

# 行政院國家科學委員會專題研究計畫 成果報告

## 國際組織之制度變遷：東南亞國協在安全共同體制度發展 之逐步適應與互賴學習 (II) 研究成果報告(精簡版)

計畫類別：個別型  
計畫編號：NSC 95-2414-H-004-027-  
執行期間：95年08月01日至96年10月15日  
執行單位：國立政治大學外交學系

計畫主持人：黃奎博

計畫參與人員：博士班研究生-兼任助理：陳正翰  
碩士班研究生-兼任助理：戴鈞鴻

報告附件：國外研究心得報告

處理方式：本計畫可公開查詢

中華民國 97年01月18日

行政院國家科學委員會補助專題研究計畫  成果報告  
 期中進度報告

國際組織之制度變遷 -

東南亞國協在安全共同體制度發展之逐步適應與互賴學習(II)

計畫類別： 個別型計畫  整合型計畫

計畫編號：NSC 95 - 2414 - H - 004 - 027 -

執行期間：95年8月1日至96年10月15日

計畫主持人：黃奎博

共同主持人：

計畫參與人員：戴鈞鴻、陳正翰

成果報告類型(依經費核定清單規定繳交)：

精簡報告  完整報告

本成果報告包括以下應繳交之附件：

赴國外出差或研習心得報告一份

赴大陸地區出差或研習心得報告一份

出席國際學術會議心得報告及發表之論文各一份

國際合作研究計畫國外研究報告書一份

處理方式：除產學合作研究計畫、提升產業技術及人才培育研究計畫、  
列管計畫及下列情形者外，得立即公開查詢

涉及專利或其他智慧財產權， 一年  二年後可公開查詢

執行單位：國立政治大學外交學系

中華民國 97 年 1 月 9 日

## 中文摘要

本研究主要以 Ernst B. Haas 的「逐步成長模式」(incremental growth model)及「管理互賴模式」(managed interdependence model) 分析東協在進入新世紀後安全機制上的轉變。在多邊機制的運作下，東協得以制訂成員都接受的規範，並透過逐步成長的適應 (adaptation) 或管理互賴的學習 (learning) 的方式，進行區域安全制度的建立與變革。

本研究確定東協在安全機制上的轉變乃具內生的 (endogenous) 與外來的 (exogenous) 兩大動因，進而造成東協在安全合作制度上的緩慢改變。經由前述的研究方式，並配合實地訪談的作法，本研究認為內生的因素雖可能具影響力，但其中如東協內部成員國的社會化所帶來的「共識型的知識」(consensual knowledge)，以及逐漸擴大的「知識社群」(epistemic community) 等等，難以有力地、單獨地解釋為何會誕生「東協安全共同體」。吾人仍必須注意外生因素的改變，以證明追求自立自主的東協試圖以緩步慎進的方式來適應區域安全情勢的變化，並去學習其他地區的經驗，在會員國國家主權內涵不被更動、東協基本價值不被挑戰的政治默契下，試圖建立有東南亞特色的「東協安全共同體」(東協憲章後改稱「東協政治與安全共同體」)。

在驗證前述的假設與分析後，本研究的附帶研判東協在日後可能的組織與規範的演變應不脫目前態勢。東協將以逐步成長的適應來應付外在環境的急遽改變，不使既存的價值觀或態度遭受衝擊，但同時亦將透過管理互賴的學習，檢討目前作法或價值觀之適用性與適當性，使其凝聚力的以強化。

## 英文摘要

The changing security mechanisms of the Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN) can be theoretically analyzed on the basis of the “incremental growth model” and the “managed interdependence model” proposed by Ernst B. Haas. Under the multilateral frameworks and mechanisms, ASEAN is able to create norms universally accepted by its member states in order to facilitate the establishment and evolution of security institutions via *adaptation through incremental growth or learning to manage interdependence*.

This research finds out that it is both endogenous and exogenous factors that cause a slow change in ASEAN’s institution on security cooperation. Based on the foregoing theoretical research approach and interviews in some of the Southeast Asian countries, this research argues that the endogenous factors may be influential but

those alone such as the socially constructed consensual knowledge resulting from the socialization of ASEAN member states and increasingly enlarged “epistemic community” do not seem able to explain the birth of the ASEAN Security Community (ASC) effectively. One still has to look at exogenous factors resulting possibly in the idea of a security community in Southeast Asia. Through the careful examination of these exogenous factors, one can better understand ASEAN seeking autonomy and independence has adapted to changes in regional security in a deliberately progressive way. Moreover, ASEAN has learned from other regions’ experiences and tried to establish a security community by persisting in the definition and proclamation of national sovereignty and avoiding any challenge targeting ASEAN’s basic value, in order to create an ASC (called the ASEAN Political and Security Community after the signing of the ASEAN Charter) with Southeast Asian characteristics.

Having tested the validity of these assumptions, this research expects a very slow change in the institutional form and norms of ASEAN. On the one hand, ASEAN will use the “incremental growth” approach to deal with dramatic changes of its external environment and prevent its existing values from being affected; on the other hand, it will move through the “managed interdependence” approach to review the suitability of its policies and values in order to strengthen cohesion among member states.

## 報告內容

本研究計畫一開始在於探究當東協從一個沒有安全建制的區域組織逐漸轉化為積極推動安全共同體的實現時，這一連串的轉變過程受到內、外因素的交互影響為何。藉由 Ernst B. Haas (1990) 與 Oran R. Young (1999) 等國際知名學者的國際組織變遷理論與分析架構，本研究計畫希望能夠從事理論與實務的驗證。

本研究計畫在理論研究上作為國際關係理論研究與東南亞區域研究的橋樑，讓東南亞區域研究可以更理論化。在現存的國際關係理論中，對於國際組織變遷的解釋並不多見，亦即少有解釋國際組織為何改變結構或運作規則的理論或分析途徑。若欲將此理論或分析途徑加諸於東協之上，則更是少有。藉由 Haas 等人對於國際組織變遷的研究發現，一些在東南亞國際關係與國際組織研究中較少被論及的項目（例如東協安全制度在多邊主義影響下如何透過談判協商的過程進行變革，以及共享的知識在東協組織變遷中所扮演的角色等等）均被加以研究。

此外，本研究計畫在經驗研究上著眼於深入瞭解東協有史以來第一個安全機制的產生，以及其可能的運作之道。東協在 2003 年 10 月提出「東協安全共同體」之構想時，曾提出要利用東協既存的機構與功能來強化東南亞各國在維護區域安全上的實力，再強化東協作為東協區域論壇(ASEAN Regional Forum, ARF)的主要動力，同時將規範建立、衝突預防、衝突解決、衝突後建立和平(post-conflict peace building)等方式作為「東協安全共同體」的運作模式與規範。但在 2007 年 11 月東協簽署東協憲章後，「東協安全共同體」除了改稱「東協政治與安全共同體」(ASEAN Political and Security Community, APSC)之外，最明顯且明確的發展是將東協秘書長在處理區域衝突事件時的地位確認了，另外便是明文將所有無法解決的紛爭移至東協高峰會(ASEAN Summit)討論。

本研究原本欲探討究竟適合東協現存組織架構的作法有哪些？吾人應如何由「共識型的知識」為出發點來看待與分析「東協安全共同體」及其行動計畫？但在與東南亞學者交換意見後，深感以此為切入點或有不周之處，所以改採全面檢視內生與外來因素的方式，先求全再求深入。

一般而言，國際政府間組織制度演變的動力可依外來與內生兩大類型加以歸納。外來的動力多半是因該組織要去適應(adapt)區域或國際環境，或者要去塑造區域或國際環境，主要包括(一)國際體系結構、(二)國際霸權領導或更迭。內生的動力多半則是因該組織內部互動後的學習(learning)而來，其中可能包括(一)組織內部政治權力的合縱連橫、(二)規範與原則、(三)長期實踐或習慣、(四)共識型知識等等。

若從國際關係理論去解釋前述的演變，吾人可暫由下列理論得出初步的觀察變數。首先，結構理論(或稱結構現實主義)認為國際結構決定國際組織制度演變，所以國際組織制度的演變主要來自於外來的因素。第二，(新)功能主義強調專家或政治菁英透過有意識地的互動與合作以促成國際組織制度轉變。第三，認知理論(cognitive theory)則指出，在歷史的大架構下，高層政治行為者的意識形態、偏好、共識與累積而來的創意決定了國際組織制度的變化。第四，建構主義有點類似於前述的認知主義，認為政治行為者依照對情勢及其中的適當行為所建構的文化，因互為主體的習慣互動或因有目的之協商而調整國際組織之制度。最後，吾人仍要注意理性主義(或稱博奕理論)的看法，亦即國家的戰略決策主要依賴單方面的計算，獎勵與懲罰規則或制度的調整可以用來使國際組織產生制度上的變化，或者使國際組織的行為符合已獲致共識的規範。

東協在 40 年前成立之初，並未受到外界的看好，但隨著其組織制度不斷的演化與外交策略靈活的運用，東協已經成為東亞區域主要行為者之一了。東協制度調整可概分為以下四大時期：

一、1967-1976：組織最小化(由部長會議統籌一切)

- 二、1976-1992：制度架構逐漸深化與廣化
- 三、1992-2003：元首高峰會制度化、設立東協秘書長
- 四、2003 迄今：籌設東協共同體（經濟、政治安全、社會文化）

由此可見，東協制度化的力道愈來愈強，而在安全議題方面，一個凝聚共同意識的「價值同盟」也正在多數會員國的討論當中。目前東協政治安全共同體的進展雖然緩慢，各會員國的歧見仍然明顯，但徵諸十餘年前的東協，現在其實已經進步很多了。

東協近十餘年間在區域安全安排上會有如此的轉變，可由前述的外來與內生兩大方向加以剖析。外來的因素比較容易觀察，亦即冷戰後國際體系結構改變，蘇聯解體而美國軍事逐漸撤出東南亞，讓東協體會到在安全上自立自強的重要性；而且冷戰結束後，東南亞權力結構逐漸改變，美國霸權雖然仍以各種形式存在，但東南亞區域引入了日本、中共、印度等勢力（尤其在「九一一」事件後），最終導致了東協自身在安全安排上必須做出調整，以適應新的東南亞安全環境。

內生的因素則複雜許多。首先，東協組織內部政治權力的重分配，使得區域內較先進的國家依其國家利益提供安全上公共財，所以泰國、新加坡等積極提出東協安全的新思維與新作為，而印尼與馬來西亞也予以回應，甚至前者還取得在區域安全共同體議題的主導地位。

其次，「東協方式」（ASEAN Way），亦即東協的基本運作規範與原則，事實上已經為東協政治安全共同體或類似的架構奠下基礎。「東協方式」中的不干涉原則、尊重主權與領土完整原則、和平解決爭端原則等，以及東南亞友好合作條約（TAC）、東協憲章，均為從聯合國、歐洲安全與合作組織（OSCE）、歐洲聯盟（EU）或國際法慣例所學習而來的運作模式。

第三，東協已經過長期實踐或習慣，使前述運作模式得以經由內化學習的過程，配合東南亞區域特性，而「東協方式」之非正式協商、保全面子、「ASEAN-X」等符合東南亞政治特性的作為，再加上區域獨立自治與經濟整合等理念，使得成立政治安全共同體的主張不僅不突兀，而且還可以保障區域經濟整合的成果。

第四，東南亞地區關於安全共同體的「共識型知識」在領導人之間普遍存在著，而知識社群（如東協戰略與國際研究所 ASEAN-ISIS、亞太安全合作委員會 CSCAP）的影響也不可小覷。此類的知識透過區域學者專家的研究與分享，已成為二軌對話機制的主流意見，並影響相關資深官員會議的意向。此種學習的過程又與歐洲經驗的借鏡合流，但其影響力較難評估。或謂其普遍的影響力已頗為可觀，但亦有東南亞學者認為其影響力依各國政府對其重視的程度而有所不同。

最後，東協各會員國政府透過自利的計算，學習到區域國家相處的模式，

瞭解到可以透過東協減少行動成本並維護國家根本利益。

本研究發現，國際組織的變遷與演化可分為「適應」與「學習」兩種態樣；「適應」係指國際組織之行爲因外在環境而有所改變，但既存的價值觀或態度並未變動，而「學習」則涉及國際組織對既有價值觀或態度之檢討或者對其他類似組織之模仿而從事的行爲修正。

東協近年在制度演化時，與傳統主權相關的不干涉原則等政治口號對於制度發展沒有實質幫助，但在適應與學習層面上，其他諸如由國際法原則所衍生的共同規範與價值、共識型知識等動因，均可以解釋當前東協組織制度的演變。

## 參考文獻

李光耀，李光耀回憶錄（1965-2000）（台北：世界書局），民國 89 年。

李萬千，告別馬哈迪時代（吉隆坡：東方企業），2003 年。

林文程，「東協區域論壇與亞太多邊安全體系的建構」，戰略與國際研究，第一卷第三期（民國 88 年 7 月），頁 74-114。

陳佩修，「邁向『安全共同體』的建構？論東南亞國協『安全治理』的機會與限制」，全球政治評論，第七卷（民國 93 年 7 月），頁 67-84。

陳勁，「東協對內及對外安全機制的演變與策略」，國立中山大學社會科學季刊，第二卷第四期（民國 89 年），頁 241-265。

陳瑩，「試析東盟安全合作的現狀與前景」，暨南學報（人文科學與社會科學版），2004 年第 3 期，頁 46-51。

陳鴻瑜，「東南亞安全與預防外交」，戰略與國際研究，第三卷第一期（民國 90 年），頁 60-83。

崔權體，東南亞三巨人（台北：開今文化），民國 84 年。

鄭先武，「東盟“安全共同體”：從理論到實踐」，東南亞研究，2004 年第 1 期，頁 26-32。

Acharya, Amitav, 1991. “Association of Southeast Asian Nations: ‘Security Community’ or ‘Defence Community’?.” *Pacific Affairs*, Vol. 64, pp. 159-178.

Acharya, Amitav, 1997. “Ideas, Identity and Institution-Building: From the ‘ASEAN Way’ to the ‘Asia-Pacific Way’?.” *The Pacific Review*, Vol. 10, pp. 319-346.

- Acharya, Amitav, 2001. *Constructing a Security Community in Southeast Asia: ASEAN and the Problem of Regional Order*. New York: Routledge.
- Acharya, Amitav, 2004. "The Role of Regional Organizations: Are Views Changing?" Paper Prepared for the Pacific Symposium, 2004, National Defense University, Washington, DC, USA, April 22-23, 2004.
- Acharya, Amitav, 2004. "How Ideas Spread: Whose Norms Matter? Norm Localization and Institutional Change in Asian Regionalism," *International Organization*, Vol. 58, No. 2, pp. 239-275.
- Acharya, Amitav, 2005. "Do Norms and Identity Matter? Community and Power in Southeast Asia's Regional Order," *The Pacific Review*, Vol. 18, No. 1, pp. 95-118.
- Adler, Emmanuel and Michael Barnett, eds., 1998. *Security Communities*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Adler, Emmanuel and Beverly Crawford, eds., 1991. *Progress in Postwar International Relations*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Adler, Emmanuel and Peter M. Haas, 1992. "Knowledge, Power, and International Policy Coordination." *International Organization*, Vol. 46, pp. 367-390.
- Aggarwal, Vinod K., ed., 1998. *Institutional Designs for a Complex World: Bargaining, Linkages, and Nesting*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.
- Antolik, Michael, 1990. *ASEAN and the Diplomacy of Accommodation*. New York: M. E. Sharpe.
- Caballero-Anthony, Mely, 2002. "Partnership for Peace in Asia: ASEAN, the ARF, and the United Nations." *Contemporary Southeast Asia*, Vol. 24, pp. 528-549.
- Chalmers, Malcolm, 1996. "Openness and Security Policy in South-East Asia." *Survival*, Vol. 38, pp. 82-101.
- Cox, Robert, 1997. *The New Realism: Perspectives on Multilateralism and World Order*. New York: St. Martin's.
- Dam, Kenneth W., 1982. *The Rules of the Game*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Dessler, David, 1989. "What's at Stake in the Agent-Structure Debate." *International Organization*, Vol. 43, pp. 441-473.
- Deutsch, Karl, et. al., 1957. *Political Community and the North Atlantic Area*. Princeton, New Jersey, Princeton University Press.



- Djiwandono, J. Soediati, 1994. "Cooperative Security in the Asia-Pacific Region: An ASEAN Perspective." *Indonesian Quarterly*, Vol. 22, pp. 205-214.
- Emmers, Ralf, 2003. *Cooperative Security and the Balance of Power in ASEAN and the ARF*. London: Taylor and Francis.
- Emmerson, Donald K. 2005. "Will the Real ASEAN Please Stand up? Security, Community, and Democracy in Southeast Asia."  
[http://iis-db.stanford.edu/evnts/4130/Emmerson\\_04\\_05\\_2005.pdf](http://iis-db.stanford.edu/evnts/4130/Emmerson_04_05_2005.pdf).
- Evans, Paul M., 2001. "Cooperative security and its discontents in Asia Pacific: The ASEAN connection." *American Asian Review*, Vol. 19, pp. 99-119.
- Fook, Kwan Han, 1998. *Lee Kuan Yew, the Man and His Ideas*. Singapore: Times Edition.
- Fosdick, Anna, 1999. "Conflict Management Learning? Policy Reflections and Institutional Reforms." *Global Governance*, Vol. 5, pp. 425-456.
- Ferguson, R. James. 2004. "ASEAN Concord II: Policy Prospects for Participant Regional 'Development'." *Contemporary Southeast Asia*, Vol. 26, No. 3, 393-415.
- Ganesan, N., 1995. "Testing Neoliberal Institutionalism in Southeast Asia." *International Journal*, Vol. 50, pp. 779-804.
- Gehring, Thomas, 1992. *Dynamic International Regimes: Institutions for International Environmental Governance*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- Haacke, Jürgen, 2003. *ASEAN's Diplomatic and Security Culture: Origins, Development and Prospects*. London: RoutledgeCurzon.
- Haas, Ernst B., 1980. "Why Collaborate? Issue-Linkage and International Regimes." *World Politics*, Vol. 33, pp. 374-405.
- Haas, Ernst B., 1990. *When Knowledge is Power: Three Models of Change in International Organizations*. Berkeley and Los Angeles, California: University of California Press.
- Haas, Peter M., 1997. "Introduction: Epistemic Communities and International Policy Coordination." In Peter M. Haas, ed., *Knowledge, Power, and International Policy Coordination*, pp. 1-36. Columbia, South Carolina: University of South Carolina Press.
- Haftendorn, Helga, Robert O. Keohane, and Celeste A. Wallander, eds. 1999.

*Imperfect Unions: Security Institutions Over Time and Space.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Haggard, Stephan and Beth Simmons, 1987. "Theories of International Regimes." *International Organization*, Vol. 41, pp. 491-517.

Hannan, Michael T. and John Freeman, 1984. "Structural Inertia and Organizational Change," *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 49, p. 159-161.

Hasenclever, Andreas, Peter Mayer and Volker Rittberger, 1997. *Theories of International Regimes.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Hernandez, Carolina G., eds., 2003. *Conflict Prevention and Peace-building in Southeast Asia: Regional Mechanisms, Best Practices and ASEAN-UN Cooperation in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century.* Manila: Institute for Strategic and Development Studies.

Holsti, K. J., 1998. *The Problem of Change in International Relations Theory.* Working Paper No. 26 (Dec. 1998). Vancouver: Institute of International Relations, University of British Columbia.

Holsti, K. J., Joseph M. Grieco, et. al., eds., 2004. *Taming the Sovereigns: Institutional Change in International Politics.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Hourn, Kim and Din Merican, eds., 1998. *Peace and Cooperation in Southeast Asia: Alternative Paradigm.* London: ASEAN Academic Press.

Inis, Claude L., 1971. *Swords into Plowshares: The Problems and Progress of International Organization.* 4<sup>th</sup> Ed. New York: Random House.

Jacobson, Harold K., William Reisinger, and Todd Mathers, 1986. "National Entanglements in International Governmental Organizations." *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 80, pp.

141-159.

Jenkins, Craig, 1977. "Radical Transformation of Organizational Goals." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 22, pp. 568-586.

Jones, David Martin and Michael L. R. Smith, 2002. "ASEAN's Imitation Community." *Orbis*, Vol. 46, pp. 93-109.

Jones, Michael E. 2004. "Forging and ASEAN Identity: The Challenge to Construct a Shared Identity," *Contemporary Southeast Asia*, Vol. 26, No. 1, pp. 140-154.

Jönsson, Christer, 1986. "Interorganization Theory and International Organizations." *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 30, pp. 39-57.

- Keohane, Robert O., 1995. "Hobbes's Dilemma and Institutional Change in World Politics: Sovereignty in International Society." In Hans-Henrik Holm and Georg Sørensen, eds., *Whose World Order? Uneven Globalization and the End of the Cold War*. Boulder, Colorado: Westview.
- Keohane, Robert O. and Lisa Martin, 2003. "Institutional Theory as a Research Program." In Colin Elman, ed., *Progress in International Relations Theory: Appraising the Field*, pp. 71-108. Boston: MIT Press.
- Keohane, Robert O. and Joseph S. Nye, 1989. *Power and Interdependence*, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edn. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman.
- Krasner, Stephen D., ed., 1983. *International Regimes*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.
- Kratochwil, Friedrich and John G. Ruggie, 1986. "International Organizations: A State of Art on An Art of State." *International Organization*, Vol. 40, pp. 753-775.
- Kratochwil, Friedrich, 1994. *Rules, Norms, and Decisions: On the Conditions of Practical and Legal reasoning in International Relations and Domestic Affairs*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Katsumata, Hiro. 2004. "Why is ASEAN Diplomacy Changing: From 'Non-Interference' to 'Open and Frank Discussion'," *Asian Survey*, Vol. 44, No. 2, pp. 234-254.
- Leifer, Michael, 1995. "ASEAN as a Model of a Security Community?." In Hadi Soesastro, ed., *ASEAN in a Changed Regional and International Political Economy*, pp. 129-142. Jakarta: Centre for Strategic and International Studies.
- Leong, Stephen, ed., 1998. *ASEAN towards 2020: Strategic Goals and Future Directions*. London: ASEAN Academic Press.
- Levy, Jack S., 1994. "Learning and Foreign Policy: Sweeping a Conceptual Minefield." *International Organization*, Vol. 48, pp. 279-312.
- Luhulima, C. P. F., 2000. *Scope of ASEAN's Security Framework for the 21st Century*. Singapore: Institute of South East Asian Studies.
- MacDonald, Tim, 1992. *Multilateral Partnership for ASEAN Security*. Sydney: Research Institute for Asia and the Pacific, University of Sydney.
- Mahathir, Mohamad, 2002. *Globalisation and the New Realities: Selected Speeches of Dr. Mahathir Mohamad, Prime Minister of Malaysia*. Kuala Lumpur: Pelanduk Pubns Sdn Bhd.

- Martin, Lisa and Beth A. Simmons, 1998. "Theories and Empirical Studies of International Institutions." *International Organization*, Vol. 52, pp. 729-757.
- McSweeney, Bill. 1999. *Security, Identity, and Interests: A Sociology of International Relations*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Thailand. 1998. "Thailand's Non-Paper on the Flexible Engagement Approach," Press Release no. 743/2541, July 27.
- Nagara, Bunn and K.S. Balakrishnan, eds., 1994. *The Making of a Security Community in the Asia-Pacific: Proceedings of the Seventh Asia-Pacific Roundtable, Kuala Lumpur, June 6-9, 1993*. Kuala Lumpur: Institute of Strategic and International Studies.
- Narine, Shaun, 1998. "Institutional Theory and Southeast Asia: The Case of ASEAN." *World Affairs*, Vol. 161, pp. 33-47.
- Narine, Shaun. 2005. "State Sovereignty and Regional Institutionalism in the Asia Pacific." Working Paper No. 41, Institute of International Relations, University of British Columbia. Vancouver, Canada: University of British Columbia.
- Nguyen, Thi Hai Yen, 2002. "Beyond Good Offices? The Role of Regional Organizations in Conflict Resolution." *Journal of International Affairs*, Vol. 55, pp. 463-484.
- Nischalke, Tobias Ingo, 2000. "Insights from ASEAN's Foreign Policy Co-operation: The 'ASEAN way', a real spirit or phantom?," *Contemporary Southeast Asia*, Vol. 22, No. 1, pp. 89-112.
- Nystrom, Paul C. and William H. Starbuck, eds., 1981. *Handbook of Organizational Design*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Öjendal, Joakim. 2004. "Back to the Future: Regionalism in South-East Asia under Unilateral Pressure," *International Affairs*, Vol. 80, No. 3, pp. 519-533.
- Ostrom, Elinor, 1990. *Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Palmujoki, Eero, 2001. *Regionalism and Globalism in Southeast Asia*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Pasquale, Gagliardi, 1986. "The Creation and Change of Organizational Culture: A Conceptual Framework." *Organizational Studies*, Vol. 7, pp. 117-134.
- Paul, Erik, 1996. "The Future of ASEAN: A Geopolitical Perspective." In Dennis Rumley, et. al., eds., *Global Geopolitical Change and the Asia-Pacific: A*

- regional perspective*, pp.230-250. Aldershot, England: Avebury.
- Peters, B. Guy, 1999. *Institutional Theory in Political Science: The New Institutionalism*. London: Pinter.
- Reinisch, August, 2001. "Securing the Accountability of International Organizations." *Global Governance*, Vol. 7, pp. 131-150.
- Rosenau, James N., 1990. *Turbulence in World Politics*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Rosenau, James N., 1997. *Along the Domestic-Foreign Frontier: Exploring Governance in a Turbulent World*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Ruggie, John Gerard, 1993. *Multilateralism Matters: The Theory and Praxis of an Institutional Form*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Samad, Paridah Abdul and Mokhtar Muhammad, 1995. "ASEAN's Role and Development as a Security Community." *Indonesian Quarterly*, Vol.23, pp.67-75.
- San, Khoo How, 2000. "ASEAN as a 'Neighborhood Watch Group'." *Contemporary Southeast Asia*, Vol. 22, pp. 279-304.
- Sebastian, Leonard C. and Chong Ja Ian, 2003. "Towards an ASEAN Security Community at Bali." *IDSS Commentaries*, Institute of Defence and Strategic Studies, Nanyang Technological University.  
[http://www.ntu.edu.sg/idss/Perspective/research\\_050336.htm](http://www.ntu.edu.sg/idss/Perspective/research_050336.htm).
- Sebenius, James K., 1997. "Challenging Conventional Explanations of International Cooperation: Negotiation Analysis and the Case of Epistemic Communities." In Peter M. Haas ed., *Knowledge, Power, and International Policy Coordination*, pp. 323-366. Columbia, South Carolina: University of South Carolina Press.
- Severino, Rodolfo C., 2004. *Towards an ASEAN Security Community*, Trends in Southeast Asia: 8. Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies.
- Simon, Sheldon W., 1996. "The Parallel Tracks of Asian Multilateralism." In Richard J. Ellings and Sheldon W. Simon, eds., *Southeast Asian Security in the New Millennium*, pp. 13-33. Armonk, New York: M. E. Sharpe.
- Singh, Jasjit, 1997. "Managing Revolutions and Polycentrism." In Hadi Soesastro, ed., *One Southeast Asia: In a New Regional and International Setting*, pp. 50-56. Jakarta: Center for Strategic and International Studies.
- Soeharto, 1991. *My Thoughts, Words, and Deeds: An autobiography*. Jakarta: Citra Lamtoro

Gung Persada.

Soesastro, Hadi, and Rizal Sukma, 1999. *Institutionalisation and Decision-Making in ASEAN: Evolution and Interpretation*. Jakarta: Center for Strategic and International Studies.

Solingen, Etel, 1999. "ASEAN, Quo Vadis? Domestic Coalitions and Regional Co-Operation." *Contemporary Southeast Asia*, Vol. 21, pp. 30-52.

Stewart, Ian, 2004. *The Mahathir legacy: A nation divided, a region at risk*. Singapore: Talisman.

Sukma, Rizal, 2003. "The Future of ASEAN: Towards a Security Community." Paper presented at a Seminar on "ASEAN Cooperation: Challenges and Prospects in the Current International Situation." June 3, 2003, New York, USA.

Thayler, Carlyle A. 1999. "ASEAN: From Constructive Engagement to Flexible Intervention," *Harvard Asia Pacific Review*, Vol. 3, No. 2, pp. 67-70.

Thompson, James D., 1967. *Organizations in Action: Social science bases of administrative theory*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Wanadi, Jusufi, 2001. "ASEAN's Past and the Challenges Ahead: Aspects of Politics and Security." In Simon S. C. Tay, Jesus P Estanislao, and Hadi Soesastro, eds., *Reinventing ASEAN*. Singapore: Institute of South East Asian Studies.

Wendt, Alexander and Raymond Duvall, 1989. "Institutions and International Order." In Ernst-Otto Czempiel and James N. Rosenau, eds., *Global Changes and Theoretical Challenges: Approaches to World Politics for the 1990s*, pp. 51-73. Lexington, Massachusetts: Lexington Books.

Wesley, Michael, 2003. "Mediating the Global Order: the past and future of Asia-Pacific regional organizations." In David W. Lovell, ed., *Asia-Pacific Security: Policy Challenges*. Singapore: Institute of South East Asian Studies.

Wesley, Michael, 2003. *The Regional Organizations of the Asia Pacific: Exploring Institutional Change*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Widajanto, Wahjudi, 2003. "The Future of ASEAN after the Financial and Economic Crisis in the Region." *Shedden Papers 2003*, pp. 82-93.  
[http://www.defence.gov.au/adc/Publication/ASC/Shedden%20Papers%202003/Col\\_Widajanto.pdf](http://www.defence.gov.au/adc/Publication/ASC/Shedden%20Papers%202003/Col_Widajanto.pdf).

Wiseman, Geoffrey, 1992. "Common Security in the Asia-Pacific Region." *The*

*Pacific Review*, Vol. 5, pp. 42-59.

Wurfel, David, 1996. "The 'New World Order' in Southeast Asia: Some Analytical Explorations." In David Wurfel and Bruce Burton, eds., *Southeast Asia in the New World Order: The Political Economy of a Dynamic Region*, pp. 273-295. New York: St. Martin's.

Young, Oran R., 1991. "Political Leadership and Regime Formation: On the Development of Institutions in International Society." *International Organization*, Vol. 45, pp. 349-376.

Young, Oran R., 1999. *Governance in World Affairs*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.

## 計畫成果自評

本研究計畫較少有可參考之文獻，故須由其他相關文獻與訪談成果中找出蛛絲馬跡，再加以解釋、分析。原本計畫僅以東協內生因素所造成的逐步適應與互賴學習來研究東協安全共同體的制度變遷，但到後期發現如此將會忽略了東協區域外來因素所造成的東協自我適應。因此，計畫方向稍做調整，改以兩者並重的方式，希望先將大致的圖像拼湊出來。尤其在赴東南亞執行實地訪談之後，更是確定了需將外來因素納入研究內容的必要性。

本研究成果頗適合於學術期刊發表。預計將研究成果整理後，配合國家主權觀的分析角度，增補為關於東南亞政治安全共同體與主權變遷的中文文章一篇。此外，關於內生動因的部分，或可加強理論論述並以英文撰寫，再投稿至國際學術期刊。

若國內教學研究之負擔能夠減輕，主持人深感應赴東南亞之越南、泰國、馬來西亞做實地訪談，以求得主要國家對東協安全共同體之觀感分析。主持人雖於2007年8月中旬因另一案訪問馬來西亞，但仍有越、泰兩國無法完成。若在本計畫的第一年便核撥出國訪談經費，則更有利於本計畫之執行。

最後，本研究除了瞭解東協安全共同體制度變遷的內、外動因，也隱約感到在可預見的未來，已更名為東協政治安全共同體的類似機制可能沒有辦法得到實質的動力以達成質變，因為東南亞仍有部分國家對此共同體心存觀望，而且東協既有的運作規範與價值觀將是對於該共同體能否成功運作及發展的「雙刃劍」，在東協無法落實許多「安全社群」(Security Community)共有的制度的情況下，東協政治安全共同體的制度轉變將受到許多政治上的限制。

## 赴國外（東南亞）訪談心得

（應受訪者要求，本部分不列人名與單位）

### **Interviews One and Two in Singapore (June 2007):**

1. The post 9/11 development, the Bali Bombing and the initiative of the Indonesian government led to a new security agenda in ASEAN.

Generally speaking the idea of the ASEAN Economic Community is more welcome by ASEAN member states. Singapore favors an AEC, but Indonesia argues that the establishment of ASC helps and reassures the growth of AEC.

Some counteractions exist among ASEAN member states. For instance, Singapore does not want the peacekeeping operation forces within ASEAN, and Vietnam seems to hold the view that Indonesia is not the sole leader in the course of setting up a regional security community.

2. There is no consensual knowledge among ASEAN top leaders. The concept of ASC is used as a structure calling attention to new security issues, so it is not very coherent. Besides, the call for ASC is not for fundamental transformation of the security structure and framework in Southeast Asia.

3. The excitement of the “epistemic community” does not last very long. The major objective of ASEAN and its related “epistemic community” is to promote solidarity and cooperation.

4. Singapore thinks that there should be no refraining measures against states. The development of those major principles are nothing but to show people that ASEAN has “one voice.”

It might be dangerous to use “community” to shape the future mechanisms of ASEAN. Some old ASEAN diplomats keep thinking about those good old days.

The influence of state sovereignty still exists.

Democracy is not a vital value for ASEAN.

### **Interview Three in Singapore (June 2007):**

1. There are several reasons explaining the evolution of ASC – various security



emergencies in Southeast Asia, as well as the rise of China and India.

The development of the idea of ASC is a consequence of crisis mentality and an elite-oriented process.

2. There are sharp differences among Thailand, Malaysia, the Philippines..., but such a vague inclusiveness is actually normal in ASEAN. Even ASC will be adopted, the balance of power will be taken into account.

3. “Epistemic community” does have influence on the evolution of ASC. Its confluence helps ASEAN scholars and officials exchange ideas and understand one another better.

ASEAN is an institutional, self-help framework for crisis management. It is also seen as a last resort (in a more pessimistic viewpoint).

ASC is not fully fledged yet.

4. There are two major ways of humanitarian intervention in Southeast Asia: the Japanese ODA version (through economic assistance and education) and the Norwegian and Canadian version.

Nowadays there have been various forms of interventions in ASEAN.

### **Interviews One and Two in the Philippines (July 2007):**

1. The definition of ASC is derived from Karl Deutsch. ASEAN has become a security community where there is no longer war with each other. The 1992 ASEAN Free Trade Agreement also helps, but it does not seem to move too fast. Barry Buzan also argues for the security of states and of governments.

2. The ASEAN Community consists of economic, security, and social-cultural communities. According to Mahathir, it follows the model of the European Union.

ASEAN wants to be distinct in East Asia, or ASEAN might lose its value of being existent. By having the ASEAN Community, ASEAN will be able to avoid being influenced or dominated by China and Japan.

ASEAN has always been elite-dominated, not successfully in organizing and stimulating transnational ties. On this point some arguments of Ernst Haas can be critical.

3. “Epistemic community” is very small in ASEAN, basically within ASEAN-ISIS.

But it is influential when governments are going to make decisions. For the Philippines, ASCC is very important because lots of Filipinos are overseas, because the Philippines is less capable of competing with major ASEAN member states in leadership in economic and security communities, and because up to now AEC and ASC do not seem very likely.

4. After the 1971 ZOPFAN and the 1993 ARF, nothing concrete has happened in Southeast Asia. Thus in 2002 ASEAN Summit, national leaders agreed to give it another try. It is a learning process more than an adaptation one.

5. In general, the Philippines favors peacekeeping operations, but its devotion has not been very efficient due to poor training and equipments.

## 赴國外（東南亞）訪談心得

（應受訪者要求，本部分不列人名與單位）

### **Interviews One and Two in Singapore (June 2007):**

1. The post 9/11 development, the Bali Bombing and the initiative of the Indonesian government led to a new security agenda in ASEAN.

Generally speaking the idea of the ASEAN Economic Community is more welcome by ASEAN member states. Singapore favors an AEC, but Indonesia argues that the establishment of ASC helps and reassures the growth of AEC.

Some counteractions exist among ASEAN member states. For instance, Singapore does not want the peacekeeping operation forces within ASEAN, and Vietnam seems to hold the view that Indonesia is not the sole leader in the course of setting up a regional security community.

2. There is no consensual knowledge among ASEAN top leaders. The concept of ASC is used as a structure calling attention to new security issues, so it is not very coherent. Besides, the call for ASC is not for fundamental transformation of the security structure and framework in Southeast Asia.

3. The excitement of the “epistemic community” does not last very long. The major objective of ASEAN and its related “epistemic community” is to promote solidarity and cooperation.

4. Singapore thinks that there should be no refraining measures against states. The development of those major principles are nothing but to show people that ASEAN has “one voice.”

It might be dangerous to use “community” to shape the future mechanisms of ASEAN. Some old ASEAN diplomats keep thinking about those good old days.

The influence of state sovereignty still exists.

Democracy is not a vital value for ASEAN.

### **Interview Three in Singapore (June 2007):**

1. There are several reasons explaining the evolution of ASC – various security emergencies in Southeast Asia, as well as the rise of China and India.

The development of the idea of ASC is a consequence of crisis mentality and an elite-oriented process.

2. There are sharp differences among Thailand, Malaysia, the Philippines..., but such a vague inclusiveness is actually normal in ASEAN. Even ASC will be adopted, the balance of power will be taken into account.

3. “Epistemic community” does have influence on the evolution of ASC. Its confluence helps ASEAN scholars and officials exchange ideas and understand one another better.

ASEAN is an institutional, self-help framework for crisis management. It is also seen as a last resort (in a more pessimistic viewpoint).

ASC is not fully fledged yet.

4. There are two major ways of humanitarian intervention in Southeast Asia: the Japanese ODA version (through economic assistance and education) and the Norwegian and Canadian version.

Nowadays there have been various forms of interventions in ASEAN.

### **Interviews One and Two in the Philippines (July 2007):**

1. The definition of ASC is derived from Karl Deutsch. ASEAN has become a security community where there is no longer war with each other. The 1992 ASEAN Free Trade Agreement also helps, but it does not seem to move too fast. Barry Buzan also argues for the security of states and of governments.

2. The ASEAN Community consists of economic, security, and social-cultural communities. According to Mahathir, it follows the model of the European Union.

ASEAN wants to be distinct in East Asia, or ASEAN might lose its value of being existent. By having the ASEAN Community, ASEAN will be able to avoid being influenced or dominated by China and Japan.

ASEAN has always been elite-dominated, not successfully in organizing and stimulating transnational ties. On this point some arguments of Ernst Haas can be critical.

3. “Epistemic community” is very small in ASEAN, basically within ASEAN-ISIS. But it is influential when governments are going to make decisions. For the

Philippines, ASCC is very important because lots of Filipinos are overseas, because the Philippines is less capable of competing with major ASEAN member states in leadership in economic and security communities, and because up to now AEC and ASC do not seem very likely.

4. After the 1971 ZOPFAN and the 1993 ARF, nothing concrete has happened in Southeast Asia. Thus in 2002 ASEAN Summit, national leaders agreed to give it another try. It is a learning process more than an adaptation one.

5. In general, the Philippines favors peacekeeping operations, but its devotion has not been very efficient due to poor training and equipments.