

Comments on Morales and Sato papers

Barbara Stallings
Brown University

General comments

- Two papers are continuation of discussion on political economy (politics?) of regionalism
- Focus on government-based institutions of cooperation in Western Hemisphere and East Asia
- Neither is portrayed as particularly effective at this point of time

Isidro Morales

Contested Regionalisms in the Americas.

The US and Brazilian Approaches.

Convergence or Contestation?

Main points

- Two different approaches in WH re integration.
- US: Economic vision, based on “hub-and-spokes” structure, aimed to open economies in region. Negative list approach. Dispute settlement includes private sector.
- Brazil: Political vision, centered in South American bloc, aimed to improve negotiating position. Positive list approach. Dispute settlement limited to states.
- The two appear highly incompatible.

Questions on US

- Much more coherent than reality. Many US visions: Executive vs Congress; business vs labor; large vs small business
- To what extent have NAFTA institutions really worked?
- Who has benefited, and what does this suggest for future?
- How much space for more agreements?

Questions on Brazil

- What is economic content of Brazil vision?
- Will Brazil's private sector go along with government's strategy? Assumption that Brazil's interests same as partners'.
- What will be impact of Venezuela membership in Mercosur?
- Will Mercosur and CAN survive (as separate or as unified organization)?

Questions on WH

- Where are two visions leading the region?
- Will there be an FTAA? With what characteristics?
- What does the idea of a “Washington-Brasilia axis” imply?
- What does the Western Hemisphere experience imply for East Asia?
- What are the implications for WTO?

Koichi Sato

The ASEAN Regime:

Its Implications for East Asian Cooperation.

A Japanese View

Main points

- ASEAN is “core actor” of EA cooperation, but lacks common factors found in EU
- Main functions: avoid conflict and carry out “conference diplomacy” (5 characteristics)
- East Asian Study Group (2002) presents vision of EA cooperation
- Japan and China are twin engines of cooperation; Japan should open economy

Questions on ASEAN

- In what sense is ASEAN really the core actor in EA economic cooperation?
- What is the importance of “conference diplomacy”?
- What is meant by saying that ASEAN is an “unreliable institution”? (p.7)
- How important is it that the economic goals of ASEAN have not been achieved?

Questions on ASEAN + 3

- How does statement that Japan and China are “twin engines” of cooperation fit with idea of ASEAN as “core actor”?
- How will conflicts between Japan and China affect regional cooperation?
- Is recommendation that Japan open its economy to regional products realistic?

Comparisons/Conclusions

- Two papers appear to present different trajectories in two regions.
- In WH, two competing visions leave doubt about future of hemispheric integration
- In EA, apparently less conflict, but unclear if intra-regional relations so harmonious.
- Many issues of national interest remain in both cases.