STUDYING REGIONALISM(S): COMPARITIVISM AND EUROCENTRICISM

Shaun Breslin
Professor of Politics and International Studies, University of Warwick, UK
Co-Editor, The Pacific Review

Email: shaun.breslin@warwick.ac.uk
Tel: +44(0)2476572558

Paper for the joint Fudan University, LSE, and Sciences Po Conference on **China and Asian Regionalism**, Shanghai, 7&8 January 2005

Extraordinarily rough first draft: not for citation

STUDYING REGIONALISM(S): COMPARITIVISM AND EUROCENTRICISM

Constructing a region is not an easy task. Consider a potential region containing states with vastly different levels of development; with different versions of domestic capitalism, different domestic political structures, different religions and belief systems. A potential region that has suffered from the expansionary military activities of one of its members and where memories of the war are still strong in the minds of many, with concerns about how to prevent the emergence of regional hegemons. A region where nations are divided with rival political regimes in an uneasy peace where the threat of conflict cannot be discounted. A region that is largely dependent on the presence of an external power, the US, for the maintenance of security and largely dependent on that same external power for its economic fortunes. A region where there is little or no identification with belonging to that region amongst the general population.

While we might use this description to think of East Asia today, it can also be applied to the situation in Europe at the end of the Second World War. In the European case, the extent of the challenges did not prevent the emergence of a regional order – a regional order that continues to evolve today, both in terms of membership and function. As such, and on the most simple of levels, students of contemporary East Asian regionalism know that the current obstacles to regional formation ***can*** be overcome – but this does not mean that they necessarily ***will*** be overcome. Crucially, nor does it does not mean that if these obstacles are overcome, then regional organisation in East Asia will ***necessarily*** resemble the European Union or that East

Asian regionalisation will emulate the European experience; it does not mean that that Europe's present ***will*** be Asia's future[1].

William Wallace has gone further than most in dismissing the European project as a basis for comparative analysis[2]. He argues that the key to understanding European regional integration is a knowledge of the specific cultural and historical context. As the specific cultural and historical contexts of other regional projects are going to be different, then how can Europe provide a model for regional processes in other parts of the world? While I have some sympathy with Wallace's approach, it perhaps goes too far. As noted above, there are similarities between the Asian and European contexts, and while there is always the danger of concept stretching, at the very least the European experience in region building has provided a host of examples – both negative and positive – for architects of regional projects elsewhere to learn from. It has also contributed much to the construction of theories of integration that can be and are deployed to study regional processes and projects elsewhere[3]. But in some respects, the existence of the European Union has been an obstacle to the emergence of a comparative literature on regionalism(s).

THE DANGER OF EUROCENTRICISM

Here I suggest that there are three – or perhaps three and a half - interrelated problems. The half problem is the question of temporal comparisons. There is little point in comparing regionalism in East Asia (or anywhere else) today with regionalism in Europe today as it is a comparison of two unlikes. Rather, the comparison should be made between East Asia today and Europe at a similar stage of the evolution of regionalism (though identifying when the similar stage was in Europe is an inherently

difficult task). Comparing unlikes is a problem – but as this kind of comparison is not particularly common, it ranks as only half of a problem in this analysis.

The first more major point is that although the European experience is just one experience of region building; it is often elevated in importance above other experiences in the study of comparative regionalisms[4]. This does not always take place in an overt manner. For example, it is common to come across descriptions of loose and/or informal integration of ASEAN, Mercosur, SADC and elsewhere. At the risk of massively oversimplifying the nature of European integration[5], if you compare Europe with any of the above examples, then the distinction between the formalised European structure and loose and informal structures elsewhere is indeed striking. But if you undertook a comparison of all of the above with Europe in a single study, then you might conclude that it is Europe that is the exception from the dominant norm – yet the question of why Europe has such formalised structures is asked much more rarely than why ASEAN *et al* are characterised by loose informal integration. Europe becomes ***the*** benchmark against which all other regional projects are judged.

Second, in some of the literature at least, Europe is not so much considered as ***a*** case, but as the ***archetypal case*** that creates the norm and an expectation that other cases will emulate. Bela Ballasa's highly influential work on economic integration[6] is also relevant here. Ballasa established a model of integration that predicted a linear progression in formal cooperation between states from a free trade area to a customs union to a common market and finally to full economic union. The fact that Ballasa's model has more or less correlated with the transformation of the EEC to the EU has

given force to his predictions – but whether it is an ineluctable process that defines all process of regional integration is en entirely different question.

Third, the European experience has had a much greater impact on theory building than other regional projects. It is not surprising that "integration theory" has drawn much and indeed most from the long running and successful (in its own terms) experience of integration in Europe. Nevertheless, the experiences of other regional projects have at times been all but ignored in theory building. For example, Rosamond notes that:

> neofunctionalism can be read at one level as a theory provoked entirely by the integrative activity among the original six member-states[7]

For Gamble and Payne[8], the European example had resulted in a conception of integration that placed too great an emphasis on institutionalised arrangements and intergovernmental processes of region building. They argued outside Europe, regional integration was largely occurring through the commercial activities of non-state actors, and often without the need for the creation of formal regional organisations. What was needed was a new look at regionalism built on a wider set of case studies to generate new theoretical understandings.

TOWARDS A "NEW REGIONALISM" APPROACH

As such, the inability of existing integration theories to adequately explain process of regional integration outside Europe led to the emergence of a strand of literature in the

mid-1990s. This literature is often grouped together under the broad heading of "New Regionalism" – though not all authors explicitly use term to classify their work[9]. The term "New Regionalism" had first been used in the urban studies literature to refer to sub-national regional processes[10]. As far as I am aware (and of course, putting it on paper is a guarantee that I will be wrong), the first person to explicitly use the term in the international relations literature was Andrew Hurrell[11], although the wide use of the term owes much to the publications emerging from the UNU WIDER project on new regionalism[12]

Some of this literature explicitly focuses on comparisons of non-EU regional projects and regionalism in non-core areas of the global political economy[13]. But although Warleigh has argued that to Europeanists have shied away from deploying new regionalism perspectives to re-analyse Europe[14], the overarching intention is not to ignore the European experience, but rather to enrich integration theory through comparative analyses of more recent processes of integration occurring in Southern Africa, North America, Latin America and East Asia/Asia Pacific. Whilst some of the resulting theories and approaches have much on common with earlier theories and approaches, if for no other reason the "new regionalism" was new because most of the case studies it drew from were "new" experiments in region building.

Characteristics of the New Regionalism

Given the now relatively large literature on new regionalism, it is difficult to pull out a single understanding of what the approach actually stands for – or indeed, if it can be considered to represent a clear single coherent approach at all[15]. One of the key difficulties in trying to generalise is because there is no attempt to find a once and for

all explanation or theory. In this respect, it is not a theory but a framework – a framework which not only allows for diversity, but indeed emphasises the fact that there is no single answer; no single set of relationships; no single simple understanding. As Katzenstein argues:

> "Because they often mediate between national and global effects, regional effects, as in the story of Goldilocks, are neither too hot, nor too cold, but just right"[16]

This understanding draws the researcher into considering, particularly through comparative approaches, how different sets of relationships emerge with different balances of power between actors in different and specific historical, geographical, social and political contexts. So although it is possible to attempt to draw out the main characteristics of the new regionalism approach, caveats about over-simplifying the debate and different interpretations within this broadly defined approach obviously apply.

Ism and Isation – Form and Process

The distinction between regionalism and regionalisation is now broadly accepted in the literature. Regionalism is largely considered to refer to formalised regions with formally agreed membership and boundaries that emerge as a result of intergovernmental dialogues and treaties. While such formal regions will necessarily encompass some form of institutionalisation, there is no conception that a specific form/type/amount of institutionalisation is required to qualify as a "proper" region. Rather, the interest is in what factors explain the wide variation in the institutional level of regions[17].

While regionalism refers to the form, regionalisation refers to the processes by which societies and economies become integrated – particularly but not only in the economic sphere. Perhaps the best definition comes from Vayrynen, who argues that:

> "The process of regionalization fills the region with substance such as economic interdependence, institutional ties, political trust, and cultural belonging"[18]

Such regionalisation and economic integration in particular can occur without the creation of formal political regionalism. They are "regions without prescribed or proscribed borders" [19] based on "transnational flows and networks"[20] rather than cartography and political borders[21]. Here the example of economic integration in East Asia is particularly important, as regionalisation has not only taken place without regionalism, with "Virtually no commercial agreements …. among East Asian countries prior to the mid-1990s"[22], and has been relatively unhindered by the political rivalries across the Taiwan Straits.

Clearly, regionalism and regionalisation are not necessarily mutually exclusive. Indeed, "old regionalism" (if we can call it that) scholars saw the emergence of regionalism as a response to regionalisation. Neofunctionalists and neoliberal institutionalists share a conviction that as economic regionalisation occurs, states often move towards co-operation to find regional solutions to common problems. In other cases, there is the suggestion that regionalism *creates* regionalisation through the reduction of transaction costs in economic activity between member states[23], and the creation of a form of regional identity.

However, not all regional projects have created regionalisation, and to a large extent, the success of a regional organisation depends on the extent to which regionalism is accompanied by regionalisation. For example, Manoli[24] has shown that although the Parliamentary Association of Black Sea Economic Cooperation (PABSEC)[25] has formally recognised boundaries, an institutionalised structure, and a permanent secretariat, the economies of member states are no more integrated than before the creation of PABSEC in 1993. The formal region is mapped on top of different processes of economic regionalisation that pull member states' economies more towards extra-regional economies (particularly the EU) than to each other. Bull notes a similar lack of real integration in Central America:

> "Central American formal integration has not been followed by a more spontaneous regionalisation, understood as `the growth of societal integration within a region and to the often undirected process of social and economic interaction' .In consequence, as the official integration process stalled, the regional project in Central America lost its dynamism"[26]

Thus, a key question for students of new regionalism is why regionalisation leads to regionalism or vice versa in some cases and not in others (with no assumption of convergence towards a single form) – explaining difference rather than predicting convergence remains at the heart of much of this work.

Actors

The distinction between regionalism and regionalisation draws attention to whose interests are served by regional projects, and who are the main actors. It is obvious that intergovernmental agreements are signed by governments. When it comes to regionalisation, the focus of attention moves to the role of non-state actors, and

particular the investment and trade decisions of non-state economic actors. Economic integration, and possibly the formal regional projects that flow from such integration, are seen as largely driven by the market, rather than by states.

It is perhaps worth noting here that this does not entail a Kenich Ohmaesque hyperglobalisation perspective. In "The End of the Nation State" Ohmae argued that governments were now irrelevant in shaping economic activity, and that markets would emerge that span national borders – region states – through natural economic activity. New regionalism scholars reject such an elimination of the state as unimportant. States play an essential role in creating the environment in which non-state actors can pursue their interests. For example, taxes are not lowered (or removed) on their own and money can only be freely exchanged across national political borders if governments allow it (well, legally at least). Neither do ports, roads and railways build themselves. Although specifically commenting on globalisation rather than regionalisation, the findings of a German Budestag report are germane here. The report concluded that the hard infrastructure that is so necessary for the physical transportation of goods is usually funded by governments rather than by the private sector and that:

> "The growing worldwide integration of economies came not by any law of nature – it has been the result of active and deliberate policies".[27]

National and local governments across the world have implemented numerous policy initiatives to facilitate increased transnational economic relationships – to open their national economic space and to encourage regionalisation. Indeed, Helen Milner has correctly pointed to the importance of domestic politics in explaining the development

(or not) of regionalism[28]. Solingen similarly emphasises the importance of domestic coalitions' regional preferences, arguing that the structure of the regional order will reflect either liberal-internationalist, statist-internationalist, or mixed forms of governance depending on the balance between economic cooperation and political accommodation on one hand, and economic cooperation and conflict on the other[29]. For Gamble and Payne, the new regionalism should be understood as a state strategy to simultaneously respond to national political pressures and the internationalised structure of the global political economy (and in particular, internationally mobile finance capital). Nevertheless, it is non-state economic actors that decide whether to respond or not, and where they are going to invest. As Walter Mattli argues, allowing non-state actors to get on with economic activity is essential if economic regionalisation is going to occur (either as a precursor to, or result of regionalism).

The state then (at both national and local levels) acts as a facilitator of regional economic integration, but non-state actors determine the extent to which that regionalisation actually occurs. As Hurrell puts it:

> "... seldom unaffected by state policies, the most important driving forces for economic regionalization come from markets, from private trade and investment flows, and from the policies and decisions of companies"

Although somewhat critical of the emphasis on economic actors at the expense of other non-state actors, Shaw argues that such a concern with different types of actors is one of the key characteristics of the new regionalism approach. Rather than just focussing on state actors and intergovernmentalism – his charge against traditional studies of regional integration, rather we should concentrate on:

> "a trio of heterogeneous actors: not just states (& interstate global & regional institutions) but also economic structures (eg multinational corporations (MNCs) & informal sectors) and civil societies from international non-governmental organisations (INGOs) to grass-roots movements. To be sure the balance among this trio varies between regions & issue-areas & over time but none of them can be excluded or overlooked in any ongoing relationship in either Africa or elsewhere"

Regionalisation, Globalisation and Capitalism

In his critique of mainstream European integration theories, Peter Cocks took issue what he perceived to be the ahistorical basis of most studies. Starting from a Marxist perspective, Cocks argued that in many ways the distinction between state building and regional building was artificial as both were essentially concerned with allowing capitalism to flourish, and legitimating the hegemony of the capitalist mode of production:

> "I conceive successful political integration in Europe since the sixteenth century as a method of state-building at the national and international level. It has performed two critical state functions: provision of the political infrastructure for the expansion of productive forces in protocapitalist and capitalist societies; and an appropriate means for legitimating the power necessary to maintain the social relations integral to these societies"[30]

As the above discussion on actors perhaps indicates, many of the new regionalism scholars share Cocks' interest in the relationship between regional formation and capitalism. Whilst not necessarily sharing Cocks' Marxist ontology, the work of

Marxian (and particularly Gramscian) scholars have been highly influential – not least amongst them, Robert Cox and his conceptions of world order.

Hurrell began his influential 1995 paper by citing Salvatore[31] and Friedberg[32], who had both argued that protectionism built on regional trade blocs were the future of the world rather than globalisation. As will be discussed in more detail below, financial crises in Asia and Latin America in the late 1990s have resulted in considerations of the way in which regional cooperation/agreements can act as a bulwark against the worst excesses of unregulated global capitalism. But in general, rather than perceiving of globalisation and regionalism as contended forces, most scholars instead perceive them to be symbiotic in nature[33].

On one level, regionalisation and globalisation are seen as largely driven by the same processes[34] defined by Oman as "the ongoing development …. of post-Taylorist "flexible" approaches to the organization of production within and between firms'[35] that have facilitated the ongoing de-territorialisation of production. In this respect, regionalisation can be perceived on one level as the localised manifestation of wider global processes. As Smart argues:

> "capitalist practices are embedded in local structures, and that certain contexts can generate new and vibrant variations upon the theme of capitalism. If nothing else, globalization produces a considerably diverse set of local outcomes"[36]

On another level, domestic policies relating to both regionalism and regionalisation are often shaped by globalisation – and in particular, the desire to participate in the global capitalist economy. For Bowles, the hegemony of neoliberalism provides the

key to understanding the growth of regional projects and processes, and in particular, the enthusiasm of developing states elites for such projects:

> "By 1991 the purpose of forming a regional trading bloc was no longer premised on the need to be more independent of the global economy but rather seen as a measure to ensure continued participation in it. The fear of developing countries was no longer one of dependence on the global economy but rather was seen as a measure to ensure continued participation in it."[37]

In terms of regionalism, this is manifest in the desire of many less developed states to join regional organisations that guarantee access to large markets, even if the prid pro quo for gaining membership is introducing domestic economic liberalisation. On one level, this is evident in accepting the criteria required to join "closed" regional projects such as the EU and NAFTA. On another, it is evident in those avowedly "open" regional projects designed to promote neoliberalism and accelerate liberalisation where any liberalisation measures apply to all other economies, not just members – for example, APEC:

> "The 'new regionalism' eschewed previously protectionist models in favour of 'open regionalism', that is, the pursuit of trade deals that were compatible with multilateralism and that did not formally discriminate against third parties…. It is distinguished from the 'old' regionalism (based on protectionism, sealed internal markets or security communities) by an openness to global capitalism and by the porosity of the emergent regionalist formations to global norms[38].

In short, regionalism is seen as:

> "a tool in the process of the internationalisation of the state, in which national political practices are adjusted to the exigencies of the global economy and the main source of state legitimacy becomes external actors and institutions"[39].

"North-South" Regions

The changing policy preference of elites in many developmental states has resulted in another key characteristic of new regionalism. The desire to gain access to lucrative markets in and investment from more developed states has resulted in what Hurrell considered to be one of the defining features of the new regionalism in practice – regionalism that cuts across the North-South divide[40]. Through the extension of the European Community to include the "Southern" (or at least, relatively less developed) states of Spain, Portugal and Greece in the 1980s (not to mention the more recent expansion of the EU), the inclusion of Mexico in the NAFTA, and the evolution of East Asian regionalisation have all created regional projects that tie (to varying degrees) economic peripheries to regional cores. For the less developed economies in the region, this can create an asymmetric dependence on their more developed neighbours – but a dependence that is not only tolerated, but actively promoted by state elites as the best way of generating economic growth.

The Post-Washington Consensus Consensus

The above analysis points to regions as a conduit for the expansion of neoliberal economic policies built on a conception of the hegemony of neoliberalism both in terms of policy and ideology[41]. Whilst this understanding still holds true today, a new tone entered the emerging literature on new regionalisms in the late 1990s. The financial crises that hit, to greater or lesser extents, East Asia, Russia and Latin America led many policy makers as well as academics to question the legitimacy, validity and efficacy of the post-Washington consensus.

The rethink did not entail a rejection of the neoliberal discourse – far from it. But:

> "the financial crises propelled a renewed emphasis on the agency of state and non-state actors in directing, managing, perhaps mitigating the impact of the specific types of global economic activity that dominated the 1990s. In short, there appears to be underway a rethinking of development models and policy principles, as well as the institutional configurations associated with them"[42]

The idea that globalisation was not only inevitable but beneficial for development came into question. Furthermore, the efficacy of the policy descriptions from the international financial institutions to deal with the crises also came into question. The idea that the crises could be overcome by more liberalisation – if you like, more globalisation – was resisted by those who thought that too much or too fast liberalisation had been a key cause of the crises in the first place.

Furthermore, the solutions promoted by the IFIs were considered by some to be politically loaded. As Western developed states both dominated the decision making processes of the IFIs and largely shaped their ideological preferences, post-crises prescriptions were sometimes perceived as a means of enforcing "proper" Anglo-American capitalism on states that had developed different forms of capitalism aimed at protecting domestic interests in one way or another[43]. Despite the fact that neither ASEAN not APEC was able or prepared to offer regional solutions independent of those prescriptions offered by the IFIs, there nevertheless emerged in many parts of the world a desire to create regional alternatives to dependence on the Westerncentric IFIs.

The idea of region as both a conduit for liberalisation and a mode of resisting liberalisation might appear to be contradictory. But what is being resisted is unfettered liberalisation (or globalisation), not the neoliberal project *per se*. As such, regions can be perceived as a mediating layer of governance between national and global economies[44] - what Helen Wallace refers to as a "filter for globalisation"[45]

Regionalism and Multi-level Governance

Despite the fact that the European project has been characterised by the evolution of a single European Union, Helen Wallace argues that within the EU, there are different locations of governance and multiple layers and levels of integration[46]. On one level, individual member states remained crucial levels of governance, and had obstinately refused to wither away as some early theorists of integration theory had prediction. More importantly for this study, different levels and layers of integration between member states exists under the overarching umbrella of the European Union. For example, even before the expansion of the EU from 15 to 25 in may 2004, not all member states had joined the Schengen zone, and not all member states had adopted the single currency. Moreover, the EU is not the only regional project in Europe. When it comes to security, you cannot simply map the European members of NATO on top of a map of EU member states and expect the two to coincide.

This understanding of multiple levels of regional governance provides yet another characteristic of the new regionalism literature. Here the "new" approaches have something on common with understandings of regional integration that predate the "old" analyses of European integration. In proposing a solution to the problems of the Tennessee Valley in the Great Depression, Mitrany argued that form should follow

function. For example, if the problem was electricity generation, then an authority should be established that only dealt with issues relating to electricity generation. If another problem was poverty alleviation amongst farmers, then a separate organisation should be established with jurisdiction over only germane issues. Each organisation should be functionally discrete with the membership and organisation of each differing and shaped by the specific function at hand.

Mitrany's approach was challenged on two grounds. First, how is it possible to separate out functionally discrete issues? How can you deal with poverty alleviation without considering land usage, environmental issues, fiscal regimes, and other issues – including in this case electricity generation? Rather than creating functionally discrete organisations, what is really needed is holistic organisations that can coordinate affairs over a wide range of interconnected issues. Second, and very much related, even if functionally discrete organisations were established based on technical expertise in the first instance, their authority would inevitably spillover into other forms of authority and governance – just as the technological expertise in the functionally discrete European Coal and Steel Community eventually spilt over into the establishment of the European Union.

As already noted, new regionalism scholars reject the necessary and inevitable spillover into an EU style form of regional governance in all cases. Rather, and building on Coxian approaches to World Order[47], the real world of new regionalisms is characterised by multiple forms, layers and levels of integration. This is partly a result of different functional arrangements. Most obviously, the security region might differ widely from the broadly defined economic region. But so too might the region

of production differ from the financial region generating different types of region with different memberships and different levels of institutionalisation.

But it is also a result of different levels of "region" – both writ small and writ large. At the lower level, much of the real integration that is taking place between economies is not between the economies of two or more nation states[48]. Rather, it often occurs between sub-national entities across national boundaries. Thus, for example, Tijuana becomes integrated with San Diego across the Mexico-USA border to a much greater extent than the Mexican and US economies become integrated as a whole. Indeed, in the case of integration between parts of southern China and Hong Kong, it can be argued that parts of China are now more integrated with external economies than they are with the rest of the domestic Chinese economy. Whilst much of this microregional integration occurs without the creation of formal regional mechanisms (microregionalisation) there are many cases of formal microregionalism – for example, Southern African development corridors and the ASEAN "growth triangles".

At the higher level, the coexistence of different forms of region at different levels has resulted in overlapping regional membership. For example, if we conceive of APEC as a regional organisation (and I'm not sure that we should), then its wide geographic reach means that its member states are all simultaneously members of smaller more discrete regional organisations. Even if we discount APEC, then we can see that the concept of multiple regional memberships still holds true. For example, Malaysia is involved in ASEAN growth triangles, in ASEAN itself, in the fast track for the ASEAN Free Trade Area liberalisation (as opposed to the slower track for the new

members), the ASEAN regional forum, ASEAN Plus Three, the ASEAN China Free Trade Agreement, the East Asia Economic Caucus, ASEM, APEC, the Asian Development Bank, the Colombo Plan and probably others that I have forgotten here[49].

Regional Identity

The majority of new regional studies are undertaken by scholars who work in the broadly defined field of international political economy. It is perhaps not surprising then that the majority of the work produced by these scholars is primarily concerned with economic dimensions of regionalism and regionalisation. However, despite the emphasis on economics, there is also a related focus on the importance of identity that draws from the work of social constructivists and the importance of imagined or cognitive regions

There is a general agreement that the cohesion of a region in large part depends on a shared sense of regional identity – a shared belied that the members of a region have something in common that binds them together and marks them out as in some way different from non-members. Building on Adler's work (and his collaborations with Barnett)[50], the sources of regional identity are most often defined in cultural terms. Cultural affinity can emerge from shared histories, languages, religions and so on. But it is often constructed in opposition to an "other" – be that a shared common security threat and the construction of imagined security communities, or a shared rejection of dominant values and norms. For example, for all that divides East Asian states, a shared rejection and in some places suspicion of dominant Western values

and norms can provide a basis for agreeing on what is to be rejected. If Asian Values is a basis for a cognitive region, it is not built on "what we are", but "what we are not".

New Regionalism and the cognitive come together when the shared common challenge is economic. This might also entail values – a rejection of the free market liberal form of capitalism championed by western states both bilaterally and through the IFIs. Or it might entail a recognition that the national economy is not and cannot be isolated from what happens in other regional economies – as was the case in the Asian Financial crisis.

What is not clear is when identity is important. Is a shared identity a necessary precursor for the creation of a region, or is it something that consolidates and holds the region together once it has been formed. Moreover, does a shared identity create the region, or does the region create identity? Nor is it clear who identity is important for. Does it matter that normal individual citizens do not have a sense of regional identity if finance ministers do and coordinate national economic policies accordingly, or investment managers do and develop their corporate strategies according? If not, then a subsidiary question is whose region is it?

New Regionalism and Security

In some respects, interest in new regionalism emerged from security debates. On one level, the end of the Cold War is the starting point for many scholars. For some scholars, the question was whether regional orders might fill the void and balance the power of the United States in a unipolar world after the collapse of the Soviet Union[51]. More generally, the shift from a bipolar geostrategic environment to a unipolar

geoeconomic environment provided the context for the promotion of neoliberal globalisation (which has largely generated the renewed interest in regionalism). It also removed the superpowers from parts of the world (or superpower as the Soviet Union's removal is more evident that the United State's) allowing regional projects to re-emerge in Africa, the Middle East, and Southeast Asia unhindered by superpower interference[52]. On another level, the economic focus of new regional studies was in some ways a response to a perceived dominance of security discourses on regionalism within the international relations community[53].

Having said that, perhaps the biggest and the most valid criticism of the new regionalism approach is its relative lack of attention to the security realm. As noted above, there is a relatively large literature in the related constructivist field considering the importance of identity and security[54]. And the fourth volume in the UN/Wider project on new regionalism does contain contributions that fall firmly in the security field[55]. But as is befitting the "new" regionalism approach, often inspired by "new" political economy, "new" security issues and human security typically come to the fore in the literature[56]. In this respect, security is often closely related to developmental concerns when security is raised as an issue in new regionalism discourses.

CHINA AND (NEW) REGIONALISM(S)

Multiple Forms of Regional Integration

The most obvious implication of applying new regional approaches to China and East Asian regionalism is that Europe does not have to be the only benchmark and model for what might be Asia's future. Asking if Asia might develop a regional organisation

akin to the EU is an interesting question – but not the only question. And if the answer is “no”, then this does not mean that Asia has no regional future.

What the European case does show is that the political/economic region and the security region do not coincide - or at least, do not yet coincide despite many years of formal integration in the EU. And whilst the new regionalisms literature largely leaves security studies to others, the disjuncture between security regions and other regional forms in East Asia is marked and, I suggest, likely to persist. It is particularly notable that of China’s partners in the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation[57], only Russia is usually discussed in analyses of East Asian regionalism – and even then only rarely and usually to explain why it isn’t being considered. Whilst this suggests a concrete example of the disjuncture between security and other regions, it also leads us towards a number of other issues.

As China increasingly defines security in terms other than just guns bombs and bullets, conceptions of what might form a security region will change. The issue of economic security will be dealt with in detail later in this paper, and the focus will be on relations with other East Asian economies. And indeed, the majority of studies of China and regionalism focus on relationships with East Asian neighbours (for good reasons). But China’s regional future does not just have to be with the rest of Asia. For example, in addition to more traditional security concerns, the search for energy security concerns might also lead China towards regional cooperation with Central Asian neighbours.

Russia is not only China's regional partner in the SCO, but also in the Tumen River Delta Project. Although little concrete regional integration has actually taken place in the TRDP for a number of reasons[58], the project does remind us of two important points. First, China's neighbours are not all Asian neighbours, and at least one of China's regional futures might be in a partnership with non-Asian states/economies. Second, it is not a matter of regional cooperation with East Asia **or** Central Asia**.** Individual states can be and are members of multiple sometimes overlapping regional organisations, and there is no reason why China will not develop deeper regional cooperation with both her Central and East Asian neighbours in the future, based on the different functional objectives of each region.

These multiple regions can also exist at different levels. By this, I refer back to the concept of microregionalism and the argument that regions do not have to encompass entire national entities working together. Though the TRDP has been largely unsuccessful in its own terms, it draws attention to the importance of different processes of microregional integration that tie (or attempt to tie) parts of China to other economies (or parts of national economies). So it is not just a question of considering multiple forms of region, but multiple forms at different levels and the way that they interact with each other.

Furthermore, as I have discussed in more detail elsewhere, we need to think about how different forms of microregional integration interact with those parts of the national economy that are not participating in microregional processes[59]. When we think of regionalism and regionalisation, we inevitably think about integration. But if only parts of a national economy are becoming integrated into wider transnational

networks of economic activity with weak linkages back to other parts of the domestic economy, then one of the consequences of regional economic integration might be national economic fragmentation.

China and East Asian Regionalism(s)

Having said this, the main focus of studies of China's regional future focuses on relations with the ASEAN states, Japan and South Korea (with the tricky issue of Taiwan often simply ignored). As with the wider discussions of new regionalisms, the end of the Cold War marked a key turning point in analyses of East Asian regionalisms. For example, the transition from the geo-strategic context of cold war politics that spawned the creation of ASEAN to a geo-economic context means that ASEAN has in many ways outlived its use – or its original use at least. With the incorporation of former enemies into ASEAN and a move towards economic cooperation with China (as well as South Korea and Japan), much of the original raison d'étre for the organisation has gone to be replaced by new economic/development rationales.

ASEAN's search for a role as a mechanism of regional economic governance has borne some fruits. But as Webber (2001) argues, the failure of ASEAN as an organisation to act in any meaningful manner to the financial crises of 1997 exposed many of its institutional and political flaws. Moreover, Webber also points to the inaction of APEC during the crisis, suggesting that both the 'small' and "big" versions of regional governance failed to provide any form of effective governance when it was most needed. And when US pressure stymied Japanese proposals to establish an Asian Monetary Fund in 1997, regional states were left with no regional solutions and

instead had no option but to accept the type of solutions imposed by western dominated financial institutions.

Although the failure of ASEAN and APEC to find effective and/or acceptable solutions to the financial crisis had much to do with political will and their institutional frameworks, there is also an extent to which they were the wrong size. In short, ASEAN was too small and APEC was too big. But recognising the limitations of existing organisations is quite a different thing from establishing an effective new replacement that is the right size and contains the necessary political will and institutions to act.

Defining a regional identity: Asian Values?

On one level, it is difficult to identify what the limits of a regional organisation should be before it is created. Often, as was the case with South East Asia, our acceptance of what constitutes that region develops after the event. In the case of South East Asia, a broadly accepted definition of the parameters of the region emerged as a consequence of first colonisation, subsequently the command structure of military forces during the second world war[60], and more latterly, ASEAN. In other cases, definitions and understandings emerge as a result of outside influences.

In the case of East Asia, the initiative to establish the Asian Europe Meeting (ASEM) process necessitated Asia deciding where it was, and who was in it. While ASEM may have produced little in tangible results other than the establishment of a conference circuit allowing academics to travel the world, it did at least result in the (or perhaps a) definition of Asia by Asian state elites themselves. The exclusion of the

Australasian states from the Asia that participates in ASEM against the expressed wishes of Australasian elites was a sign of the rejection of the concept of the Pacific as a focus of region. The absence of the South Asian states, this time by choice rather than exclusion resulted in an exclusionary definition of Asia for the purposes of ASEM with a membership that increasingly corresponds with conceptions of which states should become involved in establishing a collective regional economic governance – an issue we will return to later.

The rejection of Australasia from the ASEM process also draws attention to conceptions of values, belief systems, and power. It was a decision not just based on geography, but also more importantly on conceptions of what Asia was not. On one level, Asia was not white. Perhaps more importantly, Asian polity was not built on the precepts of individualism and liberal democracy and Asian economies were not built on the form of capitalisms that dominate in the Anglo-Saxon part of Pacific Asia. Much has been written about the concept of Asian Values, and whether it simply provides an artificial justification for the maintenance of authoritarianism, and it is not my intention to repeat them here. However, I do think that it is important to point to the widespread rejection of "Western" values that many – and not just state elites – saw as a deliberate tool of Western hegemony even before 1997. To be sure there are many differences between the many different values in the region – not least the different values held by different groups in the region's multi-ethnic/religious states. But to a large degree, what binds the region together in terms of belief systems and economic systems that it rejects.

This understanding of a rejectionary concept of Asia in large part inspired Mahathir Mohamad's proposals to establish an East Asia Economic Group in 1990. Though ultimately side-lined into a caucus within APEC, not least as a result of Japanese hesitancy over the impact on relations with the US, the concept of an Asian Asia in opposition to the wide and inclusionary Pacific Asia conception of APEC dominated by the US remains attractive to many in the region.

Defining a regional identity: the emergence of a financial region

Whilst cultural values might be important in shaping some form of regional identity, I suggest that it is in the economic realm that regional elites have developed a shared conception of what constitutes the region, and how regional cooperation can ensure national economic security. In particular, notwithstanding the original intentions of its architects[61], APEC has evolved into an organisation which, at best, does little to provide economic security for its East Asian members and, at worst, might be conceived as an organisation that prevents the formation of a real East Asian regional group.

The financial crises also confirmed for the Chinese leadership that what happens in the region has significant consequences for China, sparking new debates over the nature of "economic security"[62] (Fewsmith, 1998: Zha, 1999). Not least because of what happened to relative exchange rates after 1997, working together to head off potential crises at a regional level is increasingly seen as being in China's own self-interest – especially if such regional cooperation can mitigate the need to rely on the US dominated global financial institutions in times of crisis.

This shared conception that national economic security should be increasingly understood within a regional framework is reflected in the increasingly institutionalised nature of relations within the East Asian region. A key initiative here is the Chiang Mai Initiative (CMI), which was finally agreed by APT finance ministers in May 2000. The CMI allows signatory states to borrow US dollars from other members' reserves to buy their own currency, thus providing a bulwark against global financial flows and speculative attacks[63]. As the CMI works through the creation of bilateral swap deals, it is not strictly speaking a regional organisation. However, these bilateral processes exist under a regional umbrella, and can be considered in combination to constitute what Dent has termed "lattice regionalism"[64] Although a similar swap process existed within ASEAN prior to the CMI, the reason for its expansion, and another example of why China matters, is quite straightforward – when consensus was reached in 2000, China's foreign reserves were greater than the entire reserves of all ASEAN states combined (and Japan's reserves were even greater).

The CMI is important for three reasons. First, it suggests a growing recognition of how national economic fortunes cannot be isolated and insulated from what happens in the rest of the region. Second, it suggests a rejection of global solutions in favour of regional mechanisms for resolving (or heading off) regional crises. Third, it suggests a shared recognition of what the region actually is (and what is not part of the region) that has become quasi-formalised through the ASEAN Plus Three (APT) process (through which the CMI was arranged). While Taiwan remains absent due to the intergovernmental nature of APT discussions it has evolved into a major – and

notwithstanding the persistence of APEC perhaps ***the*** major – forum for regional dialogue and consultation[65].

Defining the Region: A region of production?

Of course, the APT is about more than just financial cooperation. The evolution of a region of production is also a key element in the evolution of China's participation in and cooperation with East Asian regional organisations, and led to the proposals to create an ASEAN-China Free Trade Area (ACFTA). First proposed at the Manila summit in 1999, the ACFTA initiative took on a new impetus with the signing of the Framework Agreement on ASEAN-China Comprehensive Economic Cooperation at the Eighth ASEAN Summit Meeting in Cambodia in 2002. ACFTA is conceived as a dual speed process, with initial common tariff reduction to be completed by 2006, and a full free trade area in place by 2013.

On the face of it, the ACFTA is an important symbol of China's importance for the regional economy, as well as an important practical step in fostering closer economic integration. It is intended to act as a spur to intra-regional investment and to increase access to the Chinese market for ASEAN producers – though the other side of the same coin is a fear that it might also lead to a new influx of Chinese imports. But ACFTA is in many ways a means to other ends, rather than just an end in itself. Stubbs notes that Japan was originally reluctant to join the APT process for fear of antagonizing the United States:

> "Although Japan was still reluctant to get involved, the Chinese government's agreement to take up ASEAN's invitation essentially forced Tokyo's hand. Beijing was interested in building on the economic ties that were developing with

> Southeast Asia and the Japanese government could not afford to let China gain an uncontested leadership position in the region."[66]

In a similar vein, ACFTA can be seen as a means of trying to force the Japanese government's hand and promote a type of Asian regionalism akin to the EAEG. Indeed, Mahathir is explicit in his desire to see ACFTA as a stepping-stone to a pan-Asian Free Trade area and to "go back to the original proposal for an East Asian Economic Group"[67]. Nevertheless, while AFCTA might be a means to an end for Mahathir, it is an important step towards ASEAN-China cooperation and regional economic integration in its own right.

Capitalism, Regionalism and Extra-Regional Actors

China's re-engagement with the global economy has played a key role in configuring both the regional economy as a whole, and the individual economies of regional states. Indeed, the impact of China's rise has been so great on some regional states that you begin to question whether it should lead to increased intra-regional conflict rather than cooperation. Lack of space forbids a detailed discussion of debates that will be familiar to the participants at this conference, so suffice to say that there is concern within the region that investment and jobs are being diverted to China, leading to a worrying increased dependence of many regional economies on China[68].

But like it or not, the particular way in which globalising state elites have inserted China into the global political economy has resulted in economic regionalisation – or perhaps more correctly, resulted in a new pattern of economic regionalisation. For example both the nature and destination of Thai exports has changed:

> "several labor-intensive manufactured exports shrunk….aggregate exports to the United States, Europe and Japan combined, comprising more than half of all Thai exports, stagnated, even as China expanded its share in those markets. Thailand successfully tapped into the expanding Chinese market. Thai exports to China grew by a blistering 24 percent [in 2002], comprising mostly of manufactures and relatively more technology-intensive products."[69]

The reality is that many of the ASEAN economies are increasingly dependent on China as a market. But at the same time (and notwithstanding the oft-stated fears of dependence on China), the Chinese economy is itself largely dependent on investment from and trade with the rest of the region (particularly in the form of components to produce exports).

The process of regionalisation of production is thus based on a complex web of relationships built on a hierarchy of asymmetric dependencies. It is a process that is driven by the investment and trade decisions of non-state economic actors, and the governmental policies put in place in regional states to facilitate private economic flows. As such, East Asian regionalisation can be conceived, in keeping with Cock's analysis of Europeanisation[70], as facilitating the expansion of capitalist productive forces built on the implicit acceptance of the hegemony of the neoliberal hegemonic project.

Crucially, this regionalisation is contingent on what happens outside the region, and a key issue for regional formation remains the crucial role of extra-regional actors in promoting the regional economic interaction that regional initiatives are at least in part concerned with addressing. Without external demand and, the formation of a

region of production centred on manufacturing in China would have taken on a very different form and moved at a different pace. And despite what investment statistics in East Asia appear to demonstrate, the region remains heavily dependent on technology and crucially finance capital from outside the region to fund the regionalisation of manufacturing[71]. As such, I suggest that if the APT process does continue to evolve into a more formalised regional project, its success will depend on first its continued devolution of economic authority to non-state actors, and second, its continued openness to extra-regional actors and the wider global economy.

CONCLUSION

In combination, the move towards currency swaps under the CMI on one hand and the movement towards a formal Free Trade Area and an informal region of production on the other demonstrate the tensions in contemporary regional projects. On one level, the region can be seen as a means of facilitating globalisation and neoliberal capitalism, whilst on another level, emerging regionalism can be seen as a means of providing a specifically regional means of providing economic security and a bulwark against uncontrolled global capital flows. And in this respect, the challenge of regional governance is no different from the challenges facing national governments – how to get the benefits of participation in the global economy without any of the potential damage.

Five main conclusions emerge from using New Regionalism perspectives to consider the case of China and East Asia. The first is that regional identity is important. Notwithstanding the potentially conflicting imperatives of globalising and regulating, there is a growing sense of regional identity in terms of what the region actually is – the starting point for any regional project. Even those nations that are suspicious of

either China's or Japan's (or both's) hegemonic aspirations in the region now largely accept that it is best to be tied to the hegemons than economically isolated and missing out.

As the following table suggests, there is a correlation between those economies involved in both formal economic regionalism and informal economic regionalisation in East Asia. The correlation is not total, and the question of which nations/economies will form the region in the future is incomplete. Quite apart from the huge question of Taiwan, where Myanmar, Laos and Cambodia fit remains a question for the future. Nevertheless, the concept of region defined as Asia-Pacific appears to have largely run its course, with the main purpose of APEC now appearing to be to embarrass national leaders by making them wear national costumes at summits.

ASEM	ASEAN+3	CMI*	Region of Production
Brunei	Brunei		
	Cambodia		
China	China	China[JK]	China
Hong Kong			Hong Kong
Indonesia	Indonesia	Indonesia[CJK]	Indonesia
Japan	Japan	Japan[CK]	Japan
	Laos		
Malaysia	Malaysia	Malaysia[CJK]	Malaysia
	Myanmar		
Philippines	Philippines	Philippines[CJK]	Philippines
Singapore	Singapore	Singapore[J]	Singapore
South Korea	South Korea	South Korea[CJ]	South Korea
Taiwan			Taiwan
Thailand	Thailand	Thailand[CHK]	Thailand
Vietnam	Vietnam		Vietnam?

* Those arrangements signed by C(hina), J(apan) or K(orea) with ASEAN states or each other.

Second, the relationship between regionalism and regionalisation is exposed by an examination of East Asia. So too is the importance of non-state actors in promotion regional integration alongside the formal political initiatives of national governments. Third, there is a need to ensure that any regional project is open to the wider global economy. East Asian new regionalism is built on a widespread acceptance of neoliberal capitalism, and designed to facilitate the capitalist mode of production – albeit a mode of capitalism that needs to be regulated. Fourth, the best way of ensuring this regulation is increasingly seen to be the regional rather than the global level. Finally, regional governance is characterised by multiple forms of overlapping regions, including different levels of region from the micro through the meso to the macro[72].

Notes and References

[1] See Richard Higgott (1998) "The International Political Economy of Regionalism: Europe and Asia Compared" in William Coleman and Geoffrey Underhill (eds) (1998) *Regionalism and Global Economic Integration:Europe, Asia, and the Americas* (London: Routledge)..

[2] William Wallace (1994) *Regional Integration: The West European Experience* (Brookings Institute, 1994).

[3] For more details on why Europe and new regionalisms should be studied together, see Alex Warleigh (2004) "In Defence of Intra-disciplinarity: 'European Studies', the 'New Regionalism', and the Issue of Democratisation" *Cambridge Review of International Affairs* 17 (2): 301-18.

[4] I should perhaps add here that this is not the fault of "Europeanists", but of those studying other areas that choose Europe as the main unit of comparison. Of course there are many more who (probably sensibly) eschew comparison and restrict their analyses to single cases. Though on a related issue, as Warleigh points out "With a few worthy exceptions, those involved in EU studies have barely made reference in their work to regional integration elsewhere. Warleigh (2004) "In Defence of Intra-disciplinarity": 302.

[5] Helen Wallace argues that the understanding of how Europe works is often informed by a study of formal processes which are heavily institutionalised, and ignores the many different levels and layers of more informal interaction. Helen Wallace (2000) "The Institutional Setting: Five Variations on a Theme", in Helen Wallace and William Wallace, (eds) *Policy-Making in the European Union (4th edition),* (Oxford: Oxford University Press): 3-37.

[6] Bela Balassa (1961) *The Theory of Economic Integration* (London: Allen and Unwin).

[7] Ben Rosamond (2000) *Theories of European Integration* (Basingstoke: Macmillan): 10.

[8] Andrew Gamble and Anthony Payne (eds) (1996) *Regionalism and World Order,* (Basingstoke, Macmillan).

[9] In addition to the works explicitly cited elsewhere in this paper, the analyses of new regionalisms draws from readings from the following sources. Alfredo Robles (2004) *The Political Economy of Interregional Relations: ASEAN and the EU* (Aldershot: Ashgate); Edward Mansfield and Helen Milner (eds) (1997) *The Political Economy of Regionalism* (New York: Columbia University Press); Finn Laursen (2003) (ed*) Comparative Regional Integration: Theoretical Perspectives* (Aldershot: Ashgate); Fredrik Soderbaum (2004) *The Political Economy of Regionalism: The Case of Southern Africa* (Basingstoke: Palgrave); Fredrik Söderbaum and Ian Taylor (eds) (2003) *Regionalism and Uneven Development in Southern Africa: The Case of the Maputo Development Corridor* (Aldershot: Ashgate); Fredrik Söderbaum and Timothy Shaw (eds) (2003) *Theories of New Regionalism: A Palgrave Reader* (Basingstoke: Palgrave); J. Andrew Grant and Fredrik Söderbaum (eds) (2003) *The New Regionalism in Africa* (Aldershot: Ashgate); David Francis (2001) *The Politics of Economic Regionalism: Sierra Leone in ECOWAS* (Aldershot: Ashgate); James Mittelman (ed) (2000) *The Globalization Syndrome: Transformation and Resistance* (Princeton: Princeton University Press); Louise Fawcett and Andres Hurrell (eds) (1996) *Regionalism in World Politics: Regional Organization and International Order* (Oxford: Oxford University Press); Meshack Khosa and Yvonne Muthien (1998) *Regionalism in the New South Africa* (Aldershot: Ashgate); Michael Schulz, Fredrik Söderbaum and Joakim Ojendal (2001) (eds) *Regionalization in a Globalizing World* (London: Zed); Morten Boas, Marianne Marchand, and Timothy Shaw (1999) "Special Issue: New Regionalisms in the New Millennium" *Third World Quarterly* 20 (5): 897-1070; Nicola Phillips (2001) "Regionalist Governance in the New Political Economy of Development: 'Relaunching' Mercosur" *Third World Quarterly* 22 (4): 565–583; Nicola Phillips (2004) The Southern Cone Model: The Political Economy of Regional Capitalist Development in Latin America (London: Routledge); Peter Katzenstein (1997) "Introduction: Asian Regionalism in Comparative Perspective" in Peter Katzenstein and Takashi Shiraishi (eds) *Network Power: Japan and Asia* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press): 1-46; Sandra MacLean, Fahimul Quadir and Timothy Shaw (eds) (2001) *Crises of Governance in Asia and Africa* (Aldershot: Ashgate); Stephen Calleya (1997) *Navigating Regional Dynamics in the Post-Cold War World* (Aldershot: Dartmouth); Theodore Pelagidis and Harry Papasotiriou. (2002) "Globalization or Regionalism? States, Markets, and the Structure of International Trade" *Review of International Studies* 28 (3): 519–535; Tony Heron (2004) *The New Political Economy of United States-Caribbean*

Relations: The Apparel Industry and the Politics of NAFTA Parity (Aldershot: Ashgate); Walter Mattli (1999) *The Logic of Regional Integration: Europe and Beyond*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

10 For two good critique of this literature with an emphasis on the relationship between regionalism and globalisation, see Gordon MacLeod (2001) "New Regionalism Reconsidered: Globalization and the Remaking of Political Economic Space" *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 25 (4): 804-29 and Allen J. Scott and Michael Storper (2003) "Regions, Globalization, Development" *Regional Studies*, 37 (6&7): 579-593.

11 Andrew Hurrell (1995) "Explaining the Resurgence of Regionalism In World Politics" *Review of International Studies* 21 (4): 332.

12 For example, Bjorn Hettne, Andras Inotai and Osvaldo Sunkel (eds) (2000) *National Perspectives on the New Regionalism in the North* (Basingstoke: Macmillan); Bjorn Hettne, Andras Inotai and Osvaldo Sunkel (eds) (2000) *National Perspectives on the New Regionalism in the South* (Basingstoke: Macmillan); Björn Hettne, Andras Inotai and Osvaldo Sunkel (eds) (2001) *Comparing Regionalisms: Implications for Global Development* (London: Palgrave); Björn Hettne, Andras Sapir and Osvaldo Sunkel (eds) (1999) *Globalism and the New Regionalism* (New York: St. Martin's Press); Bjorn Hettne, Andres Inotai and Osvaldo Sunkel (eds) *National Perspectives on the New Regionalism in the Third World* (Basingstoke: Macmillan); and Bjorn Hettne, Andres Inotai and Osvaldo Sunkel (eds) (1999) *The New Regionalism and the Future of Security and Development* (Basingstoke: Palgrave).

13 For example, Glenn Hook and Ian Kearns (eds) (1999) *Subregionalism and World Order* (Basingstoke: Macmillan).

14 Warleigh, unpublished paper

15 And with all "new" approaches, it does not take long before the new becomes the old which requires a new critique. See, for example, Kanishka Jayasuriya (2004) *Governing the Asia Pacific: Beyond the "New Regionalism"* (Bastingstoke: Palgrave)

16 Peter Katzenstein (2002) "Regionalism in Asia" in Shaun Breslin *et al* (eds) *New Regionalisms in the Global Political Economy: Theories and Cases* (London: Routledge): 104

17 Hurrell (1995) "Explaining the Resurgence of Regionalism": 332.

18 Raimo Vayrynen (2003) "Regionalism: Old and New" *International Studies Review* 5: 39.

19 Ash Amin (2004) "Regions unbound: towards a new politics and place" *Geografiska Annaler B*, 86 (1): 34.

20 *Ibid*: 31.

21 Although Castells is not usually considered to be a new regionalism scholar, his understanding of how networks operate without and beyond physical spaces is also relevant here. Manuel Castells (1996) The Rise of the Network Society (Vol. I): The Information Age: Economy, Society, and Culture (Oxford: Blackwell).

22 Edward Mansfield and Helen Milner (1999) "The New Wave of Regionalism" *International Organization* 53 (3): 598.

23 Indeed, one of the main issues addressed in the economics literature is the extent to which preferential regional trading arrangements lead to trade and financial diversion..

24 Panagiota Manoli (2003) *The Formation of Black Sea Economic Cooperation: A Case of Subregionalism* (University of Warwick, Department of Politics and International Studies, PhD Thesis).

25 Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bulgaria, Georgia, Greece, Moldova, Romania, the Russian Federation, Turkey and Ukraine.

26 Benedicte Bull (1999) "`New regionalism' in Central America" *Third World Quarterly*, 20 (5): 958.

27 German Bundestag Study Commission (Select Committee), *Globalisation of the World Economy – Challenges and Responses* (2001) http://www.bundestag.de/gremien/welt/welt_zwischenbericht/zwb003_vorw_einl_engl.pdf

28 Helen Milner, 'International Theories of Cooperation among Nations: Strengths and Weaknesses', *World Politics*, Vol. 44, No. 3 (1992), pp.466-94.

29 Etel Solingen (1997) "Economic Liberalization, Political Coalitions, and Emerging Regional Order" in David Lake and Patrick Morgan (eds) *Regional Orders: Building Security in a New World* (Pennsylvania State University Press) and Etel Solingen (1998) Regional Orders at Century's Dawn: Global and Domestic Influences on Grand Strategy (Princeton: Princeton University Press). This interpretation of Solingen's work is taken from Vayrynen (2003) "Regionalism: Old and New": 36.

[30] Peter Cocks (1980) "Towards a Marxist Theory of European Integration" *International Organization*, 34 (1): 4.

[31] Dominick Salvatore (1993) "Protectionism and World Welfare: Introduction" in Dominick Salvatore (ed.) *Protectionism and World Welfare* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press): 10.

[32] Aaron Friedberg (1993-4) "Ripe for Rivalry: Prospects for Peace in a Multipolar Asia" in *International Security* 18 (3): 5.

[33] See James Mittelman (1996) "Rethinking the 'New Regionalism' in the Context of Globalization" *Global Governance* 2 (2):189–214, and Ralph Pettman (1999) "Globalism and Regionalism: The Costs of Dichotomy" in Bjorn Hettne, Andras Inotai and Osvaldo Sunkel (eds) Globalism and the New Regionalism (Basingstoke: Macmillan).

[34] Richard Florida (1995) "Toward the Learning Region" *Futures* 27, 527–36.

[35] Charles Oman (1999) "Globalization, Regionalization, and Inequality" in Andrew Hurrell and Ngaire Woods (eds) (1999) Inequality, Globalisation and World Politics, (Oxford, Oxford University Press): 36.

[36] Alan Smart (2000) "The Emergence of Local Capitalisms in China: Overseas Chinese Investment and Pattern of Development" in Si–Ming Li and Wing-Shing Tang (eds) *China's Regions, Polity, & Economy: A Study of Spatial Transformation in the Post-Reform Era*, (Hong Kong: University of Hong Kong Press) : 64.

[37] Paul Bowles (1997) "ASEAN, AFTA and the 'New Regionalism'", *Pacific Affairs*, 70 (2): 225.

[38] Jean Grugel (2004) "New Regionalism and Modes of Governance — Comparing US and EU Strategies in Latin America" *European Journal of International Relations*, 10 (4): 604 and 605.

[39] Benedicte Bull (1999) "`New Regionalism' in Central America" *Third World Quarterly*, 20 (5): 959.

[40] See also Jean Grugel and Wil Hout (eds) (1998) *Regionalism Across the North South Divide* (London: Routledge) and Bowles (1997) "ASEAN, AFTA and the 'New Regionalism'".

[41] Robert Cox (1999) "Civil Society at the Turn of the Millennium: Prospects for an Alternative", R*eview of International Studies*, 25 (1): 12.

[42] Nicola Phillips (2002) "Governance After Financial Crisis: South American Perspectives on the Reformulation of Regionalism" in Shaun Breslin *et al* (eds) *New Regionalisms in the Global Political Economy: Theories and Cases* (London: Routledge): 66.

[43] Richard Higgott (1998) "The Asian Economic Crisis: A Study in the Politics of Resentment" *New Political Economy* 3 (3): 333-356.

[44] See Peter Katzenstein (1996) "Regionalism in Comparative Perspective" *Cooperation and Conflict* 31 (2): 123–160; and Robert Lawrence(1996) *Regionalism, Multilateralism and Deeper Integration* (Washington DC: Brookings).

[45] Helen Wallace (2002): Europeanisation and Globalisation: Complementary or Contradictory Trends?" in Shaun Breslin *et al* (eds) *New Regionalisms in the Global Political Economy: Theories and Cases* (London: Routledge): 149.

[46] *Ibid*: 144-5.

[47] In particular, Chapters Six and Seven of Robert Cox with Timothy Sinclair (1996) *Approaches to World Order* (Cambridge University Press).

[48] See, for example, Shaun Breslin and Glenn Hook (eds) (2002) Microregionalism and World Order (Basingstoke: Palgrave); Markus Perkmann and Ngai-Ling Sum (eds) (2002) Globalization, Regionalization and Cross-Border Regions (Basingstoke: Palgrave); Myo Thant, Min Tang, and Hiroshi Kakazu (eds) (1994) Growth Triangles in Asia: A New Approach to Regional Economic Cooperation (Oxford: Oxford University Press); Chia Siow Yue (1997) "Regionalism and Subregionalism in ASEAN: The Free Trade Area and Growth Triangle Models" in Ito Takatoshi and Anne Krueger (eds) Regional Versus Multilateral Trade Arrangements (Chicago: University of Chicago Press); Fredrik Söderbaum and Ian Taylor (eds) (2003) Regionalism and Uneven Development in Southern Africa: The Case of the Maputo Development Corridor (Aldershot: Ashgate); James Scott (1999) "European and North American Contexts for Cross-border Regionalism" in Regional Studies: The Journal of the Regional Studies Association, 33 (7): 605-617.

[49] International (rather than regional) organisations such as the Commonwealth and the Group of 15 non-aligned states are not considered to be a regional organisation here.

[50] For example, Emanuel Adler (1997) "Imagined (Security) Communities: Cognitive Regions in International Relations" *Millennium* 26 (2): 249–277; Emanuel Adler and Michael Barnett. (1998) "A Framework for the Study of Security Communities" in Emanuel Adler and Michael Barnett (eds) *Security Communities* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press); Emanuel Adler and Michael Barnett (2000) "Taking Our Critics Seriously" Cooperation and Conflict 35:321–323; Alexander Murphy (1991) "Regions as Social Constructs: The Gap Between Theory and Practice" Progress in Human Geography 15:22–35.

[51] For example, Richard Rosecrance and Peter Schott. (1997) "Concerts and Regional Intervention" in David Lake and Patrick Morgan (eds) *Regional Orders: Building Security in a New World* (Pennsylvania State University Press).

[52] Vayrynen (2003) "Regionalism: Old and New": 28.

[53] Thanks to Richard Higgott for this point.

[54] On identity and security in the Asian context, see Amitav Acharya (2001) Constructing a Security Community in Southeast Asia: ASEAN and the Problem of Regional Order (London: Routledge); Amitav Acharya (2003) Regionalism and Multilateralism: Essays on Cooperative Security in the Asia Pacific, 2nd edition (Singapore: Eastern Universities Press); and Muthiah Alagappa (ed) (1998) *Asian Security Practice: Material and Ideational Influence* (Stanford: Stanford University Press).

[55] Hettne *et al* (1999) *The New Regionalism and the Future of Security and Development*..

[56] For example, James Hentz and Morten Bøås (2003) *New and Critical Security and Regionalism Beyond the Nation State* (Aldershot: Ashgate).

[57] Russia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan and Uzbekistan.

[58] For details, see Christopher Hughes (2002) "Tumen River Area Development Programme (TRADP): Frustrated Microregionalism as a Microcosm of Political Rivalries" in Shaun Breslin and Glenn Hook (eds) *Microregionalism and World Order* (Basingstoke: Palgrave): 115-143; Gilbert Rozman (1998) "Flawed Regionalism: Reconceptualizing Northeast Asia in the 1990s" in *Pacific Review* 11 (1): 1-27; and Shaun Breslin (2000) "Decentralisation, Globalisation and China's Partial Engagement with the Global Economy" *New Political Economy* 5 (2): 205-26.

[59] Breslin (2000) "Decentralisation, Globalisation and China's Partial Engagement with the Global Economy" and Shaun Breslin (2004) "Greater China and the Political Economy of Regionalization" in *East Asia: An International Quarterly*.

[60] Philip Charrier (2001) "ASEAN's Inheritance: the Regionalization of Southeast Asia, 1941-61" The Pacific Review 14: 313-338.

[61] For a debate on what these intentions were, and whether Japan or Australia was the main force behind the formation of APEC, see Stuart Harris (2000) "Asian Multilateral Institutions and their Response to the Asian Economic Crisis" in *The Pacific Review* 13 (3): 495-516 and Ellis Krauss (2000) "Japan, the US, and the Emergence of Multilateralism in Asia" *The Pacific Review* 13 (3): 473-494.

[62] See Joseph Fewsmith "China in 1998: Tacking to Stay the Course" *Asian Survey* January/February: 99-113 and Zha Daojiong (1999) "Chinese Considerations of 'Economic Security'" *Journal of Chinese Political Science*, 5 (1) : 69-87.

[63] Wang Seok-Dong (2002) "Regional financial Cooperation in East Asia: the Chiang Mai Initiative and Beyond", in *UNESCAP Bulletin on Asia-Pacific Perspectives 2002/03: Asia-Pacific Economies: Sustaining Growth Amidst Uncertainties* (New York: United Nations): 93-100; Pradumna Rana (2002) *Monetary and Financial Cooperation in East Asia: the Chiang Mai Initiative and Beyond* (Asian Development Bank, Economics and Research Department Working Paper); Heribert Dieter (200) *Monetary Regionalism: Regional Integration Without Financial Crises* (University of Warwick, CSGR Working Paper No. 52/00).

[64] Though Dent was originally concerned with bilateral free trade agreements.

[65] On the evolution of ASEAN+3, see C Randall Henning (2002) *East Asian Financial Cooperation* (Washington: IIE) – particularly Chapter Three; Rodolfo C. Severino "An Emerging East Asian Community: Reality or Mirage?" in Rodolfo Severino (2001) *ASEAN Faces the Future: Collection of Speeches of Rodolfo C. Severino Jr., Secretary-General of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations* (Jakarta: The ASEAN Secretariat); Richard Stubbs (2002) "Asean Plus Three: Emerging East Asian Regionalism?" *Asian Survey* 42 (3): 440–455; Hadi Soesastro (2001), "Towards an East Asian Regional Trading Arrangement", in Simon Tay, Jesus Estanislao and Hadi Soesastro (eds.), *Reinventing ASEAN* (Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies): 226-242; Tsutomu Kikuchi (2002) "East Asian Regionalism: A

Look at the 'ASEAN plus Three' Framework" *Japan Review of International Studies* (Spring): 1-23; Yul Kwon (2004) "East Asian Regionalism Focusing on ASEAN Plus Three" *Journal of East Asian affairs* XVIII (1): 98-130; Mark Beeson (2003) "ASEAN Plus Three and the Rise of Reactionary Regionalism" *Contemporary Southeast Asia* 25 (2): 251-268; Derek McDougall (2002) "Asia-Pacific Security Regionalism: the Impact of post-1997 Developments" *Contemporary Security Policy* 23 (2): 113-134; Douglas Webber (2001) "Two Funerals and a Wedding? The Ups and Downs of Regionalism in East Asia and Asia-Pacific After the Asian Crisis" *Pacific Review* 14 (3): 339-372; Heribert Dieter and Richard Higgott (2003) "Exploring Alternative Theories of Economic Regionalism: from Trade to Finance in Asian Co-operation?" *Review of International Political Economy* 10 (3): 430-454; Takashi Terada (2003) "Constructing an 'East Asian' Concept and Growing Regional Identity: from EAEC to ASEAN+3" *Pacific Review* (16) 2: 251-277; Mark Berger (2003) "The New Asian Renaissance and its Discontents: National Narratives, Pan-Asian Visions and the Changing Post-Cold War Order" *International Politics* 40 (2): 195-222.

66 Richard Stubbs (2002) "ASEAN Plus Three: Emerging East Asian Regionalism?" *Asian Survey*, 42 (3): 443.

67 Mary Hennock (2001) "East Asian Pact Trades Up" *BBC News On-Line*, 7 November, http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/business/1641613.stm

68 I have provided more details in Shaun Breslin (2005) "Power and Production: Rethinking China's Global Economic Role" *Review of International Studies* (forthcoming).

69 World Bank (2003) "Thailand Economic Monitor, May 2003" http://www.worldbank.or.th/monitor/economic/2003may.shtml

70 Cocks (1980) "Towards a Marxist Theory of European Integration"

71 Something I have explored in more detail in Breslin (2004) "Greater China and the Political Economy of Regionalization" and Shaun Breslin (2005) "Power and Production": Rethinking China's Global Economic Role" *Review of International Studies* (forthcoming).

72 Linda Low (2003) "Multilateralism, Regionalism, Bilateral and Crossregional Free Trade Arrangements: All Paved with Good Intentions for ASEAN" *Asia Economic Journal* 17 (1): 65-86.