AEC). By the time Indonesia hosted the Summit in Bali in 2003, ASEAN members agreed to create an ASEAN Community by 2020. As stated in the so-called Bali Concord II, the ASEAN Community consists of an ASEAN Economic Community, an ASEAN Security Community, and an ASEAN Social and Cultural Community. At the following Summit in Vientiane, leaders endorsed a Vientiane Action Program (VAP) to guide the process of community building in ASEAN for next five years.

It has taken ASEAN nearly 40 years to come to the point where its members

agree to form a Community (with a C) and not simply a community (with a c). They have about 15 more years to realize this vision. This remains a big challenge for ASEAN. It can be argued that this next phase in the integration process will be much more difficult.

The ASEAN model of community building, when contrasted to other experiences, is seen as having a distinct characteristic, namely its loose and open-ended process and its reliance on minimal institutional arrangements. These, plus the principle of consensus and the sanctity of national sovereignty, have characterized the so-called ASEAN way. However, the ASEAN way has undergone a modification. ASEAN's mode of operation has evolved from one that was based on full consensus to one that allows for the emergence of the coalition of the willing. Several members also believe that the sanctity of national sovereignty can no longer be used as a protection against irresponsible actions. A new ASEAN way may be necessary to realize the ASEAN Community.

The experiment will continue. Thus far, the experience has been worthwhile. To some extent the ASEAN experience and experiment have inspired community building in the wider region.

ASEAN and the Wider Region

ASEAN has definitely left a footprint in regional community building in East Asia and the Asia Pacific because ASEAN has played a critical role in the development of cooperation processes in the wider region.

ASEAN's critical role has been due to two factors. First, its experience as the "first mover" in the region influenced the modality of other regional processes in which it is involved. Second, ASEAN's dialogue process with major countries, which established the regular (annual) Post-Ministerial Conference (PMC), provided the inspiration for a wider regional process.

When the idea of an Asia Pacific cooperation process began to take hold, ASEAN proposed that the ASEAN PMC process be the basis for it. A proposal for an Asia Pacific Forum (APF) was adopted by ASEAN Foreign Ministers but was not endorsed by some ASEAN members. The ball was then taken by Australia, and the first Ministerial Meeting of APEC (Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation) was held in Canberra

in 1989. Recognizing the fact that ASEAN had first come up with the initiative and the critical role ASEAN's participation has in any Asia Pacific process, an agreement was made that any other APEC meeting must be held in an ASEAN country. ASEAN has since become the co-pilot in the APEC community building process.

The APEC process is characterized by the important role of the chair in shaping the agenda. The one year cycle of APEC's chairmanship has its positive and negative aspects. However, the main problem with APEC is its loose and open-ended nature and its minimal institutionalization. APEC was ahead of ASEAN in setting a clear target for its process when in 1994 leaders endorsed the Bogor Goals of "free and open trade and investment in the region" by 2010 for developed countries and 2020 for developing countries. This year, APEC is undertaking a mid-term review towards the Bogor Goals. The widespread view is that the process will not be able to deliver on the leaders' commitment. APEC is in the process of some soul searching now. The APEC Business Advisory Council (ABAC) proposed that APEC abandoned its voluntary nature and move towards the creation of a Free Trade Area for the Asia Pacific (FTAAP). At the last APEC Summit in Chile, leaders rejected this proposal as being infeasible.

The other Asia Pacific process, the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF), appears to have stagnated as well. Formed in the middle of the 1990s to promote cooperation in the political and security fields, in parallel to APEC's economic cooperation process, the ARF was to become an important pillar of the Asia Pacific regional architecture. In terms of defining the process, the ARF should be less open-ended as it has formulated the three phases of confidence building, preventive diplomacy, and conflict resolution. However, the process lacks the mechanism to move from the first phase to the next, largely because it also is a very loose process. It has been questioned whether ARF's stagnation could be overcome by ASEAN's willingness to release its driver's seat in the process. The ARF is by design ASEAN-driven. This resulted from a recognition that the process would not have taken off at all if it is not driven by ASEAN. The proposal for a co-chairmanship has been aired, but there has been no decision on this.

In addition to APEC and ARF, ASEAN is involved in, and in fact also the initiator of, three other processes: ASEM (Asia Europe Meeting), FEALAC (Forum of East Asian and Latin American Countries), and most importantly the ASEAN Plus Three (ASEAN+3).

There have been regular meetings of ASEM and FEALAC, but these two processes failed to produce concrete programs or measures that can confidently be seen as creating bridges to connect East Asia with Europe and Latin America, respectively.

In comparison much more is going on in the ASEAN Plus Three process. A great deal has been written lately about this process. However, the region fails to develop a strategic plan for the ASEAN Plus Three process. This is in part the failure of ASEAN, who is in the driver's seat, to do so. Instead, governments agreed on holding an East Asian Summit without having clearly visualized and articulated a strategic plan. It was really strange to have two parallel tracks involving the same countries and with no clearly distinct agenda. This resulted in an agreement, largely as an after-thought, to expand the membership of the East Asian Summit to include India, Australia, and New Zealand, the three countries with which ASEAN also has agreed to form a Free Trade Area.

The original proposal by the East Asian Vision Group (EAVG) that was endorsed by the East Asian Study Group (EASG) was to transform the ASEAN Plus Three process to an East Asian Summit process. This was to happen after a lot of preparations and a consolidation of the ASEAN-driven ASEAN Plus Three process. It was unfortunate that the East Asian Summit was prematurely taken on the region's agenda for 2005. What then will happen to East Asian community building?

ASEAN and East Asian Community Building

Had a strategic plan for East Asia been properly worked out, it would have been concluded that the transformation of the ASEAN Plus Three process to an East Asian process is the most critical element not only for East Asian community building but also for the other processes, namely APEC, ARF, ASEM and FEALAC (or EALAF).

At this stage, ASEAN's main task is to consolidate the ASEAN Plus Three process. ASEAN must have a strategic plan to develop a new vehicle that would ensure that it as well as the Plus Three members feel comfortable to travel in even though ASEAN is no longer in the driver's seat. As things stand today, ASEAN is in the driver's seat of a defective vehicle.

It is in this new vehicle that a better "roadmap" can be traveled in. But the passengers must also behave, and the driver must be fit.

China, Korea and Japan should not continue to quarrel and must come to settlement of the historical burden. Governments must, once and for all, stand up above the public and not to allow the relationship (China-Japan and Korea-Japan) be used for domestic political purposes. ASEAN too must agree on a modality that ensures the effective functioning of its international diplomacy and not to allow the organization be held hostage to one of its members, whose regime remains illegitimate.

Once a consolidated ASEAN Plus Three process emerges, ASEAN need no longer be in the driver's seat in the process towards an East Asian community. This will be jointly pursued and managed by all East Asian countries. ASEAN should also accept that it will be East Asia as a whole, rather than ASEAN, that will be the hub in the web of relationships that have emerged.

In APEC: East Asia can function as a strong driver of a trans-Pacific relationship. This has been articulated many years ago when ASEAN proposed the East Asian Economic Caucus (EAEC).

In ARF: the process will have to become an East Asian-driven process.

In ASEM: East Asia will be an equal counterpart of the European Union. A new modality will have to be found to connect the 25 countries in Europe with the 13 countries in East Asia. While in the beginning the prevailing view was that ASEM was not to be designed as a region-to-region relationship, in practice it tends to develop in that direction. As such the European side has an advantage.

In FEALAC: East Asia and the Latin American countries also need to develop a similar modality as for ASEM.

Finally, what currently is likely to be the East Asian Summit involving India, Australia and New Zealand, should become a forum that promotes closer relations between East Asia and its immediate neighbors.

Last April, a strategic partnership between Asia and Africa was also launched. East Asia must also play an active part in the development of this relationship.

In may be argued that a major rationale for the development of an East Asian community is to enable the region to contribute to the creation of a peaceful and prosperous world through constructive relations with other parts of the globe.

Hiroshi OE
Professor, The University of Tokyo

1. Comparison with the EU

- (1) Feasibility of creating a common community similar to the EU in East Asia
- (2) Difficult process of integration of the EU

2. Economic integration in Asia

- (1) Enlargement of intra-regional economic gap by the joining of CLMV as new members in ASEAN
- (2) Significance of AFTA: intra-regional economic integration and preparation for concluding FTA with the third countries
- (3) Japan's moves for concluding economic partnership agreement with ASEAN since 2002
- (4) Realization of economic growth through inward foreign investment in ASEAN countries
- (5) Market expansion and investment attraction through AFTA and through FTA with the third countries
- (6) Need for rectifying intra- regional economic gap for further economic integration
- (7) Importance of Mekong Sub-regional Development
- (8) Importance of "cooperation" in the Economic Partnership Agreements
- (9) FTA network among Japan, China, Korea ,and ASEAN : the economic foundation for the East Asia Community
- (10)The role of ASEAN

3. Potentials for political cooperation and cooperation in the area of security

- (1) East Asia Declaration of 1999: in addition to socio-economic areas, (a) political and security (b) eliciting cooperation in trans-national issues
- (2) Importance and potentials for cooperation in the area of "Human Security"=Transnational issues
- (3) Potentials for promoting cooperation on traditional security issues
 - (a) Confidence building
 - (b) Preventive Diplomacy
 - (c) Conflict resolution
- (4) Evaluation of ARF

4. The role of culture and the sense of regional identity in regional integration

- (1) Difficulty in sharing common regional identity within multi-lingual and multi-religious culture
- (2) The role of the expansion of rapid transport of people, goods, and information as a result of globalization

5. Geographical scope of the East Asia Community

- (1) ASEAN Plus 3
- (2) India, Australia, the New Zealand
- (3) East Asia Summit

7. Appendix

(1) The Role of ASEAN Towards Community Building

by Termsak Chalermphanupap

This report was prepared by Mr. Termsak Chalermphanupap, Special Assistant to the Secretary-General of ASEAN, ASEAN Secretariat, for distribution to the participants of the Dialogue.

1. ASEAN has been in the forefront in regional cooperation since it was established in 1967. In recent years, ASEAN and its Member Countries have been active in regionalism and multilateralism in what Mr. Goh Chok Tong, Senior Minister and ex-Prime Minister of Singapore, once described as ASEAN's "virtuous promiscuity".

2. ASEAN Member Countries have been active in promoting cooperation not only in Southeast Asia, but also in East Asia (i.e. the ASEAN Plus Three, and ASEAN's Dialogue Partnerships with China, Japan, and the RoK) and in pan-Asia (i.e. the Asia Cooperation Dialogue, ASEAN's cooperation with SAARC, ECO, GCC, and SCO) as well as in inter-regional cooperation (i.e. APEC, ASEM, FEALAC, and Asia-Africa Summit). When Singapore hosts the first Asia-Middle East Dialogue later this month, ASEAN's linkages with the world will be completed.

3. In most of its first three decades, ASEAN's five founding members (Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore, and Thailand) had slowly developed their skill and gained experience in regional cooperation and external relations with Dialogue Partners* in confidence-building and development cooperation activities. Only in the early 1990s did ASEAN begin to create its free trade area under AFTA and further

expand its membership to include Viet Nam (1995), Laos and Myanmar (1997) and Cambodia (1999); Brunei Darussalam joined ASEAN in 1984 soon after gaining independence.

* *ASEAN's 10 Dialogue Partners are : Australia, Canada, China, the EU, India, Japan, the RoK, New Zealand, Russia, the USA. The UNDP is also a Dialogue Partner, but it does not attend the ASEAN+1 Post Ministerial Conference with ASEAN Foreign Ministers or the ARF. Pakistan is a Sectoral Dialogue Partner, it joined the ARF in 2004. Papua New Guinea is a Special Observer; it has been in the ARF from the beginning. This year, Timor Leste will be invited to join the ARF, at the 12th ministerial meeting of the ARF in Vientiane on 29 July 2005. Timor Leste has expressed its interest to join ASEAN and accede to the TAC and the Treaty on SEANWFZ as a regional State in Southeast Asia.*

4. Through its growing web of comprehensive cooperation activities ASEAN has practically brought its Member Countries closer together in many different ways. But it was only at the 9th ASEAN Summit in Bali on 7 October 2003 that ASEAN Leaders announced in the Declaration of ASEAN Concord II their resolve and commitment to bring about by the year 2020 an ASEAN Community comprising three pillars of ASEAN Security Community, ASEAN Economic Community, and ASEAN Socio-Cultural Community. In working towards the ASEAN Community, careful attention will also be given to narrowing the development gaps within the ASEAN membership and in pockets of undeveloped areas in the ASEAN region.

5. From ASEAN's perspective, its contribution to community building in Southeast Asia is self-evident; this need not be elaborated here.

6. However, it can be pointed out that ASEAN is also contributing to community building in East Asia by becoming in itself a strong and dynamic building block : more cohesive politically, more integrated economically, more caring socially, and more outward-looking externally.

7. The ASEAN Way of community building in Southeast Asia, consisting of universally-recognized principles and practical modalities that have withstood the test

of time and globalization, is very relevant to community building in East Asia. Let's examine the two lists below.

Principles

8. Key principles in ASEAN include the following :

- Respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of all States;
- Respect for the principle of equal rights and non-interference in internal political affairs of States;
- Respect for human rights, fundamental freedoms, and self-determination of all, without distinction as to race, creed, religion, gender, or language;
- Adherence to the decision-making by consultation and consensus and to the collective responsibility in building the ASEAN Community and taking the community-building to greater heights;
- Abstention from threat or use of force in inter-State relations;
- Settlement of differences or disputes through amicable consultations and peaceful means as provided for in the Treaty of Amity and Cooperation in Southeast Asia and other ASEAN agreements;
- Equal sharing of responsibilities, including the annual contribution to the operating budget of the ASEAN Secretariat, the rotation of chairmanship of various ASEAN sectoral bodies, and the hosting of ASEAN meetings;
- Respect for the rich cultural heritage and linguistic diversity of Member States while promoting an ASEAN common identity and a sense of belonging to and support for ASEAN;

- Non-discrimination of any Member Countries in ASEAN's external relations and cooperation activities;
- Fulfilment of all obligations to ASEAN in good faith and maximum effort in participating in ASEAN's activities; and
- Prosper thy neighbours, which is the newest principle embraced by ASEAN in 2002 in the Initiative on ASEAN Integration IAI.

9. Obviously the above are well-known universally recognized principles for inter-State relations and peaceful coexistence under the international law. Most of them, with perhaps the prosper thy neighbours as the only exception, can be found in or inferred from the UN Charter – including the principle of non-interference, which is inherent in the principle of the sovereign equality of all UN member States.

10. Most of the principles in ASEAN have been enshrined in the Treaty of Amity and Cooperation in Southeast Asia (TAC, 1976) to which a growing number of States outside of Southeast Asia have acceded : Papua New Guinea (July 1989), China and India (October 2003), Japan and Pakistan (July 2004) the RoK and Russia (November 2004). Australia and New Zealand have expressed interest to accede to the TAC; both are now taking active steps to prepare for the accession. Mongolia has also recently expressed a similar interest.

Practical Modalities

11. Over the years, ASEAN and its Member Countries have put in place practical procedures that have proven to be useful and appropriate for the pursuit of regional cooperation and external relations in light of diversity and sovereign equality. To be sure, the ASEAN Way is often neither the most desirable nor the most effective way of achieving difficult goals. Rather, it is usually the least objectionable; it is what the most unprepared or the slowest is prepared to go along. Nevertheless, it is what would keep all in ASEAN together in building the ASEAN Community by the year 2020 and beyond. The practical part of the ASEAN Way includes the following :

- ASEAN Member Countries share collective responsibilities in fulfilling their regional commitments; they take turn in an alphabetical rotation in serving as the ASEAN Chair and hosting ASEAN Summit and ministerial meetings; all other ASEAN Member Countries would support the ASEAN Chair;
- ASEAN's healthy habit of consultation and consensus-building; decision-making by consultation and consensus; rarely has there been any voting in ASEAN (though voting procedures do exist in some ASEAN agreements; in the Treaty on Southeast Asia Nuclear Weapon-Free Zone, for example, a decision can be made by a two-thirds majority should consensus cannot be reached);
- ASEAN is non-ideological; all of its Member Countries are in the Non-Aligned Movement; the political diversity in ASEAN membership is well-known; ASEAN does not attempt to change the political system of any of its members; ASEAN believes in unity in diversity; differences need not create divisiveness;
- ASEAN is neither a military bloc nor a collective defence pact; in fact ASEAN so far has no defence or military cooperation programme, though there is a move underway to start ASEAN Defence Ministers Meeting; the Philippines and Thailand are non-NATO allies of the USA, Malaysia and Singapore are in the Five Powers Defence Arrangement together with Australia, New Zealand, and the UK; no problem;
- ASEAN has no common external enemy; ASEAN does not see any major powers near or far as a potential threat; in fact, all the world's major powers are friends and partners of ASEAN;
- ASEAN always emphasizes the positive and work for a win-win outcome; differences, disputes, and conflicts among its Member Countries and

between some of its Member Countries with outsiders may happen from time to time, but they will not be allowed to distract ASEAN from pursuing common regional interest and engage its external friends and partners;

- Differences, disputes, and conflicts shall be resolved as soon as possible by quiet diplomacy and other friendly peaceful means;
- Bilateral issues shall be dealt primarily by the two direct parties concerned; they need not be brought up in a regional setting unless the two direct parties concerned seek help from ASEAN directly, like bringing a dispute to the TAC's High Council;
- ASEAN likes to do things step by step, starting with the easy and simple things first; gradualism with flexibility will ensure that every Member Country is comfortable with the pace of cooperation in ASEAN and that no one is left behind;
- Low level of institutionalization; in fact, there was no ASEAN Secretariat during the first 10 years of ASEAN until it was set up 1976 in the First ASEAN Summit in Bali; a clear preference of informal arrangements
- Most policy decisions are to be made by ASEAN Member Countries; no ASEAN regional authority to make any policy decision on behalf of the Member Countries; and
- ASEAN would do everything possible to serve as an efficient and impartial driver of cooperation processes that it has initiated, to keep them useful and outward-looking.

(2) Asia and Its Diversity

by Kai Noritake

This report was prepared by Mr. Kai Noritake, Governor of The Global Forum of Japan, for distribution to the participants of the Dialogue.

With Asia being a diverse region, ASEAN has realized a regional group based on this diversity. From this fact, ASEAN is clearly different from the EU, a homogeneous regional entity.

The idea of creating an East Asian Community in which many Asian peoples have shown keen interest intends to inaugurate an organization consisting of all the member countries of ASEAN plus Japan, China and South Korea. As we have a precedent, i.e. the EU, it is not an easy undertaking to realize a regional community in East Asia. We should pursue this mission over a long time span, making good use of the diversity and characteristics of Asia.

This essay is written to provide those concerned people with reference material in considering the idea of an East Asian Community.

1. Wisdom of Asian People

In this Essay, when we refer to Asia, Asia is covered by 13 countries including Japan, China, South Korea and the member countries of ASEAN. Alternatively, ASEAN or Southeast Asia is used to indicate the 10 member countries of ASEAN.

In order to exist as a tightly united region consisting of countries or a group of nations, it is necessary at first for the countries concerned to be closely tied politically, secondly to have strengthened economic relationships among them, thirdly to be in common in culture, fourthly to share a common sense while belonging to the same group sharing the same destiny, and lastly to achieve worldwide recognition as an independent entity.

It is beyond our imagination that despite being so diverse, the countries in Southeast Asia have been brought together to establish a longstanding organization named

ASEAN. This is a distinct character of ASEAN compared to the EU member countries among which there are lots of similarities such as Christianity, culture, tradition, values, etc.

ASEAN was established in 1967, in the midst of the war in Indochina, and the main purpose of ASEAN was to prevent the war from spreading over other parts of Asia. If it had been true that war alone held the organization together, ASEAN's solidarity might have been weakened after the Vietnam War, which worried many people. However, ASEAN was able to overcome this trial.

According to some observation, the existence of ASEAN is justified only by its relatively long history since its establishment. But this is a rather pessimistic viewpoint. Indeed, it is an Asian wisdom and a wonderful fact for the eyes of Europeans and Americans that ASEAN, composed of Southeast Asian countries having big differences in languages, customs, traditions, and cultures, has been functioning smoothly as a regional entity.

In a word, Southeast Asia had been regarded as one of the backward regions in the world in the decade from 1950 and 1960; this view seems to put emphasis only on figures centered on GDP.

Furthermore, in this region there occurred the Vietnam War, one of the biggest conflicts of the 20th century. Southeast Asia is still heading steadily toward development, spurred on by the so-called "Four Dragons", 30 years after the conclusion of the war in Vietnam.

Some people say that there is no reality named Asia, which is in contrast to Europe, a homogeneous continent. They point out the lack of cultural unity in Asia. To this, in the decade of the 1990s, a leader of Japan, Shintaro Ishihara, and the leader of Malaysia, Prime Minister Mahathir, each representing quite different cultures, formed a theory on Asian values. This theory advocates that Asia, having a long tradition, is now proceeding to forge a unity in dynamism toward development, pulled along by Japan. At the same time it is strengthened by the certainty that globalization does not necessarily mean Americanization, and the above-mentioned Asian values are considered a component of globalization. Indeed the past 500 years of history have shown that Asia is not a region shaped by Europe. America and Africa are communities made by Europe politically and economically, but not Asia. In the case of

Asia, some European elements are added to traditional, firmly established communities. In this sense, a scholar says that in the future only Asia may confront Europe in terms of culture.

Including India, Asia has at present 3 billion one hundred million people as a population. This means Asia has nearly half of the world's total population. In detail, in the continental part, India has one billion, China one point three billion. On the other hand, in the peninsular areas, there are the Indochinese countries, South and North Korea, and Malaysia. In the island parts, there are Japan, the Philippines, Indonesia and Brunei. In these peninsulas and islands, we can count eight hundred million people.

Without India, the total population of ASEAN plus three countries is about 2 billion and one hundred million people.

2. Diversity in religions and languages

In Southeast Asia, we find three different religions. In the northern continental region, Buddhism is accepted in the three Indochinese countries, Thailand and Myanmar. Among them Vietnam's Buddhism is known as Buddhism of the big vehicle, the same as in Japan. In other countries, Buddhism belongs to a different school, named Buddhism of the small vehicle. Thai people are well known as devout Buddhists, and the King is the protector of Buddhism. This northern continental region covers about two million square kilometers of land with two hundred million inhabitants.

In contrast to this region, the southern and eastern parts of Southeast Asia are mainly the world of the Malay people.

Malaysia, Indonesia and Brunei are Islamic countries and the Philippines is a Catholic country. In this area, covering about two million five hundred thousand square kilometers, there are three hundred million people. In this sense Southeast Asia is a microcosm of Asia as a whole, with Indian and Chinese cultures mixing and Buddhism, Christianity, and Islam co-existing.

At the time of the drafting of this article, in the middle of April 2005, I am not in a position to predict who will succeed Pope John Paul II after his death. Particularly in Latin America, where four hundred and fifty million Catholics out of the world's one

billion one hundred million Catholics live, there is the expectation that the new Pope will be elected from this region, a person who understands current problems in developing countries. On the other hand, whoever the next Pope will be, he is expected to play a role in promoting a dialogue with the Islamic world, because it is necessary to have foresight into the situation of the Islamic countries if we consider problems such as poverty. Now the Vatican is said to be worried that the number of Muslims is increasing in the world and that in the Middle East Christians are decreasing in number.

Islamic people are now assuming an undeniably important position in the world.

With regard to Muslims, Indonesia is the largest Muslim country in the world in terms of number and Malaysia and Brunei are also Muslim countries. In addition, in southern Thailand, in Cambodia, and in the southern part of the Philippines we find Muslim people. In this context, there should be a difference of view on the values between Muslims and non-Muslims. For instance, even at Al-Azar University, the highest authority of interpreting the Koran, there is a division of opinion about how to evaluate the 9-11 terrorism and the indiscriminate suicide bombings of Palestinian people. Although the president of the university expressed his opinion against indiscriminate suicide bombings, the majority of Imams supported it. This situation will affect the Muslim countries in Asia. In the final analysis there may be conflicts between Islamic values and democracy and freedom. The religious diversity in Asia contains the possibility of a clash of values among religions in the long run. The Islamic question in this region of the world is, therefore, a problem not to be avoided in the process of boiling down an idea of East Asian Community. Actually there exist several disputes linked with Islam. In the past some Muslims suspected that a Japanese joint venture company in Indonesia was using pork in the production of seasonings and this matter drew much attention among both Japanese and Indonesian people. We Japanese should recognize delicate problems existing in Muslim society.

The diversity in Asia is remarkable also concerning languages. So many languages coexist in the region, which is not common in the world. There exist three different characters, i.e. Burmese, Sanskrit, which is mainly used in the three countries in the Mekong basin, and Roman characters used in Vietnam, Malaysia, Indonesia and the Philippines. In addition to those three, Chinese characters are used among overseas Chinese in the region; in the past Chinese characters were written in Vietnam before the French introduced Roman characters.

In mainland China, they simplified characters after the Second World War, which are called Jiǎn tí zì; however in Taiwan and Southeast Asia, traditional characters, named Hànzì, are still being used. In China, as they simplified the characters too much, the characters lost their calligraphic beauty. So it seems that they stopped the simplification policy.

As is mentioned above, because the same characters are used in Thailand and Laos and also in Indonesia and Malaysia, people can communicate with each other by writing. On the other hand, however, communication between Vietnam and Laos is not easy.

Having no common language in Southeast Asia, Chinese and English are virtually common languages in the region. Still, in Chinese there are several big dialects such as Guāntōng huà, Fújiàn huà, etc.

The common language among Chinese people is Pǔtōng huà, a standard language. For example, popular songs are sung mainly in Pǔtōng huà in order for as many people as possible to understand them.

English is now an official language of ASEAN and the number of people studying English is increasing in the region.

The Thai language is very soft in pronunciation, as is Pǔtōng huà, and we find both Chinese and Indian influence in this language. They use Sanskrit as characters, but for intonation they have six accents, which is two more than Chinese. The intonation seems to add a musical sound. In analyzing the meaning of words, the second largest city in Thailand is called Chiang Mai, of which Chiang (Chéng) means in Chinese castle or town and Mai in Thai means new. In consequence, Chiang Mai means new town in Thai. Lǎo bān means master, being almost the same pronunciation as in Chinese. Nèi háng's pronunciation is the same, of which the meaning is master. However in Chinese it means expert or specialist. Amateur in Thai is Wài háng, the same pronunciation and meaning as in Chinese.

The people of the Philippines understand English well. Their English ability is so high Filipinos can find jobs all over the world. Not only in the US but also in Europe and the Middle East, many Filipinos are employed in engineering and other professions. We count in Japan more than one hundred thousand Filipinos. The original and native

language in this country is Tagalog. On the other hand many Spanish words are incorporated into Tagalog. Certain names come from Spanish, such as Corazon Acquino, former President. Corazón means a heart and Los Bagnõs, a famous resort area, locates in the suburbs of Manila, which means hot spring.

In addition, the way of counting is introduced from Spanish: one, two, three is uno, dos, tres, etc.

Vietnam originally belonged to the Confucianism culture block and used Chinese characters. Chinese people thought that Vietnam was a very close neighbor, as if it were a part of China. In Chinese Vietnam is called a country situated south of Yuè country. When Vietnam was divided in two, the south was called the southern part of Yuè and the north was called the northern part of Yuè in Chinese.

3. Historical interaction of Indian and Chinese Culture. Spanish fragrance.

In the region of Southeast Asia Indian and Chinese cultures coexist in a harmonious way. Indian influence was especially great, and has been strongly represented by the epics such as the Mahabarata, and Ramayana. Even in Thailand believers in Hinduism and worshipers at Hindu temples can be seen. In fact many Indians emigrated to Myanmar, Malaysia, and Thailand, and about 8 percent of the Malaysian population is of Indian origin. However, after the thirteenth century the influence of Islam became predominant. As a result Indonesia and Malaysia have become Islamic countries.

China had been the potential sovereign state of Indochinese countries, especially that of Vietnam. China ruled Vietnam for more than one thousand years, but it did not leave a visible cultural fingerprint in Cambodia and Laos. By the way, we recognize the influence of China in Vietnam, for instance by the discovery of framed calligraphy in Chinese characters in a local Buddhist temple. Before the invasion of the French in the latter half of nineteenth century, Vietnam had used Chinese characters. It was the French who introduced Roman characters to replace Chinese. If the French had not curbed the use of traditional Chinese characters, the Japanese would have felt much greater familiarity toward the Vietnamese people, and mutual understanding could have been promoted much more easily. There are several remnants of Chinese characters in Vietnam. For instance, Vietnam Airways is called Háng Kōng Vietnam. In Chinese Háng Kōng means Airlines.

Overseas Chinese (Huá Quiáo) have established a firm and strong position in Southeast Asia, especially in the economic field. There are so-called Chinatowns in every country in the region and Singapore is the typical base of activities of the Huá Quiáo, and the naming of the city comes from the Malaysian language, meaning the City of the Lion.

Seventy five percent of the people in this city-state are of Chinese origin. From the end of the Qing dynasty about thirty million Chinese emigrated abroad and eighty percent of them settled down in Southeast Asia. There they have dealt mainly with the distribution of goods and merchandise.

The Philippines is the only country in the region which still maintains the fragrance of a Latin culture, as it was a colony of Spain. In the city of Manila we can find a particular quarter which may lead us to think that we are in Mexico City. Filipino people have a worldwide reputation as excellent entertainers. This ability is a reflection of the Latin character of these people. They have come to Japan as entertainers, and for immigration purposes there is a visa category related to entertainment, so if they satisfy certain conditions their entry into Japan is not difficult.

In particular Filipino ladies have a keen service spirit, which is necessary in the field of health and aged people's care. Japan and the Philippines have already decided to have in Japan a certain number of Filipino ladies working in certain health care-related industries. The smooth implementation of this system will contribute to guaranteeing qualified care for aged people.

4. European influence

In Southeast Asia European influence remains. Southeast Asia has long been a crossroads for traffic. This geographical position, unfortunately, led to the colonization of Southeast Asia by the European powers. Historically speaking, Portugal ruled East Timor and Macao, the British ruled Burma, Malaysia, and Hong Kong, Holland ruled Indonesia, France ruled Indochina, and Spain and then the US ruled the Philippines. Only Thailand was able to keep its independence while facing the European powers. However Thailand was obliged to pay considerable sacrifice to maintain independence. Thai diplomacy was dexterous but the country endured great pain through the ceding of its territory. For example, Laos, which was once a part of Thailand, was ceded to France, as if a tree is broken in a violent way.

Even today there are similarities in customs and languages between northeastern Thailand and Laos's traditions. It is said that France took Laos with the view of strengthening the defense of Vietnam.

We find old Europe in some parts of Southeast Asia. A typical example is Yangon, capital of Myanmar. This city had a lot of obsolete but majestic buildings which reminded us of the old British era. I knew Yangon well in the 1970s. At that time the closed door policy was applied, as a result of which the number of foreign tourists was limited to a maximum of 500 persons per day. Consequently, reserving a hotel was very difficult. By the same token, tourists and businessmen could hardly visit Myanmar. Yangon had been much more prosperous than Bangkok before the Second World War. However the Yangon which I knew was an old town without vigor whose majestic buildings were all musty. Of course at the present time, when the closed-door policy has been eased, I expect the town should have regained vitality as in the past.

A quarter of downtown Manila in the Philippines reminds us of La Ciudad de México. In reality there had been services of trade ships between Manila and Acapulco in Mexico after the sixteen century. Furthermore, Hasekura Tsunenaga and his party landed at Acapulco and from there traveled to Rome. In Manila we find also China Town. Still another characteristic of Manila lies in the fact that it is representative of the Latin Quarter or Quartier Latin, being the only such place in Southeast Asia. In the Spanish spoken in Mexico there is a word called Warachi which probably originates from Waraji, or Japanese sandal. Perhaps that is one proof of Hasekura's stay in Mexico.

The Philippines derives its name from King Felipe the Second of Spain, who had governed a vast region in the world. The Spain of Felipe the Second had been the biggest empire in the world, as he inherited and governed the Iberian Peninsula, Flanders, and a great part of the Nuevo Mundo. However, after the defeat of the seemingly invincible Spanish Armada by the British fleet, the sign of decline was evident. Although they called it the invincible Armada, actually there was no such Armada.

The Spanish Armada was defeated by the British off the coast of Flanders. Historical records show that the British side resorted to the strategy of using fire as in the big battle in the Yángzǐ River that occurred at the time of the three kingdoms in China

around the third century BC. After having been hit heavily by a typhoon off the east coast of England, the Armada could barely return to Spain. The court, being afraid of the reaction of Felipe upon hearing of this tragic news, refrained from reporting it to the King. Finally they presented a report to Felipe with a comment referring to Louis the Ninth, who died of pestilence in Tunis directing the Ninth Crusade in the 13th century. They said that the King might be consoled in this defeat compared to the tragic defeat and death of Saint Louis. We recall by the name of Felipe the epoch where Spain had been losing its strength as a worldwide empire.

Hanoi, the capital of Vietnam, still conserves the fragrance and atmosphere of France due to the fact that it was constructed according to a design drawn up by French architects. In the same token, the Opera House in Hanoi looks like a small scale Opera House in Paris. As for the food, we can eat delicious bread in Laos because Laos was also a French colony.

At the same time under the influence of Chinese communities, in both Thailand and Laos they serve very tasty Chinese noodles, i.e. *lāmiàn*, much better than Japanese ones. In this sense it is interesting to note that there is no Japanese style *lāmiàn* in China. *Lāmiàn* means literally handmade noodles made from the powder of wheat and Chinese *lāmiàn* is a kind of Japanese udon made from the powder of rice.

The same noodles exist also in Vietnam. In particularly the taste of its soup is quite refined which might be welcomed by the Japanese. *Chūng juǎn*, spring roll, is a typical Chinese dish. But its size differs by country: the biggest is Vietnamese, the second biggest is Japanese, and the third is Chinese. *Chūng juǎn* is thus a common dish to these three countries in East Asia.

5. Variety in calendars

The mixed European and Asian culture can be seen in calendars. In general the European calendar is commonly used in the region. At the same time Chinese agricultural and Islamic calendars coexist. For instance the third millennium, e.g. year 2000, corresponds to 2543 in the Buddhist calendar and the Buddhist year is marked in the official documents of the Thai Government.

The Islamic calendar is used in Indonesia and Malaysia. The year 2000 is counted as the year 1378 after the Sacred Emigration to al-madina that occurred in 622 according

to the European calendar. It is a kind of wonder that such different calendars are used spontaneously in the region without any hindrance. To celebrate a New Year the timing is not the same between calendars. In the Chinese world the first day of the first month of a year varies between the end of January and the beginning of February as they use the lunar calendar. This lunar calendar is commonly called the agricultural calendar and the first day of the first month is New Year's Day. This New Year's Day reflects much more faithfully a seasonal feeling of the people than the international New Year of January 1. Japan introduced the international calendar in the Meiji epoch, and so New Year's Day doesn't correspond to a seasonal feeling. One of the famous stories about an act of revenge by the samurai class occurred on December 14 in the lunar calendar in the seventeenth century, which is on January 30 in the international calendar. Normally it has snowed heavily on December 14 or January 30 in Japan. January is the coldest month in the Tokyo region.

Huá Quiáo celebrates the traditional New Year's Day which for the Vietnamese is the celebration of Tet. Thailand celebrates the so-called water festival, which in the Thai language is called Songkran and in Laos is known as Pí Mai, as if to announce the beginning of spring. The essence of this festival is without protocol. We can't complain if water is thrown at us from behind. A long time ago a Japanese worker had water thrown upon him on his arrival at a hotel in Vientiane after several hours of tiresome drive on a rough road. This gentleman became promptly furious and beat a man who threw the water at him. He didn't know that this festival was carried out without protocol.

Of course he was detained in the police station after being arrested. This man's case is one of not being acquainted with the customs and tradition of another country. However it is not pleasant to be attacked from behind by a shower of filthy water. If possible it is preferable to be showered by clean water.

The Islamic calendar used in Indonesia and other countries is based on the lunar calendar in a strict sense of the term and one month is, therefore, composed of 29 days or 30 days. Every year 11 days is rolled back. For instance, if Ramadan is scheduled on November 30 this year, it will be on November 19 next year. Islamic people can follow Ramadan under a pleasant climate, but when it falls in the hot summer, they feel a lot of pains while performing the disciplines imposed.

In spite of the fact that the calendar seems a trifling thing, people spend their lives based on it. Therefore the differences in calendars possess an importance which cannot be ignored. A calendar also influences the way of thinking and actions of a people.

6. Southeast Asia overcomes wars and pursues economic prosperity

As was mentioned above there are similarities as well as diversities in Southeast Asia. At the same time Asia has been changing. Although in the colonial period Southeast Asia was considered a group of poor nations in a state of underdevelopment, a big industrial revolution took place in the 1970's. Asian nations have emerged as newly industrialized countries according to the Japanese model. This was the biggest event of the 1970's in the region.

In Asia there had existed wounds of historical hostilities caused by the invasion of European forces, conflicts between Japan and China, and the US versus the Soviets.

The region of the so-called "Four Dragons," representing an economic miracle, had been the stage of the "Cold War." In other words "Two Hot Wars" were fought in this region, the Korean War and the Vietnam War, in addition to others. In this sense it is marvelous to note that in spite of these wars this region has accomplished remarkable development.

We are convinced that this Asian experience will certainly contribute to the realization of an East Asian Community.

By the way, in order to see Asia from long and medium range perspectives, we should take into account the following points.

The first point is the American presence. In the beginning of its involvement the US acquired the Philippines on account of its victory in the Spanish-American War of 1898. Subsequently, after the Second World War, the US deployed its military forces in the entire Pacific basin area, taking into special consideration the presence of communist-ruled China.

However, the US did not militarily confront China on Chinese territory, and conflicts occurred mainly in the Korean Peninsula, Taiwan, and Vietnam, all on the periphery of China. At present the US has withdrawn from air bases in the Philippines but it still

maintains forces in the defense of the Western Pacific. Asia in the future and an East Asian Community could not be conceivable while excluding the US.

The second point is the Korean Peninsula, where there exist side by side tension and economic development. On one hand we find big enterprises specialized in electronics such as Samsung, Hyundai, Daewoo, and on the other hand we find about a 250 kilometer-long military demarcation line. The Korean War, fought from 1950 to 1953, was a war between the US and Chinese armies. In June 2000 a mood of temporary reconciliation was seen, but now the six party talks are in a deadlock. These talks should be reinvigorated. In addition to the question of the abduction of Japanese nationals, the suspicion of nuclear armament by North Korea has made the situation complicated. As long as the North Korean problem remains unsolved, this will be a big obstacle for the realization of an East Asian Community.

The third point concerns Sino-Taiwanese relations. These relations have become very much strengthened in recent years. In 1995 and 1996, at the time of Taiwan's presidential elections, Chinese military forces had launched drills. Even today the Chinese Government has shown its opposition to the so-called separatist movement in Taiwan in a strongly categorical way. But at the same time the Chinese government has invited leaders of Taiwan's opposition parties to check the Taiwanese government's move toward independence. On the other hand Taiwan and China are dependent on each other that politics cannot sever densely established economic ties between them.

The fourth point is the position of Vietnam. The Vietnamese people expelled the US from their territory and achieved unification in 1975. This was a victory of information rather than a military one, with the Vietnamese astutely manipulating international opinion. Twenty years after this victory Vietnam entered ASEAN. However, being exhausted by the wars which had lasted more than thirty years against the French and then the US, the country needs a lot of time for its reconstruction. It took thirty years to win the war, but it should take much more time to reconstruct the country. In terms of per capita GDP, for instance, Vietnam vs. Thailand is 1 to 5. Cambodia meanwhile was locked in a civil war, so therefore the situation in general is worse than in Vietnam. In particular, the western part of Cambodia is in an unstable situation, having been under the control of the Khmer Rouge and less developed than the rest of the country. Laos and Myanmar are akin to such a situation, which represents a sort of North-South problem inside ASEAN.

The fifth point is the relations between Japan, China and South Korea. Recently big anti-Japanese demonstrations occurred in China, partly because of the anti-Japanese education encouraged since the period of Jiang Ze Ming. It is possible that the Chinese Government might have decided to divert to an outside target (in this case Japan) the accumulated complaints and grievances of the Chinese people due to the big difference between rich and poor inside the country. In China, fundamental human rights are not yet fully guaranteed, so the government there should be liable for such demonstrations.

The problem of Takeshima, being a territorial issue, has no easy solution. The problem regarding the Japan Sea belongs in the same category. In February of this year, Shimane Prefecture's local assembly made a declaration to the effect that Takeshima belongs officially to Shimane Prefecture. This declaration put fire on the delicate situation. Shimane Prefecture should have consulted the Japanese authorities well in advance on such a hot issue as Takeshima.

The textbook issue and the question on an apology about past Japanese policy have been also taken into consideration in demonstrations in both countries. For example, both the Chinese and South Korean governments stated that without reflection on the past the Japanese government will not be qualified to be selected as a new permanent member of the UN Security Council. Japan should analyze and judge in a comprehensive way the situation and find out how to preserve its national interests in the face of Chinese claims. In any way it should avoid taking an ambiguous attitude toward the textbook and Yasukuni Shrine issues. As long as Chinese and Koreans criticize Japan on such issues, this is nothing but interference in another country's internal affairs and establishing genuine friendship is difficult.

Regrettably we find in Japan rootless criticism directed at China which unnecessarily shows disdain for and provokes the Chinese people. Such comments irritate the Chinese and are no use at all.

Before the realization of an East Asian Community we should put an end to such interregional conflicts as a prerequisite condition.

End

8. An Introduction to The Global Forum of Japan (GFJ)

【Objectives】

As we embrace the 21st century, international relations are becoming increasingly interdependent, and globalization and regionalism are becoming the big waves. In this global tendency, communicating with the world, especially neighboring countries in the Asia-Pacific region at both governmental and non-governmental level, is one of the indispensable conditions for Japan to survive. On the basis of such understanding, The Global Forum of Japan (GFJ) aims to promote the exchange of views on commonly shared interests and issues in the field ranging from politics and security to economy, trade, finance, society and culture, and to help business, opinion and political leaders both in Japan and in their counterpart countries to discuss about the formulation of new orders in global and regional arenas.

【History】

The 1982 Versailles Summit was widely seen as having exposed rifts within the Western alliance. Accordingly, there were expressed concerns that the summit meetings were becoming more and more stylized rituals and that Western solidarity was at risk. Within this context, it was realized that to revitalize the summit meetings there must be free and unfettered exchanges of private-sector views to be transmitted directly to the heads of the participating states. Accordingly, Japanese former Foreign Minister Okita Saburo, U.S. Trade Representative William Brock, E.C. Commission Vice President Etienne Davignon, and Canadian Trade Minister Edward Lumley, as representatives of the private-sector in their respective countries, took the initiative in founding The Quadrangular Forum in Washington in September 1982. Since then, the end of the Cold War and the altered nature of the economic summits themselves had made it necessary for The Quadrangular Forum to metamorphose into The Global Forum established by the American and Japanese components of The Quadrangular Forum at the World Convention in Washington in October 1991. In line with its objectives as stated above, The Global Forum was intended as a facilitator of global consensus on the many post-Cold War issues facing the international community and reached out to open its discussions not only to participants from the quadrangular countries but also to participants from other parts of the world. Over the years, the gravity of The Global Forum's activities gradually shifted from its American component (housed in The Center for Strategic and International Studies) to its Japanese component (housed in The Japan Forum on International Relations), and, after the American component ceased to be operative, the Board of Trustees of the Japanese component resolved, on February 7, 1996, that it would thereafter act as an independent body for organizing bilateral dialogues with Japan as a hub for all countries in the world, and amended its by-laws accordingly. At the same time, The Global Forum's Japanese component was reorganized into The Global Forum of Japan (GFJ) in line with the principle that the organization be self-governing, self-financing, and independent of any other organization.

【Organization】

The Global Forum of Japan (GFJ) is a private, non-profit, non-partisan, and independent membership organization in Japan to engage in and promote international exchanges on policy-oriented matters of bilateral, regional and global implications. While the secretariat is housed in The Japan Forum on International Relations, GFJ itself is independent of any other organizations, including The Japan Forum on International Relations. Originally established as the Japanese component of The Quadrangular Forum at the initiative of Hattori Ichiro, Okita Saburo, Takeyama Yasuo, Toyoda Shoichiro in 1983, GFJ is currently headed by Okawara Yoshio as Chairman and Ito Kenichi as President. The membership is composed of 14 Business Leader Members including the two Governors, Mogi Yuzaburo and Toyoda Shoichiro; 84 Opinion Leader Members including the four Governors, Ito Kenichi, Kai Noritake, Okawara Yoshio, and Shimada Haruo; and 33 Political Leader Members including the two Governors, Hatoyama Yukio, and Tanigaki Sadakazu. Financially the activities of GFJ have been supported by the annual membership fees paid by 14 leading Japanese business corporations (with 2 corporations, Toyota Motor Corporation and Kikkoman Corporation contributing 5 shares each and the other 12 corporations contributing 1 share each) as well as by the grants provided by The Japan Foundation, The Tokyo Club, The Sasakawa Peace Foundation, Japan-ASEAN Exchange Projects, The Daiwa Bank Foundation for Asia and Oceania, The Japan-Korea Cultural Foundation, Toshiba International Foundation, etc. Watanabe Mayu serves as Executive Secretary.

【Activities】

Since the start of The Global Forum of Japan (GFJ) in 1996, GFJ has shifted its focus from the exchanges with the Quadrangular countries for the purpose of contributing to the Western Summit, to those with neighboring countries in the Asia-Pacific region including US, China, Korea, Taiwan, ASEAN countries, Australia and India, for the purposes of deepening mutual understanding and contributing to the formation of international order. GFJ has been active in collaboration with international exchange organizations in those countries in organizing policy-oriented intellectual exchanges called “Dialogue.” In order to secure a substantial number of Japanese participants in the “Dialogue”, GFJ in principle holds these “Dialogues” in Tokyo. A listing of topics of “Dialogues” and its overseas co-sponsors in last six years is given below.

Year	Month	Topic	Co-sponsor
2000	May	EU's Options and Their Implications for Japan	The Royal Institute of International Affairs (UK)
	July	Asia in the New Century and Japan-China Relations	China Association for International Friendly Contact (China)
	December	Japan and Korea: Building Foundations for a New Partnership	The Seoul Forum on International Affairs (Korea)
2001	May	U.S.-Japan Security Relations under the New U.S. Administration	The Mansfield Center for Pacific Affairs (US)
	September	The Role of Japan and Taiwan in the Asia-Pacific Region in the 21st Century	Chinese Eurasian Education Foundation (Taiwan)
2002	February	The Japan and ASEAN: Cooperation for Peace and Prosperity in the Asia-Pacific Region	ASEAN ISIS (ASEAN)
	May	Japan-China Relationship in the world	China Association for International Friendly Contact (China)
	September	Japan and Australia: Perspectives on Cooperation in Asia and Pacific	Australian Consortium (Australia)
	November	Japan and Korea: Working Together for The Future of East Asia	The Seoul Forum on International Affairs (Korea)
2003	January	The Japan and ASEAN: Cooperation for Peace and Prosperity in the Asia-Pacific Region	ASEAN ISIS (ASEAN)
	April	Entrepreneurship in Asia	The Mansfield Center for Pacific Affairs (US)
	October	Japan-Taiwan Dialogue: New Situation in Asia-Pacific region and Japan-Taiwan Cooperation	Foundation on International & Cross-Strait Studies (Taiwan)
2004	July	A Roadmap towards East Asian Community	ASEAN ISIS
	September	Future Prospect of East Asian Community and Japan-China Relationship	China Association for International Friendly Contact (China)
	November	The Japan- U.S. Korea Dialogue: Future of Korean Peninsula and Japan-U.S.-Korea Security Cooperation	The Institute for Foreign Policy Analysis, The Fletcher School, Tufts University (US), Yonsei University Graduate School of International Studies (Korea)
2005	April	The Prospect of East Asian Community and Japan-Korea Cooperation	Presidential Committee on Northeast Asian Cooperation Initiative (PCNEACI)
	June	The Prospect for East Asian Community and Regional Cooperation	The Council on East Asian Community (CEAC) ASEAN ISIS (ASEAN)

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The Global Forum of Japan (GFJ) is grateful to its “Business Leader” members listed below for their generous contributions. Their support is making the activities of the Forum sustainable.

[GFJ Governors][5 share]

Toyota Motor Corporation Kikkoman Corporation

[GFJ Members][1 share]

Sumitomo Electric Industries, Ltd.

Kajima Corporation

Nippon Steel Corporation

Tokyo Electric Power Co.

Sumitomo Mitsui Banking Corporation

Asahi Glass Co. Ltd.

The Bank of Tokyo-Mitsubishi, Ltd.

Matsushita Electric Industrial Co., Ltd.

Nippon Telegraph and Telephone Corporation

Fuji Xerox Co., Ltd

Biru Daiko Co., Ltd.

H.I.S.Co.,Ltd.

(In the order of enlistment)

【Membership List of The Global Forum of Japan (131 Members)】

【Chairman】

OKAWARA Yoshio, President, Institute for International Policy Studies

【President】

ITO Kenichi, President and CEO, The Japan Forum on International Relations, Inc.

【Business Leaders】 (13 Members)

【Governors】

MOGI Yuzaburo, Chairman and CEO, Kikkoman Corporation
TOYODA Shoichiro, Honorary Chairman, Toyota Motor Corporation

【Members】

HIRAIWA Gaishi, Advisor, The Tokyo Electric Power Co., Inc.
IMAI Takashi, Honorary Chairman, Nippon Steel Corporation
ISHIKAWA Rokuro, Chairman, Kajima Corporation
KAMIYA Kenichi, Retired Chairman, Sumitomo Mitsui Banking Corporation
KOBAYASHI Yotaro, Chairman and CEO, Fuji Xerox Co., Ltd.
MATSUNO Haruki, Chief Executive Counselor, Member of the Board, Nippon Telegraph and Telephone Corporation
OKAYAMA Norio, Chairman, Sumitomo Electric Industries, Ltd.
SAWADA Hideo, Chairman, H.I.S Co., Ltd.
SEYA Hiromichi, Senior Corporate Adviser, Asahi Glass Co., Ltd.
SHOTOKU Yukio, Executive Vice President, Matsushita Electric Industrial Co., Ltd.
TAKAGAKI Tasuku, Senior Advisor, The Bank of Tokyo-Mitsubishi, Ltd.
YAGUCHI Toshikazu, President, Biru Daiko Co., Ltd.

【Opinion Leaders】 (84Members)

【Governors】

ITO Kenichi, President and CEO, The Japan Forum on International Relations Inc.
KAI Noritake, Councilor, The Japan Forum of International Relations Inc.
OKAWARA Yoshio, President, Institute for International Policy Studies
SHIMADA Haruo, Professor, Keio University

【Members】

AICHI Kazuo, Visiting Professor, Kansai University
AKASHI Yasukazu, Foreign News Editor, Jiji Press
AKASHI Yasushi, Chairman, The Japan Center for Conflict Prevention
AOKI Tamotsu, Professor, National Graduate Institute for Policy Studies
AMAKO Satoshi, Professor, Waseda University
ASOMURA Kuniaki, Executive Director, The Japan Center for Conflict Prevention
CHUMA Kiyofuku, Journalist
EBATA Kensuke, Defense Commentator
FUKAGAWA Yukiko, Professor, University of Tokyo
GOMI Norio, Professor, Rikkyo Graduate School of Business
GYOHTEN Toyoo, President, Institute for International Monetary Affairs
HAKAMADA Shigeki, Professor, Aoyama Gakuin University
HAMADA Takujiro, Former Member of the House of Councillors
HANAI Hitoshi, Professor, Reitaku University
HARUNA Mikio, Special Correspondent, Kyodo News
HASEGAWA Kazutoshi, President, Japan-Australia-New Zealand Society
HATA Kei, Vice Principal, Sakushin Gakuin
HIRONO Ryokichi, Professor Emeritus, Seikei University
ICHIKAWA Isao, Executive Advisor for Financial Affairs, Keio University
INA Hisayoshi, Columnist, The Nikkei Newspaper
INOUCHE Takashi, Professor, University of Tokyo
IOKIBE Makoto, Professor, Kobe University
ISHII Ichiji, President, The Japan Center for Conflict Prevention
ITO Eisei, Corporate Auditor, Toyota Auto Body Co., Ltd.
IWAMA Yoko, Associate Professor, National Graduate Institute for Policy Studies
IZUMI Hajime, Professor, University of Shizuoka
JIMBO Ken, Assistant Professor, Keio University
KAKIZAWA Koji, former Minister of Foreign Affairs
KAMIYA Mataka, Professor, National Defense Academy
KANEKO Kumao, President, Japan Council for Economic Research
KIMIWADA Masao, Senior Managing Director, Asahi Shimbun
KOHNO Masaru, Professor, Waseda University
KOJIMA Atsushi, Corporate Officer, The Yomiuri Shimbun
KOJIMA Tomoyuki, Professor, Keio University
KOKUBUN Ryosei, Professor, Keio University
KONDO Tetsuo, President, Institute for New Era Strategy (INES)
KUBO Fumiaki, Professor, Keio University
KUMON Shumpei, Senior Executive Director, GLOCOM, International University of Japan
KUSANO Atsushi, Professor, Keio University
MANO Teruhiko, Professor under special assignment, Seigakuin University
MATSUMOTO Kenichi, Professor, Reitaku University
MIYAMOTO Nobuo, Diplomatic Commentator
MIYAZAKI Isamu, Honorary Advisor, Daiwa Institute of Research
MIYOSHI Masaya, Chairman, J-Wave, Inc.
MORIMOTO Satoshi, Professor, Takushoku University
MURATA Koji, Associate Professor, Doshisha University
NAKAGANE Katsuji, Professor, Aoyama Gakuin University
NAKAHARA Nobuyuki, Senior Advisor, Financial Services Agency
NAKANISHI Terumasa, Professor, Kyoto University
NAGANO Shigetomo, President, Japan Forum for Strategic Studies

NISHIKAWA Megumi, Foreign News Editor, Mainichi Newspapers
OKONOGI Masao, Professor, Keio University
ONUMA Yasuaki, Professor, University of Tokyo
OSANAI Takayuki, Foreign Policy Critic
OWADA Hisashi, Judge, International Court of Justice
OHYA Eiko, Journalist
RYU Ketsu, Professor, Waseda University
SAKAKIBARA Eisuke, Professor, Keio University
SAKAMOTO Masahiro, Senior Research Fellow, The Japan Forum on International Relations Inc.
SHIRAIISHI Masaru, Professor, Kyoto University
SOEYA Yoshihide, Professor, Keio University
SONE Yasunori, Professor, Keio University
SUMIDA Nagayoshi, President, The Sankei Shimbun
TAHARA Soichiro, Journalist
TAJIMA Takashi, Guest Professor, Toyo Eiwa Women's University
TAKAHARA Akio, Professor, Rikkyo University
TAKAHASHI Kazuo, Professor, International Christian University
TAKASHIMA Hatsuhsa, Press Secretary/Director-General for Press and Publications, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
TAKUBO Tadae, Guest Professor, Kyorin University
TANAKA Akihiko, Professor, University of Tokyo
TANAKA Toshiro, Professor, Keio University
TANI Masahito, Commissioner, National Personnel Authority
TANINO Sakutarō, Former Ambassador to China
UEDA Takako, Professor, International Christian University
URATA Shujiro, Professor, Waseda University
WAKABAYASHI Masatake, Professor, University of Tokyo
YAMAGUCHI Tatsuo, Director General, Latin America Society
YAMAZAWA Ippei, President, International University
YONEKURA Seiichiro, Professor, Hitotsubashi University
YOSHITOMI Masaru, President & Chief Research Officer, Research Institute of Economy, Trade & Industry

【Political Leaders】 (33Members)

【Governors】

HATOYAMA Yukio, Member of the House of Representatives (DPJ)
TANIGAKI Sadakazu, M.H.R. (LDP)

【Members】

ABE Shinzo, Member of the House of Representatives (LDP)
AIZAWA Ichiro, M.H.R. (LDP)
HOSODA Hiroyuki, M.H.R. (LDP)
IWAKUNI Tetsundo, M.H.R. (DPJ)
KISHIDA Fumio, M.H.R. (LDP)
KOIKE Yuriko, M.H.R. (LDP)
KOIZUMI Toshiaki, M.H.R. (DPJ)
KOMIYAMA Yoko, M.H.R. (DPJ)
MAEHARA Seiji, M.H.R. (DPJ)
MASUHARA Yoshitake, M.H.R. (LDP)
MATSUMIYA Isao, M.H.R. (LDP)
NAKAGAWA Masaharu, M.H.R. (DPJ)
OTANI Nobumori, M.H.R. (DPJ)
SATO Akira, M.H.R. (LDP)
SHIOZAKI Yasuhisa, M.H.R. (LDP)
SONODA Hiroyuki, M.H.R. (LDP)
TAKEMASA Koichi, M.H.R. (DPJ)
TANAHASHI Yasufumi, M.H.R. (LDP)
TSUCHIYA Shinako, M.H.R. (LDP)
UEDA Isamu, M.H.R. (NK)
ASAO Keiichiro, Member of the House of Councillors (DPJ)
ARAKI Kiyohiro, M.H.C. (NK)
HATA Yuichiro, M.H.C. (DPJ)
HAYASHI Yoshimasa, M.H.C. (LDP)
HIRONAKA Wakako, M.H.C. (DPJ)
KATOH Shuichi, M.H.C. (NK)
SEKOU Hironari, M.H.C. (LDP)
SUZUKI Kan, M.H.C. (DPJ)
TAKANO Hiroshi, M.H.C. (NK)
TAKEMI Keizo, M.H.C. (LDP)
YANASE Susumu, M.H.C. (DPJ)

[Note] DPJ: Democratic Party of Japan
LDP: Liberal Democratic Party
NK: New Komeito

【Executive Secretary】

WATANABE Mayu

As of August 1, 2005
In alphabetical order

9. An Introduction to ASEAN-ISIS

The ASEAN Institutes of Strategic and International Studies (ASEAN-ISIS) is a loose association of institutes in the region that aims at strengthening regional cooperation through joint studies and seminars.

The group has established a series of meetings that have become a major venue for exchanges of ideas, not only amongst Southeast Asians but also with experts and government officials from other parts of the world.

ASEAN ISIS also organizes regular bilateral seminars with counterpart institutions in China, Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, India and Europe. Southeast Asia Regional Program sponsored by The Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) has provided financial support to promote these activities.

ASEAN-ISIS was founded in 1988, comprised of following institutes: The Centre of Strategic and International Studies (CSIS), Indonesia; The Institute of Strategic and International Studies (ISIS), Malaysia; Institute for Strategic and Development Studies (ISDS), Philippines; Singapore Institute of International Affairs (SIIA), Singapore; and Institute of Security and International Studies (ISIS), Thailand.

ASEAN ISIS has now nine member institutions: CSIS, Indonesia; ISIS, Malaysia; ISDS, Philippines; SIIA, Singapore; ISIS, Thailand; Brunei Darussalam Institute of Policy and Strategic Studies (BDIPSS), Brunei Darussalam; The Cambodian Institute for Cooperation and Peace (CICP), Cambodia; Institute of Foreign Affairs (IFA), Laos; and The Institute for International Relations (IIR), Vietnam.

The network came to the attention of governments through its policy papers, leading to the development of close relations with the ASEAN senior officials meeting (SOM). What is now known as track two or the second track came into being. ASEAN ISIS has become a model for a number of similar activities.

Copy Inhibit



The Global Forum of Japan

17-12-1301, Akasaka 2-chome Minato-ku, Tokyo, 107-0052, Japan

[Tel] +81-3-3584-2190 [Fax] +81-3-3589-5120

[E-mail] info@gfj.jp [URL] <http://www.gfj.jp/>