

Implication of the EU in East Asian Regionalism as a Global Actor in a Multipolar World

정한범(국방대학교)

논문 요약

탈냉전 시기 한동안 유지되던 미국의 패권체제가 약화되면서 부상한 다극적 국제체제는 유럽연합의 중요성을 부각시키고 있다. 다극적 국제체제 하에서 유럽연합은 한편으로 군사적 역량을 개선해야 할 도전에 직면해 있지만, 다른 한편으로는 그 규범적 리더십을 강화할 수 있는 기회를 맞이하고 있는 것도 사실이다. 규범적 리더십은 유사한 성격을 가진 정치행위자들에게는 효과적이지만, 강제성을 결여하고 있기 때문에 대립되는 이해관계에 놓여있는 행위자들에게는 그다지 효과적이지 못한 것이 사실이다. 미국의 군사력에 의한 지원이 없다면, 유럽연합은 미국의 쇠퇴로 인한 공백을 메우기 위하여 다소 공격적인 특성을 지닌 정치적 힘을 길러야 할 수 밖에 없을 것이다. 이처럼 성장하고 있는 유럽연합의 국제적 역할은 동아시아에서도 군사력이나 경제적 협력을 촉진하는 아세안이나 아세안지역포럼과 같은 지역주의적 제도들이 발전하는 데에 영향을 미칠 것이다. 유럽연합의 입장에서 동아시아는 그 동안 군사적 협력이 부재했고, 지정학적인 이유로 인해서 이 지역에서 직접적인 영향력을 행사하기 어려운 환경에 처해 있다. 그러므로 유럽연합이 동아시아에 정치적 영향력을 행사하는 가장 설득력 있는 방안은 이 지역에서 지역주의를 촉진시켜서 지역 간 협력을 추구하는 것이 될 것이다.

주제어 : 동아시아, 유럽연합, 규범적 리더십, 다극체제, 지역주의

I. Introduction : The EU as a Global Actor

After the end of the Cold War, especially since the US began to lose its dominant position in the world system, demand for the European Union (EU) to play a role in international relations has increased. Europe has played a significant part during the past several decades, complementing American power even though its role was not as critical as those of the US and the Soviet Union were. While the bipolar powers were coercive based on their military capabilities, European leadership was civil based on its economic capabilities. Therefore, to define the role of the EU in world politics the characteristics of its leadership should be examined.

Before identifying the characteristics of the EU's role, it is necessary to examine if the European Union is an effective international actor. In the realist school of thought, a state-centric view prevails. This view denies the EU being a reliable international player because the community is allowed to act as a representative of the member states only when their national interests are not divergent. However, with changes in the definition of the global governance, definitions of a global actor have also changed. While each member state preserves its own sovereignty, it is broadly accepted that the EU collectively represents the member states. As the EU has grown, it has strengthened its stand as an international actor by developing its own foreign and security policies. As a result, it is now generally accepted as an effective actor in global politics, which participates in the world's political, economic, and humanitarian affairs.

Governance is usually considered to be “setting goals and making decisions for an entire collectivity, including individuals or groups who have not explicitly agreed to them.”¹⁾ In this context, Keohane defined global governance as “rule making and power exercise at a global scale, but not necessarily by entities authorized by general agreement to act.”²⁾ Following this definition, global governance can be exercised by intergovernmental organizations as well as sovereign states. Even though the EU does not claim any exclusive territorial sovereignty, it has established its own identity based on shared authority through multilateral governance. With the Treaty of Lisbon, which came into force in December 2009, as momentum, the EU has reinforced its status as a unique global actor uniting the European people, consisting of member states that are comprehensively embedded in the system.

Nowadays, the EU, together with the US and China, is one of the most important economic actors in the world. It is the biggest exporter of products and trader of services as well as the largest contributor of international humanitarian aid and developmental assistance. In addition, the European currency, the Euro, is now the most important international currency next to the US dollar. Lately, the EU has been expanding its investment in strategic development of security policies in the “second pillar,” while for a long time it had mainly played an economic role in global politics focusing on “first pillar” affairs including

international trade, development, and social issues. To consolidate the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP), the EU established the president of the European Council that is a position responsible for external relations. The president of the European Council also represents the EU in the Group of Twenty (G20).³⁾ The EU is expected to remain a collective actor, composed of sovereign member states, whose foreign policy strategies are represented. This strengthened its role as a global actor. The president of the European Council for example is included in the Group of Eight (G8), representing the EU. Furthermore, the president of the EU will be produced through voluntary participations in the collective system.

II. Civilian Leader in Traditional Global Governance

In the bipolar system characterized by the US–Soviet rivalry, the EU’s traditional role in global governance was that of a “Civilian Power Europe (CPE),” while the US’s traditional role involved military power. For the concept of CPE, non–military means of leverage are central. Hanns Maull defined “civilian power” as “the acceptance of the necessity of cooperation with others in the pursuit of international objectives; the concentration on non–military, primarily economic, means to secure national goals, with military power left as a residual instrument serving essentially to safeguard other means of international interaction; and

1) Jachtenfuchs, Markus and Beate Kohler–Koch, “Governance and Institutional Development.” In Antje Wiener and Thomas Diez eds., *European Integration Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

2) Keohane, Robert O., “Global Governance and Democratic Accountability.” In David Held and Mathias Koenig–Archibugi eds., *Taming Globalization: Frontiers of Governance*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2003.

3) The EU has participated in the G 20 meetings since its inception. The first meeting of the group’s finance ministers and central bank governors was held in 1999. The EU is represented by the president of the European Council at G20 meetings, although the president of the European Commission also attended the most recent G20 meeting in Russia.

a willingness to develop supranational structures to address critical issues of international management.”⁴⁾ Francois Duchêne argues that European countries have existed longer as a civilian economic power than military power.⁵⁾ As the memory of the Second World War had faded out and the intensity of the Cold War had been alleviated in the 1970s, the importance of military capabilities decreased while the significance of economic power grew. Especially the crushing oil crisis shock in that era aggrandized the relative importance of economic power compared to traditional military power in international relations.

The nature of the European approach to global politics was essentially “civilian.” Since the 1970s, many scholars have described European power as CPE. According to them, economic and diplomatic instruments rather than military threat were the main means by which the European states exerted their influence in the international system. The European Community (EC), predecessor to the EU, contributed to the international society by settling down the post-Cold War Europe and establishing a world trade regime. The European Community also was a very active diplomat, bridging the global South and North. In particular, the European Community tried to broaden the understanding of the Third World among First World countries, making the voices of the non-Western world heard in the West and vice versa.⁶⁾

As such, the most important part of the European role in international relations was diplomatic and economic affairs. The EU’s economic engagement in the international system was sped up with the creation of the World Trade Organization (WTO) in 1995, and its influence on the global economy was maximized during the international negotiations to create the organization. Obviously, “market access, or the granting, conditioning or denial of access to the European Single Market, one of the most prosperous markets in the world” was the most effective leverage the EC had to consolidate its international influence.⁷⁾

European leadership based on economic and diplomatic power was prominent in the field of foreign aid to underdeveloped or developing countries. The EU has been the top global donor, aiding about 145 developing countries for several decades.⁸⁾ Today, the international society recognizes the EU as an international actor that has expertise in foreign assistance. Recently, the EU’s foreign aid program in Afghanistan proved the community’s active role in this field. The EU is the biggest donor of development and humanitarian assistance to Afghanistan. Between 2002 and 2011, it has contributed approximately €2.5 billion to the country, including over €500 million in humanitarian assistance. The EU’s assistance has progressed from humanitarian support to its current focus on the country’s reconstruction and support for the National Priority Programs. The EU provided more than one third of the total financial aid for Afghanistan.⁹⁾ These international

4) Maull, H., “Germany and Japan: The New Civilian Powers.” *Foreign Affairs*, vol. 69, no. 5, 1990, pp. 92~93.

5) Duchêne, F., “The European Community and the Uncertainties of Interdependence.” In M. Kohnstamm and W. Hager, eds., *A Nation Writ Large? Foreign-Policy Problems before the European Community*. London: Macmillan, 1973, p. 1~21.

6) Hill, C., “The Capability-Expectations Gap, or Conceptualising Europe’s International Role.” *Journal of Common Market Studies*, vol. 31, no. 3, 1993, pp. 310~311.

7) Smith, M. and Woolcock, S., “European Commercial Policy: A Leadership Role in the new Millennium?” *European Foreign Affairs Review*, vol. 4, no. 4, 1999, pp. 451.

8) Smith, Karen E., *European Union Foreign Policy in a Changing World*, 2nd edition. Cambridge, 2008, p. 61.

assistance activities generate a secondary power for the donor countries to impose sanctions on the recipient countries by resizing, suspending, and redirecting the assistance.¹⁰⁾ The donor's economic and diplomatic power can be used to exert influence on other countries. This EU's civil power collaboratively led the international community, complementing American coercive power in global governance.

III. Increasing Polarity and the Role of Normative Power

1. Changing Environment: Increasing Polarity

The world had for several decades been tied in a "bipolar" system. With the end of the Cold War, it was generally accepted that the world had transformed into a "unipolar" system with the US as the only remaining superpower. In the bipolar system, even though the manifestation of European power differed from that of the US, differences were not prominent because of the common threat from the communist bloc. The differences were still neglected under the US hegemony after the Cold War. However, as a new multipolar system evolves, differences in leadership styles between the EU and the US are magnified as a new controversy.

By the beginning of the 21st century, the world began to notice

numerous symptoms showing the termination of the hegemonic system centered on the US power. The 9/11 terror attacks on the World Trade Center were a symbol of the fading validity of the unipolar system even though this change in systems does not mean the complete decline of the US superpower. The evolution of the current multipolar system is largely due to the rise of newly developed countries. Newly emerging countries have experienced unprecedented economic growth over the past few decades. Haas argues that today, the contemporary multipolar world is not dominated by a small number of states but that there are dozens of states with power in diverse areas.¹¹⁾ Among the emerging countries, the rapid economic growth of the so-called BRICs countries (Brazil, Russia, India, and China) reinforces the new multipolar system.

Even though the US and the EU are still the biggest global economies in size, the BRICs countries have established considerable economic power. Especially China has been showing remarkable economic growth rates for the past several decades. Another giant population, India is also growing fast. These two countries actually share a considerable portion of the growth of the world's production. On the contrary, the share of the US and the EU in the world's economic growth is expected to further diminish drastically. Furthermore, the two Western powers are losing their reputation as leaders in the areas of scientific and technological innovation. Instead, emerging Asian countries took over the lead positions in these categories. If this trend continues, it is

9) Klaiber, K-P, "Guest Editorial: The European Union in Afghanistan: Lessons Learned." *European Foreign Affairs Review*, vol. 12, no. 1, 2007, pp. 10.

10) Smith, 2008, p. 62.

11) While the international status of the US has declined over the past decade, nevertheless, the world order is not characterized by other powers competing with each other for hegemony. In fact, the US is still considered a predominant power in the world, while other powers are recognized as being more regional.

expected that the emerging Asian economic giants will catch up with the Western powers within the next few decades. Most recent international data ranks China and India as the world's second and third largest economies, respectively.¹²⁾ Therefore the transatlantic predominance of the West is fading out. The recent financial crisis that originated in the US in 2008 is a vivid example demonstrating the decline of the West. Of course, while economic power alone cannot fully explain a power transition, it is obvious that economic capability is the base to build hard power.

2. Growing Importance of Normative Power and the EU

There are two reasons why normative power does play a more pivotal role in the current multipolar world. First, the development of a multipolar system based on the changing distribution of economic capabilities indicates an increase in importance of non-military compared to military power in global power politics. Second, as local populations, who do not welcome military conflict, gain relative power over their respective governments with an increase in economic wealth, each country is turning its policy foci to diplomatic achievements rather than military conflicts. Reflecting this trend, in spite of its long tradition of noninterventionist policy, recently China has significantly expanded diplomatic multilateral partnerships in international institutions with regard to topics such as humanitarian assistance. Hammes' fourth-generation warfare argument reflects this transitional trend.¹³⁾

12) IMF 2012, World Bank 2012.

According to him, in fourth-generation warfare the moral level of combat is more important than the physical one. This transition in international power paradigms has provoked a discussion on the importance of normative power as an organizing mechanism of a multipolar world.

The concept of normative power has frequently been used as a keyword indicating the uniqueness of the European power model compared to the US one.¹⁴⁾ What makes European power unique is its contribution to humanitarian assistance and the characteristics of its leadership style, relying on diplomacy, conversation, and compromise as the source of its power rather than on coercive power. It is necessary to distinguish the concepts "normative power" and "civilian power" since the term normative power sometimes provokes conceptual contest with civilian power, blurring the border between the two terms. Manners, who developed the concept of normative power, intended to distinguish the power of the EU from civilian power that has an empirical basis and imperialist implications, even though he acknowledged that civilian power contains a strong element of normative power.¹⁵⁾ Recently, more and more scholars and European officials prefer the concept of Normative Power Europe (NPE). NPE is different from CPE in that it emphasizes the spread of norms rather than economic and material means. In

13) Hammes, T., "War evolves into the fourth generation." *Contemporary Security Policy*, vol. 26, no. 2, 2005, pp. 189-221.

14) Kim, Nam-Kook, "The Democratic Empire of the European Union: A Normative Leader or a Realist Compromiser?" *The Korean Journal of Defense Analysis*, vol. 23, no. 4, 2010, pp. 537-555.

15) Manners, Ian, "Normative Power Europe. A Contradiction in Terms?" *Journal of Common Market Studies*, vol. 40, no. 2, 2002, pp. 239.

the concept of NPE, the most critical element is its ideological power and leadership to establish conceptions of norms in world politics even though CPE's basic principles such as democracy, liberty, rule of law, and human rights remain core elements.

Manners emphasized five ideational characteristics of the concept.¹⁶⁾ According to him, normative justification is preferred over economic or military measures; principles that regulate international behaviors should be legitimate, coherent, and consistent; international actions should be persuasive; have a socializing impact; and have holistic consequences in global politics. These progressive principles and normative leadership have been evident in the EU's activities to abolish the death penalty, to establish the International Criminal Court, and to implement the Kyoto Protocol.¹⁷⁾

Once the concept of normative power was established, many top officials in the EU began to use the word to construct a new regional identity by describing the European power as one distinguished from traditional hard power. These top political officials tended to emphasize the significance of diplomatic means to spread norms to other regions in the world. Romano Prodi, former President of the EU Commission and once one of the most important political figures of the EU, contended that the EU should make efforts to disseminate the European normative model to other regions. He maintained that European policies should transcend pursuing just their own interests in the global society and should project the European "model of development and continental

integration based on the principles of democracy, freedom and solidarity" to the rest of the world.¹⁸⁾ These European normative principles are visible in the union's humanitarian assistance policies. Especially its refugee rescue policies are based on universal human rights.

After the Cold War was officially terminated in Europe in the early 1990s, humanitarian policies became one of the most important parts of the EU's international relations policies. Promoting human rights, developing democracy, and consolidating the rule of law became one of the EU's principal goals. It was stated that this agenda "should be an integral or 'mainstream' consideration in all EU external policies."¹⁹⁾ To achieve this goal, the EU sometimes used political strategies to apply conditionalities and diplomatic leverages like foreign assistance programs.²⁰⁾ These European attempts to spread humanitarian norms have built a positive reputation for the EU. In addition to these human rights policies, its security policies focused on management of international conflict have reinforced this reputation as a normative power. As such, European normative power is one clearly distinguished from traditional civilian power as well as coercive military power.

3. Promotion of Norms through Regionalism around the World

18) Prodi, R., "2000–2005: Shaping the New Europe." *Speech to the European Parliament*, 15th February 2000.

19) European Commission. 2001. "The European Union's Role in Promoting Human Rights and Democratization in Third Countries." COM (2001) 252 final, 8th May 2001, p. 8.

20) Smith, K., "The EU, human rights and relations with third countries: 'foreign policy' with an ethical dimension?" In Smith, K. and Light, M. eds., *Ethics and Foreign Policy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001, p. 188.

16) Manners, I., *The Concept of Normative Power in World Politics*. Copenhagen: Danish Institute for International Studies, 2009.

17) Kim, 2010.

Before the end of the Cold War, there were no significant attempts to spread regionalism. It was when the discourse of normative power was established that the EU began to strategically diffuse regionalism in the rest of the world. The EU's strategic policies to promote regionalism in other global regions were coupled with foreign policies to spread normative goals such as democracy, human rights, and the rule of law. By promoting regionalism in other regions, the EU intended to establish inter-regional partnerships through which international cooperation may be facilitated.²¹⁾

The successful construction of the European regional identity has provided the rest of the world with a standard model of regional integration. In many other regions, there have been significant movements to create regional institutions. The European model was generally accepted as an ideal alternative by countries that intended to expedite international cooperation and partnership. As a result, many regional institutions and free trade areas were established on other continents by the 1990s. Even though in some regions these movements began to occur as early as the 1960s, Europe's direct influence on regionalist formations in other areas of the world started in the 1980s. Since then, the EU's model kept spreading its ideas on and experience in regional integration to other areas through foreign relations.

So far, six inter-regional agreements for partnership were signed and 19 exploratory conversations with other regional groups were arranged.²²⁾ The most salient cases of adoption of the EU model are

21) Smith, 2008, p. 109; Grugel, Jean B., "New Regionalism and Modes of Governance—Comparing US and EU Strategies in Latin America." *European Journal of International Relations*, vol. 10, no. 4, 2004, pp. 603–626.

the Andean Community, the African Union, and the Common Market of the South (Mercosur). These regional entities adopted the EU's general regulatory approaches and institutions to expedite regional integration in those regions. The path regionalism did not show the same pattern in every region, and did not necessarily lead to the adoption of the European model. The Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) for example incessantly tried to avoid the European model, worrying that a formal and supranational political entity would infringe on their national sovereignty, even though recently the countries in this region began to consider the Western model.²³⁾

Latin American and Caribbean countries developed the closest inter-regional relationships with the EU since most of the states in these regions have maintained inseparable relationships as former colonies of European nations. The most important regional institution in these regions, Mercosur, was established in 1991 through the Treaty of Asunción which originated in 1985, when the Argentine President Raúl Alfonsín and the Brazilian President José Sarney signed the "Argentina–Brazil Integration and Economics Cooperation Program." Several regional institutions such as the Andean Community, the San José Group, and the Rio Group were organized in addition. At first, the inter-regional relations between the EU and these institutions largely concentrated on economic cooperation including financial aid for

22) Smith, 2008, pp. 101–104.

23) Acharya, Amitav, "Ideas, Identity, and Institution-Building: From the 'ASEAN WAY' to the 'Asia–Pacific Way'," *The Pacific Review*, vol. 10, no. 3, 1997, pp. 319–364; Higgot, Richard, "Interregionalism and World Order: The Diverging EU and US Models." Telò, Mario (Ed.): *European Union and New Regionalism*, Aldershot, 2007.

scientific and technological innovation in these regions.

While economic cooperation launched as early as the 1960s, political agendas such as development and consolidation of democracy, rule of law, and promotion of human rights began to rise as core issues of the relations between the two regions from the early 1980s. Political dialogues to promote democracy and human rights with the Andean Community and the San José Group started in 1983 and 1984, respectively. Even though these inter-regional partnerships did not always explicitly intend to promote the integration of regional economies, it is an undeniable truth that the EU's economic aid and political leverages, especially the cooperation after the 1990s, have promoted and intensified regionalism in these areas.

The EU also made efforts to diffuse the European model of regionalism in African and Asian regions, similar to what it did in Latin America and the Caribbean Sea. However, the substantial contents and the intensity of the cooperation were quite different from those of Latin America and the Caribbean Sea. In Asia, ASEAN, founded in 1967, has been the most significant inter-regional partner. Soon after ASEAN was established, the European Community recognized it as the first inter-regional cooperation partner, and the inter-regional dialogue began in the early 1970s, resulting in a cooperation agreement between the two in 1980.

Despite a long history of inter-regional partnership between the EU and ASEAN, substantial achievements of the cooperation between the two regions have been reached relatively slowly and have a narrow scope. However, the EU's persistent political dialogue and economic

aid to promote European style regionalism in Asia recently began to produce tangible results. ASEAN is now making efforts to upgrade its regional integration by intensifying institutional completion and broadening its cooperation partnership with other Asian states such as Korea, China, and Japan.

As such, a considerable part of the EU's foreign policy strategy to disseminate European norm is founded on regionalism. By promoting regionalism in other parts of the world, the EU intends to facilitate inter-regional cooperation. This strategy is based on the calculation that, by reducing the number of global actors through regional integration, the EU can decrease the cost of international negotiation and the risk of uncertainty.

IV. Limitations of the EU's Role as a Normative Power

From the discussion above, it can be inferred that the concepts of NPE and regionalism represent the EU's contemporary principles of foreign policy. However, since the NPE concept was publicly pursued, the concept has been criticized due to various reasons.²⁴⁾ While regionalism is predominantly accepted as its foreign policy principle, it is partly controversial if the EU is really a normative power or if

24) Youngs, R., "Normative dynamics and strategic interests in the EU's external identity." *Journal of Common Market Studies*, vol. 42, no. 2, 2004, pp. 415-435; Wood, S., "The European Union: A Normative or Normal Power?" *European Foreign Affairs Review*, vol. 14, no. 1, 2009, pp. 113-128; Pace, M., "The Construction of EU Normative Power." *Journal of Common Market Studies*, vol. 45, no. 5, 2010, pp. 1041-1064.

it can keep its normative principles up under the current conditions of world politics.

In spite of the rising demand for normative leadership in an increasingly multipolarized world, there are some hindrances to the EU remaining a purely normative power. Primarily, the American superpower began to reveal its limitation in being able to cope with international conflicts occurring around the world. The US already works to capacity checking China's rise in East Asia and fighting terrorism in the Middle East. Under those circumstances, the US realized that handling the world all by itself is impossible, and the idea that Europe should contribute to maintaining the world order has gained support. In fact, the US hopes that the EU will handle at least international affairs in Europe and share the humanitarian burden in the Third World. In other words, the EU should fill the power vacuum that has developed with the decline of US superpower in the international society.

In addition, the EU also began to realize the necessity to build its military power to complement its normative leadership faced with a lack of power to enforce humanitarian intervention. This harmony of interests of the EU and the US has expedited the development of the European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP), which was transformed into the EU's Common Security and Defense Policy (CSDP) in 2010 by the 2009 Lisbon Treaty.²⁵⁾

The weak point of Manners' arguments on NPE is that he overlooked the necessity of military capability to enforce normative objectives in anarchic global politics. In fact, many of the European normative

activities such as humanitarian assistance, the norms of peace, and the rule of law have been achieved with the help of military capabilities. For instance, in the Kosovo War in 1999, the EU's main objective to establish democratic governance and the rule of law in this country was achieved by direct military engagement of the European countries to remove the Milosevic government, because diplomatic means alone were not effective enough to terminate the human rights violations on the Albanian population in Kosovo.²⁶⁾ The examples of Operation Artemis in Bunia in the Democratic Republic of Congo and Operation Atalanta in Somalia also prove the effectiveness of military power to enforce norms vis-à-vis other countries.²⁷⁾

Through the Kosovo and Iraq wars, the critical question was raised of whether the NPE concentrating on humanitarian policies is a proper strategy. The fact that there was no power in Europe to stand against American unilateral actions reminded the European political figures of the necessity of military power to acquire political autonomy. British Prime Minister Tony Blair triggered substantive discussion on the necessity of military power in the EU in 1998. He argued that Europe should be able to control international crises independently from the US. As a consequence of the debate, Britain and France signed the Saint-Malo Declaration, which stated that the European Union "must have the capacity for autonomous action, backed up by credible military forces, the means to decide to use them, and a readiness to do so,

26) Tocci, N., "The European Union as a Normative Foreign Policy Actor." *Centre for European Policy Studies Working Document*, no. 281, January 2008, pp. 15-16.

27) Trott, William, "An analysis of civilian, military and normative power in EU foreign policy." *POLIS Journal*, vol.4, 2010.

25) Kim, 2010.

in order to respond to international crises.”²⁸⁾

One neorealist perspective contends that the evolution of the ESDP as the EU’s external policy was a systemic result based on the transformation of structural power distribution.²⁹⁾ In this context, “the EU was used by its most influential member states as an instrument for collectively exercising hegemonic power,” to incorporate newly democratized Eastern European countries into the Western economic system at the end of the Cold War.³⁰⁾ Therefore, this perspective considers strategic interests of the Western countries as a critical impetus for the development of the EU’s security policy. Tocci criticizes the inconsistency in the EU’s normative stance when it dealt with the Israeli–Palestinian conflict.³¹⁾ Because the EU has had a realistic interest in keeping friendly relationships with Israel, it could not observe its normative principles on issues related to Israel. In spite of its principles to respect human rights, the EU frequently overlooked Israel’s human rights violations.³²⁾

As discussed above, while it is obvious that the EU has built its normative identity by playing a very significant role in the field of human rights promotion, its inconsistent behavior when dealing with human rights violations by other countries have undermined its reputation as a normative power. Smith criticizes that the EU’s “considerations of human rights compete with political, security and commercial considerations in foreign policy—making and states ignore

28) Saint–Malo Declaration 1998.

29) Hyde–Price, A., ‘Normative’ power Europe: a realist critique. *Journal of European Public Policy*, vol. 13, no. 2, 2006, pp. 217–234.

30) *Ibid.*, pp. 226–227.

31) Tocci, 2008.

32) Tocci, 2008, p. 19.

human rights violations in ‘friendly’ or ‘important’ countries,” especially in strategically important countries such as Russia and China.³³⁾

In sum, despite the EU’s vigorous activities to promote humanitarian norms and to consolidate democratic norms around the world, the concept of NPE has precipitated academic and political debates on whether the EU is a true normative power. On the one hand, one group of critics attacks the concept, arguing that the use, or at least the threat, of military power is a necessary condition to effectively promote those norms. On the other hand, others say that the increasing importance of military power in the EU’s security policy proves that the true mechanism moving the EU is realist considerations of its self–interest.

V. Conclusion and Implications for Korean Foreign Policy

As can be seen above, Europe, which emphasizes normative leadership such as diplomacy, economic cooperation, and human rights promotion, is expected to play a more important role in the international society, while, due to the multipolarization of international systems, the unipolar system centered on US military power is projected to crumble. However, the EU could have possibly relied on normative leadership only because the US has taken on the villain’s role, pursuing military leadership. If Europe had not received protection under NATO against

33) Smith, 2001, pp. 193–197.

the Communist threats during the latter part of the 20th century, the European nations would have had to develop leadership that is based on military capabilities and force in order to protect their democratic values.

Thus, a multipolar world, facilitated by the decline of the American superpower and the rise of emerging states, provides opportunities for Europe to enhance its leadership, while also providing a challenge to improve its military capability. Normative leadership may be effective vis-à-vis political actors that share similar characteristics; however, with the limitation of lacking coerciveness, it is difficult to be effective vis-à-vis actors that have contradicting interests. That is why, without the backing by America's military power, it is inevitable for Europe to increase its military capability to a certain degree in order for its normative leadership to be effective. In other words, Europe will have to build and increase influence in areas that America cannot cover due to its focus on China and the Middle East. However, it will need not only normative leadership but also leadership that carries some traits of coercive and political power to fill the vacuum left by the withdrawal of American power.

As mentioned above, however, even though America has lost its status as absolute hegemon, the country will not forgo activities in areas of strategic importance, as it remains the world's most powerful nation. For example, great focus will lay on checking-and-balancing the rise of China and hindering the diffusion of extremist Islam in the Middle East. These areas are directly linked to the US' national interest.

Considering the above points, it is important to look at the implications

of the EU's increasing role for East Asia. China, in keeping with its economic growth, will try to increase its political and military influence in East Asia. This can be concluded from the increasing frequency with which China has territorial disputes in East Asia. The US tries to complement its weakened influence in the region by strengthening the US-Japan alliance. On the other hand, the complex situation of East Asia poses a new challenge for Korea's foreign policy. While the US expects Korea to take an active role in the alliance with Japan, it is difficult for Korea to fulfill those expectations because of the historical problems between the two countries. Similarly, China wants Korea to participate in an East Asian economic bloc that centers around China so that it can widen its own influence. As China is the number one trading partner for Korea, it is difficult for Korea to reject China's demand, but it is also difficult to turn away from the alliance with the US. This conflict most recently became evident in the question of Korean accession to the Regional Comprehensive Economic Partnership (RCEP) and the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP), which was an issue at the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) meeting in 2013.

The EU faces foreign policy problems similarly complex as those faced by Korea. The EU is in a military alliance with the US, while it is actively working to strengthen cooperation with China, a rising economic power. Even though the EU is in a military alliance with the US, the US's intention to maintain unilateral world order based on military power contrasts with normative leadership that Europe pursues. On the other hand, even though the EU pursues economic

interaction with China, the European Union also guards itself against China and the country's global hegemonic ambitions based on its regional hegemonic status.

In this situation, Europe is expected to promote regionalism in East Asia as it traditionally has rather than to increase the tension by actively engaging with one side over the other in the region. Thus, the EU is expected to work to develop regional institutions similar to ASEAN and the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF) in East Asia where the US, China, Japan, and Korea can promote military and economic cooperation. Spreading regionalism is the only way to pursue inter-regional cooperation, which is one of the EU's goals. With low military relationship and geographical hurdles to exerting direct influence in the region, indirect influence through inter-regional cooperation is the most promising path for the EU. Thus, such an approach by Europe could solve regional issues through multilateral cooperation by strengthening regionalism in East Asia and increase the EU's indirect influence in this region through inter-regionalism.

Reference

- Acharya, Amitav, "Ideas, Identity, and Institution-Building: From the 'ASEAN WAY' to the 'Asia-Pacific Way'." *The Pacific Review*, vol. 10, no. 3, 1997.
- Duchêne, F., "The European Community and the Uncertainties of Interdependence." In M. Kohnstamm and W. Hager, eds., *A Nation Writ Large? Foreign-Policy Problems before the European Community*. London: Macmillan, 1973.
- European Commission. 2001. "The European Union's Role in Promoting Human Rights and Democratisation in Third Countries." *COM (2001) 252 final*, 8th May 2001.
- Grugel, Jean B., "New Regionalism and Modes of Governance - Comparing US and EU Strategies in Latin America." *European Journal of International Relations*, vol. 10, no. 4, 2004.
- Hammes, T., "War evolves into the fourth generation." *Contemporary Security Policy*, vol. 26, no. 2, 2005.
- Higgot, Richard, "Interregionalism and World Order: The Diverging EU and US Models." Telò, Mario (Ed.): *European Union and New Regionalism*, Aldershot, 2007.
- Hill, C., "The Capability-Expectations Gap, or Conceptualising Europe's International Role." *Journal of Common Market Studies*, vol. 31, no. 3, 1993.
- Hyde-Price, A., 'Normative' power Europe: a realist critique. *Journal of European Public Policy*, vol. 13, no. 2, 2006.
- Jachtenfuchs, Markus and Beate Kohler-Koch, "Governance and Institutional Development." In Antje Wiener and Thomas Diez eds., *European Integration Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Keohane, Robert O., "Global Governance and Democratic Accountability." In David Held and Mathias Koenig-Archibugi eds., *Taming Globalization: Frontiers of Governance*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2003.
- Klaiber, K-P, "Guest Editorial: The European Union in Afghanistan: Lessons Learned." *European Foreign Affairs Review*, vol. 12, no. 1, 2007.
- Kim, Nam-Kook, "The Democratic Empire of the European Union: A Normative

- Leader or a Realist Compromiser?" *The Korean Journal of Defense Analysis*, vol. 23, no. 4, 2010.
- Manners, Ian, "Normative Power Europe. A Contradiction in Terms?" *Journal of Common Market Studies*, vol. 40, no. 2, 2002.
- Manners, I., *The Concept of Normative Power in World Politics*. Copenhagen: Danish Institute for International Studies, 2009.
- Maull, H., "Germany and Japan: The New Civilian Powers." *Foreign Affairs*, vol. 69, no. 5, 1990.
- Pace, M., "The Construction of EU Normative Power." *Journal of Common Market Studies*, vol. 45, no. 5, 2010.
- Prodi, R., "2000–2005: Shaping the New Europe." *Speech to the European Parliament*, 15th February 2000.
- Saint–Malo Declaration. 1998. Available from: <http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cmsUpload/French>.
- Smith, M. and Woolcock, S., "European Commercial Policy: A Leadership Role in the new Millennium?" *European Foreign Affairs Review*, vol. 4, no. 4, 1999.
- Smith, K., "The EU, human rights and relations with third countries: 'foreign policy' with an ethical dimension?" In Smith, K. and M. Light, eds., *Ethics and Foreign Policy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- Smith, Karen E., *European Union Foreign Policy in a Changing World, 2nd edition*, Cambridge, 2008.
- Tocci, N., "The European Union as a Normative Foreign Policy Actor." *Centre for European Policy Studies Working Document*, no. 281, January 2008.
- Trott, William, "An analysis of civilian, military and normative power in EU foreign policy." *POLIS Journal*, vol. 4, 2010.
- Wood, S., "The European Union: A Normative or Normal Power?" *European Foreign Affairs Review*, vol. 14, no. 1, 2009.
- Youngs, R., "Normative dynamics and strategic interests in the EU's external identity." *Journal of Common Market Studies*, vol. 42, no. 2, 2004.

ABSTRACT

Implication of the EU in East Asian Regionalism
as a Global Actor in a Multipolar World

Jeong, Han–Beom(Korea National Defense University)

A post–hegemonic multipolar world provides opportunities for Europe to enhance its normative leadership, while also providing a challenge to improve its military capability. Normative leadership may be effective vis–à–vis political actors that share similar characteristics; however, with the limitation of lacking coerciveness, it is difficult to be effective vis–à–vis actors that have contradicting interests. Without backing by America's military power, it will need not only normative leadership but also leadership that carries some traits of coercive and political power to fill the vacuum left by the withdrawal of American power.

The EU's increasing role is expected to promote regionalism in East Asia similar to the ASEAN and the ASEAN Regional Forum, which can promote military and economic cooperation. With little military cooperation and geographical hurdles to exerting direct influence in this region, inter–regional cooperation by promoting regionalism is the most promising path for the EU to make influence in East Asia.

KeyWords : East Asia, European Union, Normative Power, Multipolar World, Regionalism

투고일 : 2014년 10월 30일, 심사일 : 2014년 11월 29일, 게재확정일 : 2014년 12월 4일