

ISEAS Working Paper: Politics and Security Series No. 1(2011)

**Asia Is Not One:  
Regionalism and the Ideas of Asia**

Amitav Acharya

## **ASIA IS NOT ONE: REGIONALISM AND THE IDEAS OF ASIA**

Asia is not “one”, as Okakura Kazuo (1904) had once argued, and there is no singular idea of Asia. Asia is of multiple (although not always mutually exclusive) conceptions, some drawing upon material forces, such as economic growth, interdependence and physical power, others having ideational foundations, such as civilizational linkages and normative aspirations. Some of these varied conceptions of Asia have shaped in meaningful ways the destinies of its states and peoples. Moreover, they have underpinned different forms of regionalism, which in turn has ensured that Asia, despite its fuzziness and incoherence, has remained a durable if essentially contested notion.

Before proceeding further, let me briefly comment on the concepts of region, regionalization and regionalism, the three central pillars of any meaningful discussion of the contemporary idea of Asia.<sup>1</sup> First, our understanding of what makes a region has undergone a major change. There is a growing agreement in the literature that: (1) regions are not just material constructs but also ideational ones; (2) regions are not a given or fixed, but are socially constructed- they are made and remade through political, economic social and cultural interactions; and (3) just like nations states, regions may rise and wither.<sup>2</sup>

In his discussion of the pre-World War II period, Duara sets “imperial regionalism” against the “anti-imperialist regionalization project in Asia”. While I agree, I also believe that the anti-imperialist project, which persisted well into the post-war period, was not singular as a source of Asianness and Asianism. The trajectory of Asian regionalism had varied underpinnings which need to be recognized. While Duara focuses on Tagore, Tenshin and Zhang Taiyan, I bring in Aung San, Ho Chih Minh, and Jose Rizal. The richness and diversity of the Asian

idea cannot be fully captured without looking at these Southeast Asian proponents, for as Henderson noted in 1963, it was “only in Southeast Asia where cooperative patterns [in Asia]...began to develop,” and where “an increasing pace of ‘regional activity’” would give the subregion a pivotal role in anchoring Asian regionalism that neither South Asia nor Northeast Asia could match even to this day. (Henderson 1963:92)

### **Contested Visions**

While “Asia” has not lacked protagonists for the past century and half, these protagonists have differed widely in terms of their normative beliefs and political goals. Looking at the champions of Asia and their ideas, at least four different conceptions of Asia can be identified in the early post Second World War period. These may be termed as Imperialist Asia, Nationalist Asia, Universalist Asia, and Regionalist Asia. A fifth conception, Exceptionalist Asia, though already incipient, was to emerge later as a major political force later.

These categories are not mutually exclusive. Moreover, elements and impulses within these categories may be present to different degrees in a single proponent of Asia. Thus, while Jawaharlal Nehru of India belonged primarily to Nationalist Asia, he also identified with Universalist Asia (or at least an internationalist) and Regionalist Asia. Moreover, these impulses can shift during the course of a political career, and a lifetime.

The first conception, Imperialist Asia (similar to Duara’s “imperial regionalism”), is tied to the hegemonic purpose of great powers, both Western and Asian. While the term Asia did not originate with it, Western colonial rule, even though it severely disrupted existing intra-regional commercial traffic, and helped to divide Asia into different spheres of influence, did contribute to the reification of the concept, thereby furthering the cultural and political dichotomy that had developed between Europe and Asia through the centuries, well before the “consciousness of an Asian identity originated [within Asia] largely in reaction to the colonial system and in the common denominator of anti-Western sentiment.” (Steadman 1969: 32-3)

But it was in the hands of an Asian power, Japan, that the imperialist notion of Asia assumed a peculiar prominence, as imperial Japan and its apologists sought to invoke a discourse of pan-Asianism to legitimize its dominance in a way that Western powers in the region had not and other Asian powers such as China and India would not. The dual role of Japan as Asia's savior and its hegemonic leader was clearly illustrated in the Japanese notion of a Greater East Asia Co-prosperity Sphere. Encompassing Japan (including the territories of Korea, Taiwan, and Sakhalin), China, Manchukuo, French Indochina, and the Dutch East Indies, this was of course not all of Asia, but the "the concept built on Pan-Asian notions of an "Asian community" that had earlier developed in Japan, and which would be extended to Southeast Asian and South Asian if not on the basis of race, then on the basis of a "common interest". (Duus, 2008: 146-7) Indeed, representatives from all over Asia were invited to the Greater East Asia Conference held in November 1943 (Duus, 2008: 151-2)

Although it was but one element among Japanese pan-Asianism, it had the most serious impact on the destinies of Asian states and the lives of their peoples. This was a concept of hegemonic region and regionalism. While it offered a platform for organizing the unity of those incorporated into it, it was not always on a voluntary basis, but coerced. The Japanese Imperialist Region was marked by a high degree of trade interdependence, and it certainly inspired freedom struggles all over Asia. But in political terms, it degenerated into another form of foreign dominance, no less oppressive than that of the Western colonial powers. Burma's Aung San, who had earlier endorsed the Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere, and even envisioned "a common defence policy in East Asia as the best guarantee for the maintenance of the Greater East Asia Co-prosperity Sphere" (Silverstein, 1972: 21), now insisted that "a new Asian order...will not and must not be one like the Co-prosperity Sphere of militarist Japan, nor should it be another Asiatic Monroe doctrine, nor imperial preference or currency bloc." (Silverstein, 1972: 101)

The legacy of Imperialist Asia would have a long-term effect, shaping regional perceptions of the superpower rivalry during the Cold War. The Southeast Asian Treaty Organization, although not outrightly imperial, was perceived as an attempt at neo-colonial domination by some sections in Asia, including India's Nehru and

Indonesia's Sukarno. It did not last very long, but helped to polarize Asia along the Cold War divide, probably disrupting the socialization of China (along with other issues, including the Korean War, Taiwan issue and China's own support for communist movements in the region).

Even before Japanese imperialism swept through Asia, there had emerged another conception of Asia that may be termed Universalist Asia. Its most eloquent proponent was Rabindranath Tagore, who combined a visceral distaste for nationalism with a passionate belief in the "common bond of spiritualism" among Asia's peoples. (Tagore 1918) Although Tagore did not specifically advocate a political regionalism of states, this might have been premature given that Asia was still firmly under colonial rule, his recognition and intellectual promotion of the spiritual and civilizational affinities among Asia's peoples constituted an alternative conception of Asian regionalism in which societies rather than states take the centre stage and which thrives as much as on ideational and cultural flows as on economic links or political purpose. Tagore was not alone in articulating a conception of Asia that was not premised on a narrow state-centric nationalism; Karl has analyzed an alternative form of regionalism, much more politically oriented than Tagore's, among Chinese intellectuals "rooted in non-state centered practices and non-national-chauvinist culturalism", that could be contrasted with Sun Yat-sen's "state-based, anti-imperialist vision of Asia." (Karl 1998:1096-97) This alternative regionalism that Karl speaks of was centered around the ideas and associates of Chinese intellectual Liang Qichao, and the activities of a little known organization called the Asian Solidarity Society set up in Tokyo in 1907 by Chinese intellectuals, Japanese socialists, and Indian, Vietnamese and Filipino exiles. An interesting aspect of this regionalism was the recognition accorded to the "first Filipino" Jose Rizal as "the quintessential Asian patriot, from which China and other Asian must learn". (Karl 1998: 1106) Although Rizal is better known as a champion of the unity of the Malay race, his message was appropriated by the non-state centric variety of Asian regionalism.

Tagore's innate universalism put him at odds with the powerful currents of nationalism sweeping Asia, including in the very places the poet visited in his voyages through Asia, and which he imagined as being integral to his conception of

Asia. This is not to say that the proponents of a third conception of Asia, which I call Nationalist Asia, were untouched by universalist values and instincts. Leaders such as Nehru, Aung San, and Sukarno saw little contradiction between nationalism and international cooperation. As Aung San put it, “I recognise both the virtues and limitations of pure nationalism, I love its virtues, I don’t allow myself to be blinded by its limitations, though I knew that it is not easy for the great majority of any nation to get over these limitations.”(Aung San 1974: 193) Aung San’s nationalism, like those of Nehru and Sukarno, could support both nationalism and internationalism, but these figures from Asia’s new power elite did not empathize with Universalist Asia at the expense of nationalism.

This third vision of Asia, championed by Asia’s nationalist leaders such as China’s Sun Yat-sen, India’s Jawaharlal Nehru, Burma’s Aung San, and Vietnam’s Ho Chih Minh, was geared to harnessing Asia’s rejuvenation to further the retreat of Western colonialism. Before World War II, especially around the time of the 1927 Congress of the Oppressed Nationalities, a number of leaders within the Indian National Congress (a group that was believed to include Mohandas Gandhi and C.R Das and later Nehru) had supported the idea of an “Asian federation” to organize joint struggle against Western colonialism. (Keenleyside 1982: 216) Regionalism in this sense was not only compatible with, but also a bulwark for, Asia’s restoration and rejuvenation. (Acharya, 2000) Certainly Ho Chi Minh was keen to use regional cooperation to further the cause of Vietnamese independence. (Goscha, 1999: 244) In a speech to welcome Sarat Chandra Bose, brother of Subhas Chandra Bose at the City Hall of Rangoon on July 24, 1946, Aung San stated that Burma would “stand for an Asiatic Federation in a not very, very remote future, we stand for immediate mutual understanding and joint action, wherever and whenever possible, from now for our mutual interests and for the freedom of India, Burma and indeed all Asia.” (Aung San 1971:86) In September 1945, Ho Chi Minh spoke of his interest in the creation of a “pan-Asiatic community” comprising Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos, Thailand, Malaya, Burma, India, Indonesia, and the Philippines. (China, Japan, and Korea were not included in Ho’s vision of an Asiatic community). (Goscha, 1999: 244) His ostensible goal at this stage was to foster political and economic cooperation among these countries while maintaining good relations with the US, France, and Britain. This was

a time when Ho still hoped that the colonial powers, exhausted by war, would voluntarily speed up the process of decolonization. But when this proved to be a false hope, Ho and other Southeast Asian nationalist leaders began considering the use of regional cooperation to oppose the return of European colonialism. This was clearly evident in Ho's letter to the Indonesian Prime Minister, Sutan Sjahrir, in November 1946 urging cooperation between the two countries to advance their common struggle for freedom. In this letter, Ho asked Indonesia to join him in getting India, Burma, and Malaya to develop initiatives toward a "Federation of Free Peoples of Southern Asia." But Indonesian leaders responded coolly to this idea, apparently worried that cooperating with the Vietnamese communists would give the Dutch an opportunity to use the fear of communism to delay Indonesia's own independence.

Advancing decolonization was a principal theme at the 1947 Asian Relations Conference in New Delhi, the first conference of Asian nations in the post-war period. It was even more central to the Second Asian Relations Conference, also known as the Conference on Indonesia, which was directly and specifically geared to supporting Indonesian freedom fighters after the 2nd Dutch Police Action in 1948. Yet, despite all the talk about pan-Asian unity, its proponents were willing to offer only political, rather than material support for the region's independence movements. For example, India's aid to Indonesian freedom fighters, an exception, was not extended to Ho Chih Minh, much to the disappointment of his supporters.

And these early stirrings of pan-Asianism did not translate into concrete and durable forms of cooperation or a pan-Asian institution. There was an uncomfortable sense among the smaller nations of Asia that the pan-Asianists of India, Japan and China "were primarily concerned with their own countries," and their "exhortations... largely as an extension of their own distinctive cultures." (Steadman, 1969, 33) Moreover, Southeast Asians saw in a pan-Asian community potential for Chinese or Indian domination. As one Burmese delegate to the 1947 Asian Relations Conference put it, "It was terrible to be ruled by a Western power, but it was even more so to be ruled by an Asian power." (Cited in Henderson 1955) And the pan-Asian sentiments of India's leaders were stymied by their limited contacts with nationalist leaders in other parts of Asia, their misgivings towards the Nationalist government in China, and

the rise of anti-Indian sentiments in Burma and other parts of Asia (Keenleyside 1982)

While Nationalist Asia sought to channel regionalism as an instrument of anti-colonialism and national liberation, the fourth vision, Regionalist Asia, inspired those who wished to use the combined platform of the region's newly independent nation states to seek a collective voice at the world stage. There were considerable overlap between Nationalist and Regionalist Asia, with Nehru, Aung San, Ho Chih Minh belonging to both. But the regionalists (or the regionalist side of the nationalists) went a step beyond merely securing independence from colonial rule. The logical next step to follow in the pursuit of Asianism was to seek a role in the management of regional and international affairs. As Aung San of Burma put it, "Asia has been rejuvenated and is progressively coming into world politics. Asia can no longer be ignored in international councils. Its voice grows louder and louder. You can hear it in Indonesia, you can hear it in Indo-China, you can harken to it in Burma and India and elsewhere." (Silverstein, 1972: 101). One major example of this shift was the differences in the agendas of the Asian Relations Conferences of 1947 and 1949, and that of the Asia-Africa Conference in 1955, which, despite its hybrid name, was thoroughly dominated by the Asians. While the ARC's fretted over support for decolonization, the 29 participants at Bandung, as its Secretary-General would put it, set out "to determine...the standards and procedures of present-day international relations," including "the formulation and establishment of certain norms for the conduct of present-day international relations and the instruments for the practical application of these norms." (Abdulghani 1964: 72 &103) In other words, while the ARCs were about independence (from colonial rule), Bandung was about intervention (security from great power or superpower intervention).

The regionalists also saw the possibility of restoring the historical linkages among Asian societies disrupted by European colonialism to forge a regional association. Nehru described the first Asian Relations Conference in New Delhi as an "expression of the deeper urge of the mind and spirit of Asia which has persisted in spite of the isolationism which grew up during the years of European domination" (Nehru, 1948:23). We have seen Ho Chih Minh's interest in a "Pan-Asiatic Community". Immediately after the World War II, Nehru himself would advocate a

regional association: “a closer union between India and South-East Asia on the one side, and Afghanistan, Iran, and the Arab world on the West.” (Cited in Keenleyside 1982:216-7).

But Southeast Asians were unnerved by the prospects for a larger Asian federation or even association. Even professing deep friendship with India, Aung San recognized that “(w)hile India should be one entity and China another, Southeast Asia as a whole should form an entity – then, finally, we should come together in a bigger union with the participation of other parts of Asia as well.”(Cited in Vandenbosch and Butwell, 1966: 341) Southeast Asian would find subregional unity more practical and palatable. Bear in mind that Jose Rizal had advocated the unity of the Malay race, although he was appropriated by pan-Asianists. Frustrated by the failure of his efforts to secure material aid from fellow Asian countries for his struggle against the French, Ho Chi Minh would turn to the idea of an Indochinese federation. “Because of the close geography and extricable relationship in military and politics between Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia, the success or failure of revolutionary liberation of one country will have a direct impact on that of the others. Our task is to help the revolutionary movements in Cambodia and Laos. (Ho 1995: 82)

This Southeast Asian concern was evident at the 1947 Asian Relations Conference. Abu Hanifa, one of the Indonesian representatives to the Conference, would write later that the idea of a wholly Southeast Asian grouping was conceived at the conference in response to the belief among the Southeast Asian delegates that the larger states, India and China, could not be expected to support their nationalist cause. At the meeting, delegates from Indonesia, Burma, Thailand, Vietnam, the Philippines, and Malaya “debated, talked, [and] planned a Southeast Asian Association closely cooperating first in cultural and economic matters. Later, there could be perhaps be a more closely knit political cooperation. Some of us even dreamt of a Greater Southeast Asia, a federation.” (Goscha, 1999:255)

But the legacy of Nationalist Asia was too strong and enduring to permit any quick and easy fulfillment of these early efforts at Regionalist Asia, even at the subregional level. These efforts were at best intended to strengthen, not weaken the autonomy of the nation state. ASEAN, as Singapore’s Foreign Minister S. Rajaratnam

would put it, was intended to serve and strengthen the national interest, not to dilute or compromise it.

### **Asia Between Universalism and Exceptionalism**

We have seen that the different conceptions of Asia gave rise to different regionalisms in the early post-War period. As Regionalist Asia continued to compete with Nationalist Asia for the support of Asia's new political elite, there would emerge a fifth conception of Asia, which might be termed Exceptionalist Asia.

In the 1960s, post-Bandung, Southeast Asia took the lead in developing regionalism. The leadership of India and China had ended - India's because of internal distractions, rivalry with Pakistan, ironically a member of the Colombo Powers fraternity which had collectively sponsored the Bandung gathering, and China's because its violation of its own pledge of noninterference given at the Bandung (one of the 10 principles of the Bandung Declaration). Most important, the Sino-Indian war undermined the claims of both to jointly lead Asia. In the meantime, Japan remained mired in the legacy of its imperial record, hesitant to launch new regional initiatives, especially with a political and security purpose. Southeast Asia itself was itself divided and prone to conflict, both domestic and inter-state (especially with Sukarno's Konfrontasi against newly formed Malaysia. Its first attempt to create a regional body, ASA, founded in 1960, failed because it did not include Southeast Asia's biggest player, Indonesia. A second body, Maphilindo, (Malaysia, Philippines and Indonesia), premised on the notion of the unity of the Malay race, and thus recalling Jose Rizal's identification of Philippines as a Malay nation, also collapsed over escalating tensions between Indonesia and Malaysia, as Sukarno called into question, with the military force, the legitimacy of the Malaysian federation.

Yet, even the subregional efforts were held by an underlying conception of Asianness. Thus despite being an association of Southeast Asia, ASA's proponents saw themselves as part of a larger Asian cultural, political, and economic context. For Thai Foreign Minister and a key architect of ASA, Thanat Khoman, ASA was rooted in "Asian culture and traditions" (sic). Describing ASA as an example of "Asian mutual co-operation", he argued: "For Asian solidarity must be and will be forged by Asian hands and the fact that our three countries: the Federation of Malaya, the

Philippines, and Thailand, have joined hands in accomplishing this far-reaching task cannot be a mere coincidence.”(Association of Southeast Asia, 1962:33)

After these false starts, one segment of Southeast Asia, comprising Thailand, Malaysia, Indonesia, Philippines and Singapore, finally held together to create Asia’s first viable multipurpose regional organization: ASEAN. But even by then a more powerful force, of regionalization in the sense defined above was to emerge in parallel with Southeast Asia’s search for unity and identity. This was the idea of a Pacific (later Asia-Pacific) community. Proposed by Japanese and Australian academics, and driven by the high economic growth and interdependence among the industrial economies of the Pacific Rim, the idea of a Pacific Community finally gave Japan a platform to enter the fray of Regionalist Asian, albeit at first through epistemic communities and semiofficial groupings like Pacific Basin Economic Council (PBEC, founded 1967), Pacific Trade and Development Conference (PAFTAD, 1968) and Pacific Economic Cooperation Council (PECC, 1980). But initially this was an Asia-Pacific construct, not Asia. Key roles in developing it belonged to individuals, think-tanks and governments, not just from Japan, but from outside Asia, especially from Australia and the US. But the Pacific Community idea gradually morphed into the Asia-Pacific (or Asia Pacific) idea, largely due to the need to involve ASEAN members who were deeply suspicious of the project as a move to marginalise the developing nations, and with an eye to China’s future incorporation. ASEAN’s consent and endorsement was necessary to make it work.

The Asia-Pacific idea would in 1989 lead to the first region wide inter-governmental institution (outside the ESCAP and ADB), Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation. Its purpose was not to develop a EU like supranational body. But neither was it geared to, a la, Nationalist Asia, anticolonial, or anti-western objectives. By now, those objectives had receded into the historical background. The new agenda of regionalism was interdependence, not independence. The driver was not anticolonial sentiments, but the quest for growth and dynamism. Although no direct evidence can be provided linking regionalism of the Pacific or Asia-Pacific variety with the region’s economic growth (it would be the other way around), there was little question that the idea behind it reflected economic performance and optimism for the

future. Moreover, what started as an effort defined mainly in Pacific terms became one in which the Asian element would grow to be the more prominent one.

While Regionalist Asia persisted, it was joined by a somewhat newer vision of Asia, a fifth vision which may be termed Exceptionalist Asia. It was the product of the phenomenal economic growth enjoyed by some of Asia's economies. Claims about Asia's distinctiveness were always around, but they were largely the product of Western Orientalism, which imagined Asia to be exotic, romantic, and subservient. A new form of exceptionalism, constructed by Asia's own power elite, came in to the fore in the 1990s, grounded in claims and assertions about how Asian culture might underpin its economic success. Proponents of Exceptionalist Asia were of course not averse to globalization. They actually thrived on its economic benefits, although uncomfortable with its political aspects, especially the spread of human rights and democracy. The term Asian values emerged in the 1990s in parallel with the high growth of East Asian economies, such as Japan, South Korea, Hong Kong, Taiwan and Singapore. This led some commentators, such as Singapore's Prime Minister Lee Kuan Yew, to associate economic performance with cultural traits and habit. While Lee initially spoke of Confucian values, it latter morphed into Asian Values. The list of Asian values varies, but generally includes hard work, thrift (high savings rate), emphasis on education, consensus, rejection of extreme individualism, national teamwork, and respect for authority. The term acquired a political connotation when critics viewed some elements of it, such as respect for authority, as a justification for authoritarian rule. (Sen, 1997; *The Economist*, 28 May 1994, pp.13-14) Critics argued that what passed as Asian values was in no way special or unique to Asian societies, and that the sheer political and cultural diversity of Asia could permit no such generalization about a set of commonly-held values across the region. How can one speak of a coherent set of values that can be uniquely "Asian", and ignore the differences between Confucian, Muslim and Hindu cultural norms. The Asian financial crisis of 1997 dealt a blow to the Asian Values concept, when its proponents, Lee Kuan Yew included, admitted that there could be "bad" Asian values, such as corruption and lack of transparency and accountability.

Coinciding with the emergence of Exceptionalist Asia, and partly deriving from it, a new form of regionalism challenged the hitherto Asia-Pacific movement of

“open regionalism”, setting up a contest of sorts between APEC and Malaysian Prime Minister Mahathir Mohammed’s East Asian Economic Grouping (EAEG, renamed Caucus, EAEC). (Higgott and Stubbs 1995) Following the 1997 Asian crisis, the idea of an East Asian Community gained momentum. Its advocates saw “East Asia as a “crucial and distinctive region in the world”, economically more integrated and politically and culturally more coherent than unwieldy Asia-Pacific forums like ARF and APEC that include the US, Canada and Australia. At 54% of the region’s total trade, compared to 35% in 1980, intra-East Asian trade was higher than that in the NAFTA region (46%), and “very much comparable to intra-regional trade in the European Union before the 1992 Maastricht treaty.” (Kuroda 2005) It is thus East Asia that offers the best hopes for a “bona fide regional community with shared challenges, common aspirations and a parallel destiny” and for the development of a “strong sense of regional identity and...consciousness.” (East Asia Vision Group 2001: 2, 6, 24)

So far, East Asian regionalism has turned out to be less exclusivist than initially anticipated, thanks partly to persisting transpacific trade and security dependence with the US and concern for a rising China dominating such an East Asia-only construct. The inaugural East Asian Summit in 2005 took a functional rather than geographic view of East Asia by giving a seat at the table to India, Australia and New Zealand. Now it seems US and Russia would be invited as well. But whether the non-East Asians would be assured of equal status within the East Asian Community, or being part of the core group who could drive the community building process, remains to be seen. Should the ‘purist’ (Han 2005:147) view of East Asia prevail, these nations would have good reason to be unhappy over their “second-class” status. And while the broadening of the EAS might have dispelled fears of Chinese dominance, this could engender Chinese disinterest in the summit process. The key challenge for East Asian visionaries and leaders would be to find the balance between Chinese dominance and Chinese disinterest.

In the meantime, echoes of Exceptionalist Asia can be heard in the “Rising Asia” discourse inspired by the massive economic growth, military build-up and attendant political clout of China and to a lesser extent India. While Nationalist Asia spoke of Asia’s emancipation and reemergence from Western dominance, often in

spiritual and moral terms, Rising Asia proponents speak to the possibility of Asia displacing the West from its perch of global leadership. How the Asian powers might cooperate to create a common Asian home, much less an Asian powerhouse, remains unclear in the Rising Asia discourse. (Acharya 2010)

The exceptionalists, realizing the region's sheer dependence on economic globalization, are likely to keep their regionalism relatively open. Moreover, the emerging transnational civil society in Asia seems more firmly wedded to the universalist values of human rights, democracy and increasingly the environment, which could keep under check the exceptionalists' urge to "Asianize" or truncate these values. Hence, the Asia that we may see in the coming decades may well be shaped by the contestations and compromises between Universalist Asia and Exceptionalist Asia. In the meantime, some fear that before the contest is settled, Imperialist Asia, with support and sustenance from Exceptionalist Asia, especially from within China itself, might take over and fundamentally reshape the Asian order in the 21st century. This will happen if China continues with its relentless rise and imposes a Monroe Doctrine like sphere over its neighbours. The best hope against this would be the strengthening of Regionalist Asia. But as yet, limitations of Regionalist Asia abound. Asian regional institutions are still sovereignty bound, unwilling and unable to undertake any major role in conflict resolution. The doctrine of non-interference still remains sacred. It will take time to change these underpinnings of Nationalist Asia for a truly Regionalist Asia to take over.

To conclude, as a scholar of international relations, I am in general agreement with Duara that a prominent place in the construction of Asia has to be given to regionalism and regionalization. It is heartening to see regionalism and regionalization, which are sometimes thought of as a preserve of political scientists, being viewed as a seriously helpful tool in analyzing the concept of Asia by scholars from other fields in social sciences and humanities. Without regionalism, I argue, there might not even be any idea of Asia for us to talk about. Speaking of the idea of Asia, Rebecca Karl shows that "far from always meaning the same thing or even including the same configurations of peoples and states, it has been mobilized for very different purposes at different times." (Karl 1998: 1118) Similarly, regionalism in Asia has not been a singular or coherent set of beliefs. Nor has it been an unchanging

phenomenon. It has incorporated and contributed to different conceptions of the region in different times, sustaining Asia's diversity and pointing to alternative futures.

## NOTES

1. Duara (2010) distinguishes between "region" and "regionalization", taking the former to mean "the relatively unplanned or evolutionary emergence of an area of inter-action and inter-dependence," and the latter as "the more active, often ideologically-driven political process of creating a region". While this is a valid distinction, it risks obscuring (although it is subsumed under "regionalization") the concept and practice of regionalism. Indeed, regionalization and regionalism can be analytically separated. The former is normally understood in the political economy literature as market-driven, as opposed to state-led, advance of transnational economic linkages, including trade, investment and production. Hence a relevant term here is the "regionalization of production" in East Asia, which was spurred by the southward movement of Japanese companies and capital following the reevaluation of the Yen after the Plaza Accord of 1985, thereby bringing South Korea, Taiwan, Hong Kong, Singapore and other Southeast Asian countries under the its ambit and creating a de facto economic region of East Asia. (Bernard and Ravenhill 1995) Regionalism, as understood in political science/international relations literature, implies the deliberate act of forging a common platform, including new inter-governmental organizations and transnational civil society networks, to deal with common challenges, realize common objectives and articulate/advance a common identity. While much of this can be subsumed under regionalization in the sense that Duara speaks of, regionalization can proceed in the absence "the more active, often ideologically-driven political process of creating a region", especially when the latter entails formal regional institutions. Asia was far into the process of economic interdependence and transnational production networks before the first formal intergovernmental regional economic grouping, APEC, was created in 1989. But it is regionalism which brings the notion of Asia alive.
2. I have argued elsewhere that regions should be understood in terms of: (1) material and ideational: --- regionalist ideas and regional identity that move the study of regions beyond purely materialist understandings; (2) whole and parts--- regional (as opposed to mainly country-specific) perspective based on a marriage between disciplinary and area-studies approaches; (3) past and present--- historical understanding of regions, going beyond contemporary policy issues; (4) inside and outside--- internal construction of regions, stressing the role of local agency, as opposed to external stimuli or the naming of regions by external powers; and (5) permanence and transience--- the fluidity, "porosity" and transience of regions. (Acharya 2011)

## REFERENCES

- Abdulghani, Roselan, 1964. *The Bandung Spirit*. Jakarta: Prapantja.
- Acharya, Amitav, 2000. *The Quest for Identity: International Relations of Southeast Asia*. Singapore: Oxford University Press.
- , 2009. *Whose Ideas Matter: Agency and Power in Asian Regionalism*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2009.
- , "The Idea of Asia," 2010. *Asia Policy*, vol. 9 (January): 32-39.
- , 2011. *The Making of Southeast Asia: International Relations of a Region*. (New Edition of *The Quest for Identity: International Relations of a Region*). Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies and Ithaca, Cornell University Press.
- Association of Southeast Asia, 1962. *Report of the Special Session of Foreign Ministers of ASA (Kuala Lumpur / Cameron Highlands, Federation of Malaya, April)*.
- Aung San, *Burma's Challenge*, South Okklapa, Myanmar: U Aung Gyi, 1974.
- Aung San, 1971. *Bogyoke Aung San Maint-Khun-Myar (1945-1947): General Aung San's Speeches* (Rangoon: Sarpay Bait Man Press, 1971).
- Bernard, Mitchell, and John Ravenhill, 1995. "Beyond Product Cycles and Flying Geese: Regionalization, Hierarchy, and the Industrialization of East Asia," *World Politics*, vol.47, no.2 (January): 171-209.
- Duara, Prasenjit, 2010. "Asia Redux: Conceptualizing a Region for Our Times," Manuscript..
- Duus, Peter, 2008. "The Greater East Asian Co-Prosperity Sphere: Dream and Reality," *Journal of Northeast Asian History*, vol.5, no.1 (June): 143-154.
- East Asia Vision Group, 2001. *Towards and East Asian Community: Region of Peace, Prosperity and Progress: East Asia Vision Group Report*.
- Goscha, Christopher E., 1999. *Thailand and the Southeast Asian Networks of the Vietnamese Revolution, 1885-1954*. Surrey: Curzon Press.
- Han Sung-Joo, 2005. "Roadmap for an East Asian Community", *IRI Review* (Seoul), vol.10, no. 2: 131-151.

- Henderson, William, 1955. "The Development of Regionalism in Southeast Asia," *International Organization*, vol. 9, no. 4, pp. 462-76.
- Higgott, Richard, and Stubbs, Richard 1995, 1995. "Competing Conceptions of Economic Regionalism: APEC versus EAEC in the Asia Pacific', *Review of International Political Economy*, Vol.2, No. 3. (Summer): 516-535
- Ho Chi Minh, 1995. *Ho Chi Minh Talks About History*. Hanoi: Nhà Xuất Bản Đại Học Sư Phạm. (Translated by Houg Nguyen.
- Kakuzo, Okakura, 1904. *The Ideas of the East: With Special Reference to the Art of Japan*. Available at: <http://www.sacred-texts.com/shi/ioe/ioe08.htm>. (Accessed 1 July 2010).
- Karl, Rebecca, 1998. "Creating Asia: China in the World at the Beginning of Twentieth Century," *The American Historical Review*, vol103, no.4 (October): 1096-1118.
- Keenleyside, T.A., 1982. "Nationalist Indian Attitude Towards Asia: A Troublesome Legacy," *Pacific Affairs*, vol.55, no.2 (Summer): 210-230.
- Kuroda, Haruhiko, 2005. "Towards a Borderless Asia: A Perspective on Asian Economic Integration" Speech by Haruhiko Kuroda President Asian Development Bank, At The Emerging Markets Forum 10 December 2005 Oxford, UK Available at: [http://www.adb.org/Documents/Speeches/2005/ms2005088.asp#\\_ftn3](http://www.adb.org/Documents/Speeches/2005/ms2005088.asp#_ftn3)
- Nehru, Jawaharlal. 1948. "Inaugural Address". In *Asian Relations: Report of the Proceedings and Documentation of the First Asian Relations Conference*, new Delhi, March-April, 1947. New Delhi, Asian Relations Organization, pp.22-27.
- Sen, Amartya, 1997, "Human rights and Asian values: what Kee Kuan Yew and Le Peng don't understand about Asia," *The New Republic* vol. 217 no. 2-3 July 14,
- Silverstein, Josef , 1972. *The Political Legacy of Aung San*. Ithaca, New York: Department of Asian Studies, Southeast Asian Program Cornell University [Data paper 86]
- Steadman, John M. 1969. *The Myth of Asia*. London: Macmillan.
- Tagore, Rabindranath, 1918. *Nationalism*. London: Macmillan.
- Vandenbosch, Amry, and Richard Butwell, 1966. *The Changing Face of Southeast Asia*. Lexington: University of Kentucky Press.

About the Author:

**Amitav Acharya** is a Visiting Professorial Fellow at ISEAS. He is also Chair of the ASEAN Studies Center at American University

## ISEAS WORKING PAPERS

### I. *ISEAS Working Papers on Economics and Finance* (ISSN 0218-8937)

1(96): Nick J. Freeman, *Portfolio Investment in Vietnam: Coping Without a Bourse*, February 1996.

2(96): Reza Y. Siregar, *Inflows of Portfolio Investment to Indonesia: Anticipating the Challenges Facing the Management of Macroeconomy*, March 1996.

3(96): Helen Hughes, *Perspectives for an Integrating World Economy: Implications for Reform and Development*, May 1996.

4(96): Carolyn L. Gates, *Enterprise Adjustment and Economic Transformation: Industrial Enterprise Behaviour and Performance in Vietnam during Stabilization and Liberalization*, June 1996.

5(96): Mya Than, *The Golden Quadrangle of Mainland Southeast Asia: A Myanmar Perspective*, July 1996.

1(99): Myat Thein, *Improving Resource Mobilization in Myanmar*, January 1999.

2(99): Anita G. Doraisami, *The Malaysian Currency Crisis: Causes, Policy Response and Future Implications*, February 1999.

3(99): George Abonyi, *Thailand: From Financial Crisis to Economic Renewal*, March 1999.

4(99): Carolyn L. Gates, *The East Asian Crisis and Global Integration: Mismanagement and Panic Revisited or a New Beast?*, March 1999.

5(99): Tin Maung Maung Than, *The Political Economy of Burma's (Myanmar's) Development Failure 1948-1988*, March 1999.

6(99): Kim Ong-Giger, *Southeast Asian Economies in Crisis: The Emergence of Pax Capitalia*, April 1999.

7(99): Carolyn L. Gates, *ASEAN's Foreign Economic Relations: An Evolutionary and Neo-Institutional Analysis*, May 1999.

8(99): Kim Ong-Giger, *Japanese IT Development: Implications for FDI in Southeast Asia*, September 1999.

9(99): Frank L. Bartels and Nick J. Freeman, *Multinational Firms and FDI in Southeast Asia: Post-Crisis Perception Changes in the Retail-Oriented Manufacturing Sector*, December 1999.

1(2000): Nick J. Freeman, *Constraints on Thailand's Equity Market as an Allocator of Foreign Investment Capital: Some Implications for Post-Crisis Southeast Asia*, January 2000.

2(2000): Nick J. Freeman, *Foreign Portfolio Investors' Approaches to Thailand's Equity Market: Survey Findings and Preliminary Analysis*, March 2000.

3(2000): Nick J. Freeman and Frank L. Bartels, *Portfolio Investment in Southeast Asia's Stock Markets: A Survey of Institutional Investors' Current Perceptions and Practices*, April 2000.

4(2000): Nick J. Freeman, *A Regional Platform for Trading Southeast Asian Equities: Viable Option or Lofty 'Red Herring'?*, July 2000.

5(2000): Sakulrat Montreevat, *Impact of Foreign Entry on the Thai Banking Sector: Initial Stage of Bank Restructuring*, August 2000.

6(2000): Ramkishen S. Rajan and Tracy Yang, *Devaluation of the Baht and Economic Contraction in Thailand*, December 2000.

7(2000): Tracy Yang and Paul Vandenberg, *Selected East Asian Stock Markets in the Context of Financial Liberalization: Prior to the Crisis*, December 2000.

1(2001): Tracy Yang and Reza Siregar, *An Empirical Examination of the Stock Market Returns in Selected Asia-Pacific Economies in the Pre- and Post-Financial Reform Period*, February 2001.

1(2002): Tracy Yang, *Crisis, Contagion, and East Asian Stock Markets*, February 2002.

2(2002): Ngiam Kee Jin and Lixia Loh, *Developing a Viable Corporate Bond Market: The Singapore Experience*, June 2002.

3(2002): Ramkishen S. Rajan and Rahul Sen, *International Trade in Services in Selected ASEAN Countries: Telecommunications and Finance*, August 2002.

4(2002): Arumugam Rajenthiran, *Indonesia: An Overview of the Legal Framework for Foreign Direct Investment*, October 2002.

5(2002): Arumugam Rajenthiran, *Malaysia: An Overview of the Legal Framework for Foreign Direct Investment*, October 2002.

1(2003): Lee Poh Onn, *The Water Issue Between Singapore and Malaysia: No Solution In Sight?*, January 2003.

1(2004): Denis Hew and Rahul Sen, *Towards an ASEAN Economics Community: Challenges and Prospects*, November 2004.

1(2004): Linda Low, *Policy Lessons In Development: Small, Open Economics of Singapore and Abu Dhabi in the United Arab Emirates*, December 2004.

1(2005): Rahul Sen, *Enhancing Bilateral Economic Linkages Through New Regionalism: The Case of the Agreement Between New Zealand and Singapore for a Closer Economic Partnership (ANZSCEP)*, September 2005.

1(2007): Rahul Sen, *ASEAN's Bilateral Free Trade and Economic Cooperation Agreements in ASEAN: Evolution, Characteristics and Implications for Asian Economic Integration*, March 2007.

1(2008): Aekapol Chongvilaivan and Shandre M Thangavelu, *The Impact of Material and Service Outsourcing on Employment in Thailand's Manufacturing Industries*, October 2008.

## **II. ISEAS Working Papers on Politics and Security Issues** (ISSN 0218-8953)

1(96): Derek da Cunha, *The Need for Weapons Upgrading in Southeast Asia: Present and Future*, March 1996.

1(97): Simon J. Hay, *ASEAN's Regional Security Dialogue Process: From Expectation to Reality?*, March 1997.

1(99): Sorpong Peou, *The ASEAN Regional Forum and Post-Cold War IR Theories: A Case for Constructive Realism?*, January 1999.

2(99): Sheng Li Jun, *China and the United States as Strategic Partners into the Next Century*, February 1999.

3(99): Jürgen Haacke, *'Flexible Engagement': On the Significance, Origins and Prospects of a Spurned Policy Proposal*, February 1999.

4(99): Derek da Cunha, *Southeast Asia's Security Dynamics: A Multiplicity of Approaches Amidst Changing Geopolitical Circumstances*, July 1999.

1(2001): Anthony L. Smith, *Indonesia: One State, Many States, Chaotic State?*, September 2001.

2(2001): Sheng Lijun, *One Year of the Chen Shui-Bian Government: Ice Across the Taiwan Strait*, September 2001.

3(2001): Derek da Cunha, *Renewed Military Buildups Post-Asian Crisis: The Effect on Two Key Southeast Asian Bilateral Military Balances*, December 2001.

1(2003): Sheng Lijun, *China-ASEAN Free Trade Area: Origins, Developments and Strategic Motivations*, July 2003.

1(2004): Graham Gerard Ong, '*Ships Can Be Dangerous Too*': *Coupling Piracy and Maritime Terrorism in Southeast Asia's Maritime Security Framework*, January 2004.

1(2009): Loen Comber, *The Origins of the Cold War in Southeast Asia: The Case of the Communist Party of Malaya (1948-1960). A Special Branch Perspective*, February 2009.

1(2011): Amitav Acharya, *Asia Is Not One: Regionalism and the Ideas of Asia*, March 2011.

2(2011): Bernhard Platzdasch, *Religious Freedom in Indonesia: The Case of the Ahmadiyah*, March 2011.

### **III. ISEAS Working Papers on Social and Cultural Issues**

(ISSN 0218-8961)

1(96): Federico V. Magdalena, *Ethnicity, Identity and Conflict: The Case of the Philippine Moros*, April 1996.

1(98): Patricia Lim, *Myth and Reality: Researching the Huang Genealogies*, June 1998.

2(98): M. Thien Do, *Charity and Charisma: The Dual Path of the Tinh Đô Cu Sĩ, a Popular Buddhist Group in Southern Vietnam*, September 1998.

1(99): JoAnn Aviel, *Social and Environmental NGOs in ASEAN*, August 1999.

1(2000): Lee Hock Guan, *Ethnic Relations in Peninsular Malaysia: The Cultural and Economic Dimensions*, August 2000.

1(2001): Aris Ananta, *The Impact of Migration Status on Household Financial Resilience During the Indonesian Crisis: A Case Study*, May 2001.

2(2001): Lee Hock Guan, *Political Parties and the Politics of Citizenship and Ethnicity in Peninsular Malay(sia), 1957-1968*, September 2001.

1(2005): Terence Chong, *Civil Society in Singapore: Reviewing Concepts in the Literature*, July 2005.

1(2007): Terence Chong, *Practising Global Ethnography in Southeast Asia: Reconciling Area Studies with Globalisation Theory*, March 2007.

2(2007): Lee Hock Guan, *Bangsa Malaysia: Ethnic and/or Civic Citizenship*, March 2007.

3(2007): Pritam Singh, *Framing Islamic Education in Malaysia: Transnationalism, Educational Politics, and Affirmative Action*, July 2007.

1(2008): Lee Hock Guan, *Education and Ethnic Relations in Malaysia*, January 2008.

**IV. ISEAS Working Papers by Visiting Researchers**  
(ISSN 0219-3582)

1(2000): Ramkishen S Rajan, *Examining the Case for Currency Basket Regimes for Southeast Asia*, January 2000.

2(2000): P Lim Pui Huen, *Continuity and Connectedness: The Ngee Heng Kongsu of Johor, 1844-1916*, January 2000.

3(2000): Ramkishen S Rajan, *Examining the Case for an Asian Monetary Fund*, February 2000.

4(2000): Thawatchai Jittrapanun, *The SIMEX Experience: Implications for Thailand's Futures Exchange*, February 2000.  
[Also published as EADN Working Paper, No 1, November 2001.]

5(2000): Le Minh Tam, *Reforming Vietnam's Banking System: Learning from Singapore's Model*, February 2000.  
[Also published as EADN Working Paper, No 2, November 2001.]

6(2000): Gao Haihong, *Liberalising China's Capital Account: Lessons Drawn From Thailand's Experience*, February 2000.  
[Also published as EADN Working Paper, No 3, November 2001.]

7(2000): Liliana Halim, *Reviving the Indonesian Banking Sector? Indonesia's Economic Crisis: Impact on Financial and Corporate Sectors 1997-1999*, February 2000.  
[Also published as EADN Working Paper, No 4, November 2001.]

8(2000): Ngiam Kee Jin, *Coping with the Asian Financial Crisis: The Singapore Experience*, March 2000.

9(2000): Ramkishen S. Rajan and Iman Sugema, *Capital Flows, Credit Transmission and the Currency Crisis in Southeast Asia*, March 2000.

10(2000): Wang Xiaomin, *Zhongguancun Science Park: A SWOT Analysis*, May 2000.  
[Also published as EADN Working Paper, No 5, November 2001.]

11(2000): Doan Phuong Lan, *The Asian Financial Crisis and its Implication for Vietnam's Financial System*, May 2000.

[Also published as EADN Working Paper, No 6, November 2001.]

12(2000): Tracy Yang Su-Chin, *Regulatory Reforms in the Asia-Pacific Region: A Preliminary Study*, May 2000.

[Also published as EADN Working Paper, No 7, November 2001.]

13(2000): Akhmad Bayhaqi, *Education and Macroeconomic Performance in Indonesia: A Comparison with Other ASEAN Economies*, May 2000.

[Also published as EADN Working Paper, No 8, November 2001.]

14(2000): Ai-Gek Beh and George Abonyi, *Structure of the Asset Management Industry: Organizational Factors in Portfolio Investment Decisions*, June 2000.

15(2000): Paul Vandenberg, *The Evolution of SMI Policy in Malaysia*, December 2000.

1(2001): Anis Chowdhury and Iyanatul Islam, *The East Asian Crisis — A Political Economy Explanation*, March 2001.

2(2001): Irman G. Lanti, *Back to the (Slightly Different) Future: Continuity and Change in Indonesian Politics*, April 2001.

3(2001): Bruce Matthews, *Ethnic and Religious Diversity: Myanmar's Unfolding Nemesis*, May 2001.

4(2001): Poramettee Vimolsiri, *Role of Foreign Investors in the Thai Currency Crisis of 1997*, October 2001.

5(2001): Ramkishan S. Rajan and Chung-Hua Shen, *Are Crisis-Induced Devaluations Contractionary?* November 2001.

6(2001): Graham Bird and Ramkishan S. Rajan, *Financial Crises and the Composition of International Capital Flows: Does FDI Guarantee Stability?*, November 2001.

1(2002): Ramkishan S. Rajan and Rahul Sen, *Trade Reforms In India Ten Years On: How Has It Fared Compared To Its East Asian Neighbours?*, March 2002.

2(2002): Muhammad Chatib Basri, *Why Trends of Protection Changed Over Time in Indonesia?*, March 2002.

3(2002): P.J. Lloyd, *New Regionalism and New Bilateralism in the Asia-Pacific*, May 2002.

4(2002): Vu Quoc Ngu, *The State-Owned Enterprise Reform in Vietnam: Process and Achievements*, October 2002.

5(2002): Graham Bird and Ramkishen S. Rajan, *The Political Economy of a Trade-First Approach to Regionalism*, November 2002.

1(2003): Yupana Wiwattanakantang, Raja Kali, Chutatong Chrumilind, *Crony Capital? Corporate Debt Maturity in Thailand Before the Financial Crisis*, February 2003.

2(2003): Martin P. H. Panggabean, *Integration of Indonesian Provinces: Alienated Neighbours?*, August 2003.

3(2003): George Abonyi, *Challenges of Industrial Restructuring in a Globalizing World: Implications for Small- and Medium-scale Enterprises (SMEs) in Asia*, November 2003.

1(2004): Martin P.H. Panggabean, *Regional Growth: Economically Important Sectors*, January 2004.

2(2004): Nico J. G. Kaptein, *The Voice of the 'Ulamâ': Fatwas and Religious Authority in Indonesia*, January 2004.

1(2006): Zhao Hong, *Post-1997 Financial Sector Reform in Malaysia: An Evaluation*, November 2006.

1(2007): Asiah Abu Samah, *English Language Policies in Malaysia, Singapore and the Philippines*, January 2007.

**Editor**

Tin Maung Maung Than

**Editorial Committee**

Lee Hock Guan  
Lee Poh Onn

Papers in this series are preliminary in nature and are intended to stimulate discussion and critical comment. The Editorial Committee accepts no responsibility for facts presented and views expressed, which rests exclusively with the individual author. No part of this publication may be produced in any form without permission.

Comments are welcomed and may be sent to the author.