

IDE APEC STUDY CENTER
Working Paper Series 96/97 - No. 5

The Origins of Contrasting Views on APEC

March 1997

Tatsushi Ogita

Visiting Research Fellow
APEC Study Center
Institute of Developing Economies
and
Research Officer
Research for International Issues
Fuji Research Institute Corporation

Contents

Acknowledgments

v

INTRODUCTION

1

CONTRASTS/CONFLICTS IN THE APEC PROCESS

5

- . 1 Contrasts/Conflicts on the Institutionalization of APEC 5
- . 2 Contrasts/Conflicts on the Liberalization in APEC 12
- . 3 *Cultural* Contrasts/Conflicts between *the Asian and the Western?* 17

ORIGIN ONE: DIFFERENT CONCEPTS OF *COMMUNITY* 19

- . 1 The Two Concepts of *Community* 20
- . 2 The Asian Concept of *Community* for APEC 22
- . 3 The Western Concept of *Community* for APEC 24

ORIGIN TWO: *ORIENTALIST* COGNITIVE CULTURE 27

- . 1 The *Orientalist* Dispatching, Truth, and Representations 27
- . 2 The *Orientalist* Discourse in the Context of APEC 29

CONCLUDING REMARKS 33

Bibliography

36

List of Figure and Tables

Figure: Five <i>Civilizations</i> in the APEC Region	3
Table 1: Enthusiasm for the Institutionalization of APEC	11
Table 2: Tariff Reduction Schedules under the CEPT Scheme for AFTA	15
Table 3: Friedrich's Division of the Concepts of Community	21

Acknowledgments

I am very appreciative of the kind cooperation of the following persons interviewed (in alphabetical order by surname): Mr. John H. Andre, II, Director, Office of Economic Policy, Bureau of East Asian and Pacific Affairs, United States Department of State; Dr. Richard W. Baker, Senior Fellow, Program on Regional Economics and Politics, East-West Center; Mr. Daniel E. Bob, Special Assistant for Asian and Pacific Affairs to United States Senator William V. Roth, Jr.; Mr. Robert B. Cassidy, Assistant United States Trade Representative for Asia and the Pacific; Ms. Julie J. Coons, Vice President and Representative, Washington, D.C. Representative Office, the Fuji Bank, Limited; Prof. Donald C. Hellmann, Professor, International Studies, and Director, APEC Study Center, University of Washington; Dr. Gary C. Hufbauer, Reginald Jones Senior Fellow, Institute for International Affairs; Prof. Robert Immerman, Senior Research Associate, East Asian Institute, Columbia University; Dr. Paul R. Irwin, Manager, Research and Analysis, Asia Pacific Foundation of Canada; Dr. Christopher Blake Johnstone, Government Relations Analyst, Japan Economic Institute of America; Mr. Hirotsugu Koike, Bureau Chief, Washington Bureau, the Nihon Keizai Shimbun; Mr. Michael A. Matera, Chief for Economic Affairs, Office of Japanese Affairs, Bureau of East Asian and Pacific Affairs, United States Department of State; Prof. Kenneth A. Oye, Director, Center for International Studies, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Prof. Hugh Patrick, R.D. Calkins Professor of International Business, and Director, Center on Japanese Economy and Business, Columbia University Graduate School of Business; Dr. Ernest H. Preeg, William M. School Chair in International Business, Center for Strategic and International Studies; Prof. Raymond Vernon, Harvard University John F. Kennedy School of Government; Prof. Ezra F. Vogel, Director, Fairbank Center for East Asian Research, and Henry Ford II Professor of the Social Sciences, Harvard University; Mr. Marc M. Wall, Deputy Director, Office of Economic Policy, Bureau of East Asian and Pacific Affairs, United States

Department of State; Dr. Yuen Pau Woo, Director, Research and Analysis, Asia Pacific Foundation of Canada; Prof. Susumu Yamakage, University of Tokyo; and many officials of the Japanese government, who cannot be identified here.

I also would like to express my deep appreciation to the following individuals for their kind help in arranging interviews: Mr. Akio Ema, Chief Officer, New York Office, Fuji Research Institute Corporation; Dr. Charles Morrison, Director, East-West Center; Prof. Yumiko Okamoto, Brandeis University; Prof. Michael Plummer, Kobe University; Mr. Masato Shimodaira, Special Assistant to the Economic Minister, Embassy of Japan in the United States; Mr. Tsuyoshi Sunohara, the Nihon Keizai Shimbun; and to other persons who cannot be identified here.

Additionally, I thank the members of the group with whom I read and studied the difficult books *Orientalism* by Edward W. Said and Kang Sang-jung's *Orientalizumu no Kanata e*: Ms. Yoko Noguchi and Mr. Takeo Nakanishi, Economic Research Division, Fuji Research Institute Corporation, and Ms. Akiko Ishikawa and Mr. Daisuke Hirose, International Christian University Graduate School of Comparative Culture.

I am also grateful to Mr. Jiro Okamoto, APEC Study Center, Institute of Developing Economies, for his comments on this paper; Mr. Takafumi Noguchi, Sophia University, for his assistance in my writing this paper; and Dr. Paul W. Wiseman and Mr. Hiroshi Ike, Department of Life Sciences, Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, University of Tokyo, for their proofreading this paper and its arrangement.

The interpretations and opinions expressed in this paper are my own, and do not reflect official positions of the institutions I am associated with, namely the Institute of Developing Economies, and the Fuji Research Institute Corporation.

To Ms. Yoshiko Hamamoto I dedicate this volume as a token of my affection and gratitude.

March 1997

T. O.

How does one *represent* other cultures? What is *another* culture? Is the notion of distinct culture (or race, or religion, or civilization) a useful one, or does it always get involved either in self-congratulation (when one discusses one's own) or hostility and aggression (when one discusses the "other")? Do cultural, religious, and racial differences matter more than socio-economic categories, or politicohistorical one?

Edward W. Said¹

INTRODUCTION

'From *American style* to *Asian initiative*.'² 'US appeals *getting back the initiative*.'³ These are both newspaper headlines reporting the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) annual Ministerial and Leaders Meetings: the former described the Osaka Meetings in 1995, and the latter was about the Manila/Subic Meetings in 1996. As characterized in these headlines, APEC has tended to be depicted in the binomial opposition of Asia and America / the West, or sometimes of *the Asian* and *the American / Western*.

The diversity among its member economies is one of the most notable characteristics of APEC. It is discussed to be concerned not only with territories, populations, gross domestic/national product, or levels of economic development (which are often measured by GDP/GNP per capita), but also with ways of thinking, cultures, or civilizations. APEC's membership encompasses the Pacific Ocean and includes both the Asian (or Oriental)

¹ Edward W. Said, *Orientalism*, New York: Vintage Books, 1979, p. 325 (Japanese translation by Noriko Imazawa, *Orientalizumu*, Tokyo: Heibon Sha, 1986, p. 329).

² *Mainichi Shimbun* (Tokyo), November 20, 1995.

³ *Asahi Shimbun* (Tokyo), November 26, 1996.

countries/economies on the western Pacific rim and the Western (or Occidental) countries in North America and Oceania since its foundation in 1989. Moreover, according to Samuel Huntington's well-known (and often criticized) division of civilizations, there are five distinct civilizations in the APEC region: the Western civilization consisting of Australia, Canada, New Zealand, and the United States; the Confucian of the so-called Three Chinas, Singapore, and overseas Chinese communities in other Asian countries; the Japanese of Japan alone; the Islamic of Indonesia and Malaysia; and the Latin American of Chile and Mexico [refer to Figure].⁴

Referring to Huntington, Fred Bergsten, who was the chair of APEC's advisory board known as the Eminent Persons Group, stated that '[a] successful APEC would also destroy the notion that different civilizations are more likely to confront each other than to cooperate'.⁵ Yoichi Funabashi, a journalist versed in the APEC process, also pointed out that APEC should be regarded as a *movement* toward a *fusion* of several civilizations.⁶ However, as is indicated by the newspaper headlines quoted at the outset, APEC is more often characterized by contrasts, or sometimes conflicts, between its members, especially between the Asian and the Western ones, than by harmony amongst them. In fact there have been existing contrasts and conflicts between the Asian (group of) member economies and the Western (group of) members.

Such frequent contrasts/conflicts between the Asian and the Western members are fundamentally related to the *post-Cold War* character of APEC which is sometimes called *the first regionalism after the Cold War* since it was founded almost simultaneously with the collapse of the Berlin Wall and the Malta summit.⁷ The frequency of such contrasts/conflicts

⁴ Samuel P. Huntington, "Clash of Civilizations?", in *Foreign Affairs* (New York: Council on Foreign Relations), Vol. 72 No. 3, Summer 1993. C. Fred Bergsten, "APEC and the World Economy", in *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 73 No. 3, May/June 1994, p. 25.

⁵ Bergsten, *op. cit.*, p. 25.

⁶ Yoichi Funabashi, "Bunmei to shite no APEC" (APEC as a Civilization), in *Foresight* (Tokyo: Shincho Sha), October 1995. Also refer to the same author's "Ajia o Motomeru Amerika" (America in search of Asia), in *Foresight*, January 1994; and *Asia Pacific Fusion: Japan's Role in APEC*, Washington, D.C.: Institute for International Economics, 1995, especially pp. 9-10 (Japanese translation by the author himself, *Ajia Taiheiyō Fyujon*, Tokyo: Chuo Koron Sha, 1995, pp. 21-22).

⁷ APEC is regarded to be founded at its first Ministerial Meeting in Canberra on 6-7 November 1989. Only two days later, on the historical 9 November 1989, the Berlin Wall collapsed; and about a month later, at the Malta summit on 2-3 December, the then US President George Bush and the then USSR

is believed to be due to increased clout of Asian countries/economies which had become free from pressure of the bipolar Cold War world order and which had gained greater economic power during their rapid growth in the last years of the Cold War. It is also due to the coincident decline of Western countries' superior economic power especially, of the United States' hegemonic power after the Cold War.⁸ For APEC as a *post-Cold War mega-regionalism* covering such a broad region and encompassing both Asia and the West, it is necessary to tackle the contrasts/conflicts between them in order to bring about the desired synthesis and harmony.

In the post-Cold War period such tasks must be faced not only by APEC, but also by the whole world. People today need to build up the new world order to be composed of the United States as the current sole superpower in spite of its loss of hegemony, Asian countries/economies as the emerging economic (and even political) powers, in addition to many others. APEC is required to contribute to the building of the *post-Cold War* world order by presenting a vision to sublimate (sometimes possibly cultural) contrasts/conflicts between Asia and the West, both of which are to be core parts of the new world order. Without this contribution, APEC would be only a *regionalism after the Cold War*, not a *post-Cold War regionalism*. Huntington stated that 'economic regionalism may succeed only when it is rooted in a common civilization' as is the European Union that 'rests on the shared foundation of European culture and Western Christianity'.⁹ APEC can and should find a way to go beyond this kind of parochial thinking.

In order to make APEC a model of new-order building upon Asian-Western contrasts/conflicts, it is necessary to discuss how such contrasts/conflicts have appeared in the APEC process and what their origins are. To address this aim, a retrospective of the contrasts/conflicts between the Asian and Western members in the APEC process is presented in Chapter . Then an attempt is made to present the two *cultural* origins of

President Mikhail Gorbachev announced the end of the Cold War.

⁸ Regarding to the relation between APEC and the United States' losing hegemonic economic power, also refer to Akira Hirata, Jiro Okamoto, and Tatsushi Ogita, "Strategy toward APEC: The Case of Japan", in Ippei Yamazawa and Akira Hirata (eds.), *APEC: Cooperation from Diversity*, I.D.E. Symposium Proceedings No. 16, Tokyo: Institute of Developing Economies, 1996, pp. 30-32.

⁹ Huntington, op. cit., p. 27.

the contrasts/conflicts, as frameworks for thinking, in Chapters and . Finally, in Chapter , a few concluding remarks will be given.

CONTRASTS/CONFLICTS IN THE APEC PROCESS

Contrasts/conflicts between the Asian and Western members in the APEC process have been seen since the very beginning of the institution. The oldest one involved APEC's foundation itself during the first half of 1989, while the current ones are on the modality of its regional trade and investment liberalization and facilitation process, whose implementation phase was declared to be launched at the latest (fourth) APEC Leaders Meeting at Subic, the Philippines in November 1996.¹⁰ The contrasts/ conflicts can be generally divided into two groups regarding what they involved and when they surfaced: (1) contrasts/conflicts on the institutionalization of APEC, appeared during its preparatory phase and lasted until 1993; and (2) contrasts/conflicts on its liberalization and facilitation, arose after 1994 with APEC's declared goal of achieving 'free and open trade and investment in Asia-Pacific no later than the year 2020'.¹¹

. 1 Contrasts/Conflicts on the Institutionalization of APEC

It was the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) that was disinclined for the foundation of APEC proposed by Australia.

Soon after he launched the proposal to found a then-unnamed Asia Pacific regional body and had obtained President Roh Tae Woo's consent during his visit to Korea at the end of January 1989, Australian Prime Minister Robert Hawke also obtained the Thai leader's

¹⁰ APEC Leaders Meeting, "APEC Economic Leaders' Declaration: From Vision to Action", available on the Internet at <http://www.apecsec.org.sg/mapa/leaders.html>, 1996. At the third Meeting in Osaka, Japan in November 1996, APEC Leaders also declared that APEC had 'entered the action phase' (APEC Leaders Meeting, "APEC Economic Leaders' Declaration for Action", in APEC Secretariat [eds.], *Selected APEC Documents 1995*, Singapore: APEC Secretariat, 1995, p. 1). The fact that APEC needed two years to enter from the vision phase to the action/implementation phase implicates how difficult it was for the contrasts/conflicts between the member on this project. Refer to Tatsushi Ogita, "Kodo Dankai o Mukaeta APEC" (APEC Entering the Action Phase), in *Ajiken World Trend* (Tokyo: Institute of Developing Economies), March 1997, pp. 24-25.

¹¹ APEC Leaders Meeting, "APEC Leaders' Declaration of Common Resolve", in APEC Secretariat (eds.), *Selected APEC Documents 1989-94*, Singapore: APEC Secretariat, 1995, p. 6.

basic agreement during his visit to Thailand in early February.¹² Australian Foreign and Trade Secretary Richard Woolcott, who was appointed by Bob Hawke as an envoy for the promotion of the idea of this new regional body, also received an enthusiastic response from Singapore's Lee Kuan Yew and gained approvals of some Philippine officials including President Corazon Aquino. However, Malaysian Prime Minister Mahathir Mohamad and Philippine Trade and Industry Secretary Jose Conception were not supportive. Moreover, the ministers of Indonesia, which Woolcott regarded as 'the most important country ... because it was the largest, and ASEAN does not react to any particular proposal or policy without ascertaining [its] view', were relatively cool to the Australian initiative.¹³

On the other hand, Japan, whose Ministry of International Trade and Industry (MITI) had been preparing to propose a similar regional body, had been struggling jointly with Australia for the foundation of the new body since one month before Hawke's initiation.¹⁴ MITI is now known as the virtual co-proposer of APEC with Hawke. The United States, which was excluded from the membership of Hawke's initiative but was included in MITI's, expressed its support of the Australian-Japanese proposal in Secretary of State James Baker's speech at the end of June, when MITI had succeeded in persuading Washington that the new body was never to be an *anti-American bloc* and was to include participation by the United States.¹⁵

An *Australian initiative supported by Japan and the United States* was why ASEAN was disinclined to join the new regional body to become known as APEC. ASEAN, which had nearly a quarter century long history and was regarded as a successful regionalism in the developing world,¹⁶ was apprehensive that it would lose its power being embraced by the new body which would cover the much broader region and which could, in principle, be led by industrialized members such as Japan and the United States. ASEAN

¹² *Nihon Keizai Shimbun* (Tokyo), 10 February 1989.

¹³ Funabashi, *Asia Pacific Fusion*, pp. 55-57 (*trans.*, pp. 83-85).

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 58-66 (*trans.* pp. 87-102). For the reason why Japan yielded the position of the proposer of APEC to Hawke, refer to Tatsushi Ogita, *The APEC Policy-Making Process in Japan*, IDE-APEC Study Center Working Paper Series 95/96-No. 7, Tokyo: Institute of Developing Economies, 1996, pp.12-13.

¹⁵ Funabashi, *Asia Pacific Fusion*, pp. 61-64 (*trans.*, pp. 94-98).

¹⁶ For example, refer to Noboru Kiriya, "Togo Moderu to shite no ASEAN" (ASEAN as a Model for Regional Integration), in *Shiso* (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten), April 1995, pp. 184-199.

had always been wary of proposals for regional groupings initiated by major powers, such as one proposed by former Japanese Prime Minister Masayoshi Ohira around 1980.¹⁷ Another reason for ASEAN's reluctance to join APEC was a notion of *an Asia for Asians* or that 'Asians alone can understand Asia's problems', as expressed by the Philippines' Jose Conception.¹⁸

Finally, in spite of inveterate disinclinations of Indonesia, Malaysia, and others, ASEAN endorsed holding the Australian-proposed Asia Pacific ministerial meeting to be held in Canberra in November 1989. It agreed that at its Post-Ministerial Conference which assembled the existing six ASEAN members, Australia, Canada, Japan, New Zealand, the United States and the European Community (EC) in Brunei in July, but it endorsed the Australian proposal on condition that the meeting would not be to establish any new organization.¹⁹ Furthermore, in September, at a preparatory senior officials meeting for the Canberra ministerial one, Singapore was selected to host the second ministerial meeting from among several ASEAN candidates, which virtually endorsed the foundation of APEC as a regular forum.²⁰

ASEAN changed its attitude from negative to positive because the two main advocates of APEC — Australia and Japan — struggled to make it clear that ASEAN was to be the *core* of APEC and that APEC was not to be a rigid organization. Although it had been holding out for the establishment of a permanent secretariat, Australia stopped referring to APEC as an *Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD)-type regional body*. Hawke had done it at the beginning in order to explain that the new body never did aim at becoming an economic bloc,²¹ but stopped it because OECD was an established organization with much bureaucracy.²² On the other hand, Japan had denied the OECD model for an Asia Pacific regional body since 1988 when MITI's Study Group for

¹⁷ Tatsushi Ogita, "APEC no Keii: Sono Hossoku to Henka" (The Process of APEC: Its Foundation and Change), in Ippei Yamazawa (ed.), *APEC no Shin-Tenkai: Osaka Kaigi ni Mukete* (The New Development of APEC: Toward the Osaka Meetings), Tokyo: Institute of Developing Economies, 1995, pp. 18-19. Ogita, *The APEC Policy-Making Process in Japan*, p. 13.

¹⁸ Funabashi, *Asia Pacific Fusion*, pp. 57-58 (trans., pp. 85-88).

¹⁹ *Sekai Shuho* (Tokyo: Jiji Tsushin Sha), 25 July 1989, p. 75.

²⁰ Ogita, "APEC no Keii", p. 19. Funabashi, *Asia Pacific Fusion*, pp. 64-65 (trans., p. 99).

²¹ For example, refer to *The Australian*, 1 February 1989.

Asia Pacific Trade Development issued a report recommending the creation of such a body, because it was ‘not tenable in the Asia Pacific, which requires a forum that would allow for greater diversity’.²³

The ASEAN countries were six of the twelve founding members of APEC²⁴ at its first Ministerial Meeting in Canberra but became members of APEC conditional on it being a *forum*, not an *organization*. Although APEC minimized its organizational color by, for example, not establishing the Australian-proposed permanent secretariat, ASEAN did not hesitate to express its concern over the institutionalization of APEC. It believed that such institutionalization would enhance APEC and lead to further diminution of ASEAN. Three months later, in February 1990, the ASEAN ministers convening at Kuching, Malaysia, discussed the basis of ASEAN’s participation in APEC, and adopted the so-called *Kuching Consensus* which included the following principles:

- ASEAN’s identity and cohesion should be preserved and its cooperative relations with its dialogue partners and with third countries should not be diluted in any enhanced APEC.
- An enhanced APEC should be based on the principles of equality, equity and mutual benefit, taking fully into account the differences in stages of economic development and socio-political systems among the countries in the region.
- APEC should provide a consultative forum on economic issues and should not lead to the adoption of mandatory directives for any participant to undertake or implement.
- APEC should proceed gradually and pragmatically especially in its institutionalization without inhibiting further elaboration and future expansion.²⁵

²² Ogita, “APEC no Keii”, p. 19.

²³ Funabashi, *Asia Pacific Fusion*, pp. 59-60 (*trans.*, pp. 89-90).

²⁴ At that time ASEAN was made up of the six countries. ASEAN’s seventh member Vietnam, which received the membership in July 1995, has not joined APEC yet. In this paper, the ASEAN countries/members refer to the six countries, not including Vietnam, which joined both ASEAN and APEC.

²⁵ Australia-Japan Research Centre, *Australian, Indonesian and Japanese Approaches towards APEC*, Canberra: Australia-Japan Research Centre, Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies, The

These principles represented ASEAN's opposition to an institutionalization of APEC into a rigid organization which makes mandatory, legally binding decisions, and demonstrated ASEAN's refusal to see its power eroded by APEC.

In 1991, at the third Ministerial Meeting hosted by Korea, APEC took a significant step toward its institutionalization with the adoption of the "Seoul APEC Declaration" which 'represents the principles, objectives and understandings of APEC; endows APEC with a clear international personality; and provides a firm foundation on which to base APEC's work'.²⁶ The Declaration 'is sometimes called the "APEC Charter"'.²⁷ However, it seemed to be in line with the intention of ASEAN which was still cautious regarding APEC institutionalization. Paragraphs 4 and 5 in the "Mode of Operation" part of the Declaration looked like a direct transplantation of the essence of ASEAN's Kuching Consensus mentioned before:

4. Cooperation will be based on:
 - (a) the principle of mutual benefit, taking into account the differences in the stages of economic development and in the socio-political systems, and giving due consideration to the needs of developing economies; and
 - (b) a commitment to open dialogue and consensus-building, with equal respect for the views of all participants.
5. APEC will operate through a process of consultation and exchange of views among high-level representatives of APEC economies, drawing upon research, analysis and policy ideas contributed by participating economies and other relevant organisations including the ASEAN and the South Pacific Forum (SPF) Secretariats and the PECC.²⁸

Australian National University, 1994, p. 4.

²⁶ APEC Ministerial Meeting, "Joint Statement" at Seoul on 12-14 November 1991, in APEC Secretariat (eds.), *Selected APEC Documents 1989-1994*, p. 56.

²⁷ Akiko Hirano, *Legal Aspects of the Institutionalization of APEC*, IDE-APEC Study Center Working Paper Series 95/96-No. 6, Tokyo: Institute of Developing Economies, 1996, pp. 17-18.

²⁸ APEC Ministerial Meeting, "APEC Seoul Declaration", in APEC Secretariat (eds.), *Selected APEC*

The fact that the *APEC Charter* appeared in the form of a *declaration*, and not a legally-binding *treaty*, also reflected ASEAN's caution. Moreover, although the firm foundation of its activities was provided by the Declaration as 'the most important constitutional document',²⁹ APEC still prevented establishment of its permanent secretariat and budget mainly because ASEAN insisted that this would be premature.³⁰

The long standing wish of APEC's initial proponent, Australia, to establish a permanent secretariat was finally agreed at the fourth Ministerial Meeting in Bangkok in September 1992³¹ and was realized at the beginning of 1993. With this APEC took the second significant step toward its institutionalization.³² Australia's next challenge was to change APEC's name change *APEC's C* from *Cooperation* to *Community*. Bob Hawke looked back on and realized that "cooperation" was not a particularly elegant word but he could not name the new body "organization" or "co mmission" because such words would not seem favorable to ASEAN which was worried about the organizational rigidity of the new body.³³ In advance of the fifth Ministerial Meeting in Seattle in November 1993, Hawke's successor, Paul Keating, insisted on making APEC *APECCommunity* but he ended up being unsuccessful. This attempt possibly imply Australia's (or Keating's) intention to evolve APEC from 'a consultative forum', as depicted in ASEAN's Kuching Consensus, to an institutionalized organization.³⁴

A more famous argument about the word *Community* was simultaneously had during the making of the Vision Statement which was to be adopted at the first APEC Leaders Meeting at Blake Island near Seattle. The 1993 chair United States, whose new President Bill Clinton launched a vision of a *New Pacific Community* during his visit to Japan

Documents 1989-1994, p. 63.

²⁹ Hirano, *op. cit.*, p. 18.

³⁰ Susumu Yamagami, *Ajia Taiheiyō no Jidai: APEC Setsuritsu no Kei to Tenbo* (The Time of the Asia-Pacific Region: APEC's Foundation Process and Perspective), Tokyo: Daiichi Hoki, 1994, pp. 21-23. Also refer to Ogita, "APEC no Kei", pp.25-26.

³¹ APEC Ministerial Meeting, "Joint Statement" at Bangkok on 10-11 September 1992, in APEC Secretariat (eds.), *Selected APEC Documents 1989-1994*, p. 73.

³² Hirano, *op. cit.*, pp. 3-4.

³³ Funabashi, *Asia Pacific Fusion*, p. 2 (*trans.*, p. 9).

³⁴ Refer to Jiro Okamoto, "APEC no Shin-Tenkai to Osutoraria no Taio" (The New Development of APEC

and Korea at the middle of that year,³⁵ wanted to insert the words *Asia Pacific Community* into the Statement. Firstly, at the senior official-level preparatory meetings, China's delegate firmly opposed the use of the word *Community* saying that 'APEC is not the European Community' and that '*Community* means an economic bloc'. Secondly, after the settlement of the Chinese opposition, Malaysian Trade Minister Rafidah Aziz imposed a condition that only 'a community with a small c' not *Community* which would remind them of the EC was agreed to by the APEC Ministers.³⁶ Finally, the Vision Statement appeared with the phrase 'we envision a community of Asia Pacific economies', without *Asia Pacific Community*.³⁷

As mentioned above, not only ASEAN but also China, who joined APEC later in 1991, was cautious of the institutionalization of APEC. So were Hong Kong and Chinese Taipei (Taiwan), which joined APEC at the same time as China. According to William Bodde Jr., an American diplomat who served as the first Executive Director of the APEC Secretariat in 1993, the members of APEC could be classified based on their relative support for institutionalization: the four Western members, Korea, and Singapore were classified into the '[m]ost enthusiastic'; ASEAN members except for Singapore and Malaysia and all the Three Chinas into 'the middle'; and Malaysia into 'Resisting all efforts towards APEC institution building' [refer to Table 1].³⁸ This classification generally showed an Asian-Western contrast on the institutionalization of APEC with exceptions of Korea and Singapore.

Table 1: Enthusiasm for the Institutionalization of APEC

and Australia's Stance), in Yamazawa (ed.), *APEC no Shin-Tenkai*, p. 39.

³⁵ Refer to Miho Sekizawa, *Posuto-Reisen-ki no Beikoku no Ajia Seisaku* (The United States' Asian Policies in the Post-Cold War Era), Tokyo: Fuji Research Institute Corporation, 1994, p. 10.

³⁶ Funabashi, *Asia Pacific Fusion*, pp. 1-2 (*trans.*, p. 8).

³⁷ APEC Leaders Meeting, "APEC Leaders Economic Vision Statement", in APEC Secretariat (eds.), *Selected APEC Documents 1989-1994*, p. 1.

³⁸ William Bodde Jr., *View from the 19th Floor: Reflections of the First APEC Executive Director*, Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, 1994, p. 37. The classification was on the fourteen members, who had joined APEC before the Seattle Meetings, except for Japan. Japan did not appear because it did not make its attitude clear mainly for the spread between MITI and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs which were jointly in charge of APEC.

<i>Most enthusiastic about institution building in APEC</i>	Australia, United States, Canada, New Zealand, Korea, and Singapore
<i>In the middle, from hedged to reluctant support</i>	China, Thailand, Indonesia, Hong Kong, Philippines, Brunei, and Chinese Taipei
<i>Resisting all efforts towards APEC institution building</i>	Malaysia

(Source) William Bodde Jr., *View from the 19th Floor: Reflections of the First APEC Executive Director*, Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, 1994, p. 37.

. 2 Contrasts/Conflicts on the Liberalization in APEC

As APEC established the vision of ‘a community of Asia-Pacific economies’ at the first Leaders Meeting and set the goals including ‘free and open trade and investment in the Asia-Pacific no later than 2010 in the case of industrialized economies and 2020 in the case of developing economies’ at the second Leaders Meeting at Bogor, Indonesia in November 1994, this regional body began to move toward the ‘action phase’ of its liberalization process ‘in translating this vision and these goals into reality’.³⁹ In accordance with this move, contrasts/conflicts between the members on APEC institutionalization were copied on the liberalization in APEC. Such contrasts/conflicts arose because the liberalization in APEC according to a non-binding, voluntary basis versus a legally binding, clearly-scheduled basis depended on whether APEC was a consultative forum on economic issues or a legally binding organization with specific mandatory goals.

It was natural that most ASEAN members were in favor of voluntary liberalization but not of a legally binding approach. Malaysia, the member economy most opposed to institutionalization, registered the following reservations on the so-called Bogor Declaration which set the 2010/2020 deadline for APEC liberalization:

1. In paragraph 5, concerning the *acceleration* of the Uruguay Round accords, as well as *deepening* and *broadening* the outcome, inclusive of a call for *standstill* measures

... *Malaysia will only commit to undertaking further liberalisation on a*

³⁹ These quotations are from APEC Leaders Meeting, “APEC Economic Leaders’ Declaration for Action”, p. 1.

unilateral basis at a pace of capacity commensurate with our level of development.

2. Paragraph 6 concerning the goal of free and open trade and investment in Asia Pacific to be achieved not later than 2020

Malaysia's interpretation is as follows:

- a) the liberalisation process to achieve this goal *will not create an exclusive free trade area in the Asia Pacific*;
- b) [omitted by the author]
- c) the target dates of 2020 and 2010 are *indicative dates and non-binding* on member economies;
- d) the liberalisation process to be undertaken will be on a *best endeavour basis*;
- e) APEC member economies will liberalise their trade and investment regime *based on their capacity* to undertake such liberalisation *commensurate with their level of development*; and
- f) [omitted by the author]

3. Paragraph 9 which permits a group of countries to implement a project with others joining in at a later date

It is Malaysia's understanding that *decisions in APEC should be on the basis of consensus.*

4. [omitted by the author]⁴⁰

It was said that Thailand also tried to register a similar reservation. In addition to ASEAN members, other Asian member economies, including industrialized Japan, advocated a cautious approach to APEC liberalization that would be carried out in a fashion of an agreement-based free trade areas which is characterized in the article 24 of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT). Since it was too difficult for Japan to accept

⁴⁰ Quoted from background material presented at the seminar entitled "Australian, Indonesian and Japanese Approaches towards APEC" at the International House of Japan, Tokyo on 1 December 1994. The *italicized* parts are underlined in the original document.

legally binding liberalization of its agricultural market beyond the GATT Uruguay Round commitment, Prime Minister Tomiichi Murayama privately appealed to Indonesian President Suharto, the host of the Bogor Leaders Meeting, for ‘special consideration of “nontradeable aspects of agriculture” in liberalization’.⁴¹ The Japanese view was shared by China, Korea, and Chinese Taipei. These four members had been wishing to insert the so-called *Flexibility Principle*: paragraph 8 of the liberalization and facilitation general principles in “The Osaka Action Agenda” to be adopted at the Japan-hosted third APEC Leaders Meeting in November 1995.⁴²

APEC spent all of 1995 discussing the guidelines for, but not the contents of, its liberalization, which would become the Osaka Action Agenda. APEC was stalled in these year-long discussions because of contrasts/conflicts between the Asian and Western members on the modality of the liberalization. In contrast to the Asian members, the Western member economies generally thought that there should be some rules and schedules for the liberalization which would have a certain degree of binding character if the APEC members were really committed to achieve ‘free and open trade and investment in the Asia-Pacific’ by the clarified deadlines of 2010/2020.⁴³ The United States, which had been focusing on the improvement of its current account balance since the latter half of 1980’s, was especially keen on the liberalization *based on a common rule*, in order to minimize free-riding on earlier-opened market members (mainly industrialized members) by later-opened market ones (mainly developing ones). The United States was also negative toward the *Concerted Unilateral Actions (CUA)*, an APEC-original idea through which each member would implement the liberalization literally in *concert* but *unilaterally*.⁴⁴

CUA, which surfaced at the year’s first APEC Special Senior Officials Meeting at

⁴¹ Funabashi, *Asia Pacific Fusion*, p. 216 (trans., p. 325). Also refer to Ogita, *The APEC Policy-Making Process in Japan*, p. 18.

⁴² Refer to Tatsushi Ogita and Daisuke Takoh, *The Making of the Osaka Action Agenda and Japan’s Individual Action Plan: The APEC Policy Making Process in Japan Revisited*, IDE APEC Study Center Working Paper Series 96/97-No. 7, Tokyo: Institute of Developing Economies, 1997, .

⁴³ Refer to Ogita, “Kodo Dankai o Mukaeta APEC”, pp. 24-25.

⁴⁴ Jiro Okamoto, “Boueki Toshi Jiyuka ni Taisuru APEC Ikinai-koku no Sutansu: Amerika to ASEAN no Jirei” (The Stances of the APEC Members toward the Trade and Investment Liberalization: The Cases of America and ASEAN), in *Ajiken World Trend*, No. 7, November 1995, pp. 15-16.

Fukuoka in February 1995,⁴⁵ was basically regarded as an unilateral and voluntary way of liberalization, and was favored by Asian members especially ASEAN. It can be pointed out that CUA was, in essence, a *replica* of the Common Effective Preferential Tariff (CEPT) scheme: the main mechanism under which ASEAN is forming the ASEAN Free Trade Area (AFTA) since the beginning of 1993. One of the similarities between CUA and CEPT is that the members have a deadline on *when* to complete the liberalization but have free hands on *how* to complete it. Although it is slightly more restrictive than the CUA-based liberalization, in the CEPT scheme, the AFTA members are free to decide individually on the pace of the liberalization, have a only one or two deadlines [refer to Table 2], and are just *encouraged* to liberalize at a constant pace. Another similarity is that each member can pick up certain products as the objects of irregularly delayed liberalization. Each AFTA member is allowed to carry sensitive products on the Temporary Exclusions list according to its own judgment, although the list is to be revised toward reducing exclusions.⁴⁶

Table 2: Tariff Reduction Schedules under the CEPT Scheme for AFTA

	<i>Tariff rates at the end of 1992</i>	
	<i>More than 20%</i>	<i>No more than 20%</i>
<i>Objects of the Normal Track Program</i>	Reduce to 20% or below by 1 Jan. 1998 and to 0-5% by 1 Jan. 2003.	Reduce to 0-5% by 1 Jan. 2000.
<i>Objects of the Fast Track Program</i>	Reduce to 0-5% by 1 Jan. 2000.	Reduce to 0-5% by 1 Jan. 1998.

(Reference) *Nihon Keizai Shimbun* (Tokyo), 26 September 1994.

The APEC members can decide *what products* are to be liberalized and *how fast* to liberalize them much more freely and unilaterally in the CUA scheme than the AFTA members can in the CEPT scheme. The scope and pace of APEC liberalization were finally

⁴⁵ Takeo Ohmura, "Dai-ni-kai APEC Kokyu Jimu-Reberu Kigo no Hokoku" (A Report on the Second APEC Senior Officials Meeting), in *Gekkan Boeki to Sangyo* (Tokyo: Tsusho Seisku Kenkyu Kai), September 1995, p. 19.

⁴⁶ Refer to Tatsushi Ogita, "ASEAN Jiyu Boeki Chiiki (AFTA) Keisei no Haikai to Tenbo" (The Backgrounds and the Perspective of the Formation of the ASEAN Free Trade Area), a paper unpublished, Tokyo: Fuji Research Institute Corporation, 1994, pp. 2-16.

accepted in the following ambiguous general principles in the Osaka Action Agenda:

1. *Comprehensiveness*

The APEC liberalization and facilitation process will be comprehensive, addressing all impediments to achieving the long-term goal of free and open trade and investment.

7. *Simultaneous Start, Continuous Process and Differentiated Time Tables*

APEC economies will begin simultaneously and without delay the process of liberalization, facilitation and cooperation with each member economy contributing continuously and significantly to achieve the long-term goal of free and open trade and investment.⁴⁷

It is evident that the CUA scheme is very characteristic of ASEAN thinking. According to Susumu Yamakage, CUA can be regarded as a generalization of the ASEAN way in APEC.⁴⁸ Furthermore, not only its modality but also the actual APEC liberalization process resembles ASEAN's AFTA. A Thai official stated that AFTA stood for 'Agree First, Talk After', suggesting that only *the decision to establish AFTA* had been made and the discussion on *how to do it* was left until later.⁴⁹ Similarly APEC declared a goal of achieving 'free and open trade in the Asia Pacific' before discussing *how to do it* and even *what it is*. Summarizing the analogy between ASEAN and APEC, Yoshinobu Yamamoto wrote that ASEAN is likely to regard APEC as its own broader *concentric circle*.⁵⁰

On the other hand, as mentioned earlier, the United States could not accept that

⁴⁷ APEC Leaders Meeting. "The Osaka Action Agenda: Implementation of the Bogor Declaration", in APEC Secretariat (eds.), *Selected APEC Documents 1995*, p. 6.

⁴⁸ A lecture by Susumu Yamakage at the APEC Study Center, the Institute of Developing on 25 June 1996.

⁴⁹ Adam Schwarz, "Changing Places", in *Far Eastern Economic Review* (Hong Kong: Review Publishing Company), 12 May 1994, p. 21.

⁵⁰ Yoshinobu Yamamoto, "APEC wa Jiyuka no Ninaite tariuru ka?" (Can APEC Be a Promoter of Liberalization?), in *Sekai* (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten), December 1995, p. 104.

liberalization with the specific deadlines could be completed through *unilateral* actions. It had been disinclined to set the CUA scheme as the basis of APEC liberalization and had been insisting on the removal of the acronym CUA, or at least the term *unilateral*, from the Osaka Action Agenda. The United States finally succeeded in having all of the words in the upper case ('Concerted Unilateral Actions', or 'CUA') deleted but one in the lower case ('concerted unilateral actions'). However, the substance of CUA remained in the Agenda, as is evident from the unilateral essence of the following expression '[e]ach APEC economy will ...', as the principal tool in the Action Plan a concrete plan of APEC liberalization to be submitted to the Manila Ministerial Meeting in November 1996 although it is regarded *formally* as the co-main tool with 'collective actions'.⁵¹

To compensate for accepting the CUA scheme, the United States inserted the following paragraph the so-called *Comparability Principle* as a liberalization general principle:

3. *Comparability*

APEC economies will endeavor to ensure the overall comparability of their trade and investment liberalization and facilitation, taking into account the general level of liberalization and facilitation already achieved by each APEC economy.⁵²

This principle obviously reflects the United States' intention to minimize free-riding on industrialized members by developing ones as mentioned before. Whereas the United States intends to give APEC liberalization a small degree of mandatory character via this principle, most Asian members are negative toward ensuring the rigid comparability. The Asian members insist that, given different levels of economic development between the members, it is very difficult to define the comparability of liberalization and almost impossible to achieve a comparable level of liberalization. This is likely to be one of the most controversial contrasts/conflicts between the Asian and Western members in 'the action phase' of APEC

⁵¹ Refer to APEC Leaders Meeting, "The Osaka Action Agenda". The words 'concerted unilateral actions' appear in lower case on p. 6.

⁵² APEC Leaders Meeting, "The Osaka Action Agenda", p. 5.

liberalization.

. 3 Cultural Contrasts/Conflicts between *the Asian and the Western*?

The contrasts/conflicts outlined above *seemed*, in many cases, to be between the Asian and Western member economies. Were such contrasts/conflicts *seemingly* between the Asian and Western members just *children of circumstances*, or were they rooted in *cultural* contrasts/conflicts between Asia and the West? In other words, were their origins *practical* or *cultural*?

The apprehension of losing its political clout within an Institutionalized APEC led by industrialized countries was the basic reason why ASEAN was opposed to APEC institutionalization. It was natural that the developing economies were reluctant to open their markets and be bound by mandatory agreements which industrialized economies wished to make. On the other hand, the industrialized members were positive to the institutionalization since the regional group to which they already belonged would not be eroded by the institutionalization of APEC or since they belonged no regional group like Japan. The industrialized members wanted to maximize their access to the world's fastest-growing markets in Asia, therefore, they needed APEC liberalization on a binding basis in order to allow access to the Asian markets as early as possible and to permit these markets to open on a steady basis (but Japan was exceptional that it did not want a rigid framework for APEC liberalization for its concern in its fragile agricultural industry).

Consideration of this shows that the contrasts/conflicts involving about APEC institutionalization and liberalization had *practical* origins rather than *cultural* ones, and have been mainly between the developing and industrialized members not necessarily between the Asian and Western members. Robert Immerman said that they are only based on *different national interests* as most contrasts/conflicts in the international society are.⁵³ The fact that the contrasts/conflicts in the APEC process have usually appeared to be between the Asian and Western members is only a coincidence of the circumstance that most developing members of APEC are located in Asia while most industrialized members are the

so-called Western countries. This is also supported by the fact that the contrasts/conflicts which appear to be between Asia and the West have not necessarily been between *all* the Asian and *all* the Western members. The most notable evidence of this is Singapore which is very positive toward both institutionalization and liberalization in spite of being an Asian country [refer to Table 1]. Singapore advocates an advance in the liberalization because it has an open market economy and has nothing to lose by such a move. Singapore's views are based on its national, as opposed to regional, interests.

National interests seem to be the principal causes of contrasts/conflicts within APEC. However, does this principle cover all aspects of the disputes?

Although it was enthusiastic about APEC liberalization, Singapore was comfortable with a non-biding, voluntary, unilateral approach to liberalization in accordance with the CUA scheme. On the other hand, the United States along with the other Western members seemed to regard the CUA scheme as both *unfavorable* to their interests and *incomprehensible* as a tool of liberalization.

ASEAN, which is comprised of only developing economies, wants an APEC with a similar character to its own, in spite of the fact that APEC has both developing and industrialized economies. On the other hand, the modality the United States required for APEC liberalization possibly resembles that of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) which it led to establish.

In summary, origins of contrasts/conflicts outside of the sphere of those defined by national interests may indeed be present. It is difficult to unambiguously rule out such origins as those deriving from cultural differences. Consequently, it is useful to investigate *cultural* origins of contrasts/conflicts in APEC.

ORIGIN ONE: DIFFERENT CONCEPTS OF *COMMUNITY*

In 1993, the APEC members controverted the concept of *community* as applied to

⁵³ Interview with Robert M. Immerman in New York on 26 September 1996.

APEC, as mentioned prior. The words ‘Asia Pacific *Community*’, which the United States tried to use in its own-drafting APEC leaders’ statement, were finally change to ‘*a community of Asia Pacific economies*’ following Malaysia’s objection. However, an earlier objection by China was dropped once it was persuaded to accept the insertion of the word *Community*. The persuasion of China was accomplished by suggesting that *Community* be translated into the Chinese character for *family* instead of the earlier candidate meaning institutionalized organizations. This concept of an APEC community as *family* was said to appeal greatly to the Asian leaders:

“The term ‘APEC community,’ if used, should only mean it like [sic] how families and relatives discuss their common matters,” said Thai Prime Minister Chuan Leekpai during the [leaders] meeting. “Members should utilize their diversity and complement each other.” Singaporean Prime Minister Goh Chok Tong echoed this sentiment: “An APEC community should be perceived as something like a ‘big family’ where the countries and areas in the region can maintain a sense of unity and seek common perspectives.”⁵⁴

This episode may suggest a way of considering cultural origins of contrasts/ conflicts on APEC institutionalization and liberalization between the Asian and Western members. When they say “APEC is a community/Community”, what different views of community do the APEC members have? Do Asians and Westerners apply *different concepts of community*?

. 1 The Two Concepts of *Community*

Carl Friedrich divided the nature of community according to the following three traditional arguments: (1) a community of *love* or a community of *law*; (2) a community as *organic* or a community as *purposive*; and (3) a community as *existential* or a community as

⁵⁴ Funabashi, *Asia Pacific Fusion*, pp. 1-2 (trans., pp. 7-9). The idea to translate *Community* as *family* was invented by the Three Chinas’ representatives at the APEC Eminent Persons Group.

voluntary.⁵⁵

The first distinction between a community of love and one of law is illustrated by the contrast between a *family* and a *business enterprise*. On one hand, a family is raised by ‘the two human beings who fall in love’ while, on the other hand, a business enterprise is established by ‘the two human beings who enter into partnership for the purpose of exploiting an inventions’. The former is a community based on love, and the latter is one based on the law/contract to establish itself in order to achieve particular purposes.⁵⁶

The second contrast between an organic community and a purposive community is also known as the popular German distinction of *Gemeinschaft* and *Gesellschaft*. The former, exemplified by a folk/family and a tribal group, is ‘organic in the sense that it exists regardless of any particular purposes that are being achieved or not being achieved’. On the contrary, the latter, exemplified by a business enterprise or a university, does have particular purposes to be achieved.⁵⁷

The third pair is a community as existential and a community as voluntary or as willed. The former, traditional view on community, which has existed since Aristotle, is that ‘a real community is something that is there, a given, something that exists’. ‘It is something that comes into being by the mere existence of the people or persons who belong to it.’ On the other hand, the latter view is that ‘a community develops from wilful determination, from a choice which people make to enter into the community’. In other words, it is a view of the *theory of social contract* as stated by John Locke: ‘the political community is voluntary’.⁵⁸

It is easy to see that these three pairs of distinctive views taken together lead to two concepts of community. A community of *love* is *organic* regardless of any particular purpose and *existential* in the sense that it exists merely because there are ones who belong to it. In contrast, a community of *law* is *purposive* as it has particular directives and *voluntary* in the sense that it exists because there are members who are willing to establish it

⁵⁵ Carl J. Friedrich, *An Introduction to Political Theory: Twelve Lectures at Harvard*, New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1967, p. 99 (Japanese translation by Seishu Yasu, etc., *Seiji-gaku Nyumon: Habado Daigaku 12 Koh*, Tokyo: Gakuyo Shobo, 1977, p. 123).

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 99 (trans., p. 124).

⁵⁷ Friedrich, *op. cit.*, p. 100 (trans., p. 124).

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 100-101 (trans., p. 125).

in order to achieve its purposes.⁵⁹ Recollecting that the Asian members of APEC felt a strong affinity for the *family*-like view of their regional body, the former concept of a community of *love*, as *organic*, and as *existential* seems to be

Table 3: Friedrich’s Division of the Concepts of Community

Community of love	Community of law
Community as organic (<i>Gemeinschaft</i>)	Community as purposive (<i>Gesellschaft</i>)
Community as existential	Community as voluntary/willed
<i>Asian concept of community for APEC?</i>	<i>Western concept of community for APEC?</i>

(Reference) Carl J. Friedrich, *An Introduction to Political Theory: Twelve Lectures at Harvard*, New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1967, pp. 99-101.

what the Asian members apply to APEC. Whereas the Western members, who are enthusiastic about achieving specific purposes such as regional trade and investment liberalization, seem to apply the latter concept of a community of *law*, as *purposive*, and as *voluntary/willed* [refer to Table 3].

. 2 The Asian Concept of *Community* for APEC

It is the *family* concept of an APEC community, mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, that most accurately reflects the Asian members’ views on APEC as a community of love, as organic, and as existential. Another example of this view of the Asia-Pacific community is illustrated by the following statement by Singaporean Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Kishore Mahbubani:

Those who live and travel in the Asia-Pacific region can feel that they are moving into a new epoch in which the incomes of most will double or treble in their lifetimes. They can fly from Hong Kong to Vancouver, from Seoul to Los Angeles, from Tokyo to Hawaii, or from Kuala Lumpur to Sydney and yet not feel that they have crossed a cultural divide. They feel at home in the most corners of the Pacific. *A sense of*

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 99 (trans., pp. 123-124).

*community is emerging. [Italicized by the author quoting]*⁶⁰

Mahbubani calls the shared feelings, which are spontaneously arising due to enhanced intra-regional exchange of goods, information, and experiences, a sense of *community*. This concept of community is typically *organic* and *existential*.

Such outlooks show that the Asian members are congruous and possibly more comfortable with an APEC which is bound by (not love but) certain kinds of shared feelings not law or contracts, which does not necessarily have any particular purposes to be achieved, and which exists merely because there are Asia-Pacific economies that are becoming interdependent. As they tend to regard APEC as organic and existential, they do not think that APEC should be rigidly institutionalized and rule-based or that APEC liberalization should be legally binding under clarified schedules. Also, it does not bother them to allow APEC's name to contain the abstract word *Cooperation*, instead of a more concrete description of the entity such as *Committee* or *Organization*. For the Asian members, it seems to be more important that *APEC is there* than *what APEC is*, or *how APEC does the things*.

This Asian concept of community seems to be applied not only to APEC but also to their own states. Asians, who have hardly experienced civil revolutions, have little sense of *social contract* in the existence of their states. Asian states and countries are likely to regard themselves as existential rather than purposive, as non-artificial, and to put the whole society ahead of the individuals. Many Asian leaders, both inside and outside the political realm, have presented such a standpoint on the society-individual relation. For example, Jesus Estanislao, a Philippine scholar who was a member of the APEC Eminent Persons Group, wrote the following in his short paper entitled "Asian and Western Values: Implications for the APEC Community-Building Process":

The values of order and sacrifice for economic development may be paramount for one

⁶⁰ Kishore Mahbubani, "The Pacific Way", in *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 74 No. 1, January/February 1995, p. 106.

society at a given time of its history. To secure order, it may curtail a few civil liberties. To exact adequate sacrifice for economic development, it may impose some curbs on union prerogatives and social privileges, including the licentiousness of the press. A few dissidents may get bashed in the head (not necessarily literally), and many excesses, including those of the press, may be dramatically curtailed. But it is possible that in the end, the values pursued will be successfully achieved, and that the gains may well be worth the sacrifice.

The second of these values [most conducive to both long-term economic development and social progress] is self restraint or the spirit of sacrifice for the broader good of society. This leads many persons in society to practice self control in a bid to contribute to firmer cohesion and greater order in the community. A sense of social responsibility leads to curbs being clamped on the selfish pursuit of narrow interests and on the full satisfaction of greed. An operative concern for the common good leads to specific and sometimes heroic acts of altruism, generous service and provision of personal, private resources for a common cause. It is the spirit that breeds selflessness and puts less stress on individualism, and more on communitarianism.⁶¹

The Asian members of APEC may extend this concept of community which they apply within their own borders to APEC. It may seem contradictory that Asian states put the good of society ahead of the good of individuals domestically whereas they insist on each member's voluntarism and unilateralism in APEC. However, since they do not have a sense of *social contract* in community-building, they can sometimes allow themselves to sacrifice civil rights for benefit of society as a whole, while at the same time, they are likely to regard APEC as existential and non-artificial, and they do not need the rule (contract) which has been agreed upon by all the members, which prescribes the relation between the institution and its membership on how the institution works, and which the members are obligated to

⁶¹ Jesus P. Estanislao, "Asian and Western Values: Implications for the APEC Community-Building Process", a paper presented at the APEC Study Centers Regional Conference at Manila on 9-10 May 1996, pp. 2&4.

observe.

. 3 The Western Concept of *Community* for APEC

In contrast to Asian countries, Western counterparts seem to follow the *social contract* way of thinking in their own state-building. In a Western state, one finds a higher degree of artificial organization which the constituent members establish according to their own will in order to achieve specific purposes such as social stability, maximization of welfare, and national security. In this sense, a political community for them is one of law, as purposive, and as voluntary/willed.

This concept of community may be most notable in the United States. The fact that voting rights there are only given to the persons who register themselves as voters is typical of this concept. A more radical symbol is that a person can *become American* regardless of his/her racial, ethnic, or cultural origins, if that individual so desires. In contrast, a person can scarcely become truly Japanese unless she/he has been raised by Japanese parents and has grown up in the Japanese community.

It is said that the current Clinton Administration in the United States may be influenced by the political philosophy of John Rawls who tried to renew the philosophical basis of liberalism in his highly influential *A Theory of Justice*.⁶² Rawls revived the theory of social contract, and its concept of *the state of nature* as the *original position*, in order to introduce a *deontological* way of thinking of social justice instead of a *teleological* one of utilitarianism. In the teleological theory of justice of utilitarianism, the *right* is to maximize the superior *good* previously determined and chosen with reason. On the other hand, in Rawls' deontological view on justice, known as *justice as fairness*, 'the concept of *right* is prior to that of the *good*'.⁶³ Estanislao's view mentioned previously belongs to the former category because he first determines the *good*, such as economic development and order, and

⁶² Keiichiro Tsuchiya, *Seigi-ron/Jiyu-ron* (A Theory of Justice / A Theory of Liberty), Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1996, pp. 32-33&162-166.

⁶³ John Rawls, *A Theory of Justice*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1971, pp. 30-32 (Japanese translation by Kinji Yajima, etc., *Seigi-ron*, Tokyo: Kinokuniya Shoten, 1979, pp. 21-23). Shozo Iijima, "Kosei to shite no Seigi: Jon Roruzu" (Justice as Fairness: John Rawls), in Yasunobu Fujihara and Shin Chiba (eds.), *Seiji Shiso no Genzai* (The Present of Political Thought), Tokyo: Waseda University Press,

secondly regards the way to maximize them, such as curtailing civil liberties, as the *right*. Additionally, it can be pointed out that Estanislao put more stress on *communitarianism* (the final word in the previous quotation), which had been used in the last decade as an argument against the type of liberalism advocated by Rawls (although it is not clear whether or not Estanislao used the word *communitarianism* in that context).⁶⁴

The Western members of APEC, as well as the Asian ones, may extend their concept of community as applied to their own states to their concept of the regional body. Undoubtedly their conception of APEC is a community as willed and artificial because the entity was founded and has been maintained by the member governments' willful, voluntary participation. In this sense, APEC is by nature a *political* community which means its very existence is based on the political decisions of the member governments but its agenda are not political although it developed out of growing *economic* interaction and interdependence within the region. So long as it is a voluntary, artificial community, APEC's existence should be based on a kind of *social contract* which its member have made according to their own will in order to achieve particular purposes. In other words, APEC should be a community of law and as purposive. According to the previously quoted Friedrich, political communities 'characterized by multiplicity of purpose' 'tend to be structured' as follows:

... such multiplicity of goal and objective insistently raises the problem of priority. What, for example, in any particular situation is the more important value to be realized? To determine this priority a community needs a procedure for reaching decision. This need for decision in turn forces structure and organization. There must be argument on how the decision is made by which a particular value conflict is decided. Now, it is perfectly obvious that this tendency of political communities to be structured or organized grows as they in turn grow in size and in intrinsic complexity.⁶⁵

1990, pp. 87-88. In the quotation, the words are *italicized* by the author quoting.

⁶⁴ Refer to Yasunobu Fujihara, *Jiyu-Shugi no Sai-Kento* (Rethinking Liberalism), Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1993.

⁶⁵ Friedrich, *op. cit.*, p. 102 (*trans.*, pp. 126-127).

Therefore the Western members require a rule-based or legal aspect in APEC's institutional arrangement and in its liberalization process as a natural and proper basis. They believe that APEC should have 'organs with clearly defined mandates'⁶⁶ and schedules of the liberalization to be fulfilled. Western countries do not necessarily require such an aspect for international entities to which they belong, as exemplified by the G7 Summit. However, in the context of APEC, their tendency to regard an international body as a community of law, as purposive, as voluntary/willed based on a kind of *social contract* cannot be neglected.

What are origins of the *different concepts of community*? There is a traditional explanation based on the contrast between hunting nations and farming nations. A Japanese ethnologist, Takeshi Umehara, presents one between the *wheat civilization* and the *rice civilization*. According to him, in wheat based agriculture, people can farm basically everywhere, and therefore tend to compete against nature and to put individuals first. Whereas, in rice farming, people need water, and therefore they tend to hold nature in high esteem and to put groups/communities ahead of individuals.⁶⁷

This question will be investigated at another time. However, the different concepts of community may give us a framework for thinking about cultural origins of contrasts/conflicts between the Asian and Western members in the APEC process.

ORIGIN TWO: *ORIENTALIST* COGNITIVE CULTURE

The second cultural origin of contrasts/conflicts between the Asian and Western members of APEC is inherent to neither Asian nor Western culture. It is in the *culture of those who recognize the contrasts/conflicts*. Contrasts/conflicts between the Asian and

⁶⁶ Hirano, *op. cit.*, p. 5.

⁶⁷ *Asahi Shimbun* (Tokyo), 7 January 1997, evening edition.

Western members can originate in the *cognitive culture* in which people tend to translate every contrast/conflict, either intentionally or unintentionally, into one between Asia and the West, or *the Asian* and *the Western*, through often-excessive generalization which is not necessarily reasonable or reasoned.

. 1 **The Orientalist Dispatching, Truth, and Representations**

The word *Orientalist*, in the title of these chapter and section, is not the noun that means persons who study the Orient. It is the corresponding adjective for the word *Orientalism* which is, in this case, not studies on the Orient, but Edward Said's eminent critique on the Oriental studies in the West. In his paradigm-building work entitled *Orientalism*,⁶⁸ Said defined Orientalism (Oriental studies in the West) as 'a style of thought based upon an ontological and epistemological distinction made between "the Orient" and (most of the time) "the Occident"', or 'a Western style for dominating, restructuring, and having authority over the Orient'.⁶⁹ Additionally he wrote the followings:

... [Orientalism] is an *elaboration* not only of a basic geographical distinction (the world is made up of two unequal halves, Orient and Occident) but also of a whole series of "interests" which, by such means as scholarly discovery, philological reconstruction, psychological analysis, landscape and sociological description, it not only creates but also maintains; it *is*, rather than express, a certain *will* or *intention* to understand, in some cases to control, manipulate, even to incorporate, what is a manifestly different (or alternative and novel) world; it is, above all, a discourse[.]⁷⁰

The notion of a *discourse* here is what Michel Foucault described in *The Archaeology of Knowledge* and in *Discipline and Punish*.⁷¹

⁶⁸ Chen Xiaomei, "Okushidentarizumu", Japanese translation of "Introduction" in *Occidentalism: A Theory of Counter-Discourse in Post-Mao China*, Oxford University Press, 1995, translated by Kaori Shinozaki, in *Hihyo Kukan: Critical Space* (Tokyo: Ota Shuppan), Vol. 2, No. 2, October 1996, p. 63.

⁶⁹ Said, *op. cit.*, pp. 2-3 (trans., pp. 3-4).

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 12 (trans., pp. 12-13).

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, p. 3 (trans., p. 4).

As ‘the *discipline* of Orientalism’, Said pointed out the ‘dispatching’ in which the great variety of ‘people living in the present’ is ‘always being restrained, compressed downwards and backwards to the *radical* terminal of the generality’. Through this downward and backward dispatching, Orientalism gains the following ‘truth about the distinctive differences between races, civilizations, and languages’:

... [this truth] asserted that there was no escape from origins and the types these origins enabled; it set the real boundaries between human beings, on which races, nations, and civilizations were constructed; it forced vision away from common, as well as plural, human realities like joy, suffering, political organization, forcing attention instead in the downward and backward direction of immutable origins.⁷²

Said then regards the truth as a *representation*, and believes that ‘any or all representations, because they *are* representations, are embedded first in the language and then in the culture, institutions, and political ambience of the presenter’. He further defines them as follows:

... [representations usually operate] for a purpose, according to a tendency, in a specific historical, intellectual, and even economic setting. In other words, representations have purposes, they are effective much of time, they accomplish one or many tasks. Representations are formations, or as Roland Barthes has said of all the operations of language, they are deformations.⁷³

In considering Orientalism as a discourse, according to Said, the West (or the Occident) has been representing or forming or deforming the Orient as a single entity which is inferior, premature, and underdeveloped; as something to be represented and corrected by the West; and as, above all, the *other*, the *strange*, or “them”.⁷⁴ Such a

⁷² *Ibid.*, pp. 233-234 (*trans.*, p. 238).

⁷³ Said, *op. cit.*, pp. 272-273 (*trans.*, p. 277).

⁷⁴ Refer to the table on Nagao Nishikawa, *Kokkyo no Koe-kata: Hikaku Bunka-ron Josetsu* (How to Go

presentation is ‘a decision about the Orient, not by any means a fact of nature’.⁷⁵ The Orient as “them”, as well as the West as “us”, is a man-made locale, region, or geographical sector, and ‘is an idea that has a history and a tradition of thought, imagery, and vocabulary that have given it reality and presence in and for the West’.⁷⁶ The reason why the West has needed to ‘create the Orient’⁷⁷ is that ‘no identity can ever exist by itself and without an array of opposites, negatives, oppositions: Greeks always require barbarians, and Europeans Africans, Orientals, etc.’⁷⁸

. 2 The *Orientalist* Discourse in the Context of APEC

Such *Orientalist* discourse seems to have been observed in the context of APEC and have brought on *recognition* of contrasts/conflicts between the Asian and Western members, and maybe not the contrasts/conflicts *themselves*. Or, if an abstract like a contrast/conflict only exists once it has been recognized, such discourse *does produce* contrasts/conflicts.

As mentioned in Section . 3, most contrasts/conflicts in the APEC process have originated from *practical* causes, which are in fact differing national interests, rather than *cultural* things, and have been mainly between the developing and industrialized members not necessarily between the Asian and Western members. Moreover, as has been noted previously, they have not necessarily been between *all* the Asian and *all* the Western members. Singapore’s stance toward APEC institutionalization and liberalization was heterogeneous, rather than homogeneous, with that of the other ASEAN and Asian members. The requirements of the United States with respect to APEC are somewhat unique even among the Western members.

However, the contrasts/conflicts have been mostly recognized and narrated as

across Borders: An Introduction to Comparative Culture), Tokyo: Chikuma Shobo, 1992, p. 86.

⁷⁵ Said, *op. cit.*, p. 277 (*trans.*, p. 281).

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 5 (*trans.*, p. 5).

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 40 (*trans.*, 40).

⁷⁸ Edward W. Said., *Culture and Imperialism*, New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1993, p. 52. Also refer to Naoyuki Umebayashi, “Saïdo: Seiyo Seiji Shiso no Naka no Oriento” (Said: The Orient in the Western Political Thoughts), in Yusunobu Fujihara and Shozo Ijima (eds.), *Seiyo Seiji Shiso-shi* (A History of the Western Political Thoughts), Vol. 2, Tokyo: Shin Hyoron, 1996, p. 404.

contrasts/conflicts between the Asian and Western members. When they are recognized as such, they are viewed as *cultural* contrasts/conflicts between *the Asian* and *the Western*. Such recognition, narrative, and cultural views on contrasts/conflicts are brought about through large generalization which translates them into ones between the Asian and Western members. In Said's words, it is the downward and backward 'dispatching' to the *radical terminals of the Asian and the Western generality* or to the *immutable origins of Asia and the West*. Such generalization or dispatching 'subordinate detail to' 'a recognizable, and authoritative, convention of formulation'. In this mode of thinking, each particle of Asia or the West tells of its *Asianess* or *Westernness*, so much so that the attribute of being Asian or Western overrode any countervailing instance.⁷⁹ It is like 'putting together a very wide assortment of files in a large cabinet marked' *the Asian* or *the Western*.⁸⁰

It is widely recognized that '[a]t no time in history has an Asian or Eastern civilization arisen over and above the many national and ethnic civilizations and cultures found in that vast region'.⁸¹ Even the West, which is '[u]nder the civilizational umbrella dating back to the Roman Empire, and within the unifying framework of Christian civilization',⁸² diverge in many practical aspects as Westerners themselves often recognize. However, people are likely to generalize things and events on the western Pacific rim into *the Asian* and ones in North America and Oceania into *the Western*. For example, in her article entitled "APEC: A Tool for a US Regional Domination", Helen Nesadurai presented the following 'analytical framework' without citing any particular instances as evidence:

The analysis will focus on the relationship between the US and the East Asian states [including all APEC countries except Canada, the US, Chile, Mexico, Australia, and New Zealand] since it has usually been one or other of these states which have voiced fears of possible US domination of the region through APEC. These states are less

⁷⁹ Said, *Orientalism*, p. 231 (*trans.*, p. 236).

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 234 (*trans.*, p. 239).

⁸¹ Masakazu Yamazaki, "Asia, a Civilization in the Making", in *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 75, No. 4, July/August 1996, p. 106 (Japanese translation, "Kan-Taiheiyo Bunmei no Tanjo", in *Chuo Koron* [Tokyo: Chuo Koron Sha], September 1996, p. 380).

⁸² *Ibid.*, p. 109 (*trans.*, p. 382).

likely to allow Washington to take APEC down a path which compromises their interests.⁸³

As Said pointed out, such generalization may be used for *establishing one's identity in contrasts/conflicts with the others*. The Asian members, which are emerging as new economic/political powers, are trying to establish their identities in APEC which cast them as the *other*, the *opposite*, or the *opposition*. So are the Western members which are losing their relative power. Although Said concentrated on the discourse of Orientalism as Oriental studies in the West, in which the West is “us” and the Orient is “them”, recently there can be seen homogeneous but reversed discourses in Asia, in which Asia is “us” and the West is “them”. Stephanie Lawson pointed out the following about such discourses:

The rhetoric associated with these claims [of Asian values or Asian democracy] is usually directed at both internal external audiences. For internal consumption, it operates to produce a unified nationalistic rallying point and it differentiates the unified ‘us’ from the external ‘them’.⁸⁴

Chen Xiaomei also discussed such discourses in China and called them *Occidentalism*. According to Chen, there have been two kinds of Occidental discourses in China: one is *official Occidentalism* which creates Occident, or the West, as the *opposite* in order to support and justify repressive nationalism and domestic policies; and the other is *anti-official Occidentalism* which utilizes the West as the *other* for presenting a metaphor of political liberation against ideological repression in the totalitarian state.⁸⁵ On the other hand, the West has also produced discourses which put the West as “us” against a backdrop of the rest of the world, including Asia, as “them”. Some of the most notable examples of such

⁸³ Helen E. S. Nesadurai, “APEC: A Tool for US Regional Domination?”, in *The Pacific Affairs* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia), Vol. 9, No. 1, 1996, pp. 32-33. The definition of ‘East Asia’ was given in note 4.

⁸⁴ Stephanie Lawson, *Culture, Relativism and Democracy: Political Myths about ‘Asia’ and the ‘West’*, Working Paper No. 1995/6, Canberra: Department of International Relations, Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies, Australian National University, 1995, p. 16.

Western discourses are Samuel Huntington's works such as "The Clash of Civilizations?", which was quoted at the beginning of this paper, and his most recent work "The West: Unique, Not Universal".⁸⁶

To sum up, as Said has pointed out that the Orient does, contrasts/conflicts between the Asian and Western members in the APEC process have an aspect of being formed, deformed, man-made through discourses in which people regard (or which *make* people regard) other particular APEC members as a single group, as the other or the opposite. Borrowing another expression from Said, a contrast/conflict is a *decision* about APEC, *not by any mean a fact of nature*. Furthermore, they may in fact be *fiction*. It is unlikely that we can free ourselves entirely from this kind of discourse, or thinking of binomial opposition. However, it is unfortunate that *fictional* contrasts/ conflicts cause *real* conflicts and potentially lead to the collapse of APEC.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

This paper has an *ambivalent* structure to its argument. In Chapter , it investigated the differing Asian and Western concepts of community as a possible origin of contrasts/conflicts in the APEC process. In Chapter , however, it discussed another origin, the *recognition* of contrasts/conflicts as ones between *the Asian* and *the Western* (which, it may be recognized, is perhaps a characteristic of Chapter itself).

This *ambivalence* demonstrates the difficulty of understanding how to view international contrasts/conflicts in the post-Cold War era. Huntington's view of the *clash of civilizations*, which has been mentioned several times in this manuscript, was presented as an answer to this question. However, his view is not only non-constructive but also harmful for the post-Cold War world order which should be built upon the harmony and cooperation between Asian countries as emerging powers, the still-powerful Western countries, and many

⁸⁵ Chen Xiaomei, op. cit., pp. 63-67.

⁸⁶ Samuel P. Huntington, "The West: Unique, Not Universal", in *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 75, No. 3,

others. Therefore, in Chapter , this paper cited Said's critique on Orientalism in order to discuss and criticize our tendency to seek the *other* for establishing *our* identity which creates conflicts/contrasts via binomial oppositions. However, it is not completely deniable that there exist certain kinds of cultural contrasts between Asia and the West. Therefore, as a framework for consideration of one of these contrasts, different cultural concepts of community were explored in Chapter .

As mentioned in Chapter , this paper aims to find a way to go beyond Huntington-like views on the post-Cold War world. Although it is difficult to reveal the appropriate path at this early stage, this paper conclude with a presentation of two scholars' thoughts on the subject. These insights give hints on how we might proceed in this important task.

The first is Masakazu Yamazaki's consideration on civilizations. In his essay entitled "Asia, a Civilization in the Making", he pointed out the flaws in the arguments of Huntington-like alarmists:

Failure to distinguish clearly between culture and civilization marks the thought of the prophets of the clash of civilizations. The thesis is predicated on the mistaken notions that a civilization can be as predetermined a property of an ethnic group as its culture and that a culture can be as universal and expansive as a civilization. Working from these misconceptions, it follows that a stubborn and irrational culture posing as a civilization could assert itself politically, stirring up conflict.⁸⁷

According to him, in the world today there exists a world civilization at the topmost stratum, traditional cultures at the bottom, and national civilizations in between. He indicates that 'human rights and democratic principles belong to the first stratum, distinct bodies of law and political situations to the second, and political wheeling and dealing to the third'.⁸⁸ In the context of APEC, trade and investment liberalization and facilitation or sustainable

November/December 1996, pp. 28-46.

⁸⁷ Yamazaki, *op. cit.*, pp. 115-116 (trans. pp. 388-389).

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 116 (trans., 389).

development belong to the primary world civilization stratum, and the desire for APEC institutionalization or modalities of APEC liberalization to the second or third. In this mode of thinking, APEC can realize the cooperation from diversity and pursue common purposes via debates between different modalities.

The second, and final, scholarly considerations are those of Carl Friedrich on community. Although this paper quoted from his review on the three arguments about distinct types of community – a community of love or of law, a community as organic or as purposive, a community as existential or as voluntary/willed – to discuss the two different concepts of community [refer to Table 3], Friedrich himself insisted that, in every argument, communities of the contrasting kinds merge as follows:

... every community is a community of both love and law. It may commence as the other; yet it may also develop correspondingly in the opposite direction at different rates of growth.

... such an organic community will usually develop purposes which will also be involved in its organic existence as a community. Likewise ... when people are members of a business enterprises or of a university or of some other kind of purposive organization, they will also develop elements of an organic community relationship. This is simply because of the fact that when human beings get together, the fact that they are capable of sympathy produces organic relationships such as friendship and the like which reinforce the purposive element in that sort of community.

... genuine community always involves both the existential and the willed. A community does not come into existence merely by existing, nor does it come into existence merely by being willed.⁸⁹

According to Friedrich, therefore, the contrast between the Asian concept of community for

⁸⁹ Friedrich, *op. cit.*, pp. 100-101 (*trans.*, pp. 124-126).

APEC community of love, as organic, and as existential and the Western one community of law, as purposive, and as voluntary/willed does not necessarily lead to conflicts. Even if they have basically different concepts of community for APEC, those different concepts can coalesce and merge with each other. It is possible that APEC realize the cooperation from diversity and can produce a certain kind of single community which can even be based upon the different concepts of community. In another sense, diversity and dissent among the members are precisely the bases of a *vital* APEC community, as is stated by Friedrich:

A community[,] while based on common values, interests and beliefs, presupposes dissent if it is to be a vital community. A community that has no dissent, that contains no element of radical disagreement from its commitments, including the commitments to myths, symbols and utopia, is not likely to be a community of any considerable vitality.⁹⁰

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 104 (*trans.*, p. 129).

Bibliography

APEC Leaders Meeting, "APEC Economic Leaders' Declaration: From Vision to Action", available on the Internet at <http://www.apecsec.org.sg/mapa/leaders.html>, 1996.

APEC Secretariat (eds.), *Selected APEC Documents 1989-1994*, Singapore: APEC Secretariat, 1995.

, *Selected APEC Documents 1995*, Singapore: APEC Secretariat, 1995.

Australia-Japan Research Centre, *Australian, Indonesian and Japanese Approaches Towards APEC*, Canberra: Australia-Japan Research Centre, Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies, The Australian National University, 1994.

Bodde, William, Jr., *View from the 19th Floor: Reflections of the First APEC Executive Director*, Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, 1994.

Chen, Xiaomei, "Okushidentarizumu", the Japanese translation of "Introduction" in *Occidentalism: A Theory of Counter-Discourse in Post-Mao China*, Oxford University Press, 1995, translated by Kaori Shinozaki, in *Hihyo Kukan: Critical Space* (Tokyo: Ota Shuppan), Vol. 2, No. 2, October 1996, pp. 63-88.

Estanislao, Jesus P., "Asian and Western Values: Implications for the APEC Community-Building Process", a paper presented at the APEC Study Centers Regional Conference at Manila on 9-10 May 1996.

Fujihara, Yasunobu, *Jiyu-Shugi no Sai-Kento* (Rethinking Liberalism), Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1993.

Funabashi, Yoichi, "Ajia o Motomeru Amerika" (America in search of Asia), in *Foresight*, January 1994, pp. 6-10.

, *Asia Pacific Fusion: Japan's Role in APEC*, Washington D.C.: Institute for International Economics, 1995 (Japanese translation by the author himself, *Ajia Taiheiyo Fyujon: APEC to Nippon*, Tokyo: Chuo Koron Sha, 1995).

, "Bunmei to site no APEC" (APEC as a Civilization), in *Foresight*, October 1995, pp. 6-9.

Hirano, Akiko, "APEC Osaka Kaigi no Shoten" (The Focus of the APEC Osaka Meeting), in *Fuji Soken Ronshu* (Tokyo: Fuji Research Institute Corporation), 1995 IV, October 1995, pp. 71-124.

, *Legal Aspects of the Institutionalization of APEC*, IDE-APEC Study Center Working Paper Series 95/96-No. 6, Tokyo: Institute of Developing Economies, 1996.

Hirata, Akira; Okamoto, Jiro; and Ogita, Tatsushi, "Strategy toward APEC: The Case of Japan", in Ippei Yamazawa and Akira Hirata (eds.), *APEC: Cooperation from Diversity*, I.D.E. Symposium Proceedings No. 16, Tokyo: Institute of Developing Economies, 1996, pp. 30-32.

Huntington, Samuel P., "The Clash of Civilization?", in *Foreign Affairs* (New York: Council on Foreign Relations), Vol. 72, No. 3, Summer 1993, pp. 22-49.

, "The West: Unique, Not Universal", in *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 75, No. 3, November/December 1996, pp. 28-46.

Iijima, Shozo, "Kosei to shite no Seigi: Jon Roruzu" (Justice as Fairness: John Rawls), in Fujihara, Yasunobu; and Chiba, Shin (eds.), *Seiji Shiso no Genzai* (The Present of Political Thought), Tokyo: Waseda University Press, 1990, pp. 85-119.

Kahler, Miles, "Institution Building in the Pacific", in Mack, Andrew, and Ravenhill, John (eds.), *Pacific Cooperation: Building Economic and Security Regimes in the Asia-Pacific Region*, St Leonards: Allen & Unwin, 1994, chap. 2, pp. 16-39.

Kang, Sang-jung, *Orientalizumu no Kanata e* (Beyond the Orientalism), Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1996.

Kimura, Michio, "Kurinton Seiken no 'Shin Taiheiyo Kyodotai' Koso to ASEAN no Chiiki Keizai Kyoryoku" (Clinton's 'New Pacific Community' Concept Affects the ASEAN Regional Economic Cooperation), in *Asian Trend* (Tokyo: Institute of Developing Economies), 1993-IV No. 64, December 1993, pp. 66-75.

Kiryama, Noboru, "Togo Moderu to shite no ASEAN" (ASEAN as a Model for Regional Integration), in *Shiso* (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten), April 1995, pp.

184-199.

Lawson, Stephanie, *Culture, Relativism and Democracy: Political Myths about 'Asia' and the 'West'*, Working Paper No. 1995/6, Canberra: Department of International Relations, Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies, Australian National University, 1995.

Mahbubani, Kishore, 1995, "The Pacific Way", in *Foreign Affairs* (New York: Council on Foreign Relations), Vol. 74, No. 1, January/February 1995, pp. 100-111.

Manning, Robert A., and Stern, Paula, "The Myth of the Pacific Community", in *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 73, No. 6, November/December 1994, pp. 79-93.

Nesadurai, Helen E. S., "APEC: A Tool for US Regional Domination?", in *The Pacific Affairs* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia), Vol. 9, No. 1, 1996, pp. 31-57.

Nishikawa, Nagao, *Kokkyo no Koe-kata: Hikaku Bunka-ron Josetsu* (How to Go across Borders: An Introduction to Comparative Culture), Tokyo: Chikuma Shobo, 1992.

Ogita, Tatsushi, *ASEAN Jiyu Boeki Chiiki (AFTA) Keisei no Haikei to Tenbo* (The Backgrounds and the Perspective of the Formation of the ASEAN Free Trade Area), a paper unpublished, Tokyo: Fuji Research Institute Corporation, 1994.

, "APEC no Keii: Sono Hossoku to Henka" (The Process of APEC: Its Establishment and Change), in Ippei Yamazawa (eds.), *APEC no Shin-Tenkai: Osaka Kaigi ni Mukete* (The New Development of APEC: Toward the Osaka Meetings), Tokyo: Institute of Developing Economies, 1995, chap. 2, pp. 16-35.

, *The APEC Policy-Making Process in Japan*, IDE-APEC Study Center Working Paper Series 95/96-No. 7, Tokyo: Institute of Developing Economies, 1996.*

, "Kodo Dankai o Mukaeta APEC" (APEC Entering the Action Phase), in *Ajiken World Trend* (Tokyo: Institute of Developing Economies), March 1997,

* This is out of stock but available on the Internet at <http://www.ide.go.jp/English/APEC/h96200.html>.

pp. 24-25.

Ogita, Tatsushi and Takoh, Daisuke, *The Making of the Osaka Action Agenda and Japan's Individual Action Plan: The APEC Policy Making Process in Japan Revisited*, IDE APEC Study Center Working Paper Series 96/97-No. 7, Tokyo: Institute of Developing Economies, 1997.

Ohmura, Takeo, "Dai-ni-kai APEC Kokyu Jimu-Reberu Kigo no Hokoku" (A Report on the Second APEC Senior Officials Meeting), in *Gekkan Boeki to Sangyo* (Tokyo: Tsusho Seisaku Kenkyu Kai, International Trade Policy Bureau, Ministry of International Trade and Industry), September 1995, pp. 18-20.

Okamoto, Jiro, "APEC no Shin-Tenkai to Osutoraria no Taio" (The New Development of APEC and Australia's Stance), in Ipeei Yamazawa (eds.), *APEC no Shin-tenkai: Osaka Kaigi ni Mukete*, chap. 3, pp. 39-53.

, "Boueki Toshi Jiyuka ni Taisuru APEC Ikinai-koku no Sutansu: Amerika to ASEAN no Jirei" (The Stances of the APEC Members toward the Trade and Investment Liberalization: The Cases of America and ASEAN), in *Ajiken World Trend*, No. 7, November 1995, pp. 14-17.

Rawls, John, *A Theory of Justice*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1971 (Japanese translation by Kinji Yajima, etc., *Seigi-ron*, Tokyo: Kinokuniya Shoten, 1979).

Said, Edward W., *Orientalism*, New York: Vintage Books, 1979 (Japanese translation by Noriko Imazawa, *Orientalizumu*, Tokyo: Heibon Sha, 1986).

, *Culture and Imperialism*, New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1993.

Sato, Seishi, *Seiji-Shiso no Paradaimu: Seiji-Gainen no Jizoku to Henyo* (The Paradigms of the Political Thought: The Continuity and the Change of the Political Concepts), Tokyo: Shin Hyoron, 1996.

Sato, Seizaburo, and Yamazaki, Masakazu, " 'Ajia-Taiheiyo Bunmei' Seiritsu eno Joken" (The Conditions of the Formation of the 'Asia-Pacific Civilization'), a dialogue, in *Gaiko Forum* (Tokyo: Toshi Shuppan), October 1995, pp. 16-25.

Schwarz, Adam, "Changing Places", in *Far Eastern Economic Review* (Hong Kong:

- Review Publishing Company), 12 May 1994, p. 21.
- Sekizawa, Miho, *Posuto-Reisen-ki no Beikoku no Ajia Seisaku* (The United States' Asian Policies in the Post-Cold War Era), Tokyo: Fuji Research Institute Corporation, 1994.
- Tsuchiya, Keiichiro, *Seigi-ron/Jiyu-ron* (A Theory of Justice / A Theory of Liberty), Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1996.
- Umebayashi, Naoyuki, "Saido: Seiyō Seiji Shiso no Naka no Oriento" (Said: The Orient in the Western Political Thoughts), in Yusunobu Fujihara and Shozo Ijima (eds.), *Seiyō Seiji Shiso-shi* (A History of the Western Political Thoughts), Vol. 2, Tokyo: Shin Hyoron, 1996, pp. 392-409.
- Yamagami, Susumu, *Ajia Taiheiyo no Jidai: APEC Setsuritsu no Keii to Tenbo* (The Time of the Asia-Pacific Region: APEC's Foundation Process and Perspective), Tokyo: Daiichi Hoki, 1994
- Yamamoto, Yoshinobu, "APEC wa Jiyūka no Ninaite tariuru ka?" (Can APEC Be a Promoter of Liberalization?), in *Sekai* (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten), December 1995, pp. 102-108.
- Yamauchi, Masayuki, " 'Bunmei no Shotutsu' to Nichibei-Kankei o megutte" (On 'the Clash of Civilizations' and US-Japan Relations), in Shigehiko Hasumi and Masayuki Yamuchi (eds.), *Bunmei no Shototsu ka, Kyozon ka* (Civilizations: Clash or Coexistence?), Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press, 1995, introduction, pp. 1-8.
- Yamazaki, Masakazu, "Asia, a Civilization in the Making", in *Foreign Affairs* (New York: Council on Foreign Relation), Vol. 75, No. 4, July/August 1996, pp. 106-118. (Japanese translation, "Kan-Taiheiyo Bunmei no Tanjo", in *Chuo Koron*, September 1996, pp. 379-391.)