Karolina Klecha-Tylec
Cracow University of Economics

A COMPARISON OF THE EUROPEAN UNION AND THE SOUTHEAST ASIAN MODELS OF REGIONAL INTEGRATION

Abstract: The European Community is the oldest dialogue partner of ASEAN (both bodies have entered into relations since 1972). The degree of regional integration through trade in Southeast Asia has been rising fast, especially over the two decades. By now economic integration in the European Union and in ASEAN has made enormous progress. Contemporaneously the institutional interaction between the EU and ASEAN (also in the *Asia-Europe Meeting* (ASEM) officially established in 1996) became an important element of a world economy and global politics. Implementing new regional arrangements and frameworks in East Asia (first of all ASEAN+3 and ASEAN-China FTA) make ASEAN more and more important partner in the region. The Association can even play a part of East Asian hub, taking the advantage of Sino-Japanese rivalry in the region.

Key words: model of integration, ASEAN, the European Union.

1. Introduction

Regional integration agreements are being seen as a prevailing phenomenon in the contemporary world economy. They have been reached in the growing number of countries both in existing regional blocs as well as among countries from different regions. That process is especially noticeable in the European Union (EU) which became a model of integration for many regions outside Europe. Nonetheless Southeast Asian countries, after establishing the Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN), made an effort to start their integration process in a different way to the European one. The major difference between integration in those two regions can be characterized as that between formal integration (i.e. European – distinguished by adopting common regulations and establishing supranational institutions) and informal (Southeast Asian – including sub-regional economic zones, business and production networks, informal personal contacts). However, in the course of time more and more similarities can be noticed alongside with deepening integration within ASEAN.

The aim of an article is to make an attempt to compare the European and the Southeast Asian models of integration and to determine reasons of that difference.

2. The European Union institution-based model of integration

The European Union is the most developed form of regional integration that exists in the contemporary world economy. From the historical point of view, European process of integration has been dominated by two theoretical approaches: neo-functionalism and intergovernmentalism. The neo-functionalist theory gave the base to strengthen supranational institutions. Intergovernmentalism, which presumed that the member states remain the key actors in determining results in the integration process, explained the success of the European internal market. Whereas in the 1990s neo-institutionalism exerted a strong influence on integration within the EC/EU.

The EU was established on the substructure of three European Communities (ECs), which were created in the 1950s, i.e., the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC), the European Economic Community (EEC) and the European Atomic Energy Community (EAEC or Euratom).[1] The European Communities became the first supranational form of integration of sovereign countries in the world. They were founded by six countries: Belgium, France, West Germany, Italy, Luxembourg and the Netherlands.[2]

The Paris and Rome Treaties initiated the significant new value in regional integration: the supranational institutions which have been regulating both legislation, executive as well as courts authorities. The Treaty of Paris set up the High Authority (an independent executive with supranational control over the ECSC), the Council of Ministers (an intergovernmental component), the Common Assembly (with 78 deputies) and the Court of Justice. After creating the EEC and Euratom, in accordance with the Treaties of Rome, activities of those two last mentioned institutions were expanded on the three Communities. Common Assembly was renamed the European Parliament. Besides that two other institutions were created: the separate Council and the Commission. However, after signing the Merger Treaty on April 8, 1965, the separate institutions of three European Communities were merged. That Treaty came in force on July 1, 1967. It replaced the EAEC's Commission and Council and the ECSC's High Authority and the Council, and in the consequence it set out for a single European Commission and a single Council (nowadays the Council of the European Union).

---

[1] The ECSC was established by the Treaty of Paris, signed on April 18, 1951, which entered into force in 1952. The ECSC was formed for fifty years. It expired on July 23, 2002. The EEC and Euratom were set up by Treaties signed in Rome on March 25, 1957. They both entered into force in 1958.

[2] The EC/EU's enlargements were as follows: the United Kingdom, Denmark, Ireland (in 1973); Mediterranean enlargements: Greece (1981), Spain and Portugal (1986); Austria, Finland, Sweden (1995); Eastern bloc enlargements: the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Slovakia, Slovenia and two Mediterranean countries Malta and Cyprus (2004); Romania and Bulgaria (2007). The candidate countries are: Croatia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey. The potential candidates are: Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kosovo (under the UN Security Council Resolution 1244), Montenegro, Serbia and Iceland.

The characteristic feature among European supranational institutions is the fact that a key function has been played by governments and nation states. One of the most important reasons of that was the influence of federal model of states from the United States of America. On the other hand, each of the founder of the EC/EU was comparatively homogeneous. As a result both politic and economic integration has been an outcome of politics provided by the nation states.

The next Treaty that was accepted by the EC's members was the Single European Act (SEA), signed in February 1986, effective from 1987. The SEA was the first revision of the Treaties of Rome. Its main goal was to eliminate obstacles to the free movement of goods, services, persons and capital (so-called "four freedoms"). Besides that the SEA established the EC/EU social dialogue and gave the European Communities a new momentum to political cooperation. Namely the Treaty had institutionalized political cooperation under the title of "European Political Cooperation".[3]

The Maastricht Treaty (the Treaty on European Union), signed on February 7, 1992, created the EU. It entered into force on November 1, 1993. The EU was composed of three pillars: 1) European Communities (i.e. ECSC, Euratom, EC),[4] governed on supranational level; 2) Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) – built on intergovernmental procedures of EPC; 3) Police and Judicial Co-operation in Criminal Matters (PJC) – originally Justice and Home Affairs (JHA). Besides that the Maastricht Treaty created rudiments of the European Economic and Monetary Union (EMU), basing on three stages structure anticipated in the Delors Plan and so-called convergence criteria.[5] As a result of those arrangements, the common currency of the EU – euro – was adopted in 1999.

The successive Treaty, the Amsterdam one (signed on October 2, 1997, effective from 1999), proceeded the model of the supranational EU at the expense of intergovernmental cooperation. The Treaty increased the importance of the European Parliament and expanded the role of the second EU pillar, introducing a High Representative for the EU Foreign Policy. The Treaty also incorporated into the legal system of the EU the Schengen Agreements. The main role of the next

---

[3] D. Chalmers, C. Hadjiemmanuil, G. Monti, A. Tomkins, *European Union Law*, Cambridge University Press, New York 2006, p. 25.

[4] The European Community (EC) – renamed the European Economic Community owing to new areas of activities which were added to the competence of the EC (e.g. education, culture, environmental law, healthcare, immigration policy).

[5] There are four main convergence criteria: fiscal (the ratio of government debt to GDP must not exceed 60% and the ratio of government deficit to GDP must not exceed 3%), exchange rate (the country must have maintained a stable exchange rate within the ERM II (Exchange Rate Mechanism) for at least two consecutive years and should not have devalued its currency during the period), inflation (the county's inflation rate must not be higher than 1.5 percentage points higher than that in the three EU member states with lowest inflation), long-term interests rate (the country's nominal long-term interest rate must not be higher than 2 percentage points higher than that in the three EU member states with lowest inflation).

Treaty – Nice Treaty – was to adjust the structure of the EU institutions to the new framework after the East enlargements. The Treaty was signed on February 26, 2001 and it entered into force on February 1, 2003.

The last Treaty that has been concluded in the EU was signed in Lisbon on December 13, 2007. It entered into force on December 1, 2009 after tough process of ratification in the EU members. The Treaty set up some key institutional innovations, i.e. incorporating a single legal personality for the EU, appointment of two new posts: a European Council President and a High Representative of the EU for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, so-called exit clause (making it possible for members to leave the EU). Additionally the Treaty strengthened national parliaments, decided about reducing the number of European Parliament deputies and European Commission members and extended qualified majority voting and instituted its new definition. There were three main objectives of the Treaty: an overview of the EU, its institutions and its democratic trappings; to maintain the second pillar of the EU (the third one was made a part of the first pillar); and to make the EU more efficient.[6]

3. ASEAN network-based model of integration

In the Southeast Asia region there can be distinguished a differ pattern of economic integration from that in Europe. In contradistinction to the EU model based on governments activities, in Asia and Pacific region the most important role has been played by entrepreneurs. Consequently economic integration in Southeast Asia is a result of business interrelations, with much less participation of political activities. As a result decisions about directions of trade or capital flows were taken by business communities without regionally based regime (therefore it can be also described as market-driven integration). For this reason the European model of institution-based integration was not suitable for Southeast Asian countries, although recently in conjunction with deepening integration in East Asia there can be observed an increasing pressure for consolidating institutions. There can be distinguished three types of informal integration in Asia (including Southeast Asia): 1) sub-regional economic zones which comprise cooperation based on geographical nearness, 2) production networks based on multi-tier economic division of labour, which is cooperation along the lines of industrial production, 3) ethnic business networks representing cooperation along ethical and cultural lines.[7]

---

[6] For more see: S.C. Sieberson, *Dividing Lines Between the European Union and Its Member States. The Impact of the Treaty of Lisbon*, Cambridge University Press, Hague 2008, pp. 45-51; H. Bribosia, The main institutional innovations of the Lisbon Treaty, [in:] S. Griller, J. Ziller (eds.), *The Lisbon Treaty: EU Constitutionalism without a Constitutional Treaty?*, European Community Studies Association of Austria, Springer, Wien and New York 2008, pp. 58-78.

[7] D. Peng, *An East Asian Model of Regional Economic Co-operation*, Centre for European and Asian Studies, Norwegian School of Management, Oslo 1997, p. 13.

The Association of Southeast Asian Nations was founded by signing the Bangkok Declaration on August 8, 1967. Like the EU, ASEAN had its precursors.[8] The Declaration was signed by five countries: the Philippines, Indonesia, Malaysia, Singapore and Thailand (so-called ASEAN-5). It was created mainly as a political cooperation organization and was aimed at active cooperation among the founders towards peace, stability, progress and prosperity in the South-East Asian region.[9] Political and security aspects of cooperation in ASEAN has been playing much more important role than in Europe, regarding especially first several years of the Association existence. After the end of the Cold War ASEAN sketched new projects inside the economic area.

A pressure on increasing institutionalization in the Southeast Asia region was strictly connected with the enlargement of ASEAN. Brunei joined the Association in 1984, forming the so-called ASEAN-6 group. Vietnam became a member of ASEAN in 1995, Laos and Myanmar (Burma) two years later. Cambodia, the tenth country contested for membership, experienced *coup d'état* in 1997.[10] As a result, Cambodia did not become a member of ASEAN together with Vietnam and Laos. But that event became a turning point in the institutionalization process in the Southeast Asia region. Because of the need to oversee political development and stabilization process in Cambodia, the Association started to perceive the role of institutions in the region's confidence building. On the other hand, ramifications the East Asian financial crisis of 1997-98 were confronted with the necessity of strengthening institutions. However ASEAN, unlike the EU, has no supranational authority.

At the end of January 1992 ASEAN-6 prime ministers signed a "Framework Agreement on Enhancing ASEAN Economic Cooperation" which was aimed at creating AFTA – ASEAN free trade area within fifteen years. However the lack of institutions revealed as a strong limitation for functioning of AFTA and in effect, economic cooperation in ASEAN is determined by national interests of its members. In 1994 ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF) was established. Its aim was to promote security and political dialogue in Asia-Pacific region.[11]

---

[8] I.e. SEATO (the South East Asia Treaty Organization), ASA (the Association of Southeast Asia), Malphindo (Malaysia, Philippines, Indonesia) and ASPAC (the Asian and Pacific Council).

[9] *The ASEAN Declaration (Bangkok Declaration)*, Bangkok, 8 August 1967, http://www.ase-ansec.org/1212.htm (9.04.2010).

[10] Earlier, in September 1993, when the Kingdom of Cambodia was established (monarchy was restored with Sihanouk as a king), two prime ministers were appointed (Ranariddh, a son of Sihanouk, as "the first" prime minister and Hun Sen as "the second"). In July 1997 both prime ministers bolstered their personal military forces in Phnom Penh, the capital of Cambodia. As a result the second prime minister staged a military *coup d'état*, overthrowing Ranariddh and his adherents. On May 1998 Hu Sen, after general elections, was elected as a prime minister. Next year Cambodia became a member of ASEAN; see K.R. DeRouen, U. Heo (eds.), *Civil Wars of the World. Major Conflicts since World War II*, Vol. 1, ABC-CLIO, Santa Barbara 2007, pp. 215-231.

[11] S. Kumar, S. Siddique, *Southeast Asia: The Diversity Dilemma*, Select Publishing, Singapore 2008, p. 4.

The ASEAN states also renewed attention to streamlining decision-making processes. Building on earlier decisions to introduce so-called "flexible consensus" (in 1992) and a majority-rules dispute resolution mechanism (in 1996) to the AFTA process, ASEAN members continued to debate the question of qualified majority voting and the specific possibility of expand their "ASEAN minus X" formula to technical policy matters as a way to streamline cooperation in the Association.[12]

Afterwards there were two important events within the Association. In October 2003 the members of ASEAN signed the Bali Concord II, aimed at creating an ASEAN Community by 2020 (however, it was speeded up to year 2015). Like the EU, the ASEAN Community will be constituted by three pillars: 1) ASEAN Security Community (ASC) – with seven major goals: defence cooperation, maritime security, weapons of mass destruction, setting values and norms, terrorism and transnational crimes, the ARF, cooperation with the United Nations; 2) ASEAN Economic Community (AEC) – for the purpose of creating: a single market, a highly competitive economic region, a region of equitable economic development and fully integrated into the world economy; 3) ASEAN Socio-Cultural Community (ASCC) – with six central parts: human development, social justice and rights, social protection and welfare, environmental sustainability, narrowing the development gap and building a common ASEAN identity.[13]

However, following the European experience it is hard to deepen integration without strengthening institutions. Therefore ASEAN Charter, as the second key event for the integration process in Southeast Asia, was embodied. The document was signed on November 2007 and it entered into force on December 15, 2008. It was aimed at two basic goals: to give ASEAN a legal identity and to consolidate its institutions. In the result ASEAN Chart strengthens the ASEAN Secretariat situated in Jakarta, improves decision-making, provides for permanent representatives posted to Jakarta, puts in place a system of compliance monitoring and compulsory dispute settlement.[14]

4. A comparison of two models of regional integration

The fundaments for both European and Asian processes of integration can be perceived in the same, political context – as an attempt to confine hostility among

---

[12] Earlier (in 1980) Singapore proposed a modification of ASEAN's consensual decision-making process. The result was "five minus one" principle. After first enlargement that formula was changed into "six minus one" and later "ten minus X" with the addition of new members; A.D. Ba, *(Re)Negotiating East and Southeast Asia*, Studies in Asian Security, Stanford University Press, Stanford 2009, pp. 213, 270, 275.

[13] *The ASEAN Community. Unblocking the Roadblocks*, ASEAN Studies Centre, Report No. 1, Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, Singapore 2008, pp. 1-9; R.C. Severino, *Southeast Asia in Search of an ASEAN Community*, Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, Singapore 2006, p. 356.

[14] E.L. Frost, *Asia's New Regionalism*, Lynne Rienner Publishers, London 2008, p. 136.

the countries of the region. In Europe it was Franco-German enmity (resulting in three major wars[15]) and in Southeast Asia it was first of all condition on Indonesian acts of aggression in the region. Incorporation in both cases of integration German and Indonesia respectively, influenced the peacekeeping in the regions and created stable conditions for further economic, political and social relations.

Notwithstanding within ASEAN national interests and preferences have priority over regional ones. On the other hand, as it was mentioned, unlike the EU, the regional integration of the Asian countries based on international business systems formed along ethical and cultural lines, which became a very important form of non-institutional economic cooperation in the region.[16] In the consequence informal relations became much more important in the process of integration in Asia than formal one, as it was in Europe.

Therefore the organizational structure of ASEAN comparing with the EU differs to a significant degree. In the EU there exists so-called "institutional triangle" – three mentioned main institutions that provide law, execute it and participate in decision-making processes, i.e. the European Commission, the European Parliament and the Council of the EU. Besides that there are two courts – the European Court of Justice (with subordinated court of first resort) and the Court of Auditors, financial institutions (the European Central Bank, European Investment Bank) and many subsidiary institutions (like the European Economic and Social Committee, the European the Committee of the Regions) and numerous agencies.

In ASEAN the institutional structure is not so complicated and is much less formalized. The highest decision-making organ is the ASEAN Summit – the meeting of heads of state. Besides that there exist: the ASEAN Ministerial Meeting (that may be compared to the Council of the UE), intergovernmental committees of senior officials, technical working groups and tasks forces. There is also Secretary-General in ASEAN who is appointed for a five-year term. Several dozen NGOs (Non-Governmental Organizations) have formal affiliations with ASEAN. Contemporaneously it must be underlined that the increase in the number of summits and formal ministerial conferences in ASEAN make the Association more and more similar to the intergovernmental indication of the EU.

5. Reasons of different patterns of integration in Europe and in Southeast Asia

Europe differs from Asia in many fundamental ways. Therefore also integration mechanisms in the EU and in ASEAN vary from each other. The reasons of that

---

[15] Franco-Prussian War (Franco-German, 1870-71), the First (1914-18) and the Second World War (1939-45).

[16] P.J. Katzenstein, Regionalism in Comparative Perspective, ARENA Working Papers, WP 96/1, p. 35.

dissimilarity can be linked to historical, economic, political and cultural patterns. Asian states are remarkably different in terms of their cultural heritage, historical experience and political regimes. Contemporaneously Asia is a much more heterogeneous region, comparing with Europe (or very hegemonic America). The high degree of heterogeneity in Asia, however, increases the costs of building institutions. That was the main reason why non-institutional economic cooperation in the Southeast Asia has been created. It also explains why the model of integration could have work properly along with progressive liberalization in trade and investment in the region.

The Southeast Asian countries are in majority post-colonial states which were greatly influenced by colonialism. The superpowers established in the region administrations and instituted their own spheres of influence, which tied different parts of Asia to the institutional practices, interests and educational systems of different colonial powers.[17] In the consequence religions and social forces were in appreciable extent inherited from the colonial period. The Southeast Asian states have inherited the colonial tradition of "the rule by law" rather than the European one of "rule of law". Consequently despite the fact that the ASEAN states are constituted legally, the relation between society and a state is governed much more by social, informal norms than by formal, legal expectations.[18]

After the end of the Second World War considerable participation in further process of creating ties among nation states in Asia, can be put down to the policy of the US. During the Cold War the American diplomacy was interested in generating bilateral, not multilateral relations with Asian countries. In the result, in comparison with Europe, it was much harder to create broad and institutionalized political settlements in Asia. That can be linked also with the political systems in the ASEAN countries. They differ between one another to a large extent, which induces difficulties in political connections, whilst all members of the EU are democratic countries.[19] In the consequence existing differences are a major obstacle to institutional economic cooperation. The most important barrier are economic disparities which in the ASEAN states are extremely large.[20]

---

[17] J.A. Camilleri, *Regionalism in the New Asia-Pacific Order*, Edward Elgar, Cheltenham 2005, p. 31.

[18] P.J. Katzenstein, *A World of Regions. Asia and Europe in the American Imperium*, Cornell Studies in Political Economy, Cornell University Press, New York 2005, p. 223.

[19] A member of the EU must be a democratic state. That is a consequence of the so-called accession (or Copenhagen) criteria which were instituted in 1993 at the Copenhagen European Council. They constituted that a country seeking membership of the EU must meet three criteria: economic (having a market economy and the capacity to cope with market forces and competitive pressure within the EU), political (stability of institutions guaranteeing democracy, the rule of law, human rights and respect for and protection of minorities) and the third one – acceptance of the EC's *acquis communautaire*.

[20] To overcome this problem, ASEAN has agreed on set of measures to try to narrow the development gap (see *Vientiane Action Programme*, annex 4). However there is a large problem – lacks of resources to follow the EU's example of structural funds to support the development of poorer members. E.L. Frost, *op. cit.*, p. 135.

Culture is another important difference between ASEAN and the EU. In the Southeast Asian countries there are six key religions, i.e. Buddhism, Islam, Confucianism, Taoism, Hinduism and Christianity. The EU countries are much more homogeneous with regard to religion (Europe inherits a single Judeo-Christian tradition). The Asian countries are also much more diversified in relation to language families. Consequently culture aspects extend to other categories, like business communication and practices, consumption behaviour or methods of management. In effect business networks that exist in Southeast Asia are strongly connected with cultural tradition of the region, especially with Confucianism. The results are strong personal ties and laying great stress on human relations.

The ASEAN members elaborated so-called "ASEAN Way", a consensus-based style of decision-making.[21] It gives weight to consensus, consultation and respects the principles of non-interference, equality and sanctity of national sovereignty. "ASEAN Way" means the conscious rejection of Asian leaders and politics of what they perceive to be imported from Western culture and tradition. It stresses patience, informality, pragmatism, evolution and consensus, in comparison with Western style of diplomacy which is considered to be formalistic, focused on legalistic procedures and outcomes.[22] Notwithstanding it is hard to build ASEAN Communities respecting completely those rules. Therefore an idea of "new ASEAN Way" was created. That concept is indispensable for creating the AEC, as a part of the broader ASEAN Community.[23]

On the other hand, the specific character of Asians and their culture had been exploited in creating so-called "Asian values". The process had started in 1980s in Malaysia, when Mahathir bin Mohamad, the then prime minister, launched the "Look East" campaign, with Japan and South Korea as models for economic growth. Recently that concept is even called politicized culture – an intentionally created view on the development and origins of a group (mostly nations) created by political leaders.[24]

Asians politics have also different approach to absolute economic liberalization than European ones. Whereas in Europe it was perceived as an opportunity to develop economies, in Asia eliminating trade barriers is treated more like a danger for sovereignty. It must be underlined that in contradistinction to permanent peace that was achieved by the UE, in Southeast Asia the political situation within ASEAN countries, as well as with ASEAN and other East Asian countries, is not so stable.

---

[21] ASEAN's definition of consensus is "Ten minus X principle".

[22] D.H. Capie, P.M. Evans, *The Asia-Pacific Security Lexicon*, Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, Singapore 2002, p. 4.

[23] H. Soesastro, *Accelerating ASEAN Economic Integration: Moving beyond AFTA*, CSIS Economics Working Paper, No. WPE091, Series from Centre for Strategic and International Studies, Jakarta, March 2005, pp. 13, 16.

[24] That cultural engineering by a legitimate leader can improve economic performance. Another example of politicized culture is "African renaissance" under Thabo Mbeki in South Africa; E. de Jong, *Culture and Economics*, Routledge, New York 2009, pp. 101-103, 220.

References

Ba A.D., *(Re)Negotiating East and Southeast Asia*, Studies in Asian Security, Stanford University Press, Stanford 2009.

Bribosia H., The main institutional innovations of the Lisbon Treaty, [in:] S. Griller, J. Ziller (eds.), *The Lisbon Treaty: EU Constitutionalism Without a Constitutional Treaty?*, European Community Studies Association of Austria, Springer, Wien and New York 2008.

Camilleri J.A., *Regionalism in the New Asia-Pacific Order*, Edward Elgar, Cheltenham, 2005.

Capie D.H., Evans P.M., *The Asia-Pacific Security Lexicon*, Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, Singapore 2002.

Chalmers D., Hadjiemmanuil C., Monti G., Tomkins A., *European Union Law*, Cambridge University Press, New York 2006.

DeRouen K.R., Heo U. (eds.), *Civil Wars of the World. Major Conflicts since World War II*, Vol. 1, ABC-CLIO, Santa Barbara 2007.

Frost E.L., *Asia's New Regionalism*, Lynne Rienner Publishers, London 2008.

Jong E. de, *Culture and Economics*, Routledge, New York 2009.

Katzenstein P.J., *A World of Regions. Asia and Europe in the American Imperium*, Cornell Studies in Political Economy, Cornell University Press, New York 2005.

Katzenstein P.J., *Regionalism in Comparative Perspective*, ARENA Working Papers, WP 96/1.

Kumar S., Siddique S., *Southeast Asia: The Diversity Dilemma*, Select Publishing, Singapore 2008.

Peng D., *An East Asian Model of Regional Economic Co-operation*, Centre for European and Asian Studies, Norwegian School of Management, Oslo 1997.

Severino R.C., *Southeast Asia in Search of an ASEAN Community*, Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, Singapore 2006.

Sieberson S.C., *Dividing Lines Between the European Union and Its Member States. The Impact of the Treaty of Lisbon*, Cambridge University Press, Hague 2008.

Soesastro H., *Accelerating ASEAN Economic Integration: Moving beyond AFTA*, CSIS Economics Working Paper, No. WPE091, Series from Centre for Strategic and International Studies, Jakarta, March 2005.

The ASEAN Community. Unblocking the Roadblocks, ASEAN Studies Centre, Report No. 1, Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, Singapore 2008.

The ASEAN Declaration (Bangkok Declaration), Bangkok, 8 August 1967, http://www.aseansec.org/1212.htm.

PORÓWNANIE MODELI INTEGRACJI UNII EUROPEJSKIEJ ORAZ AZJI POŁUDNIOWO-WSCHODNIEJ

Streszczenie: Postępujący proces regionalizacji gospodarki światowej doprowadził do powstania kilku głównych modeli integracji. Kluczowy jest model europejski, którego fundamentem stały się instytucje ponadnarodowe, w tym zwłaszcza Rada Unii Europejskiej, Komisja Europejska oraz Parlament Europejski. Z kolei model integracji przyjęty przez państwa Azji Południowo-Wschodniej (ASEAN), cechujące się ostrożnością w przekazywaniu narodowych kompetencji instytucjom ponadnarodowym, wyróżnia się nadrzędną rolą struktur sieciowo-strefowych. Jednak wraz z pogłębianiem integracji w Azji Południowo-Wschodniej można zauważyć coraz więcej analogii do modelu integracji europejskiej (m.in. koncepcja utworzenia Wspólnoty ASEAN, opartej na trzech filarach). Celem artykułu jest przedstawienie oraz porównanie europejskiego i azjatyckiego modelu integracji, wraz z próbą wskazania różnic, które doprowadziły do adaptacji odmiennych mechanizmów integracji.