

**Deploying the Idea of Solidarity in the Formation of
an East Asian Community**

Sunhyuk Kim

Department of Public Administration

Korea University

Seoul 136-701, Korea

Phone: (82-2)3290-2283

Fax: (82-2)925-1751

sunhyukk@korea.ac.kr

and

Hans Schattle

Department of Political Science

Yonsei University

Seoul 120-749, Korea

Phone: (82-2)2123-5945

hschattle@yonsei.ac.kr

Prepared for the 12th bi-annual meeting of the European Union Studies Association, Boston,
Massachusetts, March 3-5, 2011.

Abstract

This paper examines prospects for solidarity as a unifying idea that can inspire and promote steps toward regional political community across East Asia. Just as the European Union's founders and its past and present visionaries have appealed consistently to an inclusive, transnational model of solidarity in framing and pursuing European integration, notions of solidarity also contain important affinities with prospects for building an East Asian community. First, the paper examines how the idea of solidarity has evolved in European political thought and especially how solidarity has emerged repeatedly as a central concept in the political development of the European Union. Then, the paper turns to East Asia and considers the relevance of solidarity as an important principle in aspirations and endeavors toward the creation of an East Asian community. We base our analysis upon a variety of sources, including statements and speeches from key political actors, scholarly books and articles, and newspaper editorials and commentaries. In contrast with interpretations that suggest the conditions for developing East Asian community are inescapably distinct from the circumstances in Europe during the second half of the 20th century, we argue that the idea of solidarity has great potential to advance regional collaboration and integration in East Asia.

Introduction

Focused on the intellectual history of solidarity, this paper explores how solidarity has been employed as an essential guiding principle in European integration and suggests that it be used as an important source of inspiration in shaping a regional East Asian community in the future. In particular, we look at the substantive and systematic ways that solidarity has been translated into specific founding principles and policy measures in Europe and then trace how the idea of solidarity has also evolved in East Asia. Just as the European Union's founders and its past and present visionaries have appealed consistently to an inclusive, transnational model of solidarity in framing and pursuing European integration, notions of solidarity also contain important affinities with prospects for building an East Asian community.

In this paper, we will first examine how multiple and overlapping traditions of solidarity emerged in Europe and proved helpful, to generations of philosophers and policy makers alike, in facilitating within the EU a socially embedded version of capitalism with vigorous social welfare and regional development policies. Then we will examine how multiple traditions of solidarity have emerged in successive phases across Asia, initially in ways that aimed to differentiate Asia from the West but later in ways that carved out a distinct East Asian regional identity with aspirations for regional community. We conclude by calling for East Asian leaders to take up the aspects of solidarity that helped propel forward the European Union in its founding moments, while we call for the current leaders of the European Union to return to more robust interpretations of solidarity that their forebears regarded as vital to the European project but have eroded somewhat during the past decade.

Social and political theorists recently have been paying increasing attention to solidarity – for different reasons. Some scholars have turned to solidarity as a lever to help strengthen democracy within nation-states and overcome fractious debates within many constitutional democracies concerning identity politics and multiculturalism. Historian David Hollinger, for example, has defined ‘solidarity’ as ‘an experience of willed affiliation’ that is ‘more active than mere membership in a community’ and entails thinking about what fellow citizens or nationals owe each other, compared to what might be owed to ‘strangers’ or ‘the rest of humankind’ (Hollinger 2006). Hollinger argues that solidarity of ‘the secular, civic nation’ seems better positioned as a middle ground to secure human rights and social welfare than either more universalist or more narrowly particularist approaches to solidarity. Political theorist Sarah Song, has illustrated how American political and civic life contains two competing approaches to civic solidarity: allegiance to the principles of the Constitution, on the one hand, and the adoption of a shared national culture on the other, which Song worries can lead to social exclusion of ethnic, cultural and religious minorities and inappropriate demands for assimilation imposed upon immigrants. As Song concludes: ‘A more inclusive American solidarity requires the recognition not only of the fact that Americans are a diverse people, but they have distinctive ways of belonging to America’ (Song 2009).

Today’s cosmopolitan thinkers, meanwhile, emphasize political allegiances and solidarities dispersed across ‘multiple overlapping networks of interaction’ (Held 1999: 91) and argue that the essence of cosmopolitanism lies in mediating one’s various political and moral obligations in a series of scales across multiple communities that generate varying degrees of loyalty (Appiah 2007; Rorty 1998). As Catherine Lu has written: ‘Rather than being alienated or solitary, a cosmopolitan self acknowledges its solidarity with a multiplicity of others. From this

plurality, we derive various sources of obligation and loyalty, affinity and difference' (Lu 2000: 257). Such multilayered approaches to cosmopolitan political community have led theorists such as Daniele Archibugi to argue that stronger roles for global governing institutions neither erode feelings of solidarity among fellow nationals, nor exonerate national governments from fulfilling obligations to their citizens (Archibugi 2008: 141). Social theorist Hauke Brunkhorst frames solidarity as a means toward 'the democratic realization of individual freedom' and advocates the notion of 'solidarity among strangers' – with elements of 'differentiation, pluralism and difference' – as a corrective against the unfettered global marketplace, as a route toward global democratic legitimation, and as a way of overcoming the problem of exclusion that typically accompanies more parochial approaches to solidarity, in which solidarity with one's closer compatriots will inevitably require or lead to the exclusion of outsiders. Brunkhorst worries, though, that postnational solidarity might erode the French Revolution's professed 'patriotism of human rights', which rested upon the idea that human rights and the rule of law ought to apply to all human persons and decisively linked solidarity with the liberal principle of freedom from domination. It is this normative linkage that Brunkhorst argues must be preserved in the present day in ongoing initiatives aimed at building supranational political communities such as the European Union (Brunkhorst 2005).

For our purposes in this paper, we wish to define solidarity as an ethos of collective responsibility that translates into concrete policy decisions affirming not only pragmatic interests among a set of governments or stakeholders but also, in some cases, common normative values that can be identified among regional political and economic actors in an interdependent world. While our definition of solidarity ultimately contains more affinities with the cosmopolitan perspectives outlined above, and their emphasis on mediating overlapping sources of obligation

across multiple political communities, we also believe that certain key elements of national solidarity, such as adherence to various constitutional principles as well as Hollinger's notion of 'willed affiliation', are ripe for extrapolation beyond the national realm and can help foster important background conditions conducive for fruitful international collaboration to emerge. Our approach to solidarity, consistent with the actual manifestations of the concept in political discourse, operates across national and supranational realms as well as imperatives of idealism and pragmatism.

Moral visions of solidarity through history in Europe

The idea of solidarity – and the older idea of fraternity, which dates back to the early Christian communities of friars – emerged through history as related political concepts building upon ancient understandings of civic friendship, from Aristotle's political and social thought, and joint liability, from Roman jurisprudence. As a guiding principle that took on great vitality in the formation of modern political community in Europe – and then the transformation of Europe in the latter half of the 20th century with the launching and expansion of the European Union – solidarity has gone through four important overlapping conceptual models in its evolution and development as a key political idea, all of which continue into the present day: (1) a model enhancing the core principles of freedom and equality and descending from ideas of joint responsibility and civic friendship, dating back from the start of the French Revolution in 1789; (2) a model emphasizing socialism and eventually, social democracy, dating back from the 1848 publication of *The Communist Manifesto* by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels; (3) a model oriented toward Christian understandings of social justice and social welfare, dating back to the

publication of the Roman Catholic Church's first papal encyclical on social justice; and (4) an amalgam of the three previous models set forth at the onset of the continent's present economic and political integration that began just after the Second World War.

Despite some popular perceptions of solidarity today as a woolly idea signaling ties of common affiliation or fellowship, the earliest uses of *solidarité* in France carried more precise connotations of joint liability or joint responsibility. French legal papers from the 16th century show that early understandings of *solidarité* focused on obligations to repay debts and uphold contracts (Hayward 1959: 270-72). During the 1789 French Revolution and its immediate aftermath, revolutionary leaders began to use *solidarité* in ways that transformed the term from a legal concept to a political concept by advancing the national credo of '*liberté, égalité, fraternité*'. Leaders of the Jacobin movement, as they concentrated political power at the national level at the expense of local and regional governments, appealed to *solidarité* in their efforts to establish 'societies of brotherhood' that would transcend differences in social class, occupational backgrounds and financial status and lead to specific social policy objectives such as the common responsibility of citizens to repay public debts, a guaranteed minimum income for family support, and readiness to share resources with the needy (Stjernø 2005). The ultimate contribution to a theory of solidarity in 19th century France came from Emile Durkheim, who distinguished between the 'mechanical solidarity' of a traditional society with relatively little differentiation in cultures and lifestyles, as well as beliefs and traditions; and 'organic solidarity' that takes into account sources of divergence and interdependence within modern societies (Durkheim 1893).

At the same time, ideas of solidarity and fraternity also gained a higher profile as socialist political thinking emerged during the 19th century in the writings of Karl Marx and

Friedrich Engels. Although Marx rarely used the exact term ‘solidarity’ and worried that the ‘concept of brotherhood was so generic that it could easily obscure class interests’ (Stjernø 2005: 43-44), Marx and Engels nevertheless developed a theory of international working class solidarity, crystallized with the rallying cry in the Communist Manifesto, ‘Workingmen of all countries, unite!’ (Marx and Engels 1848) Several years later, Marx addressed the founding conference of the International Workingmen’s Association and told his audience that socialists should not underestimate the ‘fraternal bonds that should unite workers in each country and inspire them to unite in the struggle for liberation. This underestimation would always punish their ambition and result in defeat’ (Marx 1864, quoted by Sterjno 2004: 45).

Socialist theory after the death of Marx in 1883 split in two directions: the revolutionary socialism of Vladimir Lenin and the Soviet era Communist bloc, and the European social democratic tradition that eventually gained momentum after the Second World War. The social democratic tradition, which bears much more relevance to our inquiry, built upon the endeavors of French social philosophers, particularly Durkheim, to engage the idea of solidarity in balancing modern liberalism and the priority of individual autonomy with concern for political community – thereby working across capitalism and socialism rather than being situated decisively within either model. German social democratic thinker and politician Eduard Bernstein heavily influenced the emergence of social democracy across Europe at the start of the 20th century with his 1899 critique of Marxism arguing that capitalism seemed resilient in the face of economic crises and recessions, and therefore social democrats should not wait for Marx’s predicted demise of capitalism but should instead work with other social classes in pursuit of political and economic reform, particularly on behalf of workers and their rights (Bernstein 1910; Steger 1997).

Throughout the 20th century, Roman Catholic social teaching also placed increasing emphasis on solidarity in a series of papal encyclicals that influenced Christian democratic politics in continental Europe. John Paul II elevated solidarity as a core principle of Catholic social teaching in three separate documents. First came *Laborem Exercens* (1981), which endorsed worker solidarity – and collective action – in response to the *Solidarność* movement in Poland that launched national strikes one year earlier and effectively turned earlier Marxist and socialist principles of worker solidarity into a successful campaign against Soviet communism. This was followed by *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis* (1989), which cast solidarity as a universal moral obligation in the face of increasing global interdependence. John Paul II then observed the 100th anniversary of the first Roman Catholic social justice encyclical, *Rerum Novarum*, by publishing *Centesimus Annus* (1991), which more decisively linked solidarity to Catholic advocacy of the ‘preferential option for the poor’ in public policy making. By taking a universal approach to the Christian precept, ‘Love your neighbor as yourself,’ Catholic teaching on solidarity stems from a view of an interdependent human family in which each person carries inherent dignity, as created in the image of God, and accordingly calls for strong social welfare provisions and labor laws to enrich the lives of workers, the poor and the needy worldwide. The social democratic model of solidarity as well as Catholic social justice teaching throughout the 20th century influenced visionaries such as Altiero Spinelli, Jean Monnet and Robert Schuman, who would set the stage for European integration in the aftermath of the Second World War.

Solidarity in the European Union: From the Schuman Declaration and the ‘European Social Model’ to a shift toward neoliberalism

Much in the same way that freedom and equality were cast as essential founding principles in the United States Declaration of Independence, the European Union’s founders advanced solidarity as a central principle to justify economic and political integration. The Schuman Declaration, the primary document that formally proposed the establishment of European integration and marked the beginning of cooperation between France and Germany after the Second World War, included two prominent references to solidarity. Presented in 1950 by French Foreign Minister Robert Schuman and drafted by Schuman’s ministry colleagues along with Jean Monnet, the declaration outlined the case for joint management between France and Germany of coal and steel production as a first step toward European federation. As noted in the declaration: ‘The solidarity in production thus established will make it plain that any war between France and Germany becomes not merely unthinkable, but materially impossible’. In outlining aspirations for a united Europe, the document also argued: ‘Europe will not be made all at once, or according to a single plan. It will be built through concrete achievements which first create a *de facto* solidarity’ (Schuman 1950). The existing literature on the origins of the European Union does not appear to discuss exactly who inserted the specific term ‘solidarity’ into the declaration, but Schuman was a Christian Democrat strongly influenced by Catholic social teaching as well as a European social reform movement, *Solidarisme*, active at the turn of the 20th century. With its stated goal of building up a supranational economic, political and legal order to secure peace through cooperation based in part on solidarity, the Schuman Declaration amounted to a milestone in European history.

Catholic social teaching and the social democratic tradition also influenced Jacques Delors, who as president of the European Commission strengthened European social policy alongside the opening of the single market in 1992 and the decision to launch monetary union and the single currency. A devout Catholic and socialist democrat who nevertheless championed and presided over the continental expansion of the free market, Delors saw that the single market program provided the Commission with a unique opening to attach social policy initiatives that otherwise would be difficult to put through. As Stephen Liebfried and Paul Pierson observed after the 1992 project, European Union institutions have ‘gradually assumed considerable authority in policy domains beyond those directly tied to the creation of a common market’, ranging from gender equality to workplace health and safety to immigration policy (Liebfried and Pierson 1995: 3). Delors also managed to expand regional development funds that would aid poorer regions vulnerable to social and economic dislocations caused by further economic integration – and an expanded role for the Commission in the management of these funds. While Liebfried and Pierson emphasize that the EU remains much more decentralized than conventional federal states, they note that a multitiered system of shared political authority over social policy emerged at the European level after 1992 – giving tangible expression, in many respects, to aspirations of solidarity noted elsewhere in European political and social thought. The success of the Delors Commission in augmenting social policy initiatives alongside the single market is notable considering that the member states in the founding treaties did not provide the Commission with much leeway to undertake social policy initiatives.

During the drafting of the constitutional treaty in 2004, a section on ‘solidarity rights’ was included within the document’s rights charter to spell out what the European Union classifies as basic social and economic rights, particularly with regard to workers rights. This

includes the right to collective bargaining, the right to strike and ‘protection against unjust dismissal’, and rights to safe and respectful working conditions, the prohibition of child labor, the right to paid maternity leave without threat of dismissal, the right to health care, and social welfare and pension benefits for the unemployed and elderly. The ‘solidarity rights’ section, which also came across as an effort to allay concern that the new constitution would lead to intrusive government power from Brussels, also included language about European Union priorities of environmental protection, sustainable development and consumer protection. After the failure of the constitution in 2005, the provisions on solidarity were added to the Treaty of Lisbon, which took effect in December 2009. Although the idea of solidarity has long been cast in European politics as a balancing idea or ‘third way’ between liberalism and socialism, this more recent inclusion of solidarity in the treaty – the most forceful declaration yet of solidarity as a key founding principle of the European Union – has been articulated in rights language, thereby situating the idea of solidarity more decisively within liberalism than before.

While the concept of solidarity in the European Union is still linked with social policy and social rights, the idea has also more recently been deployed in directions more compatible with *laissez-faire* economics, such as emergency funds intended to be tapped in the event of natural disasters and terrorist attacks and also aid packages that attempt to cushion the impacts of global economic instability. In March 2009, the heads of government across the member states, acting at a European Council summit, doubled to €50 billion a ‘solidarity fund’ established in 2002 to aid non-member states in balance-of-payments difficulties. The member states decided to double the fund despite opposition from Luxembourg’s prime minister, Jean-Claude Juncker, who initially expressed concern about ‘potential recipient countries leaning back and neglecting their homework because they know that there is a European way out for them’ but then said after

the summit that member states had agreed to the increase ‘to show our partners that we are ready to show solidarity’, and added that he expected not all the funds would be tapped (Brunsden 2009).

More recently, the difficulties member states have overcome in deciding what to do about the financial crisis in Greece revolved heavily around ‘what European solidarity means and how much it should cost and to whom’ (Erlanger 2010a). Even with France and Germany both in the hands of relatively conservative governments, national leaders from the two countries differed markedly as to their underlying conceptions of solidarity as well as what solidarity would seem to require to help Greece emerge from its debts. While France consistently supported an aid package to Greece and cited the imperative of solidarity as a key basis for its support, German Chancellor Angela Merkel initially resisted the idea of an aid package largely on grounds that German taxpayers should not pay the price for mismanagement in Greece or set a precedent for future rescues of other weaker – and larger – Mediterranean countries, namely Spain and Portugal, facing problems similar to Greece (Erlanger 2010b).

As an illustration of how European solidarity ran into a critical test during this period, at one point, Merkel actually turned to the idea of solidarity while attempting – without success – to soften the blow of Germany’s refusal to provide support. Following a meeting during the height of the crisis in early March 2010 with Greece’s prime minister, George Papandreou, Merkel said that Germany would not provide funds but that ‘Germany can express its solidarity’ by showing understanding while withholding aid (Merkel 2010a). Merkel’s position was consistent with European Union laws (dating back to the Maastricht Treaty) forbidding member states from recognizing (or paying off) the debts of other member states, though her dilution of solidarity to a sentiment of mere sympathy, detached entirely from specific financial support, contrasted with

other political leaders in Europe who were calling for commitments of solidarity to be accompanied by aid packages. While Germany insisted that Greece take greater financial responsibility to conform to Euro-zone standards and curb political corruption, France leaned heavily on the idea of solidarity to justify an aid package to Greece and to call for Germany's role in such a package. Meanwhile, calls for European solidarity issued by national government officials in Greece almost seemed to conflate 'solidarity' and 'bailout'. As Greece's deputy prime minister, Theodoros Pangalos, said while making the case for European Union intervention for troubled member states: 'You are the next victims... I hope it doesn't happen and the solidarity prevails and we find an exit from this escalation (of borrowing costs). But if this does not happen, the next probable victim will be Portugal' (Pangalos 2010).

By the end of March 2010, the leaders of the eurozone member states – including Germany – agreed to a 'bailout mechanism' worth 30 billion euro in high-interest loans that would not be sent to Greece immediately but would be available for borrowing if the country's financial picture were to deteriorate further. Both Merkel and Papandreou once again turned to the notion of solidarity to hail the agreement, which was followed by a much larger financial commitment of \$140 billion from the European Union in May 2010 to help Greece settle its short term debts. In Merkel's words: 'I think Europe proved its capacity for action on a major issue, at the same time working to protect euro stability and demonstrating solidarity towards a country in difficulty' (Merkel 2010b). Papandreou declared: 'European solidarity has taken flesh and bones. Today's developments don't relate just to Greece, our country; it is a significant decision for both Europe and for the European Union' (Granitsas and Skrekas 2010). Analysts were more skeptical; as an editorial noted in *The Wall Street Journal*: 'It's safe to say this agreement is something less than the full-throated vote of solidarity that Athens has been hoping for. It is,

instead, an agreement struck in the hopes it will never be used' (*The Wall Street Journal Europe* 2010). The leader of the Party of European Socialists, Poul Nyrup Rasmussen, criticized the agreement as a show of weakness rather than a show of solidarity: 'There is a real solidarity gap on the deal for Greece and a real credibility gap on the plans for a European strategy for 2020. The use of the plan only as a 'last resort' runs the risk of perpetuating a crisis footing. Solidarity should not be seen as a last resort' (Papageorgiou 2010). On the other side of public opinion, many argued that Greece, not Germany, had fallen short on solidarity by mismanaging its finances in the first place – essentially failing to live up to earlier understandings of solidarity as joint responsibility. As a London resident wrote in a letter published in the *Financial Times*: 'It's time Greece showed some solidarity with the rest of Europe by starting to introduce fiscal discipline' (Zehle 2010).

The latest developments within the eurozone are now lending more confidence that solidarity will remain an essential guiding principle of European integration. At the annual summit of the World Economic Forum in January 2011, Merkel reaffirmed Germany's commitment to European monetary union and the single European currency by promising that Germany is ready to show 'solidarity' and provide financial assistance to its more heavily indebted partners in return for firmer commitments to limit budget deficits across Europe. As Merkel noted in a speech that confirmed her government's shift toward a commitment to aid in exchange for better fiscal discipline from its European counterparts and articulated a meaningful notion of solidarity as collective responsibility: 'Whoever gets solidarity needs to receive this solidarity under certain conditions... We are going to defend the euro – there is no doubt about this. The euro is our currency and is much more than just a currency; it is, if you like, the embodiment of the Europe of today. Should the euro fail, Europe will fail' (Merkel 2011). This

continued prominence of solidarity in public debates – as illustrated by the recent crisis in Greece, in which national leaders across the European continent relied heavily upon the idea of solidarity as they debated how to respond – underscores that solidarity remains a fundamental imperative in the European Union, both flowing from and feeding into heightened recognition of interdependence that has bound together the member state of the European Union even as its political elites frequently disagree over the appropriate measures to fulfill this imperative.

Solidarity and prospects for an East Asian Community

Unlike in Europe, the concept of solidarity did not play any comparably significant role in constituting political community in pre-modern East Asia, both in individual countries and at the international level. Confucius, an ancient Chinese philosopher, emphasized benevolence and integrity as personal virtues that the king and other public leaders ought to strive to acquire. Other ancient Chinese thinkers underlined other factors such as the law, military power, and love as the main principles of social and political institutions. However, solidarity similar to the models that had evolved in Europe in multiple philosophical and religious traditions did not emerge and develop in ancient East Asia. The pre-modern regional order in East Asia was characterized by a Sino-centric hierarchy consisting of successive Chinese empires at the center and their tributary neighbors in the periphery. Such a hierarchical regional order allowed little room for solidarity – in both discourse and practice – to emerge and develop. If anything, ‘solidarity’ was imposed unilaterally by hegemonic Chinese empires onto small and weak countries.

From the time Asia entered into the modern period, however, ‘solidarity’ has emerged occasionally as one of the key themes in the development of cooperation in the region. In this regard, solidarity as an organizing principle of regional organizations and institutions is a ‘modern’ phenomenon in East Asia. The evolution of the idea of solidarity in East Asia can be divided into three stages: 1) mid-19th to the early 20th century, 2) 1945-1990 (Cold War period), and 3) 1990-present (post-Cold War period).

The concept of pan-Asian solidarity first emerged and spread in East Asia in the mid-19th century. The concept of solidarity at the time had a lot of oppositional characteristics – solidarity was against the West and against the Western civilization. The proponents of Asian solidarity commonly argued for the superiority of Eastern (Asian) ‘substance’ or ‘essence’ to Western ‘technology’ or ‘tools.’ However, Korea, Japan, and China all had different notions of regional solidarity. Korea’s version of pan-Asianism, *Dongyangjueui*, envisioned a peaceful East Asia, where Korea could remain and prosper as an independent sovereign country. Korean supporters of Asianism proposed solidarity and unity, trilateral coexistence and co-prosperity of China, Korea, and Japan. They also argued that if the three Northeast Asian countries could unite themselves, they could effectively deal with the West-dominated international order at the time. Kim Ok Kyun, for example, supported ideas such as ‘Harmony of the Three Countries’ or a ‘Japan-China-Korea Alliance’ and maintained that the unity and cooperation of the three countries were essential in resisting and defeating the West’s imperial ambitions. Also, An Jung Geun espoused the concept of ‘East Asian Peace,’ proposing the establishment of an international council to discuss such issues as regional peace, a joint bank, a common currency, and a common peace corps (Kim 2005: 10).

China's pan-Asianism was best represented by Sun Yat-sen's 'Greater Asianism.' In a speech delivered in Kobe, Japan on November 28, 1924, Sun compared and contrasted Oriental civilization and Occidental civilization to develop a theory of the superiority of the former over the latter. According to his analysis, Oriental civilization was characterized by the 'rule of Right,' whereas Occidental civilization is in essence the 'rule of Might.' He prescribed: 'Should all Asiatic peoples thus unite together and present a united front against the Occidentals, they will win the final victory' (Sun 1941). The ultimate goal of Sun's 'Greater Asianism' was global peace, comprised of multiple concrete steps of regional cooperation and integration. His 'Greater Asianism' contained manifestly racial components, such as the fateful clash between the Asian race and the Caucasian race. Also, he underscored the need for aligning populous China with powerful Japan in combating Western imperialism (Sun 1941).

Japan's Asianism at the turn of the century can be divided into two stages: the initial relatively non-aggressive stage and the later expansionist and military stage. In the 1850-60s, Japan's Asianism aimed for Asian solidarity with a view to resisting Western imperialists' intrusion into Asia. The main premise of this earlier version of Asianism was Japan's self-realization that Japan was historically and currently part of Asia. 'Asia' was not only a geographical concept but also a concept emphasizing the same race and the same (Confucian) culture. 'Asian solidarity' meant the unity and cooperation of China, Korea, and Japan in resistance to Western imperialism. It was advocated by both liberal and progressive civil rights activists and relatively conservative social groups. However, 'Asian solidarity' did not receive much attention and public support at the time, largely because the movement remained abstract and did not offer any specific means and methods to achieve its objectives. As well, Japan's

‘Asian solidarity’ was clearly Japan-centric and recommended ‘unequal’ cooperation among the three Northeast Asian countries (Kim 2005: 13).

The initial, relatively non-expansionist Asianism in Japan gradually changed into an aggressive and imperialistic version of ‘Greater Asianism,’ supported by the military and rightist groups such as *Genyosha* (Dark Ocean Society) and *Kokuryukai* (Black Dragon Society). Intellectuals such as Yoshida Shoin envisioned a Northeast Asian regional order with a hegemonic Japanese empire at the top. Japan’s ‘Greater Asianism’ became consolidated through the Sino-Japanese and Russo-Japanese Wars in the early 20th century. It culminated with the notion of a ‘Greater Asian Co-Prosperity Sphere’ that was used by the Japanese military to justify and fortify their invasion, conquest, and colonization of Asian countries up until World War II.

The idea of solidarity in East Asia during the Cold War period (1945-89) was evoked in two polarized forms, either taking sides with either of the two global superpowers (the United States or the Soviet Union) or resisting both hegemons to pursue ‘neutrality’. There were two noticeable attempts at building solidarity of Asian countries: the Non-Aligned Movement and ASEAN. First proposed at the Asian-African Conference held in Bandung, Indonesia in 1955, the Non-Aligned Movement was intended to promote unity and cooperation of Third World countries in Asia and Africa, free from the influences of powerful countries, particularly the two superpowers of the Cold War bipolar international structure. However, the solidarity the movement advocated and promoted was not quite about the Asian region. Rather, the movement was cross-regional, broadly involving oppressed and underdeveloped nations on different continents. The Non-Aligned Movement did not gain much support from Third World countries that belonged to either of the two ideological camps and fizzled out.

ASEAN started with the signing of the ASEAN Declaration by the foreign ministers of Indonesia, Thailand, Malaysia, the Philippines, and Singapore in Bangkok in 1967. The five founding members, in the face of rapid expansion and diffusion of Communism in the Indochinese Peninsula, intended to deal with the threat of Communism collectively. ASEAN was established under the sponsorship of the United States and had a highly ideological character from the very beginning. With initiatives for an ASEAN Free Trade Area (AFTA) in the 1980s and the membership expansion to include 10 countries, ASEAN gradually developed into a comprehensive forum of economic and social cooperation. But the Asian solidarity on which ASEAN was based was Southeast Asian solidarity. On the Northeast Asian front, regional solidarity did not emerge as an important concept throughout the Cold War period. Japan and South Korea each maintained bilateral alliances with the U.S. and served as strong anti-communist footholds in Asia. If any, the regional solidarity that existed in Northeast Asia was not very different from that of Southeast Asia, i.e., pro-U.S. and anti-Communist solidarity.

Toward the end of the Cold War era, scholars pointed to the 'Rise of Asia' or the arrival of the 'Pacific Century'. Several Asian countries such as Japan and Korea emerged from postwar devastation to become global economic powerhouses. China, after the paradigmatic change to opening and reform in the late 1970s, has continued to surprise the world with its fast growth and formidable potential. Other Asian countries, small and large, showed substantial economic development and political transformation, impressing the international public at large. With the end of the Cold War, the early 1990s witnessed a visible 'resurgence' of Asianism, reminiscent of the rise of various versions of Greater Asianism during the pre-Cold War period. Most Asian countries sustained substantial economic growth through the 1980s and the 1990s. This experience generated collective confidence in the distinctive model of Asian development,

centered upon the effective role of the state historically exemplified by Japan and South Korea during the 1970s and 1980s. The rise of Asia culminated with the ‘Asian Values’ debate in the early to mid-1990s, with the ‘flurry of articles and books praising supposedly inherent Asian values that seemingly propelled regional economic growth’ (Terada 2003, note 6). Asian leaders became confident about their achievements and critical about ‘Western’ values and ‘global standards.’

In 1990, Malaysian Prime Minister Mahathir proposed the creation of the East Asian Economic Group (EAEG). EAEG was predicated on the concept of a broader and more unified Asian region, consolidating the existing notions of separate Asian regions – Northeast Asia and Southeast Asia – into the new appellation of ‘East Asia’ (Terada 2003: 256). ‘East Asia’ was innovative because most of the existing regional groupings had – both during and after the Cold War – revolved around ‘Southeast Asian’ (e.g., ASEAN), ‘Pacific’ (e.g., PECC), or ‘Asia-Pacific’ (e.g., APEC) (Terada 2003: 256). In October 1991, at the Meeting of the ASEAN Economic Ministers held in Kuala Lumpur, ASEAN countries agreed to change EAEG to the East Asian Economic Caucus (EAEC). However, EAEG/EAEC did not gain much influence because ASEAN members failed to elaborate on EAEC’s objectives, structures, and functions, and Japan preferred the existing concept of the ‘Asia-Pacific.’

On the 30th anniversary of ASEAN in 1997, Mahathir resuscitated the idea of EAEG/EAEC by proposing ASEAN+3 (ASEAN Plus Three; APT) and extended invitations to the prime ministers of China, Japan, and Korea. In 1998, South Korean president Kim Dae Jung fleshed out Mahathir’s idea further by proposing the establishment of The East Asian Vision Group (EAVG) of eminent persons, an ‘East Asian’ grouping of Northeast and Southeast Asia that was very similar to Mahathir’s EAEG/EAEC. EAVG studied and developed APT’s ultimate

purposes, basic principles, and specific programs for cooperation and submitted a report on ideas to deepen long-term cooperation among APT members to the 5th APT Summit in 2001. EAVG examined the ultimate aims of a pan-Asian regional cooperative organization and proposed the East Asian Summit, the East Asia Forum, and the East Asia Free Trade Area as long-term goals. In 2001 the East Asian Study Group (EASG), which was composed of high-ranking officials from thirteen APT countries, reviewed EAVG's report and released an elaborate plan for regional cooperation and collaboration in November 2002, breaking down EAVG's 26 projects into specific long-term, mid-term, and short-term measures. As a result of these efforts, the first East Asia Summit was held in December 2005.

Despite Mahathir's persistence and Kim Dae Jung's facilitation, APT as a new regional forum based on the 'East Asian' solidarity would not have come to fruition without the unexpected eruption of the Asian financial crisis in 1997-98. The post-crisis 'East Asian' solidarity, an expert points out, is characterized by its 'state-led' and 'exclusionary' (of the U.S.) nature (Bowles 2002). Above all, the crisis brought to relief the dire need of the countries in the region to establish and develop common institutions and measures to prevent, manage, and overcome various economic challenges. Based on their successful experiences with the developmental state in the past decades, countries in the region could easily agree on the need for the states to be (back) in charge. Their strong intentions to intervene and encompass (or reclaim) both monetary and trade dimensions considerably spurred the drive for post-crisis regionalism.

Most important, '[i]t was from the perception of collective humiliation by essentially 'Western' institutions like the IMF and World Bank that the felt need for greater regional solidarity emerged' (Jones and Smith 2007: 169). The Asian financial crisis prompted the East Asian countries to entertain profound skepticism about the United States-led global economic

order. As one observer commented, '[t]he evolving regional narrative ascribed the cause of the crisis to U.S.-dominated global funds that ruthlessly shifted 'hot' money in and out of Asia' (Jones and Smith 2007: 170). East Asian countries began to openly criticize the deficiency of political legitimacy of the global financial architecture and began trying to become 'rule makers rather than rule takers through various regional financial arrangements' (Sohn 2005). A desire to limit the influence in the region of the U.S. and the international financial institutions became palpable.

As a result, the post-crisis regionalism in East Asia is different from the pre-crisis 'open' regionalism. While the former is premised on an Asia-only vision of economic cooperation forged to counter the power of the U.S. and Europe, the latter was largely based on the natural development of trading and production networks in Asia. APT was exclusive, effectively drawing the boundaries of 'East Asia' in a way that ruled out those countries on its periphery, most notably, the 'Western' liberal democracies (Bowles 200: 263).

China's and Japan's convergence of interest in and cooperation with APT and East Asian community-building were also critical to APT's success. China consistently kept a low profile and encouraged ASEAN to lead the process. As a Chinese analyst observes: 'ASEAN has played a key role in bridging and bringing other East Asian countries together for cooperation ... and will continue to play an important role in the future East Asia cooperation process. ... China does not want to be a center of power or a leader' (Zhang 2005: 3, 6). Meanwhile, Japan also changed its previous critical view on 'East Asia.' Japanese prime minister Koizumi Junichiro, in a policy speech delivered in Singapore in January 2002, proposed the creation of an East Asian 'community that acts together and advances together' (Koizumi 2002). In a speech delivered at

the UN in September 2004, Koizumi publicly announced that he had ‘advocated the idea of an ‘East Asia Community’ ... building upon ASEAN + 3’ (Koizumi 2004).

The latest interesting development in terms of regionalism based on solidarity was the September 2009 election of a Democrat-controlled government led by Hatoyama Yukio in Japan. In an editorial commentary that was published in newspapers around the world a few weeks before the election, Hatoyama defined his understanding of fraternity as ‘the principle of independence and coexistence’ and viewed solidarity as a concept capable of taming global capitalism as well as a ‘a force for the moderating the danger inherent within freedom’ (Hatoyama 2009). While Hatoyama’s essay was widely noted around the world for its aspirations toward an East Asian political and economic community, portions of his commentary also framed ‘fraternity’ as primarily a local or national corrective to a monolithic framing of ‘globalism’ as akin to American economic dominance and therefore suggested that solidarity would entail a turn away from globalism rather than a redeployment of globalism. Thus Hatoyama cast the relationship between ‘fraternity’ and ‘globalism’ as inherently negative, and framed a possible East Asian community and his envisioned initial elements of a common East Asian currency and collective security provisions as ‘a national goal that emerges from the concept of fraternity’ (Hatoyama 2009).

While Hatoyama depicted regional integration as a ‘national goal,’ particularly to advance the principles of pacifism and multilateral cooperation built into Japan’s constitution, he located a prospective East Asian political community inspired by ‘fraternity’ as a desirable middle ground that would avoid ‘excessive nationalism,’ on the one hand, and ‘U.S. political and economic excesses’ on the other. Hatoyama also argued that potential obstacles to East Asian political community – namely increased militarization and lingering territorial disputes on all

sides – have their best chances of resolution in a multilateral setting, as opposed to bilateral negotiations, and therefore ‘somewhat paradoxically, that the issues that stand in the way of regional integration can only be truly resolved by moving toward greater integration. The experience of the EU shows us how regional integration can defuse territorial disputes.’

Hatoyama’s idea of fraternity, with clear references to EU and emphases on its value as an antidote to the dominant global liberalism and Asian nationalism, put forward a conception of solidarity that so far bears the closest affinities with European approaches to solidarity.

Hatoyama’s prime ministership collapsed in June 2010, less than one year after the Democratic Party of Japan’s electoral victory, following a series of campaign financing scandals and an impasse over the question of relocating a U.S. military base on Okinawa. It remains to be seen whether Hatoyama’s ideas of fraternity and solidarity turn out to be as ephemeral as his government or surprisingly enduring to influence the actual process of community-building and institutional development in the East Asian region. Indications are that his successor, Kan Naoto, while still playing lip service to the idea of an Asian community, has not made it a priority issue. Furthermore, diplomatic incidents with China in September 2010 have put a freeze on warming Sino-Japanese relations, a prerequisite for advancing the idea of community.

In summary, ASEAN’s initiative, South Korea’s facilitative role, the Asian financial crisis, and the changes of Japan and China were the main causes of the recent surge of regionalism in East Asia. It will be difficult to exclude the U.S. in new regional institutions and organizations. One of the reasons why the new East Asian solidarity cannot be too exclusionary will be Washington’s strong opposition. U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton has made it clear that the U.S. intends to be a leader in building effective regional institutions in Asia. She emphasizes that the U.S. will take advantage of its existing bilateral alliance relationships;

pursue security, growth, and democracy; and develop informal, sub-regional institutions. U.S. policymakers believe that an active and engaged global policy is critical to the success of regional institutions in Asia (Clinton 2010).

As far as the current round of East Asian regionalism curbs a exclusionary propensity, we can conclude that the negativistic elements of the previous varieties of (Greater) Asianism during the last century will be substantially diluted. Greater Asianism in the late 19th and early 20th centuries was largely anti-Western. As compared with Greater Asianism during the earlier half of the last century, the current wave of East Asian regionalism is more focused on positive goods to pursue, such as increased exchanges and interdependencies, collective problem-solving, and efforts at building common institutions. This is why, unlike the previous versions of regionalism in Asia, Northeast Asia, Southeast Asia, the Pacific, and the Asia-Pacific, the current wave of regionalism in *East Asia* has a greater potential to utilize solidarity as its crucial organizing principle.

Conclusion

Solidarity in East Asia is only beginning to work as an organizing principle of regional institution-building. Just as the concept of solidarity played a crucial role in the formative years of the European Union, solidarity should play an important role in inspiring and promoting the process of East Asian cooperation and future integration. In this regard, an important task in East Asia is to deploy the idea of solidarity more actively, making it more positive, substantive, specific, and problem-solving. As a fervid supporter and aggressive promoter of APT has once declared:

The regional cooperation has brought home the exciting realization that we, the people of East Asia, are very capable of working together, with goodwill and solidarity, to create a better future for all of us and a better world for our descendants. ... While there is no roadmap towards a community of East Asian nations, our leaders have come to accept the crucial common belief that we, East Asians, must cooperate and build our future together. They deserve our active support. For we are all in this together. The journey has begun (Chalermphanupap 2002).

In Europe, meanwhile, the immediate task is for the continent's public officials and policy makers to return decisively to the rich traditions of solidarity that made the concept indispensable during the formative years of European integration. With the European Union now very much submerged within the neoliberal character of the global economy – and its overriding emphasis upon deregulation, privatization and free trade – notions of European solidarity have often drifted from the conceptual pillars of collective responsibility and social democracy as well as more inclusive, outward-looking approaches to solidarity. In the recent debates surrounding aid to Mediterranean countries in financial trouble, Germany and its partners in the single European currency are certainly correct to insist that national governments such as Greece must hold themselves more accountable to basic standards of transparency and fiscal accountability within the euro zone. At the same time, for the euro zone to prosper once again, the partner countries must take policy measures that genuinely affirm stronger senses of joint responsibility and the willingness to undertake shared sacrifices as manifestations to maintain their common interests in European monetary integration and, more broadly, the entire project of the European Union as both an economic and political community. A redoubling of solidarity is also needed for European Union enlargement, in which commitments for regional development and

‘cohesion’ funding have not been as strong in recent years as during the launch of the single market nearly two decades ago.

We conclude, then, by emphasizing that the idea of solidarity should serve as a common vehicle for inspiring and facilitating a new regional community in East Asia and rejuvenating the existing economic and political community in Europe. In contrast with interpretations that suggest the conditions for developing an East Asian community are inescapably distinct from the circumstances in Europe during the second half of the 20th century, we argue that the concept of solidarity offers great potential as a conceptual lever to advance regional collaboration and integration in East Asia. And despite recent developments in European Union politics that have heightened concern that the current generation of leaders in Europe has veered away from a robust model of solidarity in the aftermath of European Union enlargement and in the midst of ongoing financial crises, we argue that solidarity remains a core concept of the European project and that the future of European integration itself will depend in part on reinvigorating solidarity and generating European public policies that give clear expression to principles of solidarity as articulated in the earlier traditions that continue to hold much resonance within European political culture. All in all, the idea of solidarity highlights an important normative parallel between the path of European integration taken during the past half century and the prospective path of East Asian regional cooperation. The specific contents of solidarity – as well as suitable policy measures that follow – must now be fleshed out by the visions, ideas, and imaginations of able and charismatic leaders in both East Asia and Europe.

References

- Appiah, A. (2007) *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers*. New York: Norton.
- Bernstein, E. (1910) *Die Arbeiterbewegung*. Frankfurt am Main: Literarische Anstalt Rütten & Leoning.
- Bowles, P. (2002) 'Asia's Post-Crisis Regionalism: Bringing the State Back in, Keeping the (United) States Out', *Review of International Political Economy* 9 (2): 244-70.
- Brunkhorst, H. (2005) *Solidarity: From Civic Friendship to a Global Legal Community*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Brunsdon, J. (2010) 'European Solidarity Fund To Be Doubled', *European Voice*, 20 March.
- Calhoun, C. (2002) 'The Class Consciousness of Frequent Travelers: Towards a Critique of Actually Existing Cosmopolitanism', in S. Vertovec and R. Cohen (eds.), *Conceiving Cosmopolitanism: Theory, Context and Practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 86-109.
- Chalermphanupap, T. (2002) 'Towards an East Asian Community: The Journey Has Begun'. Paper presented at the 5th China-ASEAN Research Institutes Roundtable on Regionalism and Community Building in East Asia, Hong Kong, 17-19 October.
- Clinton, H. R. (2010) 'Remarks on Regional Architecture in Asia: Principles and Priorities', East-West Center, Honolulu, Hawaii, USA, 12 January.
- Remarks by Secretary Clinton on Regional Architecture in Asia: Principles and Priorities, Available from: <http://www.state.gov/secretary/rm/2010/01/135090.htm>.
- Durkheim, E. (1984 [1893]) *The Division of Labour in Society*. London: Macmillan.
- Erlanger, S. (2010) 'Europe Wants America's Respect', *The New York Times*, 29 March, p. 1.

- Erlanger, S. (2010) 'French and German Ties Fray Over Debt Crisis in Greece', *The New York Times*, 12 April, p. A4.
- Granitsas, A., and Skrekas, N. (2010) 'Greece Hails EU/IMF Aid Deal, Has Not Asked For Loan', *Dow Jones International News*, 12 April. Available from: <http://www.foxbusiness.com/story/markets/industries/finance/greece-hails-euimf-aid-deal-asked-loan/>.
- Hatoyama, Y. (2009) 'A New Path for Japan', *The New York Times*, 26 August. Available from: <http://www.nytimes.com/2009/08/27/opinion/27iht-edhatoyama.html>.
- Hayward, J. E. S. (1959) 'Solidarity: The Social History of an Idea in 19th Century France', *International Review of Social History* 4: 261-84.
- Held, D. (1999) 'The Transformation of Political Community: Rethinking Democracy in the Context of Globalization', in I. Shapiro and C. Hacker-Cordón (eds.), *Democracy's Edges* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 84-111.
- Hollinger, D. (2006) 'From Identity to Solidarity', *Daedalus*, 135(4): 23-31.
- Jones, D. M., and Smith, M. L. R. (2007) 'Constructing Communities: The Curious Case of East Asian Regionalism', *Review of International Studies* 33: 165-86.
- Kim, K. (2005) 'Multilaterality of Pan-Asianism and Regional Cooperation in Northeast Asia (in Korean)', *Journal of Northeast Asian Studies* 37: 5-29.
- Koizumi, J. (2002) 'Japan and ASEAN in East Asia: A Sincere and Open Partnership.' Available from: <http://www.mofa.go.jp/region/asia-paci/pm0201/speech.html>.
- Koizumi, J. (2004) 'A New United Nations for the New Era.' Available from: <http://www.mofa.go.jp/policy/un/adress0409.html>.

- Liebfried, S., and P. Pierson (1995) 'Multitiered Institutions and the Making of Social Policy', in S. Liebfried and P. Pierson (eds.) *European Social Policy: Between Fragmentation and Integration*. Washington: Brookings, pp. 1-40.
- Lu, C. (2000) 'The One and Many Faces of Cosmopolitanism', *Journal of Political Philosophy*, 8 (2): 244-67.
- Lu, C. (2000) 'The One and Many Faces of Cosmopolitanism', *Journal of Political Philosophy*, 8 (2): 244-67.
- Marx, K. and F. Engels (1848) 'Manifesto of the Communist Party'. Available from: <http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1848/communist-manifesto/>.
- Merkel, A. (2010a) quoted in 'Amid Clashes in Greece, Germany's Merkel Offers No Financial Support', *Euclid Infotech*. 8 March. Available from: <http://abcnews.go.com/Business/wireStory?id=10026886>.
- Merkel, A. (2010b) quoted in 'Merkel calls the shots at EU summit', *Plus News Pakistan*, 27 March. Available from: http://www.expatica.com/de/news/german-rss-news/merkel-calls-the-shots-at-eu-summit_33593.html.
- Merkel, A (2011) quoted by Tony Czuczka and Patrick Donahue, 'Merkel demands euro-area debt reductions in return for help from Germany', *Bloomberg*. 29 January. Available from: <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2011-01-28/merkel-demands-euro-area-debt-reductions-in-return-for-help-from-germany.html>
- Mohamad, M. (2006) 'Let Asians Build Their Own Future Regionalism,' *Global Asia* 1(1): 13-15.

- Pangalos, T. (2010) quoted in 'Greek Official Warns Portugal May Falter Next', *The New York Times*, 5 April. Available from:
<http://www.reuters.com/article/idUSLDE6340AQ20100405>.
- Papageorgiou, A. (2010) 'It's All Greek To Me', *New Europe*, 28 March. Available from:
<http://www.neurope.eu/articles/Its-all-Greek-to-me/99923.php>.
- Rorty, R. (1998) 'Justice as a Larger Loyalty' in P. Cheah and B. Robbins (eds.), *Cosmopolitics*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, pp. 45-58.
- Schuman, R. (1950) 'Declaration of 9 May 1950.' Available from:
http://europa.eu/abc/symbols/9-may/decl_en.htm.
- Sohn, I. (2005) 'Asian Financial Cooperation: The Problem of Legitimacy in Global Financial Governance', *Global Governance* 11: 487-504.
- Song, S. (2009) 'What Does It Mean To Be An American', *Daedalus*, Spring 2009: 31-40.
- Steger, M. (1997) *The Quest for Evolutionary Socialism: Eduard Bernstein and Social Democracy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stjernø, S. (2005) *Solidarity in Europe: The History of an Idea*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sun, Y. (1941) 'China and Japan: Natural Friends, Unnatural Enemies.' Available from:
http://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Sun_Yat-sen's_speech_on_Pan-Asianism.
- Terada, T. (2003) 'Constructing an 'East Asian' Concept and Growing Regional Identity: From EAEC to ASEAN+3', *Pacific Review* 16 (2): 251-77.
- The Wall Street Journal Europe (2010) 'Who Will Rescue Greece's Rescuers?' 29 March, p. 11.

Zehle, S. (2010) 'Greece – Show Some Solidarity With The Rest of Europe', *Financial Times*,
12 April. Available from:

http://search.ft.com/search?queryText=zehle+greece&ftsearchType=type_news.

Zhang, Y. (2005) 'Emerging New East Asian Regionalism', *Asia-Pacific Review* 12(1): 1-18.