

Regionalization and Regionalism in Southeast and East Asia

The Effects of Integration in Southeast and East Asia on the European Union in selected Policy Areas

1. Introduction	1
1.1 Globalization, Regionalization and Regionalism	1
1.2 ASEAN's role as the motor of integration in and for South East and East Asia	3
2. Project aims, structure and theses	4
2.1 Project aims	4
2.2. Main project theses	8
2.3 Structure: A preliminary table of content	10
2.4 State of the art	12
3. Innovation – Methods – Cooperation	14
3.1 Project significance and innovation	14
3.2 Additional aspects	15
3.3 Theoretical and methodical approach	16
3.4 Timetable	18
3.5 National and international cooperations / Communication of results	18
4. Human resources	19
5. Project costs	20
6. Selected Bibliography	21
Supplement 1: The OIIP	26
Supplement 2: The research personnel	29
Supplement 3: Travel plans and workshops	40

Regionalization and Regionalism in Southeast and East Asia

The Effects of Integration in Southeast and East Asia on the European Union in selected Policy Areas

1. Introduction

1.1 Globalization, Regionalization and Regionalism

Globalization has made the world a smaller but also a more complex place, as especially since the 1970s nation-states have gradually transferred certain sovereign rights to global, regional, sub-state regional and local authorities and institutions in order to deal with challenges like interdependence, security threats, migration or environmental problems. States and international organizations, however, are not the sole actors in international politics anymore: Both transnational corporations (TNCs) and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) act increasingly across national borders too, engaging with each other and governmental actors alike (Beck 2000; Giddens 1999). Overall, the nation-states are under pressure to find innovative political mechanisms to cope with old and new challenges that threaten to diminish their steering capacities (Zürn 1998; Ohmae 1995).

Facilitated by institutions, common norms and values, regional cooperation among states and transnational actors is regarded by certain theorists, especially by neoliberal institutionalists, as a promising method for dealing with the global environment, notably globalization processes, security threats or interdependence (Keohane 2002; Burchill 2001; Dunne 1997). Eventually regional cooperation and integration, also labelled “regionalism”, can lead to the creation of regional organizations and regimes, i.e. a system of regional governance. Interlinking different territorial levels, such a system delegates and disperses political decision-making power to state, sub-state and non-public actors alike. Although the policy outcome might be more efficient, the new modes of governance applied in this complex network, such as private - public or public - semi-public partnerships, do also raise crucial questions of democratic legitimacy and responsibility (Gerstl 2002; Scholte 2002; Gerstl/Pernicka 2001; Kersbergen/van Waarden 2001). Another concern is whether such systems of regional governance may develop into a global system of governance or, as other scholars fear, whether increased regionalism will lead to bloc to bloc diplomacy, thus undermining multilateralism (cf. Krahnmann 2003; Urata 2002).

Both regionalization and regionalism are very recent phenomena in East Asia¹, a vast and heterogeneous region in terms of ethnicity, culture, language, religious beliefs, political regimes, socioeconomic development or topography. Whereas regionalization means a process of closer transnational cooperation among neighbour states caused by non-political forces, regionalism is the attempt to deliberately steer the process of regionalization politically (cf. Liu 2003a, b; Bhalla/Bhalla 1997). In Southeast Asia—one of the most diverse (sub)regions in the world—till the 1990s regionalization was mainly driven by the free market, inter alia by ethnical Chinese business networks and, since the 1970s, Japanese TNCs. Because of the interests of the national elites in maintaining a closed, intransparent economy, weak and undemocratic regimes that emphasized their national sovereignty and autonomy initially lacked both the will and the ability to steer this process (Felker 2004).

In order to promote further regional and national socioeconomic development in whole East Asia, the crucial task of today is to maintain stability and order in such a resource rich but volatile region (Khoo/ Smith 2002). The political and security landscape of East and Southeast Asia, however, remains complex, and is shaped primarily by the interests, ambitions and rivalries of a few Asian and outside powers, notably the United States, Russia, China, Japan and India (Beeson 2004a; Liu 2003a; Ikenberry/Mastanduno 2003). In addition, impersonal global trends such as the rising economic interdependence since the 1970s, the (demise of the) Cold War, globalization and the threat of terrorism have further moulded East Asia's political, economic and security structure (Narine 2002). Overall, there persist considerable obstacles for the emergence of a regional system of governance that bridges Southeast and Northeast Asia.

The European Union (EU) has several times acknowledged its commitment to a multilateral world order in which the East Asian and especially the Southeast Asian nations would be crucial partner (EC 2004 and 2003). Yet its role in the region is very limited, although “Brussel” has substantial political, economic and security interests in Southeast and East Asia. Despite these stakes, despite Southeast Asia's importance for the global political order and its economic dynamism—based on impressive economic growth rates in the last decades², on a combined market with 550 million people and a gross domestic product of nearly 700 billion Euros—,

¹ East Asia encompasses Northeast Asia (China, Japan, South Korea, North Korea, Taiwan, Mongolia) and Southeast Asia (Brunei, Cambodia, East Timor, Indonesia, Laos, Malaysia, Myanmar/Burma, the Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, Vietnam).

² The process of rapid economic development has started with Japan after the Second World War, then, in the late 1960s, spread to South Korea, Hong Kong, Taiwan and Singapore before, in the 1980s, it reached Thailand, Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Vietnam and, of course, China. There is no single explanation for this amazing development (Rigg 2003; World Bank 1993). Furthermore, the Asian “miracle” seems to give arguments both to neoclassical and market-critical economists (Todaro/Smith 2003: 702-705).

the region has attracted comparatively low scholarly attention in Austria.³ In examining the distinct features of Southeast and, subsequently, East Asian regionalism and in developing scenarios for the further regional integration processes and its effects on the EU, the proposed project aims to close this research gap.

1.2 ASEAN's role as the integration motor in and for South East and East Asia

Apart from the European Union, which is regarded as an integration model *sui generis* (Grande/Jachtenfuchs 2000; Kohler-Koch/Eising 1999), certain scholars and politicians label the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) as the most successful regional organization (Stubbs 2004: 216; Krishnamra 2003: 85; Ravenhill 1995: 850). Compared with other regional groupings, like the League of Arab Nations, the African Union or the new South American Union, where economic, political, security or technical cooperation is limited, ASEAN looks indeed mature and effective. Yet, since its establishment in 1967, ASEAN's cooperation and integration process has also been regarded as a lacklustre effort, as its integration endeavour has gained both depth and vision only as recently as in the 1990s (Capie 2003; Dosch 1997). In short, the history of ASEAN is a story of self-discovery, slow progress and backlashes.

In the context of East Asia—a region that till the mid-1990s lacked regional institutions and regimes in all political spheres (Ikenberry/Tsuchiyama 2002; Hemmer/Katzenstein 2002)—ASEAN plays the role as a creative director and as the hub in a loosely institutionalized network that interlinks Southeast with Northeast Asia.⁴ ASEAN has established or contributed to the establishment of dialogue and cooperation forums in the fields of economics, trade and security, f.i. the ASEAN Free Trade Area (AFTA), the Asia Pacific Economic cooperation (APEC), the East Asian Economic Caucus (EAEC), the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF) or ASEAN plus 3 (APT). Thus it has indeed “ASEANized” the regional political structures, as all these institutions have ingrained the “ASEAN way” of equal sovereignty, non-interference, consensual decision-making and voluntarism (Haacke 2003; Acharya 2001) – values based on traditional Javanese norms for conflict resolution (Katsumata 2004; Liu 2003a). These achievements were also possible because the major powers tend to regard ASEAN as honest broker who lacks the military power (and the political will) to act as a regional hegemon.

³ From the late 1980s on, only a mere dozen political scientists and economists, mainly from the universities in Vienna and Innsbruck, have written their Master or doctoral thesis on East or Southeast Asian issues, f.i. Denison 2003, Schönbauer 2001; Penninger-Seidel 2000, Pichler 2000, Erharter 2000; Lenk 1998; Kosicec 1997.

⁴ As ASEAN is regarded as the main agent of the process and the institutional link between Southeast and East Asia, we use “ASEAN” as a synonym for Southeast Asian regionalism.

However, only a broadly conceived Southeast Asian system of governance—broadly in terms of membership and policy areas—seems able to deal with the challenges the subregion faces. At the Bali summit in October 2003, the ASEAN leaders have envisioned both a deeper and a wider Asian Community, encompassing an economic, a security and a sociocultural pillar by the year 2020 (Bali Concord II). The Economic Community is ASEAN's by far most challenging integration project, aiming at a single market and a common production base (Ferguson 2004; Gerstl 2004). Yet, despite these highflying schemes, ASEAN has not reached the stage of *political* integration yet (and it does not attempt supranational cooperation like the EU) (Liu 2003b). The impediments for deeper integration, though, remain high, as ASEAN is a heterogeneous organization in regard to the socioeconomic development of its members (their economic and export structure, though, is quiet similar which makes many of them to competitors for direct investments and export markets) and their political systems, especially after the admission of Vietnam, Laos, Myanmar and Cambodia in the 1990s.

Despite all these hindrances and uncertainties, overall ASEAN holds the key for understanding East Asian regionalism: It is in economic and security terms a salient example for a new, open regionalism, based on voluntarism and non-discriminatory liberalization (Liu/Régnier 2003; Stubbs 2002). ASEAN can be regarded as the core circle in a model of concentric circles, the other circles representing China, Japan and South Korea, then the remaining East Asian nations and, finally, the United States, Russia, India and the EU. Nevertheless, it has to be stated that ASEAN is only able to influence, not fully control the developments in its own region, due to a range of geopolitical, security and economic realities and interests in East Asia.

2. Project aims, structure and theses

2.1 Project aims

Basically, the project aims are twofold:

Firstly, to conceptualize ASEAN's integration process from the 1960s till the present and to give a prognosis of the future development of Southeast Asian regionalism. Subsequently it will focus on how Southeast Asian regionalism spills over into East Asia regionalism.

Secondly, to examine how the EU is affected by these processes, especially in the areas of politics, economics and security (notably terrorism), and whether "Brussels" could politically and technically assist ASEAN in its integration project.

Approximately 50 percent of the project will deal with the development of Southeast Asian regionalism, 15 percent with the geopolitical structure and integration in East Asia and 35 percent with the impacts of Southeast Asian and East Asian regionalism on the EU (see also 2.3). – The two project aims in detail:

First, we aim to analyze the various driving forces and constraints that foster or hamper regional cooperation and integration in Southeast Asia. Distinguishing between external and internal factors, we regard, *inter alia*, globalization, the strategic interests of the major powers, traditional and new security threats, the 1997 financial crisis and the tsunami disaster 2004 as external quantities. As internal factors we view mainly the domestic political and economic systems as well as national traditions and specific cultural values, as expressed both in the domestic political cultures and ASEAN's specific norms. Special attention will be given to the broad set of internal driving forces and constraints in Singapore, Malaysia, Indonesia, Thailand, the Philippines and Vietnam.⁵ Thereby we will question the prospects for further democratization and good governance in these six countries and the region at whole.

- As ASEAN is the core institution and promoter of integration in Southeast Asia and already shapes the institutional architecture in East Asia, we will review ASEAN's development from a diplomatic to a security and an economic organization (Krishnamra 2003; Capie 2003). We will break down ASEAN's political, economic and institutional achievements and shortcomings since its foundation in the light of the strategic interests of the major East Asian and external powers. Thereby we will also examine the ASEAN institutions and the "ASEAN way", questioning ASEAN's distinctive organizational character.
- In the context of the analyses of the ASEAN decision-making norms and the domestic systems of the selected member states, we will discuss the role of the so-called "Asian values". We will ask whether they really are the expression of a specific (South-)East Asian culture and identity and whether they constitute an "Asian" (or at least a non-culture specific communitarian) form of capitalism or democracy distinct from the liberal Western conception (Ogan 2004; Chua 2004; Stubbs 2002; Opletal 2002).

⁵ Different reasons make each of these countries especially interesting for an analysis: The vulnerable port-city of Singapore advocates out of strategic reasons the strengthening of regional economic and security cooperation; Malaysia shows a strong economic record but remains a sceptic of democratic and liberal values; Indonesia is in danger of becoming a failed state; the Philippines have to deal with ethnic and religious uprisings, too; Thailand, benefiting economically from ASEAN's enlargement to Indochina, faces ethnic tensions and ecological problems; and Vietnam is a late-comer that uses ASEAN as a means to realize domestic political and economic goals but has not yet embraced the idea of full integration.

- Consequently, it has to be examined if an “Asian” system of regional governance both in Southeast and East Asia, based on specific norms, traditions and values, would be fundamentally distinct from other regional systems in terms of values and norms and what consequences this would have for theory building in integration research.
- Based on this thorough historical analysis and conceptualization of regionalization and regionalism in Southeast Asia, the project will assess the overall logic behind the integration process. The crucial quest is whether integration can be regarded as a goal itself (positive regionalism) or as “reactionary regionalism” (Mark Beeson), i.e. a regionalism without conviction, a bandwagon approach in reaction to the emergence of the EU and NAFTA “blocs” or the challenges posed by the international environment. In this context we will also ask what role ASEAN will likely play in the future in the world order.
- On this basis, the project breaks new ground in developing scenarios for the development of Southeast Asian regionalism in the next 20 years. Thereby we will mainly focus on the fields of politics (notably democracy, human rights, good governance, political culture), security (comprehensive security, human security, terrorism), economics (trade, investments, financial and monetary cooperation, labour rights) and culture (cultural exchange, education, community building, Southeast Asian public space).
 - The first scenario (1a) sees the emergence of a system of regional governance that encompasses all Southeast Asian nations as well as a broad set of policies. With ASEAN and its various forums as the core, Southeast Asian regionalism spills over into the whole East Asian region, leading to a regional system of governance that additionally embraces (nearly) all East Asian nations (scenario 1b).
 - However, there is also the prospect of institutionalized but only limited regional integration, both in Southeast Asia (scenario 2a) and East Asia (scenario 2b). Those patchworks of cooperation would be limited in regard to the topics and the participants, f.i. a free trade area of the economically higher developed nations.
 - Also a possibility is the the backfall into ad hoc intergovernmental collaboration, i.e. a kind of ad hoc or post-crisis cooperation rather than a proactive approach, again both in Southeast and whole East Asia (scenarios 3a and 3b).
- Using at least two case studies, we will question how a crisis or a conflict, for instance terrorist threats in Indonesia, Malaysia or the Philippines or an environmental disaster such as the 2004 tsunami or financial turmoils (like the 1997 Asian crisis), could be dealt with according to the specific multilateral or bilateral instruments each of the six scenarios provides.

Second, we aim to investigate how the EU is affected by the parallelogram of forces in South-east and East Asia in general and the ongoing integration processes in particular. We will illustrate their effects with examples in the areas of politics, economics and security. In addition, as the emergence of representative regional organizations in Southeast and East Asia could increase the EU's strategic leeway we will examine how Brussels could politically and technically assist its Southeast and East Asian partners in their integration endeavours.

- Overall, the research addresses the question which political, security and economic stakes the EU has in and shares with Southeast and East Asia. We will especially focus on three areas: economics (financial cooperation, trade patterns, investments, developmental aid after the tsunami disaster and so on), security issues (non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, disarmament, terrorism, human security risks, China's rise to military power, North Korea, ethnic uprisings, danger of failed states) as well as politics and the cultural dialogue (democracy, good governance, the "Asian" notion of the universality of human rights with special regard on the strengthening of the civil society and the conflicting views of ASEAN and the EU on Myanmar).
- We will question what role "Brussels" is, firstly, willing and, secondly, able to play in Southeast and East Asia: Has the EU a grand strategy which combines its strategic, political and economic interests to deal with the region or does it use a case-by-case approach? Thus we will scrutinize the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP), the European Security and Defense Policy (ESDP) and the EU's development assistance programme in regard to Southeast and East Asia as well as economic programmes such as the Trans-Regional EU-ASEAN Trade Initiative (TREATI) (EC 2003).
- Investigating the Asia-Europe dialogue, we will survey whether the Asia-Europe Meeting (ASEM) of the EU with the ASEAN+3 members that bridges 26 policy areas or the Asia-Europe ministerial meetings are still appropriate mechanisms for dealing with the complex challenges of the 21st century. Using APEC as a standard of comparison, the need for a stronger institutionalized approach to the Asia-Europe process will be addressed. Special attention will be given to the dialogue of the civil societies in Southeast Asia and Europe, with a focus on NGOs and the intergovernmental Asia-Europe Foundation (ASEF) (Hainisch 2004; www.ias.nl/asef).
- As the the global fight against terrorism could act as a catalyst for a closer cooperation between ASEAN and the EU as well as for promoting democracy, human rights and good governance, we will analyze whether "Brussels" has a coherent counter-terrorism strategy in Southeast and East Asia that is different from the US approach. Moreover, it

has to be examined how the EU would react to human rights abuses, low democratic standards or bad governance practices in its antiterrorism cooperation with its Southeast Asian partners.

2.2 Main project theses

The main project thesis states that a combination of *external threats* in the fields of security, economics and politics formed the necessary prerequisites for the *initial stages* of the integration processes in Southeast Asia.⁶ In reaction to these structural challenges, from the 1960s on, the governments started to enhance regional cooperation. At this early stage, however, cooperation as such had no intrinsic value for them. Rather, as we believe, it was merely an instrument for achieving broader domestic goals, notably a peaceful external environment that does not hamper the national socioeconomic development which in turn is the legitimacy for the national elites (cf. Felker 2004; Stubbs 2004).

However, as the thesis further postulates, external forces can act as driving forces only till a certain stage of the process. Hence at a *later stage* of the process the *domestic political systems* of the ASEAN members become increasingly decisive for the progress of integration, notably the institutional setting and the cultural dimension. Under institutional setting we understand the type and character of the political system, its degree of openness, pluralism and transparency as well as the character of the economic system, its degree of market- and outward-orientation, social and labour rights and so on; under the cultural dimension we subsume the specific political culture; national traditions and values, especially the societal notion of individual freedom and collective rights and leadership (“Asian values”).

Like constructivists we stress that integration must be transformed from a technical affair into a *political project*, in which ideas and political concepts rather than solely structural pressures shape the integration path (see Jachtenfuchs 2002; Parsons 2002; Schönbauer 2001). Without a political vision a genuine transnational, regional identity that binds peoples together cannot emerge, thus reducing the changes for the establishment of a system of regional governance (cf. Jones 2004; Ganesan 2003a; Hund 2002). Though, such a transformation will only occur, if the process is politically steered (cf. Gilpin 2000). To that end, however, it is necessary to get

⁶ So far, we have identified the following “classical” external threats which have caused and intensified Southeast (and East) Asian regionalism: the (perceived) Communist menace in the past (China, Russia and local uprisings in the 1960s and 1970s; Vietnam in the 1970s and early 1980s), the present dangers caused by China’s rise to power, terrorism as well as economic challenges (f.i. the fear of protectionistic trade blocs in Europe and America or the wish to gain a single voice in multilateral negotiations). Furthermore, there exist new threats in the fields of environment, migration or drugs, best labelled with the term “comprehensive security” (OIIP 2000).

the commitment of all partner states. Consequently, the degree of governmental commitment to integration depends on the internal determinants: from the government's aim to integrate and the institutional, political and economical ability of the domestic system to act accordingly.

As the domestic system operates as a transmission belt, translating the gains from integration into economic benefits and increased opportunities for the citizens (it eases the societal costs respectively) (Rieger/Leibfried 2003), the effectiveness of a political system is a crucial factor of how the citizens value regional integration. Because, in general, as we will argue, to reach a really deep and sustainable degree of integration (not necessarily as deep as in the EU)⁷, integration as such, the wish to interact with people from other nations at a qualitative new level, has to become a broadly accepted positive goal, anchored in the hearts and minds of the broad public, not only in those of the political elites. As we believe, without such a political vision integration is doomed to fail – or reduced to (limited) cooperation.

Yet, as we will argue, in case of ASEAN *internal* political and economic obstacles (mainly the lack of democracy and a pluralist, open society) and various egoistic motives of the national elites act as chock blocks rather than as driving forces for deeper integration. Hence, we postulate, a democratization of the Southeast Asian regimes will lead to the deepening of regional integration and enhance the prospects for the Asian Community project.

The EU shares strategic interests with ASEAN, notably a stable multilateral world order and further economic and trade liberalization, but also has own strategic stakes in the region. As China, Japan, South Korea and ASEAN are crucial economic and political partners, the EU has a vital interest in the emergence of open Southeast and East Asian (economic) communities rather than isolationistic trade blocs or even antagonistic political groupings. Furthermore, Brussels views ASEAN as a potential ally for reimplementing a multilateral approach in international politics, notably in the war against terror (EC 2004 and 2003; Scholik 2004).

However, because of different national security, political and economic interests there exists no coherent EU policy towards Southeast and East Asia, especially not in human rights or towards China (Dosch 2004; Penninger-Seidel 2000). Overall, the EU seems to lack ambition in its relation with the region: Rather than following a multilateral grand strategy the European Commission endorses the bilateral approach of its member states (EC 2003). Though, the *war*

⁷ Because of the prevailing specific historical circumstances after the Second World War that led to the European integration, the EU cannot be regarded as a role model that ASEAN has to copy. Rather the EU and the EU institutions will be regarded as standards of comparison. In addition, supranational cooperation will not be deployed as a criteria for the “success” of ASEAN’s integration efforts.

against terrorism which has become a priority for the EU and its member states has, as we believe, the potential to foster a common EU approach towards Southeast and East Asia.

Especially Southeast Asia looms after September 11 “as the potential next battleground in the war against terrorism” (Campbell/Tatsumi 2002: 41). The Philippines, Thailand, Burma, Malaysia and notably Indonesia, the world’s largest Muslim nation with more than 200 million people, will remain in the spotlight because of ethnic and religious uprisings (Fealy 2004; Belamy 2004; Desker 2002; Jones/Smith 2002; Dibb 2001). The Indonesian Jemaah Islamiyah is an example that terrorism, however, is primarily a home-made phenomenon, caused by underdevelopment, poverty, social and political marginalization or, in general, poor governance (Singh 2004; cf. Smith 2005 and 2004; Berman 2004). Thus it remains doubtful whether the military inspired approach of the US in the “war on terror”—which, like the US policy in East Asia since 1945 in general, is based on bilateralism—can become an additional catalyst for the emergence of a system of regional governance in Southeast Asia or even a system that bridges Northeast and Southeast Asia (Lankowski 2003; Snitwongse 2003).

Not being a military superpower, we regard the EU as well suited to address the broad internal and external causes for terrorism in Southeast Asia in a dialogue with ASEAN. Furthermore Brussels has the credibility to engage in a broad but working cooperation mechanism with the Southeast Asian governments and peoples that focuses not only on security or economic relations but on other crucial political and humanitarian questions. (Austria as a small neutral state could advocate topics such as democracy, human rights and good governance that may not be popular within the national elites but the civil societies.) Notably the reconstruction programmes of the EU after the tsunami disaster 2004 and the common political and technical efforts to minimize future natural and man-made human security risks through regional early warning systems could foster closer cooperations between ASEAN and the EU (Friberg 2005).

2.3 Structure: A preliminary table of content

1. The phenomena of regionalization and regionalism in global and theoretical perspective
 - 1.1 Globalization – Regionalization – Regionalism
 - 1.2 Conceptualization: “Integration”, “(New) Regionalism”, “Regional Governance” ...
 - 1.2.1ff Regionalism in Europe, North, Central and South America
 - 1.3ff. Economic, security and political features of regionalism
 - 1.4 Theoretical explanations for regionalization and regionalism
 - 1.4.1ff. Federalism, Intergovernmentalism, neoliberal Institutionalism, Structuralism ...
2. Southeast and East Asia

- 2.1 Definition, history and complexity of a region
- 2.2 The major external players and their strategic interests
 - 2.2.1f. The major external players and their views of each other and of ASEAN
- 2.3 Conflicts and cooperation among the Southeast Asian nations (1945–2005)
- 2.4 ASEAN
 - 2.4.1 History and development from the 1960s till the present
 - 2.4.2 Policy areas
 - 2.4.3 ASEAN institutions: AFTA, ARF, ASEAN+3 ...
 - 2.4.4ff. ASEAN's external relations: US, China, Japan, EU ...
 - 2.4.5 ASEAN's distinct and non-specific features: the "ASEAN way"
- 3. Cooperation and integration in Southeast Asia
 - 3.1 The present state of integration and the "Asian Community" project
 - 3.2 External driving forces and obstacles for integration
 - 3.2.1 Globalization, interdependence, bloc building
 - 3.2.2ff. Regional and external powers and their strategic interests
 - 3.2.X "Terrorism" – Southeast and East Asian definitions
 - 3.2.Y The Tsunami disaster 2004 – a catalyst for regionalism?
 - 3.3 Internal driving forces and obstacles for integration in six selected ASEAN members
 - 3.3.1 The political systems and political cultures
 - 3.3.2 The economic systems
 - 3.3.3 "Asian values": Cultural or ideological values? Liberalism vs. Communitarism?
 - 3.3.3.1.1ff. "Asian democracy" and "Asian capitalism"?
- 4. The future of regionalism in Southeast and East Asia – six scenarios
 - 4.1 First Scenario: The emergence of a system of regional governance
 - 4.1.1f. Scenario 1a and 1b: Regional governance in Southeast (1a) and East Asia (1b)
 - 4.2 Second Scenario: Limited regional integration
 - 4.2.1 Scenario 2a: Integration à la carte in Southeast Asia
 - 4.2.2 Scenario 2b: Patchworks of cooperation between East and Southeast Asia
 - 4.3 Scenario Three: Intergovernmental cooperation
 - 4.3.1 Scenario 3a: The backfall to intergovernmental cooperation in Southeast Asia
 - 4.3.2 Scenario 3b: Cooperation and major power rivalries in East Asia
 - 4.4ff. The six scenarios contested: Case studies
 - 4.4.1 Terrorist threats in Southeast Asia: country studies
 - 4.5 Conceptualization of Southeast and East Asian regionalism
- 5. The EU and Southeast and East Asia
 - 5.1 History of the Asia-Europe relations from Colonialism till today
 - 5.2 The EU's strategic interests and role in Southeast and East Asia
 - 5.2.1ff. Politics and culture
 - 5.2.2 Comprehensive security: The CFSP and the developmental aid programme
 - 5.2.2.1 The EU's approach in the war against terror
 - 5.2.3ff. Economics and trade
 - 5.4ff. The six scenarios and their impacts on the EU: Politics, Security, Economics

5.5 Possible contributions of the EU to Southeast and East Asian regionalism

5.5.X A potential EU approach in the war on terror

5.6 The EU – a role model for ASEAN?

5.7. ASEAN – a role model for the enlarged EU?

5.X Conclusio: Southeast and East Asian regionalism and the EU

2.4 State of the art

From the 1990s on, regionalism, regional integration and regional governance in general—and in East Asia in special—have attracted considerable scientific attention. Although certain scholars have attempted to conceptualize the distinct features of East and Southeast Asian regionalism (Liu/Régnier 2003; Beeson 2003; Dent/Huang 2002; Ravenhill 2002; Stubbs 2002 and 1995; Sum 2002; Yamazawa 2001; Mansfield/Milner 1999; Bhalla/Bhalla 1997), as yet there exists no general accepted explanation of this phenomenon (Khoo 2004; Liu 2003a). Because of the strong economic features of East Asian regionalism most scholars pay special regard to the economic cooperation and institution-building process, connecting it with globalization, economic interdependence or trade liberalization (Yue 2004; Urata 2002; Sum 2002; Islam/Chowdhury 2000; Higgott 2000; Shari 2000; Gilpin 2000; Stubbs 2000; Ravenhill 1995).

In the aftermath of the Asian financial crisis 1997, financial and economic aspects dominated the literature about East Asia. In this context, the emergence of ASEAN plus 3 was broadly reviewed and seen as a new impetus and link for regional cooperation between South East and Northeast Asia (Cheng 2004; Stubbs 2004; Beeson 2003; Cai 2003; Ba 2003; Bowles 2002). More recently, security threats in the region have been increasingly scrutinized, especially from a neorealist, neoliberal and constructivist point of view (Acharya 2004 and 2001; Ganesan 2003a; Haacke 2003; Ikenberry/Mastanduno 2003; Harris/Mack 1997). Thereby the broad security, political and economic interests of the US, Japan and China as the dominant powers have been widely analyzed. Although there emerges a consensus that the US focus on the war on terror has altered the security environment in the Asia Pacific, it remains unclear whether this will hamper or foster regional cooperation (Smith 2005; Cruz de Castro 2004; Lankowski 2003; Quingguo 2002; Campbell/Tatsumi 2002). Other researchers focus on China's development into a military superpower, its perception of the US, Japan and ASEAN or the tensions between Beijing and Taipeh as well as those in the South Chinese Sea and on the Korean Peninsular (Hsu 2003; Roy 2003; Pablo-Baviera 2002). The future regional influence of Japan, which has played a pivotal role in promoting Southeast Asian regionalism since the late 1970s, has also received attention (Furuoka 2002; Huntington 2001; Funabashi 2000).

Certain authors examine the existing building blocks for a system of regional governance, f.i. AFTA, APEC or ARF (Ogan 2004; Ganesan 2003b; Garofano 2002; Ravenhill 2000; Stubbs 2000). They also describe the crucial issues which this system has to address, for instance environmental concerns, labour migration, energy resources, drug trafficking or technological divides (Rigg 2003; Sudo 2003; Mack/Ravenhill 1994). On the other side, there exists a bulk of literature on the domestic political systems in Southeast and East Asia and their specific institutions and governance styles, both single country studies and regional comparisons (The Far East and Australasia 2005; Beeson 2004a; Knight 2004; Derichs/Heberer 2003; SarDesai 2003; Feldbauer/Husa/Korff 2003; Kingsbury 2001; Funston 2001; Kindermann 2001; Tarling 1999; Dosch 1997; Nohlen/Nuscheler 1994).

Additionally, considerable attention has been paid both to the “Asian” form of capitalism and democracy (Riggs 2003; Stubbs 2002; Tomioka 2001; Islam/Chowdhury 2000; World Bank 1993); for instance, because of the strong role of governmental planning in the economic and social life, Johnson (1982) or Hoogvelt (1997) regard the Asian nations as developmental states. Because of the financial crisis in 1997 advocates of the “Asian values”—norms that contribute to the distinct Asian notions of individuality, community, human rights or the state and thus to the “Asian” capitalism and democracy (Chua 2004; Koh 2000; Donnelly 1999; Sen 1997)—have a difficult stance: Certain scholars regard exactly those values as one of the main sources of the crisis (Islam/Chowdhury 2000). Other researchers focus on (traditional) cultural norms in community building in Southeast and East Asia. In the context of the emergence of a feeling of regional identity, they analyze how the civil society and transnational NGOs can improve their political influence (Hanisch 2004; Mutz 2003; He 2002; Hund 2002; Yamamoto 1996).

There exists a vast body of literature about the European integration process, its history and the development of the EU institutions. Furthermore there is no lack of approaches attempting to explain Europe’s integration (federalism and confederalism, functionalism and neofunctionalism, intergouvernementalism, multi-level governance, constructivism, theories of identity ...; for a comprehensive review see Wiener 2004; Bieling/Lerch 2004; Jachtenfuchs/Kohler-Koch 2003; Gerstl/Pernicka 2001; Wallace/Wallace 2000). Yet, as most scholars focus on the EU’s political system (f.i. Wessels 2004) or aspects like the enlargement process, the various policy areas or Europe’s role in the world (Bretherton/Vogler 2005), the relationship between the EU and East Asia, notably Southeast Asia, is still a less researched topic: Although the economic or security relations with China, Japan and South Korea (Das 2004; Preston/Gilson 2002; Gu 2002; Dent 1999; Fukasaku/Kimura/Urata 1998) and, albeit to a lesser extent, with ASEAN

(Algieri 2004; Dosch 2004; Fort/Zotti 2004; Gilson 2002; Machetzky 2002; Yeo 2002; Rüländ 2001) have been analyzed, the overall effects of the emergence of both a Southeast and an East Asian system of governance on the EU and its strategic interests as a major player in international politics and in the region still have to be closer examined.

3. Innovation – Methods – Cooperation

3.1 Project significance and innovation

In terms of shared security and especially emotionally (tsunami disaster 2004, Bali bombings 2002), Southeast Asia has become increasingly close to Europe. Economically, it is one of the most dynamic regions in the world and offers vast opportunities for European business interests. Furthermore, the necessity to resolve East Asia's long standing conflicts further emphasizes the need for greater political dialogue, not at least due to the increasing intensity of today's political, economic and social interdependence. The EU (EC 2003) has already stressed its vital interest in contributing to the establishment of a regional system of governance that deals with all factors which threaten human security or give rise to terrorism, above all the fragility of the multicultural post-colonial states and the lack of good governance (Desker 2002).

Although the project is clearly focused on Southeast Asian regionalism, it will prominently address the impacts of this process on cooperation and integration in whole East Asia as well as on the EU in crucial policy areas. In order to give a valid prognosis for the future of Southeast Asian regionalism, we will reconceptualize cooperation and integration, going beyond the existing approaches, as our focus is based neither on economic nor security policy as the sole explanatory variables: As yet, a convincing explanation of Southeast and East Asian regionalism that combines the broad set of external impulses in the fields of security, politics, culture and economics with the various domestic interests and institutional obstacles of the Southeast Asian nations is still missing. The profound knowledge of the project team in international relations theories, modern political theories, economic and judicial approaches will be a great asset for conceptualizing Southeast and East Asian regionalism in a comprehensive new way.

What kind of structures, regimes and institutions will emerge in Southeast and East Asia depends not only on external factors but is also the result of deliberate political decision-making of the ASEAN countries. Although with ASEM and, albeit to a lesser extent, as a partner in the ARF and in APEC the EU already possess instruments to influence ASEAN's decision-making process (Dosch 2004; Gilson 2002; Yeo 2002), they seem insufficient. Hence the pro-

ject explores innovative new mechanisms for the EU to participate more actively in the South-east and East Asian political structures, notably in cooperation with the civil society.

Because of the uncertainty concerning the future developments in East and Southeast Asia, it is a desiderate to explore how cooperation and integration might develop in the next 20 to 50 years. In correlating those scenarios with the EU's strategic, political, economic and security interests in the region, this research project additionally breaks new ground. Those scenarios will enable clear views on complex realities, offering political and economic decision-makers, both in Austria and on EU level, a sound analytical basis for their strategic planning.

A key research interests is terrorism in Southeast Asia, because we view the war against terror as a potential catalyst for closer regional integration and closer cooperation between the EU and ASEAN as well as a promoter of democracy, human rights and good governance. Thus we will elaborate an adequate counter-terrorism strategy for the EU that reflects the regional realities and needs as well as the EU's strategic interests and its values. Finally, while Southeast Asia is a prominent research topic throughout Europe, the region has not attracted sufficient attention in Austria. Thus another key significance of this project lies in strengthening the critical mass in Austria. This will also enhance the relevant networking with the scientific community across Europe, Southeast and East Asia.

3.2 Additional aspects

The project will have a significant impact on international relations and integration theories, as it combines different subdisciplines of political science (inter alia, modern political theory, comparative politics, security studies and terrorism research) and economic approaches to a fruitful smorgasboard. Scholars of European integration will also benefit substantially, as the project will deliver a sound analytical basis for comparing similarities as well as differences between the cooperation and integration processes in Europe and Southeast and East Asia. Notably the project will elaborate what European decision-makers could learn from the way ASEAN steers the integration process politically and its institutions cope with it.

Moreover, the project is also designed to give policy recommendations for decision-makers both at EU and Austrian level. Therefore we will cooperate from the earliest stage of our work on with the Austrian Ministry for Defense or the Ministry for Foreign Affairs as well as with the Austrian EU presidency (first half year 2006), the Finnish EU presidency (second half year 2006), as Helsinki will organize the 2006 ASEM, and the EU's external relations Commissio-

ner. Furthermore, the project outcome will act as a profound base for decision-making for private business companies or Chambers of Commerce and Industry.

3.3 Theoretical and methodical approach

We believe that integration processes are too complex phenomena to be reduced to a single cause and to be explained by a single theory. This holds especially true for the specific context of Southeast Asia where non-state actors such as (Japanese) TNCs and ethnic networks have played a crucial role in advancing regionalism. Till the 1990s, the states, led by weak and/or corrupt governments, lacked the ability to steer this process, inter alia because of the interests of the national elites in maintaining a closed, intransparent economy. In general, in Southeast Asia the role of the post-colonial state differs from the West. Certain scholars regard it merely as an instrument in the hands of the national elites. As the elites indeed legitimize their grip on power through socioeconomic development, the Southeast Asian states additionally face more non-traditional security threats, especially in economic terms, than their Western counterparts (Felker 2004; Bellamy 2004).

Therefore we will approach “regionalism” with a comprehensive approach that combines a broad variety of external and internal driving forces and constraints: “Adequate understanding requires eclecticism, not parsimony” (Katzenstein/Okawara 2001: 167). Consequently we will use different theoretical approaches like neoliberal institutionalism, structural realism, neofunctionalism, constructivism or new regionalism without theoretical blinders to assess the different features of regionalism (notably the economic, security and civil society dimension). To describe and conceptualize key terms like integration, regionalization, regionalism or regional governance, we will briefly compare regional integration in Europe, North America as well as in the third world (South America, Africa, the Middle East) and discuss how the existing theoretical approaches are able to explain the ongoing integration processes.

Neorealism, for instance, seems outstanding in explaining the security related driving forces and constraints for the promotion of integration (Bellamy 2004). Subscribing to the neorealist view of the importance of the geopolitical structure to explain state behaviour (Beeson 2004a and 2004b), we will pay special regard to security threats (f.i. the conflicts between Beijing and Taipeh, North and South Korea, in the South Chinese Sea or piracy in the Strait of Malacca) and economic developments (globalization, regionalization, economic interdependence) as well as to political challenges (migration, drug trafficking, health problems, environment).

Though because of its neglect of the domestic systems in its analysis—the basic neorealist assumption states the international system is fundamentally distinct from the national ones—the neorealist approach cannot conceptualize the internal factors (Waltz 1996). In this regard, neoliberal or constructivist approaches are more appropriate tools to examine the motives of the national elites: They do not exclusively focus on states and governments but also on NGOs and TNCs. Although neoliberals in general and neoliberal institutionalists in particular have a great deal in common with neorealists, their world view is more optimistic: For them, regional or even global integration is the trend of the future (Dunne 1997). States, as they postulate, are interested in cooperation, even if other states gain more benefits than themselves. International institutions, norms and regimes are perceived as mediators – means to enhance and foster cooperation and integration (Keohane 2002). – Using different approaches will help us understand and reduce the complex reality of Southeast and East Asian regionalism and will contribute to the process of theory building in this field (cf. Ikenberry/Mastanduno 2003).

Methodically, this research project is based both on interviews and a broad literature study: We have already systematically reviewed all volumes of the journals *Asia Europe Journal*, *Asia-Pacific Review*, *Asia survey*, *International Relations of the Asia-Pacific*, *Southeast Asia and Southeast Asian Affairs*. Additionally, we have analyzed the last 15 years (respectively all existing volumes of more recent journals) of *Asia Affairs*, *Asia Survey*, *American Asian Review*, *Australian Journal of International Affairs*, *Contemporary Southeast Asia*, *European Journal of International Relations*, *International Review of the Asia-Pacific*, *Japanese Journal of Political Science*, *The Pacific Review*, *Pacifica Review* as well as selected articles in leading journals like *Foreign Affairs*, *Global Governance*, *International Organization*, *International Security*, *Journal of European Public Policy*, *Review of International Political Economy*, *Third World Quarterly* or *World Politics*. Of course, for the project other Asian, European and US journals have to be scrutinized as well as leading international and national newspapers like the *Bangkok Post*, the *Jakarta Post*, the *Singaporean Straits Times*, the *Manila Times*, the Japanese *Asahi Shimbun*, the *Chinese People's Daily*, the *Sydney Morning Herald*, the *New York Times*, the French *Le Monde* or the Swiss *Neue Zürcher Zeitung*.

Apart from secondary sources, we will analyze official statements and policy papers from ASEAN, the EU and from national governments in Southeast and East Asia. Additionally, we plan to conduct interviews with academics, political decision-makers, business people, journalists and civil society representatives in Southeast Asia and in Brussels on their view of Southeast and East Asian regionalism, Asia-Europe relations and the EU's role in the region.

3.4 Timetable

Month	Schedule
01	<i>Phase 1: Globalization, regionalization and regionalism; theories of integration</i> Literature review and conceptualization
02	Conceptualization Workshop (WS) with selected experts in Vienna (2 days): <i>Regionalism in Southeast and East Asia/The EU's strategic regional interests</i>
04	Discussions and literature study in Brussels and Leiden (1 week/1 team member)
06	<i>Phase 2: Regionalism and regional governance in Southeast and East Asia</i> Literature review: Regionalism; external factors, major power interests
08	Focal point ASEAN, history, institutions, "ASEAN way", ARF, ASEAN+3 ...
09	Interviews at ASEM 2006, Tampere (1 team member/5 days)
10	Discussions with academics, politicians, business people and NGO representatives in Singapore, Malaysia and Indonesia (3 weeks/1 team member): Regionalism in Southeast Asia/ASEAN/East Asia's geopolitical structure
12	Work on ASEAN country studies: internal driving forces, political systems
15	ASEAN country profiles: economic systems and human rights
18	Halftime report: Results and identification of open questions
20	Discussion of report, WS in Vienna with Austrian experts (1 day)
21	Regional Governance – the six scenarios: Literature review, interviews
22	Discussions in Singapore, Indonesia, Malaysia and the Philippines (3 weeks/1 team member): Political systems/terrorism/How can the EU assist ASEAN?
24	<i>Phase 3: Regional governance in Southeast and East Asia and its effects on the EU.</i> Focal point: Europe's strategic interests and role in (South-)East Asia
27	Focal point terrorism in Southeast Asia, its effects on the EU
29	Research trip Vietnam and Thailand (2 weeks/1 team member)
31	Interviews with EU decision-makers in Brussels (1 week)
33	Conceptualization of regionalism in Southeast and East Asia: Draft Final Report
36	Dissemination Workshop with academics and decision-makers in Vienna (OIIP)

3.5 National and international cooperations / Communication of results

The project team attempts not only to contribute substantially to the existing research, but will also form a network of scholars and practitioners in order to foster stronger ties between Asia and Europe. We will cooperate with international relations, Southeast, East Asia and Asia-Europe relations experts both in Europe and East Asia. Our existing network within both regions will be a great asset for every aspect of our work, especially for conducting interviews with renowned experts as well as for evaluating and comparing our research results. Inter alia, we will work together closely with the following individuals and their respective institutions:

Dr. Amitav Acharya, Deputy Director, Institute of Defence & Strategic Studies (IDSS), Singapore

Dr. Axel Berkofsky, Senior Policy Analyst, European Policy Center (EPC), Brussels

Dr. Derek Da Cunha, Senior Fellow, Institute of Southeast Asian Studies (ISEAS), Singapore

Dr. Bertrand Fort, Director, Intellectual Exchange, Asia-Europe Foundation (ASEF), Singapore

Mr. David Fouquet, Director, Asia-Europe Project, Leiden

Eric Friberg, Research Fellow, Centre for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS), Jakarta

Dr. Willem van der Geest, Director, European Institute for Asian Studies (EIAS), Brussels
Dr. Carolina Hernandez, President, Institute Strategic and Development Studies (ISDS), Manila
Prof. Richard Higgot, Centre for the Study of Globalisation and Regionalisation, Univ. Warwick
Prof. Otmar Höll, Director, and **Prof. Heinz Gärtner**, both OIIP, Vienna
Dr. Yeo Lay Hwee, Executive Director, Singapore Institute of International Affairs (SIIA), Manila
Prof. Helmut Kramer, Department for Politics, University Vienna
Professor Federico M. Macaranas, Dean, Asian Institute of Management (AIM), Manila
Dr. Kishore Mahbubani, Dean, Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy, Singapore
Dr. Helmut Opletal, Journalist, Austrian Broadcasting Company (ORF), Vienna
Dr. Gregory Pemberton, Convenor, Master of International Relations, Macquarie Univ., Sydney
DDr. Erich Reiter, Head, Department for Security Policy, Austrian Ministry of Defense, Vienna
Dr. Albrecht Rothacher, Editor in Chief, Asia-Europe Journal, Singapore
Ambassador Dr. Wolfgang Schallenberg, Austrian Governor, Asia-Europe Foundation (ASEF)
Prof. Willem A. L. Stockhof, Director, International Institute for Asian Studies (IIAS), Leiden
Dr. Charit Tingsabadh, Director, European Studies Programme, Chulalongkorn Univ., Bangkok.

Furthermore, we will organize two workshops in Vienna where a couple of experts will critically assess our research design and the preliminary results. Notably our close collaboration with the Viennese Department for Politics, especially with Prof. Helmut Kramer, an international relations expert, and Dr. Helmut Opletal, a specialist for East Asia, will be beneficial for our work. Our study trips will give us further opportunities for discussions with international experts. Thereby we plan to build a cooperation base between our research institute, the Vienna based Austrian Institute for International Politics (OIIP) (see supplement 1), and the research institutes listed above, thus strengthening the international standing of the OIIP.

After the end of the project, we will publish our main results both in bookform and in a series of articles. Due to our excellent contacts, though, we are able to communicate our findings from the earliest stage on both in European and Southeast Asian academic networks and journals as well as on a project website. An eventual lecture tour organized by the Asia-Europe Foundation, the planned study trips as well as the workshops and our international conference in Vienna will further contribute to creating synergies, providing concrete and sustainable outcomes throughout the project and disseminating the results.

4. Human resources

As the project objectives are very ambitious and concern different scientific disciplines, the research cannot be carried out by a single person. Therefore the applicant Alfred Gerstl (double Masters and PhD), a senior postdoc researcher and university lecturer at the Department for Politics at the University Vienna, will be assisted by Dominik Zotti (candidate for a double

Masters degree in economics). Gerstl will work 40 hours per week during the first project year, full time during the second and third year. Starting with eight hours per week in the first year, after finishing his studies Zotti will work full time during the last two years. Both researchers have profound knowledge in the area of foreign and security policy, the project, though, will strongly benefit from the expertise of Anna Scholik, Maître en Droit and MES, on terrorism in Southeast Asia and the EU's counter-terrorism strategies. She will work 20 hours per week for a six month period during the third year on a contract base (see also supplement 2).

The three researchers combine the relevant academic knowledge in political science, international relations, history, economics and law that is necessary to successfully conduct the research: Gerstl has studied political science in Vienna and international relations with a special focus on Southeast Asia in Sydney (Macquarie University). Zotti, a former project executive of the Asia-Europe Foundation in Singapore, is currently finishing his Master of Public Policy Programme at the Hubert Humphrey Institute for Public Affairs (University of Minnesota) and his two Master studies at the University for Economics and Business Administration in Vienna.

For Gerstl, the project plays an important role for promoting his academic career (publications, university courses) not only in regard to his specialization on Southeast and East Asia but to analytically and methodically combine international relations and political theory to a fruitful mixture. Additionally, the project will be a great intellectual (and financial) opportunity for him to start working on his habilitation thesis on a topic not yet specified but related to Southeast Asian regionalism and modes of (regional) governance. This project will enable Zotti to further deepen his knowledge in South East and East Asian Studies and Asia-Europe relations. Notably he will be able to write his doctoral thesis (tentative title: Economic integration in East Asia and its regional and global effects) which is essential for his further university career.

5. Project costs

In total, the project costs amount to 236.572,50 Euros. Thereof the personnel costs are 205.970 Euros: for Gerstl 56.780,00 in the first year, 42.585,00 in the second and third year respectively; for Zotti 5.280 in the first year (research grant) and 29.370 in the second and third year respectively. Additionally, Scholik will receive 7.342,50 Euros (contract base). In order to conduct the interviews, Gerstl and Zotti will travel to Southeast Asia, Brussels and Tampere; the costs for the flights (9) and hotels (80 nights) are 9.710 Euros. The two small workshops and the dissemination conference cost 13.550 Euros (for a detailed overview see supplement 3).

6. Selected Bibliography

- Acharya, Amitav (2004): "Will Asia's Past be its Future?", *International Security*, Vol. 28/No. 3, pp. 149–164.
- (2001): *Constructing a security community in Southeast Asia: ASEAN and the problem of regional order*. New York: Routledge.
- Algieri, Franco (2004): "Asienpolitik", in Weidenfeld, Werner and Wolfgang Wessels (eds.): *Handbuch der europäischen Integration*. Baden-Baden: Nomos, pp. 251–254.
- Ba, Alice D. (2003): "China and ASEAN. Renavigating Relations for a 21st Century Asia", *Asian Survey*, Vol. 43/ No. 4, pp. 622–647.
- Beck, Ulrich (2000): *What is Globalization?* Malden: Polity Press.
- Beeson, Mark (ed.) (2004a): *Contemporary Southeast Asia. Regional Dynamics, National Differences*. Houndsmills: Palgram Macmillan.
- (2004b): "Southeast Asia and the Major Powers: The United States, Japan and China", in Beeson 2000a, pp. 198–215.
- (2003): "ASEAN Plus Three and the Rise of Reactionary Regionalism", *Contemporary Southeast Asia (CSEA)*, Vol. 25/No. 2, pp. 251–268.
- Bellamy, Alex J. (2004): "The Pursuit of Security in Southeast Asia: Beyond Realism", in Beeson 2004a, pp. 156–177.
- Berman, Paul (2004): *Terror und Liberalismus*. Bonn: Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung.
- Bhalla, A.S. and P. Bhalla (1997): *Regional Blocs. Building Blocks or Stumbling Blocks?* Houndsmills: Macmillan.
- Bieling, Hans-Jürgen and Marika Lerch (eds.) (2004): *Theorien europäischer Integration*. Opladen: Leske + Budrich.
- Bowles, Paul (2002): "Asia's post-crisis regionalism: bringing the state back in, keeping the (United) States out", *Review of International Political Economy*, Vol. 9/No. 2, pp. 244–270.
- Bretherton, Charlotte and John Vogler (2005): *The European Union as a Global Actor*. 2nd ed. London: Routledge.
- Burchill, Scott (2001): "Liberalism", in Scott Burchill, Richard Devetak, Andrew Linklater, Matthew Patterson, Christian Reus-Smit and Jacqui True (eds.): *Theories of International Relations*. 2nd ed., Hampshire: Palgrave, pp. 29–69.
- Cai, Kevin G. (2003): "The ASEAN-China free trade agreement and East Asian regional grouping", *CSEA*, Vol. 25/No. 3, pp. 387–404.
- Campbell, Kurt M. and Yuki Tatsumi (2002): "In the Aftermath of the Storm: US Foreign Policy in the Wake of 9/11 and its Implication for the Asia-Pacific region", *Asia-Pacific Review (APR)*, Vol. 9/No. 2, pp. 31–44.
- Capie, David (2003): "Rival Regions? East Asian Regionalism and its Challenges to the Asia-Pacific", in Jim Rolfe (ed.): *The Asia-Pacific: A Region in Transition*, APCSS: Honolulu, pp. 149–165.
- Cheng, Joseph Yu-shek (2004): "The ASEAN-China Free Trade Area: genesis and implications", *Australian Journal of International Affairs (AJIA)*, Vol. 58/No. 2, pp. 257–277.
- Chua, Beng Huat (ed.) (2004): *Communitarian Politics in Asia*. London/New York: RoutledgeCurzon.
- Cruz de Castro, Renato (2004): "Addressing International Terrorism in Southeast Asia: A Matter of Strategic or Functional Approach", *CSEA*, Vol. 26/No. 2, pp.193–217.
- Das, Rahul Peter (2004): "Europe in Eurasian Strategic Consideration: Introductory Remarks", in Erich Reiter and Peter Hazdra (eds.): *The Impact of Asian Powers on Global Developments*. Heidelberg: Physica, pp. 1–15.
- Denison, Elisabeth (2003): *A Path towards Integration in South East Asia*. Master thesis, Linz.
- Dent, Christopher M. (1999): *The European Union and East Asia: An Economic Relationship*. New York: RoutledgeCurzon.
- and David W.F. Huang (eds.) (2002): *Northeast Asian Regionalism. Learning from the European experience*. London: RoutledgeCurzon.
- Derichs, Claudia and Thomas Heberer (eds.) (2003): *Einführung in die politischen Systeme Ostasiens. VR China, Hongkong, Japan, Nordkorea, Südkorea, Taiwan*. Opladen: Leske + Budrich.
- Desker, Barry (2002): "Islam and society in South-East Asia after 11 September", *AJIA*, Vol. 56/No. 3, pp. 383–394.

- Dibb, Paul (2001): "Indonesia: the key to South-East Asia's Security", *International Affairs*, Vol. 77/ No. 4, pp. 829–842.
- Donnelly, Jack (1999): "Human Rights and Asian Values: A Defense of 'Western' Universalism", in Joanne R. Bauer and Daniel A. Bell (eds.): *The East Asian Challenge for Human Rights*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (CUP), pp. 60–87.
- Dosch, Jörn (2004): "Das Verhältnis der EU und der USA zur Region Südostasien", *Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte* B 21–22, pp. 7–14.
- (1997): *Die ASEAN – Akteure, Interessenlagen, Kooperationsbeziehungen*. Hamburg: Abera Verlag.
- Dunne, Timothy (1997): "Liberalism", in John Baylis and Steve Smith (eds.): *The Globalization of World Politics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press (OUP), pp. 147–163.
- Elm, Ralf (ed.) (2002): *Europäische Identität: Paradigmen und Methodenfragen*. Baden-Baden: Nomos.
- European Commission (2004): *Regional Indicative Programme 2005–2006, ASEAN*. Brussels, 22. Sept.
- (2003): *A New Partnership with Southeast Asia*. COM 399 final. Brussels, 9. July.
- European Union (2004): *Declaration on Combating Terrorism*. Brussels, 25. March.
- Fealy, Greg (2004): "Islam in Southeast Asia: Domestic Pietism, Diplomacy and Security", in Beeson 2004a, pp. 136–155.
- Felker, Greg (2004): "Southeast Asian Development in Regional and Historical Perspective", in Beeson 2004a, pp. 50–74.
- Feldbauer, Peter, Husa, Karl and Rüdiger Korff (eds.) (2003): *Südostasien: Gesellschaften, Räume und Entwicklung im 20. Jahrhundert*. Wien: Promedia.
- Ferguson, James R. (2004): "ASEAN Concord II: Policy Prospects for Participant Regional 'Development'", *CSEA*, Vol. 26/No. 3, pp. 393–415.
- Fort, Bertrand with Dominik Zotti (2004): "What role can ASEM have for enhancing cooperation on security in Asia and Europe?", *Conference Paper: New Security Challenges*. Beijing, 23. April.
- Friberg, Erik (2005): "Preventing natural and man-made disasters", *The Jakarta Post*, 31. January.
- Fukasaku, Kiichiro, Fukunari Kimura and Shujiro Urata (eds.) (1998): *Asia and Europe: Beyond Competing Regionalism*. Portland: Sussex Academic Press.
- Funabashi, Yoichi (2000): "Japan's Moment of Truth", *Survival*, Vol. 42/No. 4, pp. 73–84.
- Funston, John (ed.) (2000): *Government and Politics in Southeast Asia*. Singapore: ISEAS.
- Furuoka, Fumutuka (2002): "Challenges for Japanese Diplomacy After the End of the Cold War", *CSEA*, Vol. 24/No. 1, pp. 68–81.
- Ganesan, Narayanan (2003a): "'Mirror, mirror on the wall': misplaced polarities in the study of South-east Asia security", *International Review of the Asia-Pacific*, Vol. 3, pp. 221–240.
- (2003b): "ASEAN: a Community Stalled?", in Rolfe, pp. 116–132.
- Garofano, John (2002): "Powers, Institutions, and the ASEAN Regional Forum. A Security Community for Asia?", *Asian survey*, Vol. 42/No. 3, pp. 502–521.
- Gerstl, Alfred (2004): *External and Internal Driving Forces in Integration Processes – The Case of East Asia*. July, Master thesis, Master of International Relations, Macquarie University Sydney.
- (2002): *Governance – neue Anforderungen an "neues Regieren"*. (Research project; final report for the Austrian Federal Ministry for Science and Culture). Vienna.
- and Susanne Pernicka (2001): "Europäische Forschungs- und Technologiepolitik zwischen Effektivität und Demokratie. Die mögliche Einflussnahme von IGs in den Bereichen Aeronautik und Sozioökonomie im fünften Forschungsrahmenprogramm der EU", *ÖZP* Vol. 30/No. 4, pp. 331–347.
- Giddens, Anthony (1999): "Globalization." *BBC Reith Lectures 1999*. (http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/english/static/events/reith_99/default.htm, retrieved 15.6.2004.
- Gilpin, Robert (2000): *The Challenge of Global Capitalism. The World Economy in the 21st Century*. Princeton/ Oxford: Princeton University Press.
- Gilson, Julie (ed.) (2002): *Asia meets Europe. Inter-Regionalism and the Asia-Europe Meeting*. Northampton: E. Elgar.
- Grande, Edgar and Markus Jachtenfuchs (eds.) (2000): *Wie problemlösungsfähig ist die EU? Regieren im europäischen Mehrebenensystem*. Baden-Baden: Nomos.
- Gu, Xuewu (ed.) (2002): *Europe and Asia. Mutual Perceptions and Expectations on the Way to a New Partnership in the twenty-first Century*. Baden-Baden: Nomos.
- Haacke, Jürgen (2003): "ASEAN's diplomatic and security architecture: a constructivist assessment", *International Relations of the Asia-Pacific (IRAP)*, Vol. 3/No. 1, pp. 57–87.

- Hanisch, Rolf (2004): "Nichtregierungsorganisationen und Demokratisierung in Südostasien", *Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte (APuZ)* B 21–22, pp. 22–31.
- Harris, Stuart and Andrew Mack (eds.) (1997): *Asia-Pacific security: The economics-politics nexus*. St. Leonards: Allen & Unwin.
- He, Baogang (2002): "Cosmopolitan democracy and the national identity question in Europe and East Asia", *IRAP*, Vol. 2/No. 1, pp. 47–68.
- Hemmer, Christopher and Peter J. Katzenstein (2002): "Why is There No NATO in Asia? Collective Identity, Regionalism and the Origins of Multilateralism", *International Organization (IO)*, Vol. 56/No.3, pp. 575–607.
- Higgott, Richard: "Studying Regionalism under Globalisation", *New Political Economy*, Vol. 5/No. 4, pp. 333–352.
- Hoogvelt, Ankie (1997): *Globalization and the Postcolonial World. The New Political Economy of the Development*. London: Macmillan.
- Hsiung, James C. (2002): "Pacific Asia in the Twenty-First Century World Order", *Asian Affairs: An American Review*, Vol. 29/No. 2, pp. 99–115.
- Hsu, Szue-Chin Philip (2003): "China's Domestic Politics and U.S.-Taiwan-China Relations: An Assessment in the Aftermath of the CCP's 16th National Congress", *American Foreign Policy Interests* No. 25, pp. 43–51.
- Hund, Markus (2002): "From 'neighbourhood watch group' to community? The case of ASEAN institutions and the pooling of sovereignty", *AJIA*, Vol 56/No. 1, pp. 99–122.
- Huntington, Samuel P. (2001): "Japan's role in global politics", *IRAP*, Vol. 1/No. 1, pp. 131–142.
- Ikenberry, John G. and Michael Mastanduno (eds.) (2003): *International Theories and the Asia-Pacific*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- and Jitsuo Tsuchiyama (2002): "Between balance of power and community: the future of multilateral security co-operation in the Asia-Pacific", *IRAP*, Vol. 2/No. 1, pp. 69–94.
- Islam, Iyanatub and Anis Chowdhury (2000): *The Political Economy of East Asia. Postcrisis Debates*. Oxford: OUP.
- Jachtenfuchs, Markus (2002): *Die Konstruktion Europas. Verfassungsideen und institutionelle Entwicklung*. Baden-Baden: Nomos.
- and Beate Kohler-Koch (eds.) (2003): *Europäische Integration*. 2nd ed. Opladen: Leske + Budrich.
- Johnson, Chalmer (1982): *MITI and the Japanese Economic Miracle: The Growth of Industrial Policy, 1925–1975*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Jones, David Martin and Mike Lawrence Smith (2002): "From *Konfrontasi* to *Disintegrasi*: ASEAN and the Rise of Islamism in Southeast Asia", *Studies in Conflict and Terrorism*, Vol. 25/No. 6, pp. 343–356.
- Jones, Michael E. (2004): "Forging an ASEAN Identity: The Challenge to Construct a Shared Destiny", *CSEA*, Vol. 26/No. 1, pp. 140–154.
- Katsumata, Hiro (2004): "Why is ASEAN diplomacy changing from 'non-interference' to 'open and frank discussions'", *Asian Survey*, Vol. 44/No. 2, pp. 237–254.
- Katzenstein, Peter J. and Nobuo Okawara (2001): "Japan, Asian-Pacific Security and the Case for Analytical Eclecticism", *International Security*, Vol. 26/No. 3, pp.153–185.
- Keohane, Robert (2002): *Global Governance and Democratic Accountability*. Internet Manuscript, Wisconsin (www.poli.duke.edu/people/Faculty/docs/millpaper.pdf ; visited at 25.3.2004).
- Kersbergen, Kees van and Frans van Waarden (2001): *Shifts in Governance: Problems of Legitimacy and Accountability*. The Hague: MaGW.
- Khoo, Nicholas (2004): "Deconstructing the ASEAN security community: a review essay", *IRAP*, Vol. 4/No. 1, pp. 35–46.
- and Michael L. Smith (2002): "The future of American hegemony in the Asia-Pacific: a Concert of Asia or a clear pecking order?", *AJIA*, Vol. 56/No. 1, pp. 65–81.
- Kikuchi, Tsutomu (2003): "Regionalism and regional governance in Northeast Asia", in Liu/Régnier, pp. 100–118.
- Kindermann, Gottfried-Karl (2001): *Der Aufstieg Ostasiens in der Weltpolitik 1840–2000. Vom Opiumkrieg bis heute*. München: DVA.
- Kingsbury, Damien (2001): *Sout-East Asia. A Political Profile*. Oxford: OUP.
- Knight, (2004): *Understanding Australia's Neighbours: An introduction to East and Southeast Asia*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: CUP.

- Koh, Tommy B. (2000): "Asian values reconsidered", *APR*, Vol. 7/No. 1, pp. 131–136.
- Kohler-Koch, Beate and Rainer Eising (eds.) (1999): *The Transformation of Governance in the European Union*. London and New York: RoutledgeCurzon, pp. 330–349.
- Kosicek, Prisca (1997): *Die Wirtschaft ASEANs: Historische Entwicklung, die verstärkte regionale Integration und Zukunftstendenzen*. Master thesis, Vienna.
- Krahmann, Elke (2003) "National, Regional and Global Governance: One Phenomenon or Many?", *Global Governance*, Vol. 9/No. 3, pp. 323–346.
- Krishnamra, Nadhavathna (2003): "Regionalism and subregional cooperation. The ASEAN experience", in Liu/Régnier, pp. 85–99.
- Lankowski, Michael (2003): "America's Asian alliances in a changing world", *AJIA*, Vol. 57/No. 1, pp. 113–124.
- Lenk, Philipp (1998): *ASEAN: Vergangenheit, Gegenwart und Zukunft der Assoziation Südostasiatischer Staaten*. Master thesis, Innsbruck.
- Liu, Fu-Kuo (2003a): "East Asian regionalism. Theoretical perspectives", in Liu/Régnier, pp. 3–29.
- (2003b): "Conclusion. The renewal of regionalism and an East Asian new order", in Liu/Régnier, pp. 220–230.
- and Philippe Régnier (eds.) (2003): *Regionalism in East Asia. Paradigm shifting?* London: RoutledgeCurzon.
- Machetzki, Rüdiger (2002): "Free Trade Arrangements: Opportunities and Strategies for High-Tech Ventures in Europe and Asia", *Südostasien Aktuell*, Special Issue 2002, pp. 16–21.
- Mack, Andrew and John Ravenhill (eds.) (1994): *Pacific cooperation: Building economic and security regimes in the Asia-Pacific region*. St. Leonhards: Allen & Unwin.
- Mansfield, Edward D. and Helen V. Milner (1999): "The New Wave of Regionalism", *IO*, Vol. 53/No. 3, pp. 589–627.
- Milner, Anthony (2003): "Reviewing our Asian engagement", *AJIA*, Vol. 57/1, pp. 9–16.
- Mutz, Gerd (2003): "Zivilgesellschaftliche Entwicklung in Südostasien", *APuZ B* 35-36, pp. 32–38.
- Narine, Shaun (2002) "ASEAN in the Aftermath: The Consequences of the East Asian Economic Crisis", *Global Governance*, Vol. 8/No. 2, pp. 179–194.
- Nohlen, Dieter and Franz Nuscheler (eds.) (1994): *Handbuch der Dritten Welt: Südostasien und Südostasien*. (Vol. 7.) Bonn: Dietz.
- Nowak, Manfred (2002): *Einführung in das internationale Menschenrechtssystem*. Wien/Graz: Neuer Wissenschaftlicher Verlag.
- Nozaki, Akira (2003): "Regional cooperation in East Asia: economic and political aspects", *Asia Europe Journal*, Vol. 1/No. 3, pp. 371–379.
- Ogan, Toru (2004): "Rediscovering Asianness: the role of institutional discourses in APEC", 1989–1997", *IRAP*, Vol. 4/No. 2., pp. 287–317.
- Ohmae, Kenichi (1995): *The End of the Nation-state: The Rise of the Regional Economies*. New York: Free Press.
- Opletal, Helmut (2002): "Ökonomische Entwicklung ohne Demokratie? Gedanken zum asiatischen Wirtschaftswunder", in Christine Erten and Reinhard Pirker (eds.): *Wirtschaftsmacht Süd-Ost-Asien. Länderspezifische Erfolgsfaktoren für wirtschaftliches Handeln*. Wien: Wirtschaftsverlag, pp. 19–28.
- Österreichisches Institut für Internationale Politik (OIIP) (ed.) (2000): *Comprehensive Security. Bericht an das Bundesministerium für Bildung und Wissenschaft*. Wien: OIIP.
- Pablo-Baviera, Aileen San (2002): "The China factor in US alliances in East Asia and the Asia Pacific", *AJIA*, Vol. 57/No. 2, pp. 339–352.
- Parsons, Craig (2002): "Showing Ideas as Causes: The Origins of the European Union", *IO*, Vol. 56/No. 1, pp. 47–84.
- Penninger-Seidel, Bettina (2000): *Die Rolle der Menschenrechte in den Beziehungen der EU zu den ASEAN-Staaten*. Doctoral thesis, Vienna.
- Pichler, Monika (2000): *Growth Triangles in Southeast Asia – A Snapshot of Development before Asian Crisis began*. Master Thesis, Vienna.
- Preston, Peter W. and Julie Gilson (eds.) (2002): *The European Union and East Asia: Interregional linkages in a changing global system*. Northampton: E. Elgar.
- Quingguo, Jia (2002): "The impact of 9-11 on Sino-US relations: a preliminary assessment", *IRAP*, Vol. 3/No. 2, pp. 159–177.

- Ravenhill, John (2002): "A three bloc world? The new East Asian regionalism", *IRAP*, Vol. 2/No. 2, pp. 167–195.
- (2000): "APEC adrift: implications for economic regionalism in Asia and the Pacific", *The Pacific Review*, Vol. 13/No. 2, pp. 319–333.
- (1995): "Economic Cooperation in Southeast Asia. Changing Incentives", *Asian Survey*, Vol. 35/No. 9, pp. 850–866.
- Rieger, Elmar and Stephan Leibfried (2003): *Limits to Globalization: Welfare states and the World Economy*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Rigg, Jonathan (2003): *Southeast Asia. The human landscape of modernization and development*. London and New York: RoutledgeCurzon.
- Roy, Denny (2003): "China's Reaction to American Predominance", *Survival*, Vol. 45/No.3, pp. 57–78.
- Rüland, Roland (2001): "ASEAN and the European Union: A bumpy interregional relationship". Bonn: ZEI Discussion Paper.
- SarDesai, Damodar R. (2003): *Southeast Asia. Past & Present*. (5th edition) Boulder: Westview Press.
- Scholik, Anna (2004): *Die rechtspolitischen Systeme im gegenwärtigen Kampf gegen den Terrorismus: Europäische Union und Vereinigte Staaten*. Master thesis, Vienna.
- Scholte, Jaan Art (2002): "Civil Society and Democracy in Global Governance", *Global Governance*, Vol. 8/No. 2, pp. 281 – 304.
- Schönbauer, Norbert (2001): *Die ASEAN – die künftige EU Südostasien? Eine integrationstheoretische Analyse*. Master thesis, Vienna.
- Sen, Amartya (1997): "Human Rights and Asian Values", *The New Republic*, July 14 & 21, pp. 33–40.
- Shari, Ishak (2000): "Globalization and economic disparities in East and Southeast Asia: new dilemmas", *Third World Quarterly*, Vol. 21/No. 6, pp. 963–975.
- Singh, Bilveer (2004): "The challenge of militant Islam and terrorism in Indonesia", *AJIA*, Vol. 58/No. 1, pp. 47–68.
- Smith, Anthony L. (2005): "The Politics of Negotiating the Terrorist Problem in Indonesia", *Studies in Conflict and Terrorism*, Vol. 28/No. 1, pp. 33–44.
- Snitwognse, Kusuma (2003): "A New World Order in East Asia?", *APR*, Vol. 10/No. 2, pp. 36–51.
- Stubbs, Richard (2002): "ASEAN Plus Three. Emerging East Asian Regionalism?", *Asian Survey*, Vol. 42/No. 3, pp. 440–455.
- (2000): "Signing on to liberalization: AFTA and the politics of regional economic cooperation", *The Pacific Review*, Vol. 13/No. 2, pp. 297–318.
- (1995): "Asia-Pacific Regionalization and the Global Economy. A Third Form of Capitalism?", *Asian Survey*, Vol. 35/No. 9, pp. 785–797.
- Sudo, Suelo (2003): "Regional Governance and East and Southeast Asia: Towards the Regulatory State?", *Japanese Journal of Political Science* Vol. 4/No. 2, pp. 331–347.
- Sum, Ngai-Ling (2002): "Globalization, Regionalization and Cross-Border Modes of Growth in East Asia: the (Re-)Constitution of 'Time-Space Governance'", in Markus Perkmann and Ngai-Ling Sum (eds.): *Globalization, Regionalization and Cross-Border Regions*. Houndsmills: Palgrave, pp. 50–76.
- Tarling, Nicholas (ed.) (1999): *The Cambridge History of Southeast Asia. Volume Two: The nineteenth and twentieth centuries*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- The Far East and Australia 2005*. 36th ed. London: Europa Publications.
- Urata, Shujiro (2002): "Globalization and the Growth in Free Trade Agreements", *APR*, Vol. 9/No. 1, pp. 20–32.
- Wallace, Helen and William Wallace (eds.) (2000): *Policy-Making in the European Union*. 4th ed. Oxford: OUP.
- Waltz, Kenneth (1979): *Theory of International Politics*. Reading: Addison-Wesley.
- Wessels, Wolfgang (2004): *Das politische System der EU*. Opladen: Leske + Budrich.
- Wiener, Antje (ed.) (2004): *European Integration Theory*. Oxford: OUP.
- World Bank (1993): *The East Asian Miracle. Economic Growth and Public Policy*. New York: OUP.
- Yamazawa, Ipeei (2001): "Whither East Asian regionalism", *APR*, Vol. 8/No. 2, pp. 18–27.
- Yamamoto, Tadashi (ed.) (1996): *Emerging Civil Society in the Asia Pacific Community. Nongovernmental underpinnings of the Emerging Asia Pacific Regional Community*. Singapore/Tokyo: JCIE.
- Yeo Lay Hwee (2002): "The Asia-Europe Meeting (ASEM): From Selective Engagement to Comprehensive Partnership", *Südostasien Aktuell*, Special Issue, pp. 7–15.
- Zürn, Michael (1998): *Regieren jenseits des Nationalstaates*. Suhrkamp: Frankfurt am Main.

Supplement 1:

The Austrian Institute for International Politics (OIIP)

The Austrian Institute for International Affairs (OIIP) carries out research on its own initiative or for others on international politics and international relations with particular reference to comprehensive security, which is the institute's main research focus.

Within this context researchers at the OIIP study the various aspects of international politics and analyze the political processes involved.

The results of its research are published and the Institute also exchanges information with the scientific community through events organized by the OIIP on its own or in collaboration with partner institutes. In this way it serves the public good and also makes a contribution to the study of national and international politics.

Type of organization

The Institute is a non-profit public institution overseen by an Executive Board of Governors consisting of top political leaders, with a Scientific Advisory Board of high-ranking international figures also playing an important role. Primary financing is provided by the Federal Ministry for Education, Science and Culture, with other partners and sponsors including Federal Chancellery, the Federal Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the European Commission, the Austrian National Bank, the City of Vienna and the Ministry of Defense.

Board of Governors

President: Dr. Franz Vranitzky, Former Federal Chancellor

Vice President: Dr. Wolfgang Schüssel, Federal Chancellor (until December 2003)

Dr. Josef Cap, Member of the Parliament; Head of the Zukunftswerkstätte

Dr. Herbert Cordt, Cordt & Partner

Prof. Heinz Fischer, Federal President of the Republic of Austria

Dr. Peter Jankowitsch; Secretary-General of the Franco-Austrian Centre, Former Minister of Foreign Affairs (treasurer)

Dr. Peter Kapral, Former Member of the Parliament

Dkfm. Ferdinand Lacina, Adviser to Bank Austria - CA, Former Federal Minister of Finance

Prof. Heinrich Neisser, Professor of Political Sciences, University of Innsbruck

Dr. Wolfgang Schallenberg, President of the Austrian Society for Foreign Policy and International Relations

Peter Schieder, Member of the Parliament and Council of Europe

Dr. Hannes Swoboda, Member of the European Parliament

Scientific Advisory Board

Chairman: Prof. Dr. Hanspeter Neuhold, University of Vienna

Austrian Members

Prof. emeritus Dr. Walter Dostal, University of Vienna

Prof. Dr. Gerhard Drekonja, University of Vienna
Dr. Gerald Hinteregger, Chairman of the "Arbeitskreis Ost", Vienna
Ass.-Prof. Renate Kicker, University of Graz
Dr. Raoul F. Kneucker, Federal Ministry of Education, Science and Culture, Vienna (retired)
Prof. Heribert F. Köck, University of Linz
Prof. Helmut Kramer, University of Vienna
Dr. Thomas Nowotny, University of Vienna, FGG, Vienna
Prof. Anton Pelinka, University of Innsbruck
Dr. Manfred Rauchensteiner, Museum of Military History, Vienna
Prof. emeritus Kurt W. Rothschild, University of Linz
Prof. Manfred Rotter, University of Linz
Prof. Heinrich Schneider, University of Vienna
Dr. Walter Siegl, Federal Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Vienna (retired)
Dr. Heinz Vetschera, National Defense Academy, Vienna
Prof. Georg Winckler, University of Vienna
Prof. Karl Zemanek, University of Vienna

International Members

Prof. John A. Groom, University of Kent
Prof. Olav Knudsen, Södertörns Högskola University College, Stockholm
Prof. Daniel N. Nelson, George C. Marshall European Center for Security Studies, University
of Norfolk, Virginia
Prof. Udo Steinbach, German Institut for Middle East Studies, Hamburg
Dr. Heinz Timmermann, Federal Institute for Russian, East European and International
Studies, Cologne
Prof. Helen Wallace, University of Sussex

The staff

Director

Otmar Höll

Researchers

John Bunzl
Heinz Gärtner
Paul Luif
Gerhard Mangott
Reiner Meyer
Henriette Riegler
Barbara Rohregger

Administrative staff

Gabriele Reinharter
Andrea Sutrich
Lili Gneisz
Christine Sommer
Astrid Jane Rieger

Library

Susanne Fleck

Research focuses

European Union
Southeastern Europe
Russia, Central and Eastern Europe
Middle East
Pacific Region
Transatlantic Relations
Comprehensive security after September 11
International development policy
International Conflict Management
Political Psychology

Expert Networks

Vienna Meets Eastern Europe
Expert Forum on South Eastern Europe
Women in international politics
Security Concepts and Security Policy

Events Program

Lectures, Workshops, international Conferences on OIIP topics

Other OIIP activities

Vienna Fellowship on Crisis Management and Conflict Research
Promotion of young researchers
Publications
External teaching and research

National and international networks

OIIP has links with other research institutes specializing in international politics and international relations throughout the world. It acts as an intermediary for members of the public interested in political processes. It is able to network at the national and international level thanks to its transparent method of working, ongoing reporting on topical issues and the state of the research being carried out.

OIIP is an active member of:

European Consortium for Political Research (ECPR)
International Studies Association (ISA)
Trans European Policy Studies Association (TEPSA)
Euro-Mediterranean Study Commission (EuroMESCO)
Assembly of Directors of European “International Relations-Institute”

Supplement 2:

The research personnel

1. The team members

Person	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
Alfred Gerstl	40 hours/week	30 hours/week	30 hours/week
Dominik Zotti*	(at least) 8 hours/week	40 hours/week	40 hours/week
Anna Scholik (on contract base)			20 hours per week during 6months

* Although Dominik Zotti will finish his Master studies not before June 2006, he will contribute substantially from the beginning on (on the basis of a research grant for Master students). This is a necessity because of the crucial conceptualization work in the first months. Because of Zotti's limited workload in the first year, Gerstl will work 40 hours per week during this period. This arrangement will ensure that all project objectives will be achieved in time.

2. Criteria for the selection of the team members

The two project members, assisted by Anna Scholik, form a young interdisciplinary and ambitious but already highly experienced and skilled team, as they combine both academic and relevant organizational skills. The two young scientists Dominik Zotti and Anna Scholik were selected because they bring with them substantial academic and professional experience and expertise in the subject area itself as well as in the related subjects, which will greatly benefit and enhance the whole research project.

The three researchers do complete each other perfectly: The combined educational backgrounds in the areas of political science, international relations, economics, international business, European studies and law from which the project team can draw will be greatly beneficial in accomplishing the research and project objectives. Having worked in the areas of Southeast and East Asian politics, foreign and security policy, Asia-Europe relations, the European Union, international relations or political theory both academically as well as professionally, the project team can build on its previous efforts and interests in the subject area.

Mag.Dr. **Alfred Gerstl**, M.A., the project leader, has studied political sciences in Vienna and Sydney (at both universities he has earned his degrees with distinction). While his Master thesis (1993) dealt with foreign policy and diplomacy (both on a theoretical level and exemplified with the Austrian foreign policy in the 1990s), his doctoral thesis examined the history of liberalism in Austria and the founding process of the Liberal Forum, a political party. During his postgraduate studies in international relations at Macquarie University (Sydney), he has further specialized in Southeast and East Asian politics, economics and culture. In his academic career, Gerstl has conducted various social science research projects for the Institute of Advanced Studies (IHS), for the Austrian Ministry of Sciences and Education, for the Department for Culture and Science of the City of Vienna (MA 7), for the Liberal Bildungsforum (LBF) or the Documentation Centre of Austrian Resistance (DÖW). Whether the regional focus was on Austria, the political system and decision-making mechanism of the EU, Southeast Asia or the global community – thematically most of the projects dealt with the new challenges for democracy, legitimacy, governance and the participation of the civil society in complex networks formed by the interactions of traditional and new actors.

Additionally, since 2001 Gerstl lectures at the Department for Political Sciences at the University Vienna both international/comparative politics and political theory. The themes of the courses were, inter alia, the analysis of the political and party systems in Europe and of the EU, in North America, Southeast and East Asia as well as theories of Liberalism, Neoliberalism/Globalization and Communitarism. During his stay in Sydney, Gerstl did assist Dr. Gregory Pemberton, the Convenor of the Master of International Relations (MIR) programme, in setting up the new course “The EU in the International System”. In 2005, he plans to conduct courses on Southeast and East Asian politics and integration processes at the University Vienna.

Cand. MMag. **Dominik Zotti** is a former Project Executive of the Asia-Europe Foundation (ASEF) in Singapore. During his attachment with ASEF he worked extensively in the field of Asia-Europe Relations, forging close contacts with many of the most respected scholars and practitioners in the field of Asia-Europe Relations and East Asian Studies. He collaborated with many experts on a wide variety of issues such as security, regionalisation, economic integration, education and civil society during his tenure, and attended a great number of related conferences, workshops and seminars. He also organised a variety of academic conferences for the Intellectual Exchange Department of the Foundation, inter alia, on new security challenges, civil society, multiculturalism and academic cooperation. He is a steering committee member

of the Model Asia-Europe Meeting, a member of the ASEF University Alumni Network, and is currently working towards the establishment of an Asia-Europe Society.

Previously to his work for ASEF, Zotti studied at the Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, Sorbonne University and the University of Vienna's Political Science Department. Currently he is an international scholar at the Hubert H. Humphrey Institute for Public Affairs with a concentration on Economic Development and Foreign Policy through a scholarship provided by the Good Governance Consortium. He is also in his final year of studies towards his Master degree in Economics and International Business Administration at the Vienna University of Economics and Business Administration.

Anna Scholik, Maître en Droit and MES, has studied international relations, international law, and European law in France. After her law studies she has started a masters program at the University of Vienna in 2004. During her European master studies, she has deepened her knowledge in a wide range of fields, f.i. European law, economics, political science, international relations, human rights, international security systems and institutions (f.i. UN, EU, OSCE). From March till May 2005 she worked with an internship in the United Nations' "Terrorism Prevention Branch" (TPB) within the UN Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC), based in Vienna. From June 2005 till approximately November 2006 she will work for the Austrian Ministry for Interior, Federal Office for the Protection of the Constitution and for Counter-terrorism Measures as an analyst.

In the second half of 2005, Scholik will start to write her doctoral thesis on the topic of terrorism, focusing on the legal and political aspects of the EU's fight against terrorism and the international cooperation in the war against terror.

Overall, the project will greatly benefit all members of the team in their academic career ambitions, notably the two junior scientists. It will also help to advance their knowledge and expertise in the subject area, raise their research profile among notable international academics and practitioners in the field. The project will further contribute substantially to their career focus on Southeast/East Asian and European politics.

3. Division of labour

3.1 Job description: Alfred Gerstl

As project leader Alfred Gerstl will coordinate the workload and will be responsible for the research design, the research results and the dissemination of the results. He will also represent the project team towards the FWF or other research institutes.

Drawing from his experience in governance research, he will also bear the main responsibility for the conceptualization of regionalization and regionalism in general and on Southeast and East Asian regionalism in particular. Because of his background in International Relations theory and Political Theory, he will also conduct the research on theories of integration, regionalism in different world regions, the work on ASEAN's historical development, the political systems of the selected ASEAN members and the "Asian values" with the assistance of the other team members.

Because of his knowledge of the EU's role in the international system and its internal decision-making mechanisms, he will also contribute to the EU part, notably to the EU's political and cultural interests in Southeast and East Asia and the effects of Southeast and East Asian regionalism in this sphere.

3.2 Job description: Dominik Zotti

Due to his academic background in economics and international business in general and international political economy and economic integration and development in particular (his Master thesis is about the political dimension of fair trade), Dominik Zotti will focus on the economic aspects of the research project. Hence he will cover the economic and financial integration in Southeast and East Asia, the socioeconomic development in the ASEAN nations and their economic systems, the role of private business in the regionalization processes or the impacts of regional integration on trade, financial or economic cooperation with the EU. Zotti will assist the project leader in conceptualizing Southeast Asian regionalism and defining the strategic economic and security interests of the major external powers in the region.

Because of his excellent contacts with the Southeast and East Asian scientific community, Zotti will also be responsible for coordinating our external contacts (both with the scientific community and the civil society) and the travel and interview plans.

As Zotti will finish his two Master theses in June 2006, he should be officially awarded with his titles in October. However, because of the ambitious time table as well as and the team chemistry, it is a desiderate to cooperate with Zotti from the start on. Working 8 hours per week with a research grant will allow him both to finish his studies in time and to contribute substantially to the first project phase.

3.3 Job description: Anna Scholik

Because of her scientific and professional background, Anna Scholik is an ideal fit for conducting the research on the EU's counter-terrorism measures and its cooperation efforts with ASEAN and East Asian partners. In this context she will also work on the CFSP, the EU's developmental aid and question whether the EU and ASEAN could agree on a common terrorism definition. Examining the differences in the EU and US approaches, she will pay special attention to human rights, democracy and good governance. Additionally, she will assist the other team members who conduct the relevant research with her expertise on the terrorist threats in Southeast Asia (case studies Indonesia, Malaysia and the Philippines).

3.4 Division of labour and main responsibilities exemplified with a table of content

1. The phenomena of regionalization and regionalism (AG, DZ)
2. Southeast and East Asia (AG, DZ)
 - 2.1 Definition, history and complexity of a region (AG)
 - 2.2 The major external players and their strategic interests (DZ)
 - 2.2.1 The major external players and their views of each other (DZ)
 - 2.2.2 The major external players and their views of ASEAN (AG)
 - 2.4 ASEAN (AG, DZ)
 - 2.4.5 ASEAN's distinct and non-specific features: the "ASEAN way" (AG)
3. Cooperation and integration in Southeast Asia (AG, DZ)
 - 3.1 The present state of integration and the "Asian Community" (AG)
 - 3.2 External driving forces and obstacles for integration (AG, DZ)
 - 3.2.X "Terrorism" – Southeast and East Asian definitions (DZ, AS)
 - 3.3 Internal driving forces and obstacles for integration (AG, DZ)
 - 3.3.1 The political systems and political cultures (AG)
 - 3.3.2 The economic systems (DZ)
 - 3.3.3 "Asian values": Cultural or ideological values? (AG)

- 3.3..3.1.1ff. “Asian democracy” and “Asian capitalism”? (AG, DZ)
- 4. The future of regionalism in Southeast and East Asia – six scenarios (AG, DZ)
 - 4.5 Conceptualization of Southeast and East Asian regionalism (AG, DZ)
- 5. The EU and Southeast and East Asia (AG, DZ)
 - 5.1 History of the Asia-Europe relations from Colonialism till today (DZ)
 - 5.2 The EU’s strategic interests and role in Southeast and East Asia (DZ, AS)
 - 5.2.1 Politics and culture (AG)
 - 5.2.2 Comprehensive security (DZ, AS)
 - 5.3.3 Economics and trade (DZ)
 - 5.4ff. The six scenarios and their impacts on the EU (DZ, AG)
 - 5.5 Possible contributions of the EU to Southeast and East Asian regionalism (DZ)
 - 5.5.X A potential EU approach in the war on terror (AS)
 - 5.6 The EU – a role model for ASEAN? (DZ)
 - 5.7.ASEAN – a role model for the enlarged EU? (AG)
 - 5.X Conclusio (AG, DZ)

Curriculum Vitae Alfred Gerstl

Date of birth 29. April 1971
Nationality Austrian
Address Radetzkystr. 10/18, A-1030 Vienna
Email a.gerstl@gmx.at

Educational record

M.A. Sept. 2004 International Relations (July 2003 – August 2004),
Macquarie University, Sydney (Australia)
PhD Dec. 1999 Political Science (Oct. 1993 – Dec. 1999), Univ. Vienna
Mag.phil. Dec. 1993 Political Science (Oct. 1989 – Oct 1993), Univ. Vienna
(Second major: Economics, history, Third World studies)
High school June 1989 Vienna (with distinction)

Academic career

Since Sept. 2004 *Academic and journalist freelancer*
Aug. 2001 – Aug. 2003 *Scientific Consultant*, Austrian Ministry for Education, Science
and Culture,
Since 2001 *Lecturer* at the Department for Politics, University Vienna,
Nov. 1999 – Dec. 2001 *Researcher*, Institute for Advanced Studies (IHS), Vienna
Feb. 1996 – Nov. 1999 *Research assistant*, Liberal Bildungsforum (LBF), Vienna
July 1993 – Jan. 1996 *Parliamentary Assistant*, Liberal Forum (political party)

Awards

2004 Vice-Chancellor's Commendation for postgraduate studies,
Macquarie University, Sydney
2002 Great Research Grantship of the Department for Culture and
Science, City of Vienna

Language Skills

- German (native speaker)
- English (excellent)
- French (good)
- Spanish (basics)

List of selected publications

- Winter 2005 Together with Jorgo Chatzimarkakis (eds.): *Liberale Parteien in Europa*. Baden-Baden: Nomos Verlag.
- Summer 2005 *Liberalismus in und aus Wien. Von der Aufklärung bis zur Gegenwart*. Klagenfurt: Wieser Verlag (Reihe Enzyklopädie des Wiener Wissens).
- July 2004 *External and Internal Driving Forces in Integration Processes – The Case of East Asia*. Master thesis, Macquarie University Sydney.
- Februar 2004 *Southeast Asia*, *ÖZP*, Vol. 33/No. 1, pp. 117–118 (Book reviews).
- Dec. 2002 Together with Susanne Pernicka, Monika Feigl-Heihls and Peter Biegelbauer: *Wie demokratisch ist die europäische Forschungs- und Technologiepolitik? Der politische Entscheidungsfindungsprozess zum fünften Forschungsrahmenprogramm aus österreichischer Perspektive*. Baden-Baden: Nomos Verlag.
- Aug. 2002 *Governance – neue Anforderungen an „neues Regieren“*. Wien (Endbericht an das BMBWK).
- March 2002 Together with Thomas Pankratz (eds.): *Menschenrechts-Reader: Texte zum Jahr der Menschenrechte*. 2nd ed. (originally published 1998). Wien: LBF.
- Oct. 2001 *Globalisierung und Neoliberalismus*. Manuskript zum Proseminar, Uni Wien.
- Oct. 2001 Together with Susanne Pernicka: “Europäische Forschungs- und Technologiepolitik zwischen Effektivität und Demokratie. Die mögliche Einflussnahme von Interessengruppen in den Bereichen Aeronautik und Sozioökonomie im fünften Forschungsrahmenprogramm der EU”, *ÖZP* Vol. 30/No. 4, pp. 331–347.
- März 2001 “Die Liberalismus/Kommunitarismus-Diskussion”, *texte&thesen* 2, pp. 1–12.

Curriculum Vitae Dominik Zotti

Date of birth 29. March 1979
Nationality Austrian
Address Mondweg 5/3/1, A-1140 Vienna
Email dzotti@gmx.at

Educational record

June 2006	Master	International Business Administration University of Economics and Business Administration
June 2006	Master	Economics, Vienna Univ. of Economics and Business Administr.
Sept. 2005	Certificate	Good Governance Programme (Sept. 2004 – Sept. 2005). Academic Programme, Good Governance Consortium, Vienna Univ. of Economics and Business Administration
May 2005	Master of Public Policy Programme	Hubert Humphrey Institute for Public Affairs Univ. of Minnesota
Sept. – Dec. 2002	Studies	Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, Hong Kong

Academic/professional career

June 2003 – June 2004	<i>Project Executive</i> , Asia-Europe Foundation (ASEF), Singapore
Jan. – Feb. 2003	<i>Trainee</i> , Austrian General Consulate, Montreal (Canada), Commercial Counsellor's Office
Nov. 1999 – Jan. 2001	<i>Research and educational Assistant (Civil service)</i> , Simon Wiesenthal Center, Los Angeles (USA)
June. 1998 – Sept. 1998	<i>Intern</i> , International Bank for Foreign Trade, Vienna
Feb. 1997 – Nov. 1999	<i>Marketing and Finance Director</i> , Organization for Services Abroad, Vienna

Language Skills

- German (native speaker)
- English (excellent)
- French (working knowledge)
- Mandarin (basics)

List of selected publications

- 2004 **Asia-Europe Foundation (ASEF) (ed.): The Barcelona Report. Recommendations from Civil Society on Asian-Europe Relations addressed to the ASEM Leaders. (Co-editor.)**
- 2004 **Fort, Bertrand with Dominik Zotti: “What role can ASEM have for enhancing cooperation on security in Asia and Europe?”, *Conference Paper: New Security Challenges for Asia and Europe*. Beijing, 23. April.**

Additionally regular contributions to the ASEF Newsletter on regional integration, international relations that examine regional-level issues; governance (human rights, labour relations); new security challenges; civil society.

Recent Conferences attended

- Annual Meeting of the Association for Asian Studies 2005, Chicago, USA
- Harvard National Model United Nations 2005, Boston, USA
- ASEFUAN Annual General Meeting 2004, Singapore
- Model Asia-Europe Meeting 2004, Singapore
- Harvard Project For Asian And International Relations 2004, Shanghai, China
- Harvard Asia Business Conference 2004, Fudan University. Shanghai, China
- Connecting Civil Society of Asia and Europe, June 2004, Barcelona, Spain
- Asia-Europe Dialogue on Security, April 2004, Beijing, China
- World Student Summit, National University of Singapore, Dec. 2003, Singapore
- 2nd ASEM Education Hub Meeting, Nov. 2003, Singapore
- Asia-Europe Conference on Multicultural Understanding, Oct. 2003, Singapore

Memberships

Asia-Europe Society, Austrian Association for Foreign Policy and International Relations; Academic Forum for Foreign Affairs – Austria; ASEF University Alumni Network (ASEFUAN); Model ASEM Steering Committee; United Nations Youth and Student Association of Austria (UNYSA-AUSTRIA); Model United Nations Club – Austria.

Curriculum Vitae Anna Scholik

Date of birth 10 May 1977
Nationality Austrian and French
Address Elisenstrasse 96, 1230 Vienna
Email annascholik@gmx.at

Educational record

MES	Sept. 2004	Master of European Studies, Univ. Vienna
Maîtrise de Droit Public	June 2002	Master's degree in public law, Université de Toulon et du Var, France
High School	June 1996	Lycée Francais de Vienne

Language Skills

- German (native speaker)
- French (native speaker)
- English (excellent)

Academic/professional career

June 2005 – (approx.) Nov. 2006	Federal Austrian Ministry of the Interior, Federal Office for the Protection of the Constitution and for Counter-terrorism Measures, <i>Analyst</i>
March – May 2005	Terrorism Prevention Branch, United Nations, Vienna <i>Internship</i>

List of selected publications

Sept. 2004 **Die rechtspolitischen Systeme im gegenwärtigen Kampf gegen den Terrorismus: Europäische Union - Vereinigte Staaten. Master thesis, University Vienna.**

Supplement 3:

Project costs

1. Personnel costs

<u>Person</u>	<u>Contribution</u>	<u>1st year</u>	<u>2nd year</u>	<u>3rd year</u>
Alfred Gerstl	100 % / 75%	56.780,00	42.585,00	42.585,00
Dominik Zotti	15% / 100%	5.280,00	29.370,00	29.370,00
<hr/>				
Total		62.060,00	71.955,00	71.955,00

Personnel costs

205.970,00 Euros

For the duration of the project, Gerstl and Zotti will be employees of the OIIP. (In the first year, Zotti will receive a research grant for Master students.) Scholik will get a contract for work and services (20 hours per week, 6 months) which amounts to **7.342,50 Euros**.

Personnel costs total

213.312,50 Euros.

2. Travel costs

In order to interview local academics, political and economic decision-makers, journalists or civil society representatives as well as for literature study, it is essential to conduct study trips through Southeast Asia, notably Singapore, Malaysia, Indonesia, Thailand and the Philippines (3 weeks/2 team members), and to Brussels and Leiden respectively (1 week/2 team members). As the ASEM 2006 will be held under the Finnish EU presidency in Tampere in September 2006, one team member will use the opportunity to attend the meeting and conduct interviews with key decision-makers as well as NGO representatives.

These research trips are essential for the success of our project as they enable us to get better insights in the political, economic and social developments and debates in the region, especially through conducting interviews. According to their thematic responsibilities and in order to make the most out of our research trips, Alfred Gerstl will cover Singapore, Malaysia, Thailand and Vietnam, Dominik Zotti Indonesia and the Philippines. However, as Singapore and Indonesia play important roles as information and network hubs for the project, both scientists will visit these countries:

Alfred Gerstl will focus on Singapore, Malaysia and Thailand (Month 10)

1 flight Vienna – Singapore/Bangkok – Vienna (950 Euros)

1 flight Singapore – Kuala Lumpur (120 Euros)

Flight costs 1.070 Euros

Hotel costs (50 Euros per night, 23 nights) 1.150 Euros

Trip in total 2.220 Euros

Dominik Zotti will cover Singapore, Indonesia and the Philippines (Month 22)

1 flight Vienna – Jakarta (stop over Kuala Lumpur) – Vienna (950 Euros)

1 flight Jakarta – Singapore – Jakarta (200 Euros)

1 flight Jakarta – Manila – Jakarta (750 Euros)

Flight costs 1.900 Euros

Hotel costs (50 Euros per night, 23 nights) 1.150 Euros

Trip in total 3.050 Euros

Either Alfred Gerstl or Dominik Zotti will conduct a second research trip to Thailand and Vietnam (Month 29)

1 flight Vienna – Hanoi (stop over Bangkok) – Vienna (1350 Euros)

Flight costs	1.350 Euros
Hotel costs (50 Euros per night, 17 nights)	850 Euros
Trip in total	2.200 Euros

Alfred Gerstl (Month 4) and Dominik Zotti (Months 31):

2 flights Vienna – Brussels – Vienna (300 Euros each)

Flight costs	600 Euros
Hotel costs (70 Euros per night, 12 nights)	840 Euros
Trip in total	1.440 Euros

Dominik Zotti (approx. Month 9):

1 Flight Vienna – Tampere – Vienna (450 Euros)

Flight costs	450 Euros
Hotel costs (70 Euros per night, 5 nights)	350 Euros
Trip in total	850 Euros

Flights in total **5.370 Euros**

Hotels in total **4.340 Euros**

Flights and hotels in total: **9.710 Euros.**

3. Costs for workshops and conference

3.1 First workshop

In order to illustrate the start of the project a public workshop with renowned international experts will be held at the OIIP in Vienna. The main function of the workshop will be to help the project team to refine its conceptualization of Southeast and East Asian regionalism as well as the role and strategic interests of the European Union in this world region. A public lecture of an eminent expert on South and East Asia, held at the first day, will send a strong signal about the importance of this project to the scientific community and the interested public.

The initial workshop will start with a public lecture. The one day workshop with approximately 15 participants will be held the next day. Venue for the public lecture and the workshop is the OIIP library.

Travel costs 2 participants South/East Asia	Euro	1.000
Travel costs 3 participants Austria/Europe		1.200
Hotel costs 3 nights *) (à Euro 110)		1.650
Service lecture (beverages)		50
Meals workshop (2 coffee breaks/dinner)		500
Costs for programme (graphic artist)		120
Mailing costs		200
<u>OIIP-Overhead</u>		<u>1.000</u>
Total		5.720

3.2 Second workshop

A small second workshop with two or three national and international experts, held at the OIIP, will help the project team to critically assess the half time report and to identify the open questions for the second part of the project:

Travel costs 3 participants Austria/Europe		1.200
Hotel costs 2 nights *) (à Euro 110)		660
<u>Meals workshop (2 coffee breaks/dinner)</u>		<u>300</u>
Total		2.160

3.3 Conference

At the end of the project a public conference (one day) will be held at the OIIP. The conference will be crucial for the dissemination of the research results to the international scientific community as well as the interested public and the media. It will also substantially contribute to the networking of the project team and the OIIP.

Travel costs 2 participants South/East Asia	Euro	1.000
Travel costs 3 participants Austria/Europe		1.200
Hotel costs 3 nights *) (à Euro 110)		1.650
Meals (2 coffee breaks, snacks at OIIP)		500
Costs for programme (graphic artist)		120
Mailing costs		200
<u>OIIP-Overhead</u>		<u>1.000</u>
Total		5.670 Euros

Total costs Workshops and Conference **13.550 Euros**

*) Calculation base 3 nights, as this allows the purchase of a cheaper pex travel ticket.

4 Total project costs

In total, the project costs amount to **236.572,50** Euros for 36 months.