

Session 1

- *September 12th 9:30am -11:00am Americas/Political Economy*

Presenters: Isidro Morales Moreno, Las Americas University, “The goals, scope and limits of US “open regionalism” in the Americas. From NAFTA to the FTAA negotiations”

Chair: Junji Nakagawa, ISS

Discussants: Tomoo Marukawa, ISS & **Gaspare Genna**, University of Texas at El Paso

Notes on Presentation:

p.1b: Point 3, “Minilateralism” refers to agreements such as NAFTA and CAFTA.

Point 4, Prof. Morales says there is a stalemate here, but it is not a crisis but rather strategy of negotiations between the US and Brazil.

p.2a: This charts depicts the situation since the mid 80's. %'s are US exports.

p.2b: NAFTA is set up not to reduce tariffs but to create rules and principles (disciplinary approach).

p.3ab, 4a: NAFTA did not specifically create growth in US-Mexico trade.

p.7: On Brazil's incentives: Mercosur is not keen to “sensitive areas” negotiations such as in agriculture. Mercosur values each state and not full integration. Brazil is looking to be a major player in negotiations in the region.

Conclusion: Open regionalism is not in a crisis.

Comments:

Prof. Marukawa: Two interesting points.

- In NAFTA negotiations, environmental and labor issues are included. This is different from in Asia, as, for example, people in Japan may see the difference in these issues as even an advantage. Are there “other opinions” in US and Mexico?
- As the map slide showed, Mexico's proximity to the US benefited closer regions. However, there is a doubt on FTAA. Can Brazil and other countries far away from the US benefit as much as Mexico did?

Prof. Genna: US-Brazil axis is important, but is a limited factor (as compared to France-Germany one). FTAA and WTO are closely related. On labor/environment issue, they were not desired to be in negotiation by Canada or Mexico, but were due to social pressure from within US to make side agreements. As shown in the slides, neo-liberal reforms before NAFTA helped in the increase in export for Mexico, but more importantly, Mexico did not revert back after NAFTA was signed. How would the US and Brazil's power affect

preferences and incentives for other countries in the region?

Replies by Prof. Morales: Proximity is not that important. Brazil has a lot to gain by FTAA. One of the questions is how to translate “economic power” into regionalism. By positioning, how coalitions are made, how agents act. In case of Brazil, domestic issue is important.
Floor:

Q(Schulz): On “NAFTA is about disciplining” issue. Mercosur is changing, but in which way? EU like, disciplining, or inter-governmental platform? What is the driving force for hegemony of the US and to a lesser degree Brazil?

Q(Day): There are a dynamic of resistance to NAFTA in the US and the political shift to the socio-democratic left. Are there formal or informal meetings to counter these? On labor, there is a pressure by consumers on western firms to raise labor standards in China. On environment, sulfur dioxide comes from China to Japan and South Korea. What kind of future ramifications is possible in these issues?

A: Brazil is similar to Mexico. Brazil is useful to US as it can be an ally in talks with EU and Japan. Mercosur is very weak. Environment was not an issue in Mexico.

Session 2

● *September 12th 11:15am-12:45pm Europe/Economics*

Presenters: **Ken’ichi Ando**, Shizuoka University and **Odile E. M. Janne**, University of London “The Role of FDI from a Local Perspective: the Cases of the West Midlands and Shizuoka-Aichi”

Chair: **Akira Kudo**, ISS

Discussant: **Martin Schulz**, Fujitsu Research Institute

Ando and Janne examined the role of FDI/Multinational companies (MNCs) in the automotive clusters of Japanese Shizuoka-Aichi and British West Midlands. The clusters are heartland of the automobile industry in their respective country and MNCs in the regions have an impact on the regional development through externalities.

Their points of view are following; 1) local perspective compared to global, regional and national perspective and 2) comparison of between UK and Japan at the local level considering current surge of cluster policy.

Through a comparative study of the regions which face different background, they argue that the impact of MNCs depends on the interaction between the integrated strategies of MNCs and the region’s comparative advantage and relative competitive position in the industry.

This paper is really ambitious paper regarding a prospect of regional integration in East Asia. Main comments are as follows. First, it is not good performance/condition in WM compared to local areas in EU. Second, the indicators of divergence/convergence don't seem to be compatible, and finally they are missing the disadvantages of agglomeration which are very important to explain Shizukoka-Aichi area.

Notes on Mr. Ando and Ms. Janne

- 本稿での主題として、FDI、空洞化、クラスターアプローチを扱う。
- グローバリゼーション・地域統合をローカルな視点 (local perspective) から考える。
- FDI は国家間を動く tangible/intangible asset であり、FDI/MNCs と地域経済との間には相互作用がある。
- ただし、FDI/MNCs にも後述するように様々なパターンがある。
- ローカル政策としてクラスター政策が流行になっているが、クラスター政策の効率性と、当該地域を取り巻く背景を考慮する必要がある。

- グローバリゼーション・地域統合は地域・国家間の characteristics を reduce させる。
- ただし、これらによってすべての国が benefit を得られるとは限らない。
- M. Porter の影響でクラスター政策が流行しているが、以下の事例研究を取り上げて評価しよう。

- WM と SAP の一般的な概要
- グローバルトレンドとして、EU 諸国間の収束、国内での発散；アジア諸国間の収束、国内での発散
→ つまり、グローバルゼーションはよりローカルに影響を与えている。
- UK はリベラルな対外政策を採ってきたが、日本は (UK の経験を追随するように) 今日はいよりリベラルな政策を採るようになってきた。

- MNCs の地域経済発展に与える影響を、ケーススタディーを通じて見て行こう。
- 企業が集積することによって外部経済が得られる。
- 外部経済には、熟練労働やインフラアクセスのほか、企業間の緊密なネットワークにより knowledge spillover や innovation が期待できる。
- WM と SAP における自動車産業 (組立て、下請け企業等) の概要。WM : 外資系企業が占める。SAP : 外資系企業少なく、国内企業が占める。その他、置かれている環境により活動・事業展開の相違、比較優位がもたらされる。
- WM・SAP ではクラスター政策が行われているが、それは地域の発展にどのような影響があるか、それぞれに問題を抱えている。

- WM ではクラスター政策がこの地域の背景にあった automobile specific な政策であるのに対し、SAP は自動車産業が集積しているのも関わらず、日本経済産業省の進めるクラスター政策は、hi-tech やバイオテクノロジー政策が強調されている。

Notes on Mr. Shultz's comments

- グローバルに動く FDI とローカルで何が起きているのかに注目したタイムリーで興味深い研究である。
- (Central and Eastern European Countries(CEECs)を念頭にして)FDI の議論をするにあたり、要素賦存が異なる先進国と途上国の相違には留意すべきである。各地域の cluster policy ないし FDI attractiveness/promotion policy の focus/scheme が異なる。
- Comparative case studies are an appropriate mythology. But, your convergence and divergence indicators are not compatible.
- Where are the West Midlands in the EU context? Looking at EU Exceptional regional performances, WM is not outperforming region and my image is pretty mixed.
- WM wants to develop faster
→ see Benchmarking regional competitiveness. What drives it?
- UK top down reforms (industrial policy at national level) vs. bottom up reforms (devolution, cluster policy at the regional level) →WM hope the latter, but the result is mixed.
- The impact of FDI on Eastern European automobile clusters.
→ positive effects for automobile suppliers. But employment effects in the region itself might be limited. Thus, mixed
- Cluster polices what is it and helps? Where is it going? How do you get a region to develop and what to do?

Reply from Ando

- クラスター政策は政府(national)レベルでも浜松市(local)レベルでも実施されているが、先にも述べたように automobile industry に注意を払った政策ではない。knowledge-based innovation, process-based innovation に焦点を絞ったクラスター政策が求められる。

Questions and comments from the floor

- I want to know critical difference of these two comparisons: UK under EU vs. Japan
←EU: institutionalized regional integration, e.g. labor mobility and other cooperation mechanisms in social and employment policy.
←Japan: production system has changed without regional integration.
- How do you predict an effect that Japan tries to negotiate FTA with Asian countries?

Foreign ownership increases even in Japan?

- In your presentation, you are missing disadvantages of agglomeration. これは特に静岡・愛知地域には重要な視点であり、この地域では労働者が不足してきている。日本の自動車産業で fastest growing な地域は九州であり、九州にはまだ労働者が豊富。
- Prospect of automobile industry in SAP area.
- 東アジア統合の展望はどうか。EU と同じ現象 (relocation, hollowing out) が起こるのか？

Session 3

● *September 12th 2:10pm-3:40pm Europe/Politics*

Presenter: Yoichiro Usui, Niigata International Information University, “New Modes of Governance and the Climate Change Strategy in the European Union: Implications for Democracy in Regional Integration

Chair: Kenji Hirashima, ISS

Discussants: Stephen Day, Oita University & **Gaspere Genna**, University of Texas at El Paso

Discussion

Three major issues were raised from the commentators, one concerning the scope of the alleged new governance model, another on the notion of “efficiency” of policies, the other regarding the nature and derivation of so-called democratic deficiency.

On the scope of the new governance approach, a suspicion was raised against the obsolescence of the traditional Community method, as a mode of governance directly connected to the genetic nature of the EU. It is especially the case when the green parties in the European Parliament has vigorously acted to bring to the fore European environmental issues. As the speaker’s main aim was limited to refutation of the prevailing dichotomy of the teleological model and the *sui generis* model of the EU governance, the most which can be said from the arguments in the presentation was only that the EU has been faced with a big challenge of how to maintain efficiency and democracy in the system. Simultaneously, as a complicating factor the expansion of the EU was pointed out, in that while before the accession the new member countries are only to accept the existing institution as it is, after that they may be opposed to it, as is already seen in some issue areas.

As to the “efficiency” notion, its clear definition and adequate measurement was discussed in the context of decision making. Distinction among three levels of analysis was raised, i.e. local, national, and European level, and the necessity of further investigation into the notion was agreed, being aware of such difference. Examples were suggested of some methods actually used to benchmark policy efficiency in the EU and in the U.S.

The existence of democratic deficiency, which was assumed in the presentation, was cast into doubt from the perspective that the EU lacks the necessary condition to be regarded as a polity. Attention was paid to the fact that issues typically contested at European Parliament election are not so much of European concern, but rather local ones. Yet another question was raised, given that the problem of democratic deficiency does exist, whether it emerged *in spite of* the fact that the EU has been the most advanced regional integration project or *because* it has succeeded in achieving at that height. It was argued that politics of the EU is distinctively discursive, in that it is sometimes the case that illusory images are dispersed into its political atmosphere.

Several topics were further discussed and among them was the necessary consciousness of diversity in the domestic political settings of each country. Noticed was the existence of huge diversity in political system among Asian countries. Although the *sui generis* model may not represent the governance in the EU to the full extent, nor succeed in grasping the essence of it, its uniqueness cannot be overlooked in sharing the democratic value among the member countries. And yet, in the contemporary world the democratic value has widely been shared, and civic movements can be seen outside Europe. Whether one institution is democratic or not can hardly be ignored facing such situation.

Session 4

- **September 12th 4:10pm-5:40pm General Discussion:** *How and What Should We Analyze on “East Asian Regionalism”?*

Chair: **Dan Sasaki**, ISS

*

Prof. Sasaki stated that the purpose of this session is brainstorming. He expressed his belief that it was important to make a consensus among the participants on the agenda and methodology of CREP.

He then announced that Dr. Yepes would give a concise address before the general discussion.

Dr. Yepes made a brief introduction to the “Comparative Regional Integration Studies” of United Nations University. He pointed out that it is important not to lose sight of the global

perspective while studying regional integration. He considered it interesting to pay attention to the influence of the regional, national and transnational networks of think tanks as agents for regional integration.

*

The Chairperson then declared the general discussion open.

Prof. Wang asked Dr. Yepes what was the distinctive feature of APEC in comparison with EU.

Dr. Yepes said that he was interested in whether there were transnational epistemic communities that might promote the regional integration in East Asia as in Europe.

Prof. Morales Moreno pointed out that, while EU studies could have a definite object to study because EU was established as an institution, East Asian studies was very difficult for there had been yet little formal arrangements in East Asia. He suggested that it should be decided, at the beginning, what kind of regionalism CREP would study.

Prof. Day mentioned that the Australian government had expressed in her homepage that member states did not intend to make ASEAN formalized.

Prof. Nakamura referred to the Bali Concord (2003) that had mentioned East Asian “Community” with new implementation mechanism. While agreeing that the East Asian integration had yet gone so far, he expressed the view that there was a stream for institutionalization in East Asia.

Prof. Genna stated that the informal integration might be omnipresent and, therefore, CREP should focus on the institutional aspects that could make the integration stable.

Prof. Ando thought that, if the integration meant the increase of mobility of goods, capital, labor etc., and then informal integration could be seen not only in a specific region but also everywhere.

The Chairperson, noting that the connection between informal aspect and formal aspect of the regional integration, formulated the question as followed: should CREP apply disciplines of social sciences or those of cultural studies.

Prof. Wang was of the opinion that CREP might mainly concentrate on the institutional aspect of the regionalism with its political and economic situation.

*

Prof. Cheng put a question whether the purpose of CREP was proposing an appropriate model of integration in East Asia.

Prof. Marukawa explained that, as to the regional integration, the East Asian countries were late comers. He considered that they might learn from the experience of EU and NAFTA.

Dr. Yepes put a question that what should be the advantage of CREP as compared with other

regional studies.

Prof. Nakamura stated that CREP might aim not at just “comparison for comparison” but at comparison for better understanding of East Asian regional integration. In that case, he found the agenda of CREP in inventing new concepts to understand the deepening interdependence among East Asian countries as a movement for integration and formulating a desirable model for East Asian integration.

Dr. Schulz suggested that, while carrying out the plan thus proposed, it might be useful not only to build a desirable model but also to make negative list. For example, he thought that over-centralization with too much bureaucracy must be avoided.

The Chairperson raised a question whether the project should be policy-oriented or purely scientific.

Prof. Genna observed that the project should not refrain from making policy propositions.

Prof. Wang said that it was hoped that the project would present constructive proposals not only to Japan but also to other countries who took leadership in East Asia.

*

During the discussion, Prof. Cheng stressed the importance of the constraints of the global legal circumstances upon each regional arrangement.

Dr. Janne suggested that the agenda of CREP should include the analysis of the reason why countries had preferred multilateral trade agreements to bilateral treaties.

Prof. Genna reminded the participants of the political situation of the East Asia. He emphasized the significance of China who remained socialist power after the end of cold war.

The session then adjourned.

Session 5

● *September 13th 9:30am-11:00am East Asia/Law*

Presenters: **Wang Guiguo**, City University of Hong, “*Regionalism in the Globalized World*”, Kong & **Seung Wha Chang**, Seoul National University, “*Regional Trade Agreements and the WTO: WTO Consistency of East Asian RTAs*”

Chair: **Tamio Nakamura**, ISS

Discussants: **Takao Suami**, Waseda University & **Shigeru Minamino**, Kyushu University

The meeting was opened by the Chairperson, Prof. Nakamura, who spoke of the necessity of understanding the influence of the global legal circumstances upon regionalism.

The chairperson introduced two presenters and declared Prof. Wang took the floor.

*

Prof. Wang read his paper on the relationship between regional integration in general and

GATT/WTO. First of all, he stated that the regionalism was an exception to WTO and was aimed at protecting the interests of member states vis-a-vis non-member states. He then described the stipulations of WTO agreements which regulated the relationship with regional arrangements. He picked up article twenty-four of GATT, articles five and seven of GATS. He went on to looking at the practice under the GATT/WTO and took up four examples, namely European Free Trade Association, Yaounde Convention, Turkey case, and coordination among different agreements. In conclusion, he expected that countries would compete with each other for seeking valuable partners of FTA in South Asia and East Asia.

Prof. Cheng then gave an address on the consistency of East Asian Regional Trade Agreements with WTO agreements. He started with historical overview. He stated that, until recently, Japan and Korea had not promoted Regional Trade Agreements and depended mainly on WTO regime. He expressed the view that they changed their policy to conclude FTAs because they had suffered from disadvantage in exportation with members of other FTAs. He then indicated three issues for discussion: first, the interpretation of “substantially all the trade” in article twenty-four, paragraph eight of GATT, secondly, that of “other restrictive regulations of commerce” in the same paragraph, finally, the meaning of the “rules of origin”. He concluded by stressing the importance of the multilateral approach through WTO while discussing the issues thus enumerated.

*

After the two presentations, two discussants brought up some issues for consideration.

Prof. Suami raised four points. In the beginning, he doubted that WTO was very effective in regulating regional arrangements. Secondly, he placed a high value on the provisions of some FTAs that gave themselves priority to other agreements. Thirdly, he emphasized the importance of understanding the exact motivation for concluding FTAs. Finally, he pointed out that the East Asian community could follow two models: networks of bilateral FTAs and the “Community” such as EU.

Prof. Minamino put three questions. At the start, was there cultural or religious difference that prevented East Asian countries from establishing East Asian “Community”? Secondly, if regional FTAs would coordinate regional trades, then was WTO going to find its function in harmonizing the regional arrangements? Thirdly, did the empowerment of regional institutions turned out to erode the sovereignty of states?

*

Concerning Prof. Suami’s first point, Prof. Wang said that, while acknowledging that WTO was not effective then, WTO would evolve through dispute on the consistency of the measures with WTO standard. With regard to Prof. Suami’s fourth point, he expected that East Asian countries could not constitute a “Community” because of the economic or political diversity of

themselves. As to Prof. Minamino's first question, he thought that the economic integration could be achieved notwithstanding the cultural or religious difference by harmonizing the way of governance in the region. Relating to Prof. Minamino's third question, he considered that sovereignty could be eroded by regional integration.

Prof. Cheng replied to Prof. Suami's second point by stating that there would remain a problem whether the decision of the regional FTA was opposable to other forums or not. As to Prof. Suami's third point, he argued that East Asian countries used WTO because it was easier to refer WTO than to establish new regional institution. As for Prof. Suami's fourth point, he expected that East Asian "Community" could not be established in near future because most states resisted the domestic law reform to adjust the expected regional arrangement. Regarding Prof. Minamino's third question, he mentioned a judgment of Korean Supreme Court that declared a municipal ordinance invalid because of its inconsistency with a WTO agreement. He thought that, while this judgment was an exception so far, WTO could deteriorate the sovereignty of states.

*

The chairperson invited questions or comments from the floor.

Prof. Genna asked whether the difference of legal tradition among East Asian countries disturbed the regional integration. Prof. Nakagawa pointed out that countries concluded bilateral FTAs on account of the negotiation cost in WTO. Prof. Morales Moreno suggested that one should not lose sight of the problem of consistency of domestic laws with WTO.

Prof. Wang answered the question by Prof. Genna by stating that most countries in East Asia belonged to civil law tradition. Prof. Cheng pointed out that the degree of economic development was much important than the difference of legal culture. Prof. Wang responded to Prof. Nakagawa by stating that the motivation of concluding FTAs was not only economic but also strategic. In response to the question by Prof. Morales Moreno, Prof. Cheng said that, until then, there had been little judgments that declared national legislation invalid because of its inconsistency with WTO.

The session then adjourned.

Session 6

● ***September 13th 11:10am-12:40pm Americas/Law***

Presenter: Junji Nakagawa, ISS, "Comparing Dispute Settlement Systems: NAFTA and WTO"

Chair: Tamio Nakamura, ISS

Discussants: Wang Guiguo, City University of Hong Kong
& **Seung Wha Chang**, Seoul National University

Discussion

Following presentation by Professor Nakamura, several comments was made summary of which is as follows:

One comment addresses the legal cultural difference between the NAFTA countries and East Asia. While in NAFTA, disputes are likely to be resolved by legal means, in East Asia, where conciliatory culture prevails, governments as well as people take an aversive attitude towards litigation. Under such circumstances, consultation is more general and likely to be more successful as a way of resolving conflicts than an institutionalised litigation or arbitration system. A response was made that if such is the case and formal dispute settlement system have little prospect of being used in regional frameworks, the significance of an established mechanism to resolve disputes still remains, as, by enabling ultimate resort to it, it regulates the consultation process implicitly.

Another comment concerns with the advantage of the WTO dispute settlement system. Countries which send no Appellate body member may fear that its decision is likely to be distorted and disadvantageous to them, and therefore may find it difficult to have recourse to the WTO system. However, it was invoked that the WTO system has established a high reputation in its neutrality and professionalism and trust to it among member states is pervasive and it was pointed out that given such perception, the doubt as to such a bias in WTO appellate body is only unlikely to arise. Simultaneously it was noticed that neutrality issue has been addressed also in NAFTA, in such a way as to make a change in appointing the arbitration body so that each party appoints two arbitrators who have nationality of the other state party, and then the four members chosen accordingly choose the head.

It is argued that parallelism of different dispute resolution frameworks may allow one case to be handled by two frameworks, as on the one hand, parties can invent a new argument to reinvoke a once settled issue, or, on the other hand, a third party may submit the same dispute to the WTO dispute resolution mechanism, which widely provides legal standing. It was suggested that the former case indicates a necessity of some principle on closure of a case, while the latter need not be regarded as a problem for it is only that different legal effects result according to different frameworks. In this context, three variations in exclusivity were referred to: (1) NAFTA allows free choice of the complaining party, (2) MERCOSUR gives priority to WTO dispute settlement mechanism, and (3) the EC exclusively handles issues within the system. The third, EC type of stipulation is an unparalleled one, reflecting the political aspiration of the institution to maintain its unitary legal system.

Several issues were put forwards, such as the impact of interstate trade dispute resolution system on regionalism more broadly, or the extent to which the WTO head can have impact upon international trade norms.

Session7

● **September 13th 2:10pm-3:40 pm Theory & Methodology of Comparing Regionalism**

Presenter: *Gaspare Genna*, University of Texas at El Paso, “*Power Preponderance, Institutional Homogeneity, and the Likelihood of Regional Integration*”

Chair: *Tomoo Marukawa*, ISS

Discussant: *Toshihiro Matsumura*, ISS

Genna introduced a theory that attempts to explain and predict levels of regional integration worldwide. The central argument is that the likelihood of institutionalized regional integration increases under a power predominance structural condition and high levels of trade which promote homogenization of domestic institutions. After he reviewed earlier political science literature on regionalism and then synthesized reliable theories into a general theory of regional integration, he provided a preliminary method of hypothesis testing.

Prof. Matsumura who is a theoretical economist commented on Genna’s paper. First, he pointed out that Geena’s paper contains interesting points, e.g., institutional aspects of regional integration, which economists often miss. Next, regarding the political point of view that asymmetric distribution leads to a deeper integration, he mentioned that the point is at variant with that of industrial organization (economics). Finally, he wondered whether the proxy variables for PP, homogeneity and SQ satisfaction are appropriate.

The comments from the floor are mainly divided into two points: (1) the definition of regional integration, and (2) the variables and selection bias in hypothesis testing. To put it concretely, some argued that the definition should include not only market factors but also non market factors such as production process. Others pointed out that the complexity of measuring variables and evaluating different type of regional trade agreements that have variant number of members.

In conclusion, the model that Genna suggested seems to apply very well to the enlargement of EU. Attendances at the session expected to develop and improve his model in the near future to explain or forecast East Asian integration very well.

Notes on Dr. Genna

- What is regionalism? The definitions of integration by earlier studies.
 - Hass (1958), Lindberg (1970)
 - economic definition, for example Smith (1993) → missing institutional aspect of integration His definition follows closely those of Hass and Lindberg. Further, he emphasizes that his

definition¹ includes economic aspects as well as political aspects.

To understand the definition, the followings are important.

← (1) intergovernmental and (2) supranational

- Branches of literature
 - Neofunctionalism
 - Institutionalism
 - Power theories
 - Intergovernmentalism
- General theory of regionalism and hypothesis
 - Putting all literatures together→develop a general theory of literature
 - Feedback mechanism among preponderance*SQ satisfaction, institutional homogeneity and regional integration
- method of hypothesis test
 - unit: individual regionalism like European, Africa, North and South America...
 - econometric method: using simultaneous equation
 - variables: see below
- How to measure variables
 - The degree of regionalism: Integration Achievement Score (IAS)
 - preponderance:
$$PP = \frac{GDP_i}{\sum_{j=1}^j GDP_j}$$
 - SQ satisfaction:
$$SQsatisfaction = \frac{\sum Exports}{\sum GDP}$$

where, export means intra-regional exports and GDP means intra-regional output.
 - homogeneity: Standard Deviation (SD) of economic institutional variables.
- Further studies

The above method can be used to forecast East Asian regional integration.

Notes on discussion

- PP をなぜ GDP だけで測るのか？また homogeneity に関しても economic variables だけでなく、political factors (such as election system)も考慮すべきである。SQ についても域内貿易量だけで測るのではなく、他の変数も考慮すべきではないか。
- Satisfaction SQ について。東アジアにおける中国、台湾などを事例として域外貿易の大きさを指摘。

¹ See his paper for full details.

- Integration Attachment Score (IAS)について。Geena は Trade in goods and services を 0 ~5 のスコアで評価しているが、それぞれを別々に検定するつもりはあるか？もし IAS の要素を combined して検定した場合、どのように評価するのか。IAS を構成する要素間には相関がありそうで、複雑なように思える。Homogeneity の変数 (SD) についても、ほかにいくつも収束の指標があるのではないか。
- Unit of analysis in testing について。異なる加盟国数 (規模) の different type of regionalism をいかに比較するか。3 カ国からなる地域統合や 14 カ国からなる地域統合もある。
- EU の通貨統合前 (Euro 導入前) には統合するエリアに関して多くの議論があり、ヨーロッパは統一通貨に適していないという理論があったが、現実には実現した。これはより重要な要素が EU の統合にはあったと思える。Geena の理論に基づく計算が成功するかどうか分からないが、もし失敗したら、あなたはどのようにそれを説明するのか？
- 統合の定義について、market factor ばかりでなく production process のような non market factor にも注目すべき。
- 定義について、regional elements も加えたらどうか。
- このモデルの行方。What kind of regionalism appears in Asia?
- 東アジアでは、EU 型の highly institutionalized integration? あるいは intergovernmental integration?
- Do you have any alternative theory or variable to explain regional integration?
- I found measuring problem. I think it is difficult for me to operationalize integration, because of the variance of integration like cross time, cross space, etc. Unit analysis becomes more important.
- IAS について、データセットに selection bias が生じる可能性があるのでは。
- variables に経済データを使っているが、他の変数も入れたほうがよい。
- EU の拡大がこのモデルの good example
- Do you have any tentative or prospect for East Asia? Or how deepening integration occurs in Asia?

Session 8

- *September 13th 4:10pm-5:40pm General Discussion: How Should We Compare Regionalism in Asia, Europe and Americas? (Building our methodology and analytical framework)*

Chair: Gregory W. Noble, ISS

(Titles of the speakers omitted)

Noble: There is a lot of material covering many topics. The problem is how to bring things all together, as there are many regions and many academic disciplines. I will introduce some broad issues that we might discuss here.

First, the legal side is strong. But so far the integration of legal and political sides is not as far along as it could be. Another, possibly disturbing, issue is that there have not been comparisons across regions. Although we discussed what the experience in NAFTA or EU may imply for East Asia, more systematic comparisons are needed. Economics should be integrated more, also.

The leader/proponent of the project must decide where the participants' comparative advantages lie and what each can bring to the project, think through what the important question is and what our main theoretical question or approach is going to be, and put some order on materials we have so far, since otherwise it will be tougher as time goes on.

Q: Time table? How to segregate chapters in the book?

A: 3 years. Publish a book in English, and possibly in Japanese too. The book format is not decided yet.

Q: (Could not clearly pick up the question) Regarding Prof. Noble's first point on the integration of law and political science...

A(Noble): There has been few work on East Asia, and there could be many fruitful things we can possibly accomplish. For example, by combining a European specialist with another with Asian expertise. This is partly because East Asia so far has been much less integrated. One area that has changed is FTA. So there is now a new interest in this region.

Q(Genna): What is it about regional integration that is of interest to the project? Institutional building? Or many different things? We need to have a focused research question to move forward.

A(Noble): There are two complementary questions in this. One is, the level of institutionalization in East Asia has been low. But the economic precursors have been very

high. As there is a talk for institutionalization, we can learn from NAFTA and EU examples. Another is the disciplinary side. We need more institutional integration before we can understand the situation in East Asia, but this is still in its very early stages.

Nakamura: A question I have in mind is on “East Asian Community”. Is it possible or not? If possible, what for? But to answer that we need to study other experiences. I would like to propose 3 stages of research.

- 1: Comparison of where we are now in Europe, Americas, and Asia.
 - We can generalize a trend or features of those relevant regions.
- 2: Making assessments.
 - From lawyers’ viewpoint, law on equality, sovereignty issue, constraints by national and international law etc.
 - From political scientists’ view: democracy, etc.
 - From economists’ view: efficiency.
- 3: Proposal as East Asian Community.

Nakagawa: These could be possible chapters in the book.

Comparative analysis on the current issues in each region. => Assessment on possible regional integrations and restraints, etc. => Smaller chapters on proposal.

Q: Time span and papers submitted. First stage by July next year?

A(Nakamura): First and second stages go together, as they are very much related. Then we can discuss if we can make proposals thereafter. But this is just a plan and need not go as planned.

Noble: Following up on Prof. Nakagawa, I agree. Organizing by discipline or region is dangerous and has no intellectual coherence. But two possible implications exist. Either the editor must make authors fit the topics and/or the editor must write settings before individual papers, which is probably already a good idea as the volume will not be too integrated.

Q(Genna): Policy implications. An important aspect?

A(Nakamura): Yes.

Q(Chang): Will the participants change?

A(Nakamura): I assume and hope most will stay. But, it is up to you.

Q(Genna): On methodology. I, for one, am willing to write the paper in two directions; one as is now and another to fit this project.

A(Noble): An appendix with technical material is a good idea.

Another thing that may be useful is creating public goods, gathering basic data and ideas that could be useful to readers and students.

Q(Day): Are we using institutionalization as an umbrella? It seems to be a goal for regionalization. There are legal, political, and economic aspects to institutionalization.

A(Nakamura): Institutionalization is not “the” umbrella, but is one of umbrellas. There are other issues such as securities that are distinct elements that can be seen as umbrellas.

Q(Wang): Master plan at this moment is important. Some detailed outline is necessary. See whether individual members are interested in pursuing each research topic. There should be some general directions so that the end product is a book/structure with one mind rather than collection of papers. The other important aspect is information sharing. Different people need data, so may be a centralized data collection is useful.

A(Nakamura): It is ideal, but we are not sure how much funds we can get.

Nakagawa: On umbrellas, East Asian Community could be built top-down by governments or bottom-up by private sectors. The reality is probably both. We should consider both directions. Then we can invite Profs Ando and Janne for local, regional, and global issues.

Day: Do we need an overreaching umbrella, or two or three different umbrellas?

Noble: This is a developmental process. I suggest considering the issue of “the levels”. There is a relatively strong bottom-up process and weak top-down process in East Asia. The issue of sovereignty is not successfully examined yet. The governments do not always reject challenges to its sovereignty. Two examples are Mexico’s incentives in NAFTA and China’s joining WTO to proceed with structural reform that is otherwise difficult to be achieved. So insiders can use outside pressures, and we need to be sensitive to mixed motivations to different “levels”. The US does not allow NAFTA or the WTO to interfere with its sovereignty but uses WTO standards on China to determine its openness. The complicated interaction between different levels can be taken into account and the calculative strategy may be domestic as much as international.

Genna: The best umbrella may be to combine the “levels” argument with motivations, constraints, and reforms. This will bring in a lot of works in the last two days.

Day: Is this related to multilevel governance literature?

Nakamura: Yes.

Chang: As Prof. Wang suggested, may we ask the project managers to come up with something in writing on possible format or possible institution, umbrellas (unitary or multiple), then collect comments from the participants. Then set a direction...

Nakamura: I think we all agree that we should embrace all disciplines. We could set up questionnaires, but at this moment we cannot come up with much content, but some general questions may be possible. I cannot dictate what kind of research agenda or methodology you have to take. This should be left to each member, and we can discuss this when we meet next year. For example the term “power” is different between lawyers and political scientists. So I do not want to control much at all.

Nakagawa: We should be flexible. But practically, in two weeks I have to meet the editor and have to discuss the outcome of this meeting. Also, we are applying for funds. So we need research concept written up. We can change points later.

Nakamura: What kind of guidelines or questionnaires do you (the floor) desire?

Wang: Not questionnaire, as it will require some predetermined opinion in mind. Another issue is that we do not want five lawyers to all write on the same subject. There should be a division of labor. So we need some method to learn who is doing what.

Nakagawa: By doing that, we can find vacancy in the project. (“We need another person in this topic.”)

Wang: Bottom-up? Maybe in two weeks you may ask the members on the topic. Then you will have a better picture.

Noble: There should be an interaction of bottom-up and top-down. For example, Ando-Janne paper is perhaps a little too specific and not linked to the larger picture of Pan-East Asia regionalism. An interaction between the authors and editors will be imperative in such cases. Nakamura-san seems to be too tentative.

Omori: Collection volumes usually have no coherence at all and are boring. In order to avoid that, at least, some connections to East Asian region and/or implications of East Asian Community are necessary in all chapters.

Day: The editor will probably demand the above for the book to be published.

Wang: Theme is important, so everyone will follow the same direction, instead of exercising too much freedom.

Marukawa: Can we agree that we are writing to make contributions to East-Asian integration? Everyone should put some implications on integration.

Day: What is the one-line title of the book?

Nakamura: The key word is “East-Asian Community”, not integration.

Noble: There are 2 to 4 books that everyone should read. One is 「東アジア共同体」 by Prof. Taniguchi at Waseda Univ. (谷口誠『東アジア共同体』岩波新書、2003)

Nakamura: I am happy to be able to have consensus on this common theme of “East Asian Community.”

Nakagawa: Maybe there should be a core-member meeting.

Please do not quote without expressed permission.
Institute of Social Science, University of Tokyo

Nakamura: Please ponder on your research interests. Then we can use emails to finalize the tasks for each of us.

The next meeting: July 15th-16th, 2006. Open to the public