

Anreizstrukturen, die Akteure in privaten wie öffentlichen Hochschulen derzeit dazu bewegen Veränderungsprozesse voranzutreiben. Als wichtigste institutionelle Modellvorbilder konnten amerikanische Einrichtungen identifiziert werden.

Zum Abschluss des Workshops präsentierte Dr. Axel Czaya ein gemeinsames Paper mit Prof. Dr. Wilfried Hesser (beide Helmut Schmidt Universität Hamburg) zum Thema „Die Normierung als Instrument der regionalen Integration: Tendenzen im asiatischen Raum“. Ausgehend vom Beispiel der EU wurde aufgezeigt, dass die Normung ein ausgesprochen leistungsfähiges Instrument zur technischen und sozioökonomischen Integration von Wirtschaftsregionen darstellen kann. Die Analyse aktueller Entwicklungstendenzen in Ostasien zeigte aber, dass dort die Normierungsaktivität so gering ist, dass davon kaum ein integrativer Impuls zu erwarten ist. Die große Heterogenität der Regionalpartner und deren Interessensdivergenzen verhindern, dass dieser Mechanismus sein integrationsförderndes Potenzial entfalten kann.

Der Workshop insgesamt warf Schlaglichter auf wichtige institutionelle Grundlagen (bzw. Defizite) der ökonomischen Entwicklung in Ostasien und gab so über die Veranstaltung hinaus Anlass zu weiterführenden Debatten. Im Verbund mit den Workshopbeiträgen des Jahres 2007 ist derzeit eine englischsprachige Publikation geplant, um so diese Diskussion in einen breiteren Raum zu tragen.

Werner Pascha, Cornelia Storz, Markus Taube

Initiatives of Regional Integration in Asia in Comparative Perspective – Concepts, Contents and Prospects

Workshop, Social Science Research Council – International Conference on Inter-Asian Connections, Dubai, UAE, February 21-23

Workshop Directors: Howard Loewen, GIGA Institute of Asian Studies; Anja Zorob, GIGA Institute of Middle East Studies.

Many countries in Asia form part of a steadily growing network of *regional integration agreements* (RIAs). These treaties are mostly signed bilaterally between countries neighbouring each other or that belong to the same sub-region. In Asia this pattern applies in particular to the sub-regions of both the Middle East and East Asia. Lately, however, also agreements were concluded or are in the making between countries from across the region connecting countries like Jordan and Singapore, China and Pakistan or the Arab Gulf Countries with Malaysia, India or Pakistan. In addition, there are a host of multilateral RIAs such as the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), ASEAN + 3, Asia Pacific Economic Organization (APEC), the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO) or the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) and last but not least the Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC). Besides all of these treaties one should not forget that regionalization in trade and factor movements has developed in and among different

parts of Asia also outside the framework of formal agreements fostered for instance by the growth of international production networks or flows of aid and workers remittances among countries of the region.

Most of the literature and conferences or workshops organized on topics of regionalism / regionalization in Asia have concentrated to date on one specific area or sub-region, i.e. the Middle East *or* South-East Asia or they have focused on a specific academic discipline. This workshop, however, will brought together speakers and discussants from different disciplinary backgrounds. In addition, it promised to take up an 'inter-Asian' perspective offering the opportunity to explore and compare the fairly diverse experiences of regionalization gained thus far in the different parts of Asia. Could these variations be traced back primarily to different concepts and / or specific contents of RIAs or to other *preconditions* frequently stipulated in the literature – or what for example the Middle East might learn from initiatives of regional integration in other parts of Asia? Besides looking at past experiences the workshop with its 'inter-Asian' perspective and the multidisciplinary background of its speakers aimed at critically discussing and comparing new approaches and concepts put forward most recently by different political actors and institutions in and outside the Asian region. Finally, case studies presented in this workshop and the accompanying discussions helped to critically test or discuss theories of regional integration and in particular its 'potential effects', its constraints and prerequisites as stipulated in the literature.

Against the background outlined above, the papers selected for presentation in the workshop dealt with one or more of the following issues of regional integration:

- Introducing new methodological and/or innovative theoretical conceptualizations regarding the causes and effects of bilateral/multilateral RIAs
- Debating and comparing preconditions for successful integration among RIAs in Asia/its major sub-regions
- Assessing and comparing concepts underlying the design of existing and potential future RIAs in Asia
- Measuring outcomes of formal initiatives of integration and market-driven patterns of regionalization in different policy fields (trade, investment, political and security cooperation etc.)
- Assessing the role of regional powers / potential Hubs (China, Japan, India) as well as extra-regional actors (USA, EU) in promoting or hindering regional economic and/or political cooperation/integration
- Case studies of bilateral and multilateral RIAs in Asia and their interplay with global economic institutions / governance

Looking at the disciplinary background of the prospective speakers the workshop brought together academics, scientific staff and practitioners in development

cooperation representing experts in economics, international political economy, sociology, political science and international relations.

The first paper was delivered by *Lurong Chen*, a researcher at UNU-CRIS (United Nations University—Comparative Regional Integration Studies, Brugge, Belgium) and Ph.D. candidate in International Economics at the Graduate Institute of International Studies in Geneva. In his paper he measured the existing bilateral trade relations among East Asian countries by calculating BTL indices (de facto bilateral trade liberalization) and economic distance. Based on the comparison of de facto trade preferences among East Asian countries he discusses who might be potential hub and sub-hub candidates arguing that a FTA between China and ASEAN might trigger important domino effects and therefore represent a potential future milestone in East Asian regional integration.

The second talk given by *Peter Richter*, Senior Advisor at the German Technical Cooperation (Deutsche Gesellschaft fuer Technische Zusammenarbeit, GTZ) and responsible for Project Promotion of Economic Integration in BIMP EAGA. In his paper he took a critical look at the *Brunei Darussalam-Indonesia-Malaysia-Philippines East ASEAN Growth Area (BIMP-EAGA)* sub-regional cooperation initiative launched in 1994, its slow progress to date and its prospects for future implementation. For this purpose the author explores the differences in the preconditions between the BIMP-EAGA cooperation initiative and the South-East Asian ‘Growth Triangles’ (*IMS-GT, IMT-GT and Mekong Sub-region*) which success it wants to emulate and which concept it adopted. He concluded that policies and institutions in BIMP-EAGA need to be substantially strengthened and reformed; in addition he proposed an alternative concept and different institutional set-up better suited to the conditions in BIMP-EAGA to make the agreement work and produce the expected benefits.

Following Richter, *Christopher M. Dent*, Reader in East Asia’s International Political Economy at the Department of East Asian Studies at the University of Leeds, UK, spoke about the new Regional Financial Agreements (RFAs) already initiated among Asian countries or proposed as future initiatives such as *The Chiang Mai Initiative (CMI) scheme of currency swap agreements* launched in 2000. He tried to assess how these new agreements schemes could contribute to fostering regional and as part of it trade integration in Asia. Thereby he not only challenged the traditional view assuming that economic integration should proceed in stages beginning with free trade as the first stage. In addition, he shed some light on potential differences between financial and trade integration with respect to political economy considerations and thus the political feasibility of such initiatives and explored, among other things, how the new RFAs might impact on the interplay between regional and global financial governance.

After the coffee break, *Norma Nicola Hazboun*, Associate Professor at the Social Sciences Department, Bethlehem University, Palestine, delivered a paper on Arab-

Israeli Regional Cooperation. Based on the findings of a field research conducted in Bethlehem District she argued that the overwhelming majority of the Palestinian leadership rejected Israeli plans of pushing 'Normalization' by way of regional economic cooperation as a means to end the regional political and economic isolation of Israel and as a precondition or basis to achieve a final settlement or Arab-Israeli peace. She further explored what might be the impact of such a strategy which has been backed also by the West from the very beginning on future political rights of the Palestinians and their policies and strategies of economic development.

George Gravillis, Assistant Professor at the Department of Government, University of Texas, Austin, USA, proposed a rather unconventional new concept assuming that state collapse might serve as an incentive or starting point for regional integration. To illustrate his concept he explored two cases of state failure, the collapse of Afghanistan and the break-up of the Soviet Union, and connected them to a number of both formal and informal initiatives at integration among surrounding countries which followed thereafter. By doing so, he took a look, among others, on the reactions or strategies of regional powers neighbouring failed states (China in Tajikistan and Iran in Afghanistan) and explained why state collapse prompted formal initiatives at integration in some cases and rather informal attempts in others.

Ruediger Frank, Professor of East Asian Economy and Society at the East Asian Institute, University of Vienna, Austria, focused on recent efforts at regional economic integration as well as security cooperation in East Asia and its impact on the North Korean issue and vice versa. Using standard IR theories, the author explored the options and limits for North Korea to participate in East Asian regional initiatives. In conjunction with an assessment of the activities conducted so far he tried to infer a number of conditions based on which East Asian regionalization could serve as an alternative approach to the solution of the various issues concerning North Korea and among them the country's nuclear program and analyzed how this, in turn, could affect East Asian community building.

Following Frank, *Fred Lawson*, Rice Professor of Government at Mills College, Oakland, USA compared projects of regional integration in East Asia and Southwest Asia or the Middle East. The regional formations investigated in his paper are the *Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC)* founded by the six Arab Gulf countries in 1981 and the *Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN)* established in 1967 and expanded more recently to ASEAN+3 (10 ASEAN members plus Japan, South Korea and China). The author tried to ascertain parallel trends and processes stimulating, consolidating and sustaining regionalization across contemporary Asia by contrasting the key developments that have transformed the GCC from an initially loose security arrangement into a more integrated regional project today with those that prompted ASEAN members to spur collaboration among each other and, more importantly, with neighbouring countries.

In the final session *Ishtiaq Ahmad*, Associate Professor at the Department of International Relations, Quaid-i-Azam University, Islamabad, Pakistan, focused on a critical evaluation of the concept, contents, membership, and outcomes of the *Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO)*, established in 2001 by Russia, China, Kazakhstan, Tajikistan, Kyrgyzstan and Uzbekistan. He discussed the various economic, security and political challenges the SCO is facing and described how the SCO has responded to tackle these challenges and to elucidate what remains to be done. This analysis of its achievements and drawbacks is framed in a comparison to the performance of other initiatives of regional integration involving Central Asian countries like, for example, the Economic Cooperation Organization (ECO). The author concluded by clarifying what the SCO has been able to achieve what other initiatives at regional integration in this area could not and this is, among others, to create greater confidence among its members. In addition, however, he also discussed the lessons the SCO might learn from success stories of regionalism in Asia such as ASEAN.

The workshop concluded with a discussion and wrap-up of the main findings presented during the different sessions. The ultimate aim of the workshop organizers is to finally publish the papers presented in the workshop as a book at one of the well-known publishing houses interested in the study of issues of regional integration in general and regionalism and regionalization in Asia in specific.

Howard Loewen