CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A. Problem Background

ASEAN established on August 8th, 1967 in the midst of growing tension between US leading West Block and USSR grasping East Block in Cold War. This regional architecture appeared as a real response in managing the cooperation among states in Southeast Asia when at that time it was just compiling 5 of 10 as Indonesia, Malaysia, Philippine, Singapore, and Thailand. But, the dream was to unite all states in this region on constructive interaction based on common interest for the future.

Prior to the establishment of ASEAN, there were some attempts done by countries in Southeast Asia in constructing the umbrella covering the whole region namely Association of Southeast Asia (ASA), compelling Malaysia, the Philippines, and which was initiated in 1961. It was desigenated as the first organization for regional cooperation in Southeast Asia. Khoman argued that the reason on why this region needs such kind of organizational body to maintain the interstate affairs are power vacuum due to withdrawal of the colonial powers, ineffectivity of co-operation among disparate members located in distant lands, self protection against big power rivalry, and the notion of cooperation and ultimately integration serving the interests of all where is something that individual efforts can never achieve.[1]

---

[1] Further readings in ASEAN History: S. Rajaratnam, "ASEAN: The Way Ahead", The ASEAN Reader (Singapore:Institute of Southeast Asian Studie , 1992), p.145

The need of having united Southeast Asia actually has been uttered by Narcisco Ramos, Philippine Secretary of Foreign Affairs in the initial days of ASEAN Establishment by stating:

> "The fragmented economies of Southeast Asia," he said, "(with) each country pursuing its own limited objectives and dissipating its meager resources in the overlapping or even conflicting endeavors of sister states carry the seeds of weakness in their incapacity for growth and their self-perpetuating dependence on the advanced, industrial nations. ASEAN, therefore, could marshal the still untapped potentials of this rich region through more substantial united action."[2]

As explained before that one of the concerns pertaining to the establishment of ASEAN was the appearance of external big power in the region which was at that time dominated by colonial's grip. Adam Malik, the foreign minister of Indonesia in that years, went on to describe Indonesia's vision of a Southeast Asia developing into "a region which can stand on its own feet, strong enough to defend itself against any negative influence from outside the region." Such a vision, he stressed, was not wishful thinking, if the countries of the region effectively cooperated with each other, considering their combined natural resources and manpower. He referred to differences of outlook among the member countries, but those differences, he said, would be overcome through a maximum of goodwill and understanding, faith and realism. Hard work, patience and perseverance, he added, would also be necessary.[3]

---

[2] ASEAN Secretariat, The Founding of ASEAN, retrieved from http://www.aseansec.org/7069.htm on December 29th, 2010
[3] ibid

Those idea from the founding seems stand on the foundation and stepping line for ASEAN to move forward aftermath.

Moreover, citing the Tun Abdul Razak's perspective on the ASEAN unity, it can be called:

> "We the nations and peoples of Southeast Asia must get together and form by ourselves a new perspective and a new framework for our region. It is important that individually and jointly we should create a deep awareness that we cannot survive for long as independent but isolated peoples unless we also think and act together and unless we prove by deeds that we belong to a family of Southeast Asian nations bound together by ties of friendship and goodwill and imbued with our own ideals and aspirations and determined to shape our own destiny". And then, "with the establishment of ASEAN, we have taken a firm and a bold step on that road".[4]

The significance of this statement is the possibility of extending the relations among Southeast Asian countries to work together under their framework of ASEAN through mutual consent and interest to get closer one to another in the sense of friendship. This point was going to be realized and launched formally in 12th ASEAN Summit in 2007 to recall the concept of "caring and sharing community" as previewed on the statement below:

> We resolved to uphold the centrality of ASEAN and to enhance its standing as an effective driving force for regional initiatives and collective responses to the challenges and opportunities facing our region, countries and peoples. We stressed that the ASEAN community we are building shall be a community of peoples caring for and sharing their human, natural and cultural resources and strengths for their common good and mutual benefit.[5]

---

[4] ibid

[5] ASEAN Secretariat, One Caring and Sharing Community, 2007, retrieved from http://www.aseansec.org/19280.htm on 29th December 2010

A decade before that, by entering the 21st century, the membership expanded covering Brunei, Cambodia, Vietnam, Myanmar, and Lao too. ASEAN came up to answer the regional challenge, peace, and stability through round discussion. It was not easy for ASEAN to keep the fragile sentiment among its member states.

In 2003, ASEAN declared Bali Concord II that reiterate the need to further consolidate and enhance the achievements as a dynamic, resilient, and cohesive regional association for the well being of its member states and people as well as the need to further strengthen the Association's guidelines in achieving a more coherent and clearer path for cooperation. The idea of ASEAN Community constituted comprising three pillars, namely political and security cooperation, economic cooperation, and socio-cultural cooperation.

To make every path ASEAN Community building clear in details, the sort of summit started in 2003 focused on this issue. At the 12th ASEAN Summit in January 2007, the leaders affirmed their strong commitment to accelerate the establishment of an ASEAN Community by 2015. In the end of the summit, the leaders comformed to sign the Cebu Declaration on the Acceleration of the Establishment of an ASEAN Community by 2015. At the 13th ASEAN Summit in November 2007, ASEAN leaders signed the ASEAN Charter and The Declaration on the ASEAN Economic Community Blueprint. At the 14th ASEAN Summit in February 2009, ASEAN leaders signed the Cha-am Hua Hin Declaration on the Roadmap for an ASEAN Community (2009-2015). At the 16th ASEAN Summit in April 2010, ASEAN countries signed the Protocol to the ASEAN Charter on Dispute Settlement

Mechanisms, which is expected to help facilitate the implementation of ASEAN Charter and Community building.[6]

In dealing with the structural and paradigm shifting, the transformation do happens in the organization structure of body. The highest decision-making body of ASEAN is the ASEAN Summit. The summit is convened twice every year. It is held on a rotational basis by the country which holds the chairmanship of the ASEAN Standing Committee. To enhance capacity building, ASEAN has set up ASEAN Coordinating Council and three ASEAN Community Councils including the ASEAN Political-Security Community Council, ASEAN Economic Community Council and ASEAN Socio-Cultural Community Council.

From this angle, it can be seen that the type of classic regionalism no longer fully suits the recent dynamics of ASEAN. The major study on ASEAN previously conducted from realist point of view before neo-functional and institutional referred to starting from 1980s and 1990s[7]. Along with the end of the Cold War, the way concerning on the new type of regionalism having been changed from merely talking about state business with a strong sense in inward looking to be more candid and comprehensive by huddling non-state actors based on mutually beneficial integration and common value. In line with the allignment of globalization phenomenon, the point of view in looking at the future of ASEAN shifted from formal top level and

[6] ASEAN Secretariat, ASEAN Summit, retrieved from http://asean.org on 29th December, 2010

[7] Johan Saravanamuttu, "Wither the ASEAN Security Community? Some Reflections," IIAPS, Vol. 1

government elite approach to be such kind of people driven organization. The involvement of people and civil society are required. Ortuoste showed,

> ASEAN had, for the longest time, been an elite-driven organization. Its norms and principles have allowed its members to proceed along different state-building trajectories relatively unencumbered by demands from its neighbors. Yet by allowing its member countries to diverge, ASEAN and its members are faced with the growing challenge of coordination, cooperation and harmonization of policies and values in the midst of growing extra-regional and domestic demands.[8]

This is what indicated as the shifting paradigm from classic or old regionalism to new regionalism.

This research aims to point out the conditions transforming the classic to new regionalism paradigm in triggering establishment of ASEAN Community by elaborating with relevant theory and explaining in details about the factors.

B. Research Question

1. What are triggering conditions transforming ASEAN from classic to new regionalism paradigm?

2. How the process of transformation happen in the shifting paradigm from classic to new regionalism paradigm in the establishment of ASEAN Community?

---

[8] Maria Ortuoste, Crafting the State and ASEAN: A Study on the Institutional Dynamics of Governance, retrieved from http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p254032_index.html on 29th December 2010

C. Theoretical Framework

1. Neo-realism Systemic Theory

Systemic theory highlights the wide range role of political and economic structures in a region and the influence of external pressure towards a region. This theory relays on out-side-in point of view in which a region perceived as a subsystem of the broaden system. Neo-realism comes to explain the phenomenon in which the neighboring countries that are geographically close tend to cooperate. Thus, Neo-realist argues that there are two factors contributing to the establishment of regionalism which are, first, international pressure economically and politically, and second, the role of hegemony or dominating power. As proposed by Waltz, regionalism determined by the external power configuration, the dynamics of power politics, and the role of international political system.

Furthermore, regionalism is seen as a response towards external challenges politically and economically. Fawcett considers the coalition among the states in the third world to create a regional umbrella endorsed by the growing consciousness, hope, and anxiety toward marginalization and vulnerability. They stand on the shadow of great powers so every single policy taken by influence the ongoing process of third world regional system.

Relating to the phenomenon of ASEAN integration namely as ASEAN Community, one of the remarkable factors is the revival of influential external

a single dominated style of US and the two waking up sleeping giant which are China and India. The power contestation among them, or the relation conducted with them gives the impact to ASEAN directly as well as indiretly.

2. Constructivism Theory

Constructivist theory rejects the basic assumption of neo-realist theory that the state of anarchy (lack of a higher authority or government) is a structural condition inherent in the system of states. Rather, it argues, in Alexander Wendt's words, that 'Anarchy is what states make of it'. That is, anarchy is a condition of the system of states because states in some sense 'choose' to make it so. Anarchy is the result of a process that constructs the rules or norms that govern the interaction of states. The condition of the system of states today as self-helpers in the midst of anarchy is a result of the process by which states and the system of states was constructed. It is not an inherent fact of state-to-state relations. Thus, constructivist theory holds that it is possible to change the anarchic nature of the system of states.

Research on international norms, the third area addressed by the books under review, has been heavily influenced by regime analysis. These scholars have typically demonstrated that regime norms constrain the behavior of states; they are an explanatory variable that intervenes between underlying power distributions and outcomes.[9]

---

[9] Mark Zacher, Governing Global Networks: International Regimes for Transportation and Communications (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996)

In fact, the leaders of ASEAN actually realize the importance of "cultural tapping point" in spinning the idea of ASEAN Community regarding to the "we feeling" and the shape of "caring and sharing community" as noticed in Cebu Summit outcomes.

3. Regionalism Theory

Region is a contested concept and defining regionalism can be as problematic. The idea of region as simply a geographical concept has been increasingly challenged as new definitions emerged taking into consideration developments in global social theory such as social constructivism. For instance, Andrew Hurrell borrowing Benedict Anderson's description of nations as imagined communities sees region as a social and political construct. Regions are created and recreated in the process of global transformation, or as Hurrell further elaborates,"it is how political actors perceive and interpret the idea of a region and notions of regionness". In the case of ASEAN, the regionalism appears as a political construction which attempt to create such kind of "regioness" to unite certain elements on behalf the advanvement and betterment of the region.

The concept of regionalism also can be understood through the concise definitions of the term "regional cooperation," the definition provided by Michael Leifer, is the most insightful. He states,

Regional cooperation proper is distinguished by the viable functioning of institutionalised arrangements for consultation and harmonisation of

recognised region or of such a proportion of those states that in concert they shape the pattern of inter-state relationships.[10]

"Regionalism" is best defined by Mutiah Alagappa as "sustained cooperation, formal or informal, among governments, non-government organizations or the private sector in three or more contiguous countries for mutual gain."[11]

The aim of regionalism is to pursue and promote common goals in one or more issue areas. Based on this goal, regionalism is divided into two main categories: soft regionalism where regionalism is aimed at promoting a sense of regional awareness through consolidating regional networks; and hard regionalism, by means of formalizing interstate arrangements and organizations.[12]

Regionalism can also be identified in terms of both socio-cultural factors internal and political factors external to the region. The inclusive definition of regionalism by Cantori and Spiegel emphasizes on geographic proximity, international interactions, common bond, and a sense of identity that is sometimes accentuated by the actions of countries outside of the

[10] Michael Leifer, "Problems and Prospects of Regional Cooperation in Asia: The Political Dimension," The Indonesian Quarterly, Vol. IV, No. 2,3,4 1976, Special Issue, p. 92.
[11] Muthiah Alagappa, "Regionalism and Conflict Management: A Framework For Analysis," Review of International Studies, Vol. 21, 1995, p. 362
[12] Louise Fawcett, " Exploring Regional Domains: A Comparative History of Regionalism", International Affairs, Vol.80 , No. 3, 2004, p.433.

region.[13] Moreover,this definition make a concept of ASEAN Social and Cultural Community expainable.

The discussion on regionalism cocnsists of two kind of distict scopes in its correlation with the dinamics of world politics as Tavares underlined:

Table 1.1 Ontological Elements of Old and New Regionalism

Variable	Old Regionalism	New Regionalism
Actor	States	Wide variety of actors, both states and non states
Driving force	Singledimensional form which is politics and military.	Multidimensional forms of integration covering political, economic, and social
Direction	Structural-imposed projects of government elites	Constructed by human actions and social practices
Coverage	European Phenomenon (before 1990s-the formation of European Union)	Going global ·

Source: Tavares, Rodrigo. 2004. The State of the Art of Regionalism: The Past, Present, and Future of a Discipline. In UNU/CRIS e-Working Papers W-2004/10.

---

[13] Louis J Cantori and Steven L Spiegel eds, The International Politics of Regions: A Comparative

Further, on the main difference between regional cooperation and regionalism Michael Antolik notes that regional cooperation is the commitment of several states to reach common goals by means of joint-policy undertakings, often institutionalised in the form of agencies to fulfill programs, and it differs from regionalism, which is more a belief that a commonality (if not a community) exists that should be fostered.[14]

4. Integration Theory

Philippe De Lombaerde and Luk Van Langenhove define regional integration as " a worldwide phenomenon of territorial systems that increase the interactions between their components and create new forms of organization, co-existing with traditional forms of state-led organization at the national level."[15] According to Hans van Ginkel, regional integration refers to the process by which states within a particular region increase their level of interaction with regard to economic, security, political, and also social and cultural issues.[16]

In Leon Lindberg's study of the early EEC, The Political Dynamics of European Economic Integration, integration was defined without reference to an end point:

---

[14] Michael Antolik, ASEAN and the Diplomacy of Accommodation (London: ME. Sharpe Inc, 1990), p.73
[15] De Lombaerde, P. and Van Langenhove, L, "Regional Integration, Poverty and Social Policy," Global Social Policy, Vol. 7, No.3, 2007, pp. 377-383.
[16] Van Ginkel, H. and Van Langenhove, L, "Introduction and Context" in Hans van Ginkel, Julius Court and Luk Van Langenhove (Eds.), Integrating Africa : Perspectives on Regional Integration and Development, Brugge: UNU Press, 1-9, 2003, p. 201.

"... political integration is (1) the process whereby nations forgo the desire and ability to conduct foreign and key domestic policies independently of each other, seeking instead to make joint decisions or to delegate the decision-making process to new central organs; and (2) the process whereby political actors in several distinct settings are persuaded to shift their expectations and political activities to a new center (Lindberg, 1963: 6)."

Van Langenhove asserted that regional integration initiatives[17], according to, should fulfil at least eight important functions:

- the strengthening of trade integration in the region

- the creation of an appropriate enabling environment for private sector development

- the development of infrastructure programmes in support of economic growth and regional integration

- the development of strong public sector institutions and good governance;

- the reduction of social exclusion and the development of an inclusive civil society

- contribution to peace and security in the region

- the building of environment programmes at the regional level

- the strengthening of the region's interaction with other regions of the world.

[17]D. L. l. V. L. 2007 177 202

Regional integration also can be understood as "a set of policies by one or more states designed to promote the emergence of a cohesive regional unit, which dominates the pattern of relations between the states of that region and the rest of the world, and which forms the organizing basis for policy within the region across a range of issues".[18]

Regionalism measurement lays on several levels, from a community awareness (soft or informal regionalism) to the international/regional treaties (hard or formal regionalism), although both would share the same objective.[19]

D. Hypohesis

There are three triggering conditions transform the classic to new regionalism paradigm in establishment of ASEAN Community as follows, firstly, the broader framework of cooperation among ASEAN countries leads the process into integration in the form of community belonging in which the shared value exist, secondly, there is a recently constructed idea for ASEAN to move beyond member driven organization by engaging with non-state actor like people to create sense of belonging, and last, in the post-Cold War period, the emerging global powers such as India and China appears as dominating power so ASEAN leaders realize the capacity

---

[18] Andrew Hurrell, "Latin America in the New World Order: A Regional Bloc of the Americas?", International Affairs, Vol.68, No. 1, Jan. 1992, p. 123.

[19] Louise Fawcett, "Exploring Regional Domains: A Comparative History of Regionalism", International Affairs", Vol. 80, No.3, 2004, p. 246.

of integration in giving more benefits for all such as in economy to cope with this phenomenon.

Those three conditions affect the dynamics of ASEAN during the process of transformation in the shifting paradigm from classic to new regionalism paradigm in the establishment of ASEAN Community.

E. Purposes of Research

1. To analyze the actual phenomenon of new regionalism formulation in Southeast ASEAN in which the idea of establishing ASEAN Community 2015 will take into effect.

2. To indicate the shifting paradigm on contemporary regionalism and integration discourse through modeling the relational transition thought from neo realism dominated to constructivism emerged study.

3. To discover the triggering factor behind the process of shifting paradigm underlying the ASEAN transformation from state centric to people driven organization.

F. Research Method

This thesis will synthesize the logic of thinking by appalying the deductive one. Relying on deductive logic, it reasons from general theoretical statements

developed independently to the data collected-the evidence obtained from the social research:theory to data. [20]

As the purpose of this paper is to shed light in defining the case and reassesing the hypothesis which has been formulated before, it is conducted on the empirical analysis made of library reasearch. Rising in parallel, range of resources that the writer uses during the research comprise printed and electronic format. The first includes the sections about books, journals, and publications. Meanwhile the second covers the web resources. The way the writer conduct the research in composing this thesis is determined my theoretical framework in filtering and selecting the deep analysis on the data collected.

G. Range of Research

Aiming to get the proper analysis, this research straightforwardly covers the area concerns of the shifting paradigm from classic to new regionalism in facing the phenomenon of the establishment of ASEAN Community.

H. System of Writing

This thesis is written by following such outline below:

Chapter 1   : This section which is named as Introduction comprises background, research question, theoretical framework,

---

[20] Leonard Cargan, Doing Social Research (Maryland: Bowman & Littlefield, 2007), p.31.

hypothesis, purposes of research, research method, range of research, and system of writing.

Chapter 2   : This part focuses on the process of establishment of ASEAN Community as a manifestation of the new regionalism perspective.

Chapter 3   : This chapter contains the explanation on the transformation from classic to new regionalism paradigm by underlining the internal factor of ASEAN and the commom value sharing.

Chapter 4   : This part offers the descriptive analysis of the triggering conditions of the establishment ASEAN Community in the transformation from classic to new regionalism paradigm by emphasizing on the existance of the big powers.

Chapter 5   : The last chapter which is conclusion becomes the closing section of the thesis.