ASEAN-EU COMPARATIVE REGIONALISM ARCHITECTURE. STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP IN SECURITY COOPERATION

Andreea LOSEKAMM*

*Management Specialist, U.S. Department of State, Washington D.C.. USA/ General Consulate of the USA, Frankfurt, Germany

Abstract: *Both the European Union and ASEAN are generally dealing with similar issues. One of their major concerns represents the growth of weaknesses engaging them in continuous political efforts in order to overcome the threats at any level. The geographical location of Asian and European countries has shaped their position right after the War in the debate of international relations, in the belief that this would contribute to restoring security in the Balkans, with beneficial implications for the whole continent. The end of the war urged the reshaping of international relations, demanding a redefinition of the structure, of the concept of security. Thus, new factors on the international stage determined new forms of diplomacy and new security strategies. This article proposes to examine the changes in modern regionalism architecture along the process of integration and disintegration after some major events occurred on the international stage; the factors which determined this alternative to traditional diplomacy, and to initiate plans of action for measuring the changes. While EU is seen as a supranational organization and a model for ASEAN, the last one is simply a Free Trade Area, making its way towards ASEAN Community, but both are known in world politics for their effective diplomacy, pursuing an engagement strategy adapted for the 21st century.*

Keywords: EU;ASEAN; EU-ASEAN strategic partnership; security

1. INTRODUCTION

Both the European Union and ASEAN are generally dealing with similar issues. One of their major concerns represents the growth of weaknesses engaging them in continuous political efforts in order to overcome the threats at any level. The geographical location of Asian and European countries has shaped their position right after the War in the debate of international relations, in the belief that this would contribute to restoring security in the Balkans, with beneficial implications for the whole continent. The end of the war urged the reshaping of international relations (Blue Book, 2008), demanding a redefinition of the structure, of the concept of security. Thus, new factors on the international stage determined new forms of diplomacy and new security strategies.

This article proposes to examine the changes in modern regionalism architecture along the process of integration and disintegration after some major events occurred on the international stage; the factors which determined this alternative to traditional diplomacy, and to initiate plans of action for measuring the changes. Even if in the past diplomats negotiated with the political ideology and military alliance of their governments in mind, today behind negotiations stands political and economic benefits mainly. Leguey-Feilleux, Baldwin, Collier & Gilpin observed the diminishing nature of ideology in diplomacy, all of them making the same mistake: the observation from a strictly political or a strictly economic perspective, without examining other aspects (*apud Trunk*, 2011). While EU is seen as a supranational organization and a model for ASEAN, the last one is simply a Free Trade Area, making its way towards ASEAN Community, but both known in the world politics for their effective diplomacy, pursuing an engagement strategy adapted for the 21st century.

Furthermore, EU and ASEAN have built the transatlantic cooperation between their groupings filling up the missing link of the European and Asian continents. In fact, ASEAN is a loosely-structured organization initially established to preserve peace and security while EU was primarily established as a European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC). How will the two regional groupings maintain good cooperation and strengthen their bilateral ties in the future to come?

Prior to the establishment of ASEAN, there were attempts to establish other regional groupings as to settle down conflicts within the region such as SEATO, ASPAC, ASA. To be specific, factors driving the establishment of ASEAN and those organizations are mainly conflicts among Southeast Asian countries. Ben Rosamond (2001) argues that there are three dangers in comparing these two regional groupings as they could lead analysts to the dangerous trap of Eurocentrism. The first one is European regionalism as mentioned above. The second one is noted for its "depth" and its accompanying institutionalization. The final one is early academic models of political and economic integration. When the world is changing, ASEAN and EU have still maintained its mainly aim to adapt their countries to the change of multipolarity. Hence, the implications of regionalism and democratization upon the emergence of many regional groups. Reasons to pursue observing ASEAN and the EU vary but they do not go beyond the concept of regionalism or globalization. Regional integration has aroused many interests as to seek answers whether there is virtually a necessity to integrate the region or not. If the integration owes itself to the concept of regionalism and globalization, the functions of two regional groupings should be similar. The second interesting aspect is that ASEAN and the EU has to do with the possibilities of comparison. The understanding of the two models can be best obtained from the comparable studies which will lead to the comprehension of ASEAN and the EU.

The present article has been the doubts whether regional groupings will be sustainable amidst the rapidly changing world or not. We are entering the era whereby politics have become the secondary activity. It is the era where fragmented economies are no longer needed or regarded as instable. Richard Lee Armitage, former Deputy Secretary of State and the Chairman of Armitage International has stated in the speech on "the United States, Asia and a Rapidly Changing World" on June 02, 2006 that challenges in the next 15-20 years are the existence globalization process which may not be successful persuading failed states to co-exist peacefully with international community. Secondly, the world economy will grow but the gap between the rich and the poor will be wide. Thus, it will cause migrants problem especially workers and also the problem of poverty will exist. Third, China will be another economic superpower, but it is unpredictable. There will be uncertainty between international politics of China in the future and the readiness of U.S.A. in accommodating China's

superpower. Fourth, the ageing population will cause problems on stability. Fifth, there will be problems on urbanization as to whether metropolitan cities can manage the livings condition of its population (problem particularly projected to China). Sixth, U.S.A. will remain the superpower in the next 20 years, assuming from the fact that U.S.A has benefits in almost every region. The challenges are to what extent all countries can accept the existence of U.S.A. as a superpower.

This does not mean that ASEAN and the EU would compete with any superpower. What we have to realize is the fact that since the end of the Cold War, many new state actors have emerged. The world has turned into multipolarity since the collapse of the Berlin Wall in 1989. Therefore, each regional grouping has to prepare itself to adapt with the changing world. International cooperation is vital in the world of interdependence, with security threatened almost on a day basis.

The objectives of the article are three-fold: (1) To compare the development of ASEAN and EU in terms of historical background, integration, enlargement process; (2) To study the cooperation of ASEAN and EU or ASEM. To foresee the development of ASEAN and whether this establishment would outweigh the role of superpowers or not.

2. THEORY OF INTEGRATION

Taking theories which are applied to European integration, it can also be said that ASEAN integration is similar to EU's one. ASEAN, is integrated by way of mutual agreement, as suggested by confederalism, in order to transform the existing patterns of relations into the internal relations of one state. To elaborate further as to attempt to classify ASEAN's integration into one kind of integration, it is justified to understand the situation encouraging integration process of many groupings.

Karl Deutsch (1994) sees integration as "the process" leading to the establishment of security community. Members of community have to realize that they are members from the same community and have the strict implementation for plans. These plans are guarantor in the long-term to serve the needs of people who wish to see the peaceful change. Regarding the behavior, the result of the integration has made political units change their political behavior. Ernst B. Haas (1961) defines integration as "the process" by which each

state alter loyalty and expectation including political activities which are implemented freely to be under the control of central political unit. This unit controls the decision-making process and has supra-national power as to fulfill the goals of each state by peaceful means. This process decreases an importance of state territory and environment in the nation state system and will create the complete international community system in later time. Johan Galtung (1968) defines integrations as "the process" whereby the political actor from two to create bigger political actors. When that process terminates, former political actor vanishes. However, from the above definitions, the integration process refers to at least two political units or state actors, interact under conditions which are different according to the condition of integration. The said interaction occurs under the process which brings about changes in many matters such as decision-making process, attitude towards national interests of members and the establishment of new political organization. The development of integration theory has initiated from Federalism as it is believed that politics which has emerged from the composition of many small independent states as USA, Australia could exist at the international level through the effective integration under the constitution. Under this system, there is the separation between central institution and the secondary institution. The former is responsible in keeping the mutual benefits of each state.

The other related integration theory is transactionalism which explains the integration in terms of conditions which encourages or obstruct with the integration of states. These conditions comprise sense of community which will exist only when there are transactions and the relations of prominent values or geographical proximity. Later on, functionalism has emerged. As previously mentioned in the first part, functionalism has paved the hypothesis that problems which many nations have encountered are technical problems which are for more too complex to be solved by government alone. Hence, experts are needed to assist rectifying these problems. Apart from the complexity, many nations need to face the problems together. Thus, to effectively solve the problems, it is important to implement the plan through experts which will narrow the political units to become closer.

3. DEVELOPMENT OF EU

The phenomena of European integration cannot be captured in a single or explained within one concept. Many analysts refer to European integration as "sui generis" or taken as given. Thus, it might be worthwhile to examine the evolving process of European integration through various conceptual and theoretical perspectives. The former means thinking about phenomena in abstract terms, and theorizing means - to give general explanations of phenomena. It is true that both concepts and theories contradict each other.

Three concepts of EU's prominent character will be briefly mentioned to pave the way for better understanding of theories of integration in the latter part.

- **States and intergovernmental organizations:** It cannot be denied that to conceptualize EU requires understanding of the smaller unit of international system which is 'state' with its characteristics. EU does not fall onto the definition of 'state' nor has the characters of 'statehood' as traditionally understood. EU had shown that it possesses traditional characteristics of state but the progress of integration has shown that the development of EU's integration will strengthen this characteristic. Cooperation among states known as intergovernmental organization (IGO) could not also be applied to the EU integration while IGOs are organizations in which representatives of national governments come together to cooperate on a voluntary basis for reasons of mutual benefit. EU is neither a state nor is it an intergovernmental organization.

- **State-centrism and consociationalism:** Model of state-centrism is the advance process of intergovernmental view of integration process. This concept views EU as nation states that have gathered to cooperate for specific purposes. It is true that states have rights to vote supporting or against EU's decision. But most of the times, member states have to change all their rules of law to comply with EU's regulations even prior to their membership. Each member state has to surrender their sovereignty to EU's supranational actors.

- **Multi-level governance:** In early 1990s, EU has been viewed as multi-level governance into analysis of EU integration. This concept is in opposition with state-centric model which sees state executives as actors and decision-makers. It might be argued that national government is important to a certain degree but they do not dominate and control decision-making processes of EU.

Gary Marks, Liesbet Hoohe and Kermit Black (1996:345-346) have explained the multi-level governance model of EU in three main aspects.

1. Decision-making competences are exercised by national government, institutions and actors at

other levels. Supranational actors such as the Commission, the EP and the Court of Justice influence on policy processes and policy outcomes. Member states do have roles to play with regional and local authorities to engage in policy activities that are not controllable by national governments.

2. Collective decision-making by states at the EU level is regarded as a loss of national sovereignty and loss of control by national governments. States, according to intergovernmental view, retain the ultimate decision-making power which cannot be applied to the concept of multi-level governance one.

3. Political arenas are interconnected. So national political activity is confined to the national arena and national inputs into EU decision-making. The collective decision-making is finally channelled via state-level actors, a variety of channels and interconnections between different levels of government, supranational, national and subnational.

The integration process in Europe begun in 1951 when Belgium, France, West Germany, Italy, Luxembourg and the Netherlands signed the Treaties of Paris to found the European Coal and steel Community (ECSC). Later in 1957, these six states signed the Treaties of Rome to found the European Economic Community (EEC) and Euratom. Similar to ASEAN, European integration has expanded to cover more countries along the way. The achievement of ECSC in its early years encouraged further integration by the creation of the two further European Communities in 1957. The first one is European Defence Community (EDC) and Western European Union (WEU). The EU was created by the Maastricht Treaty, which entered into force on November 1, 1993. The treaty was designed to enhance European political and economic integration by creating: a single currency, a unified foreign and security policy, and common citizenship rights and by advancing cooperation in the areas of immigration, asylum, and judicial affairs.

4. DEVELOPMENT OF ASEAN

As the integration theory vary and ASEAN is merely a free trade area paving its way for community, the most suitable theory to be applied will be Transactionalism and Functionalism. For the former, Deutsch's concept will be used as it concerns the establishment of community. In the case of ASEAN, its birth can be considered to be pluralistic security community. The Association of Southeast Asia or ASA which was set up in 1961

was the first organization revealing true regional co-operation in Southeast Asia and emerged few years after Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO).

The main motivation for mutual efforts to band together was to strengthen the position and protect themselves against Big Power rivalry. However, ASA collapsed as fast as SEATO following territorial dispute, relating to a colonial legacy, erupted between the Philippines and Indonesia and Malaysia.

Other initiatives followed which eventually shared same destiny as its predecessors' following failure in regional co-operation.

On 8 August 1967, five leaders from those countries signed the Bangkok Declaration to establish the Association of Southeast Asian nations or ASEAN. Indonesia, Malaysia, Philippines, Singapore, and Thailand signed the Bangkok Declaration to officially establish the Association of Southeast Asian Nations.

After its establishment, ASEAN declared its various objectives in Bangkok Declaration, 8 August 1967, as can be narrated as follows:

1. To accelerate the economic growth, social progress, and cultural development in the region through joint endeavours in the spirit of equality and partnership in order to strengthen the foundation for a prosperous and peaceful community of Southeast Asian nations;

2. To promote regional peace and stability through abiding respect for justice and the rule of law in the relationship among countries of the region and adherence to the principles of the United Nations Charter;

3. To promote active collaboration and mutual assistance on matters of common interest in the economic, social, cultural, technical, scientific and administrative fields.

Hence, ASEAN begun its enlargement process by including countries in Southeast Asia region. Later on, in the coming fourth decade, ASEAN has set up ASEAN Vision 2020 (1997) to create ASEAN a concert of Southeast Asian Nations. The main principles of ASEAN in the coming decade concerning political cooperation are three-fold: (1) To be the zone of stable peace, freedom and neutrality; (2) To be the balance of power in the multipolarity world; (3) To have unity within ASEAN.

5. EU-ASEAN ANALOGY

Similarities and differences of ASEAN and EU can be examined through five main points:

A. The two regional groupings were established with different motivation. ASEAN emerged out of political factors, driven mainly by the spread of communism in Southeast Asia region. On the other hand, EU was established as ECSC which is clearly the economic factors. At that time, Europe did need an organization capable of uniting the continent after World War II. ASEAN and Asian regional groupings such as SEATO, ASPAC, MAPHILINDO were purely initiative of Asian Nations. Southeast Asian Nations needed regional cooperation for stability and solidarity ASEAN was created without any support from countries outside Southeast Asian region.

On the other hand, the evolving process of integration in Europe can be said to be partly supported by USA. After World War II, America has drawn a Marshall Plan to help assisting financial situation of Europe. USA has indirectly urged European nations to integrate as it has become more influential in economic and political aspects. As a matter of fact, both ASEAN and EU were established to sanction US presence and hegemony in the region. The former wanted to sanction US presence in Vietnam as in the case of SEATO while the latter wanted to have its own power without relying on USA and the Soviet Union. Both regions learned that they should rely on their own power as the third force might not be reliable in the long run.

Considering the motives of the establishment of ASEAN and EU, there seems to be no similarities in terms of structural development. EU has begun its integration not with Free Trade Area but as a Common Market. Furthermore, it has begun its integration with the establishment of the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) upon Schuman Declaration in 1950. Later in 1951, the six Founding countries signed the Treaty of Paris which has become effective in 1952. The Treaty has laid down major principles founding a common market for basic materials for industrialized society namely, coal, coke, iron ore, steel and scrap. The reason behind it is to ensure sufficient supplies to all member states, produce a rational expansion and modernization of production and improve the conditions and lifestyles of those working in the industries in question. Moreover, this Treaty has shown that EU possess significant supranational characteristics. These could be found in the new central institutions: the High Authority, Council of Ministers, Common Assembly and Court of Justice.

On the other hand, ASEAN was established upon the Bangkok Declaration signed by five countries, namely, Indonesia, Malaysia, Philippines, Singapore and Thailand. The prime aim was not to create a common market but a Free Trade Area. Thus, the structure of ASEAN does not have any similarities to share with that of EU or ECSC. That is to say, ASEAN does not have any supranational authorities which have power to control or harmonize all ASEAN's internal law. ASEAN member countries are bound to change law simply because they have to abide by rules and regulations of international organization as World Trade Organisations (WTO). Thus, ASEAN is smaller in scale than the present EU or even then ECSC. The highest level of mechanism is ASEAN Summit meeting which holds a meeting three times a year. Participants are Heads of Government of member countries. The next lower mechanism is ASEAN Ministerial Meeting (AMM) which is the forum for Foreign Ministers. Its main aim is to lay down guideline policies for cooperation among ASEAN member countries. Apart from these, there is ASEAN Economic Ministerial Meeting (AEMM) to be held twice a year as to lay down policies concerning economic aspects to correspond with consensus of ASEAN Summit Meeting. There is a Meeting of Ministers in their Respective Fields held for functional cooperation among ASEAN countries such as transportation, education. In order to follow up the work of ASEAN's activities as agreed upon in the Summit Meeting, Standing Committee has been set up. A level lower than this Committee is Senior Official Meeting (SOM) which hold meetings on politics (SOM) and on economics (SEOM). ASEAN has also set up ASEAN Secretariat which has the headquarter in Jakarta, Indonesia.

Hence, the structure of ASEAN and EU is completely different. What is interesting about the structure of both groupings does not lie in the fact that they are not similar. But this leads to a question why the present EU has started its establishment as supranational institutions or common market whereas ASEAN rather establishes itself as merely free trade area. It may be possible to make an abrupt assumption that EU had to start its establishment form common market due to its internal conflicts. Should ECSC begin as free trade area like ASEAN, superpowers as Germany, France and United Kingdom would make objection due to their economic benefits.

The other dimension of ASEAN and EU is that ASEAN has been integrated to prevent communist threats and internal conflicts at the same time.

The difference among ASEAN countries is more vast and higher than that of EU. Generally

speaking, EU founding members are those countries who colonized most ASEAN countries. In practice, they can make further progress than ASEAN as EU member countries are more or less at the same level in terms of politics and economics. That might be the answer why EU could start its establishment from common market rather than free trade area.

B. The integration process of the two regions is also similar in the sense that it embraces countries with diversity to become a regional grouping. ASEAN comprises ten countries which do not share similar language, religion, or ruling systems. Europe is also a region of diversity divided by language, religion cultural traditions and historical experiences. Therefore, the establishment of ASEAN and EU has served to manage the diversity and to make the whole continent turn each country's interests into communal benefits.

C. With regards to EU, candidate countries will have similar pattern of economy, to be a democratic country, and fulfill similar requirements. The concept of this criteria reflects the need of EU to become an actual supranational organization. At present, EU has issued its own constitution. On the contrary, ASEAN has no such criteria as it holds on to "non-interference" policy. The fact that ASEAN has not set any criteria for candidates but instead has set its goals that it would cover the ten countries in the Southeast Asia region reflects that ASEAN is different from EU in terms of the scale of integration. The outstanding character of ASEAN is not a supranational organization but a regional grouping at the level of free trade area. No ASEAN countries would lose its sovereignty to comply its laws with any communal regulations.

D. Both ASEAN and EU have enlarged their membership to include countries with transitional economies or former communist countries. The only difference is that EU has more members than ASEAN and has tendency to enlarge further to cover countries once had centrally planned economies. Meanwhile, ASEAN will maintain its members as ten in the near future without enlarging further to cover other countries in Southeast Asia as China or Japan.

E. The EU and ASEAN are like-minded partners in a challenging geopolitical context, both of believe in multilateralism rules-based. Over the course of forty-five years of cooperation, ASEAN and the EU have managed to build a strong relationship, based primarily on trade and economic ties, and are currently strategic partners. For ASEAN, the EU is the second most important trading partner, After the USA and China, ASEAN is the EU's third largest partner outside of Europe. The overarching goal remains the conclusion of an EU-ASEAN Free Trade Agreement (FTA) at regional level. Aside from ASEAN's big interest in expnanding trade sector, there is the EU main interest towards strenghtening security cooperation with geographically strategic partners.

6. PLAN OF ACTION TO IMPLMENT EU-ASEAN STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP (2023-2027)

The Plan of Action to strengthen the ASEAN-EU enhanced partnership 2013-2017 came in response to the decision of Foreign Ministers at the 18th ASEAN-EU Ministerial Meeting in Madrid, on 26 May 2010. Building on the successes of 35 years of ASEAN-EU Dialogue Relations, it planned to advance collaboration by tackling issues of common interest on a regional and global scale for the forthcoming five years 2013–2017. It included a wide range of topics, from political and security, economic, and sociocultural, reflecting the complexity of relations between ASEAN and the EU. This Plan of Action basically reaffirmed the statement in the Nuremberg Declaration on ASEAN-EU Enhanced Partnership (2007), of a long commitment to boost dialogue relations.

After the ASEAN-EU Plan of Action for 2013-2017 [10] was successfully put into effect, the two parties collaborated on a new document that would pave the way for further cooperation between them. This resulted into the ASEAN-EU Plan of Action for 2018–2022 [11], which emphasised the same three areas of cooperation: political and security, economic, and sociocultural. Additionally, it addressed two topics that cut across all areas, namely connectivity and closing the ASEAN development gap.

Marking their longstanding relationship, namely forty-four years of liasion, the EU and the ASEAN agreed to upgrade their cooperation on December 1, 2020, by opening a new chapter: a strategic partnership for 2023-2027. One year later, the EU was acknowledging the importance of ASEAN in the EU strategy for Indo-Pacific Cooperation.

This strategic partnership would have the same directions of action as the plans before, however more focused on the security cooperation:
- economic cooperation forging a sustainable development
  - security cooperation
  - preserving peace and stability

- fighting against transnational crime and counter terrorism cybersecurity

- maritime security

This Plan of Action upgrade to Implement the ASEAN-EU Strategic Partnership supersedes the ASEAN-EU Plan of Action (2018-2022) and it was adopted at the ASEAN Post-Ministerial Conference (PMC) +1 with the EU.

The two regional bodies have been engaging in dialogue and agreements for several decades, so this may seem like a long-time coming. Not to mention it surged in the wake of the world's largest free trade zone agreement - the Regional Comprehensive Economic Partnership (RCEP), which brings together ASEAN and its individual free trade partners in Australia, China, Japan, South Korea, and New Zealand - so what an interesting and better timing for the Asian region to become even more important strategically to the EU. In line with their respective Member States' obligations under international law and their respective Member States' domestic laws, regulations and policies, ASEAN and the EU will cooperate in the following security areas as outlined in the Plan of Action (EU External Action, 2022):

1. Political and Security Cooperation

1.1 Enhance strategic dialogue and deepen political and security cooperation

- Convene biennial ASEAN-EU Ministerial Meetings (AEMM), Annual ASEAN Post Ministerial Conference with the EU (PMC)+1, supported by regular meetings of the ASEAN-EU Senior Officials' Meeting (SOM) and ASEAN-EU Joint Cooperation Committee (JCC) Meeting.

- Strengthen cooperation in regional and multilateral fora, including the United Nations and other bodies within the UN system, with the Asia – Europe Meeting (ASEM) and the G20, as well as enhance mutual support and develop joint positions where applicable/appropriate.

- Enhance dialogue between the Committee of Permanent Representatives to ASEAN (CPR) and the EU Mission to ASEAN in Jakarta to support efforts in advancing the ASEAN-EU Strategic Partnership, which is based on mutual cooperation and mutual benefit.

1.2 Enhance the ASEAN-EU cooperation in the ASEAN-led security architecture

- Support ASEAN centrality in the evolving regional architecture in Southeast Asia through ASEAN-led mechanisms.

- Support the open, transparent, inclusive, and rules-based ASEAN-led regional architecture, as well as the deepening of the engagement of the EU with the region through ASEAN-led processes and platforms, noting the EU's commitment to adhere to all relevant ASEAN-led security mechanisms, including the East Asia Summit, and the ADMM-Plus, relevant procedures and processes.

- Enhance dialogue and promote cooperation on defence and security matters, such as in the areas of maritime security, women, peace and security (WPS), youth, peace and security (YPS), peacekeeping operations, military medicine, cybersecurity, and counter-terrorism, as well as on humanitarian assistance and disaster relief.

2. Combat terrorism, transnational crimes, address other non-traditional security issues

- Support the implementation of the ASEAN Plan of Action in Combating Transnational Crime (2016-2025) and implement the ASEAN-EU Work Plan to Combat Terrorism and Transnational Crime (2022-2024) as well as their successors.

3. Enhance maritime security cooperation

4. Promote disarmament and non-proliferation

5. Promote peace-building initiatives

Therefore, the plan will pursue cooperation in conformity with their respective Member States' obligations under international law, and in accordance with their respective Member States' domestic laws, regulations and policies in the above areas.

On the occasion of the 45th anniversary of EU-ASEAN Dialogue Relations, the Member States of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations and the European Union, gathered on Decmeber 14, 2022, in Brussels, Belgium, at the EU-ASEAN Commemorative Summit.

During the summit, EU-ASEAN Plan of Action to implement the ASEAN-EU Strategic Partnership (2023-2027) was deemed promising, given adequate follow-up to ensure it yields tangible initiatives.

Moreover, the ASEAN should respond to mounting pressure to choose a side between US and China.

Another notable intervention raised concerns around whether the financial resources which the European Union and its individual member states are spending on the consequences of the War in Ukraine will draw budget away from new initiatives in Southeast Asia.

7. CONCLUSIONS

The image of regionalism is viewed as a reflection of the variety and complexities of world

politics. Without a wide range of organizations, the world would be short of solutions to important questions about security and economic development. To manage the regionalism depends on the extent to which regionalism can express and channel the needs of the actors involved with it. On the other hand, regionalism can be seen as a means which authority is transferred from states and other groupings to regional bodies to better be able manage the problems that confront them. The effectiveness of regional bodies is the extend to which security and prosperity can be achieved through collective action at the regional level. At the other level, regionalism appears as a contributor to or as an obstacle to world order and the management of the changing international arena. During 1990's there has been the concept of "open" and "closed" regionalism. The former implies the needs to adapt to the world order whereas the latter is an attempt to build a fortress and to manage by using regionalism as an insulator against the challenges of world politics. However, in the same period, the concept of "open regionalism" has been supported in terms of economic and security.

In short, regionalism can be seen as a force for integration and as a force for disintegration in world politics. It expresses the desire for difference and distinctiveness in the world arena.

Andrew Hurrell (*apud* Smith, 1997:88) has concluded that there are three theoretical approaches to regionalism, first, systemic theories which see regionalism as a response to outside pressures and forces. The main theme of the theories is on the development of regional interconnectedness and interdependence. Domestic-level theories focus on the impact of changes such as democratization and the tendency to regionalization and regional cooperation. Regionalism, in a larger context, has capsulated the paradoxes of a world more united yet in some ways more divided than ever before and it raises an important question about the future both of the state and of the world order.

Whatever the result might be, the enlargement process of both groupings clearly confirms the need to change the world to face global challenges and to arrange the new world order. That is, there is no alternative to regionalism and democracy. The balance of power is shown in the pattern of grouping, not by countries or in the form of fragmented economies as experiences of divided world has taught us that integrated countries would attain peace, stability and security more effectively.

8. ACKNOWLEDGMENT

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. ASEAN Heads of State/ Government. (1997). 1997 ASEAN Vision 2020. 2nd Informal Summit, Kuala Lumpur, Malysia, 15 December.
2. Deutsch, Karl W. *et al.* (1994). Political Community and the North Atlantic Area. In Brent F. Nelsen & Alexander Stubb (eds)., *The European Union. Readings on the Theory and Practice of European Integration.* Boulder, London: Lynne Rienner Publisher.121-143.
3. EU Mission to ASEAN. (2018). EU- ASEAN Cooperation. Blue Book 2018. *European Commission* [online]. URL: https://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/sites/devco/files/eu-asean-bluebook 2018_en_1.pdf. [Accessed on June, 2023].
4. EU. (2022). Plan to Action to Implement the ASEAN-EU Strategic Partnership (2023-2027). Final AFM-EU/2022/01/POA. *European Union External Action* [online]. URL: https://www.eeas.europa.eu/sites/default/files/documents/Plan%20of%20Action%20to%20Implement%20the%20ASEAN-EU%20Strategic%20Partnership%20%282023-2027%29.pdf [Accessed on June, 2023].
5. Galtung, Johan. (1968). A Structural Theory of Integration. *Journal of Peace Research.* Vol.5, no.4.
6. Jantz, Felix & Duc Quang Ly. (2022, Dec 27). The EU-ASEAN Strategic Partnership and Its Prospoects. Karl Adenauer Stiftung. Foundation Office Thailand. [online]. URL: https://www.kas.de/en/web/thailand/veranstaltungsberichte/detail/-/content/the-eu-asean-strategic-partnership-and-its-prospects-1 [Accessed on June, 2023].
7. Kei Koga. (2011). The US and East Asian Regional Security Architecture: Building a

Regional Security Nexus on Hub-and-Spoke. *Asian Perspective Journal.* Vol.35, no.1. 1-36.

8. Marks, Gary; Hoohe, Liesbet & Black, Kermit. (1996). *E*uropean Integration from the 1980s: State-Centric v. Multi-level Governance. *Journal of Common Market Studies.* Vol.34, No.3. 345-346.

9. Rosamond, Ben. (2001). *Regional Integration in Europe and Asia.* ASEF University Library.

10. Smith, Michael. (1997). Regions and Regionalism. In Brian White, Richard Little and Michael Smith (eds.), *Issues in the world politics.* London: Red Globe Press. 69-89.

11. Trunk, Judit. (2011). Changing Diplomacy Demands New Type of Diplomats. *Institute of Cultural Diplomacy's International Conference. The Future of U.S. Foreign Policy: "The Revival of Soft Power and Cultural Diplomacy?"*, January 4-6, 2011. Washington, DC.