THE EUROPEAN UNION IN INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

The European Union's Security Relations with Asian Partners

Edited by
Thomas Christiansen
Emil Kirchner
See Seng Tan

palgrave
macmillan

The European Union in International Affairs

This Book Series aims to be a central resource for the growing community of scholars and policy-makers who engage with the evolving interface between the EU and international affairs. It provides in-depth, cutting edge and original contributions of world-class research on the EU in international affairs by highlighting new developments, insights, challenges and opportunities. It encompasses analyses of the EU's international role, as mediated by its own Member States, in international institutions and in its strategic bilateral and regional partnerships. Books in the Series examine evolving EU internal policies that have external implications and the ways in which these are both driven by, and feed back into, international developments. Grounded in Political Science, International Relations, International Political Economy, Law, Sociology and History, the Series reflects a commitment to interdisciplinary scholarship. We welcome book proposals relating to the changing role of the EU in international affairs across policies and the Union's relations with different parts of the world, as well as relations with states and multilateral institutions. We are interested in research on values and norms, interests and global governance and welcome both theory-informed studies and studies comparing the EU with other major global actors. To submit a proposal, please contact Commissioning Editor Ambra Finotello ambra.finotello@palgrave.com.

This series is indexed by Scopus.

More information about this series at
http://www.palgrave.com/gp/series/14438

Thomas Christiansen
Emil Kirchner
See Seng Tan
Editors

The European Union's Security Relations with Asian Partners

palgrave
macmillan

Editors
Thomas Christiansen
Department of Political Science
Luiss University
Rome, Italy

Emil Kirchner
Department of Government
University of Essex
Colchester, UK

See Seng Tan
S. Rajaratnam School of
International Studies (RSIS)
Nanyang Technological University
Singapore, Singapore

ISSN 2662-5911 ISSN 2662-592X (electronic)
The European Union in International Affairs
ISBN 978-3-030-69965-9 ISBN 978-3-030-69966-6 (eBook)
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-69966-6

This Palgrave Macmillan imprint is published by the registered company Springer Nature Switzerland AG
The registered company address is: Gewerbestrasse 11, 6330 Cham, Switzerland

Thomas Christiansen: to Youngah
Emil Kirchner: to Axel Milan
See Seng Tan: to Trina and Elisabeth

Preface

This volume originates from our long-standing interest in the study of relations between Europe and Asia,[1] and more specifically in the relations between the European Union and its key partners in the region. It is a relationship that is often viewed in terms of economic issues—trade, investment and connectivity—and, while we agree that such issues remain central to understanding EU–Asia relations, our concern has been that the dominant focus on economic interactions might obscure academic attention to other important aspects, specifically the security issues in relations between the EU and Asia. In particular, in the context of a multipolar world characterised by the re-emergence of great power rivalry, we believe that a book providing a comprehensive coverage of EU–Asia *security* relations adds an important perspective to the academic literature and to the public debate.

When developing our ideas for an edited volume that would make this contribution, it was important to us to conceive of 'security' in a broad way, and in particular to address both traditional security issues (such as military security or non-proliferation) as well as non-traditional dimensions of security (such as human security or climate action). In our view,

[1] See, for example, T. Christiansen, E. Kirchner and P. Murray (Eds), *The Palgrave Handbook on EU-Asia Relations* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013) and T. Christiansen, E. Kirchner and U. Wissenbach, *The European Union and China* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2019).

such a wider understanding of security is essential in order to be able to capture the variety of ways in which the EU and its Asian partners relate to one another. In doing so, we also remain open-minded about the nature of any such relations, inviting authors to look for evidence of both convergence and divergence in security relations between the EU and its Asian partners.

In approaching the subject matter of the book in such a way, we were able to build on previous research projects that we had been involved in, and which were focused more narrowly on the European Union's security relations with China[2] and Japan,[3] respectively. Making use in this volume of the same conceptual approach that had been developed and applied in these earlier projects allowed us and our contributors to enlarge the analysis to a wider range of players in the Asia-Pacific region, including key partners such as South Korea, Australia and the Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN). In addition, we are glad that this more encompassing approach also allowed us to include a chapter on the important role played by the other major powers—the United States, Russia and India—with influence in the region.

We believe that in this way the present volume presents a comprehensive treatment of the subject matter and, beyond that, makes a valuable contribution to wider debates about the European Union's role in world politics.

While the focus of the book inevitably makes EU policy central to the analysis, avoiding a Eurocentric bias has been important to us. Beyond guidance to the authors that each chapter would need to provide a balanced account of threat perceptions and policy responses on both the European and the Asian side, this also included the systematic invitations to colleagues based in Europe and in the Asia-Pacific to co-author the various chapters. This has ensured not only that each contribution provides multiple perspectives on the subject matter, but also that the composition of the entire volume has been a genuinely global affair.

Bringing together—and facilitating the co-authorship of—almost 40 contributors from across four continents is no easy matter. In the context

[2] E. Kirchner, T. Christiansen and H. Dorussen (Eds), *Security Relations between China and the European Union: From Convergence to Cooperation?* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016).

[3] E. Kirchner and H. Dorussen (Eds), *EU-Japan Security Cooperation: Trends and Prospects* (London: Routledge, 2019).

of our project, this was made possible through the financial support from the European Union's ERASMUS+ programme[4] which we gratefully acknowledge. This funding facilitated the organisation of a series of conferences and workshops in Berlin, Singapore and Rome at which initial ideas were discussed, views and information exchanged, draft chapters presented and feedback provided. Our thanks go to the authors for their willingness to contribute, and their responsiveness to our guidance and the comments received on various occasions, as well as to the colleagues at the Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik in Berlin, at the S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS) at Nanyang Technological University in Singapore, and at the Istituto Affari Internazionale (IAI) and Luiss University in Rome who provided essential support in realising these meetings. In addition, individual draft chapters and the concept for the book as a whole were presented at various seminars and international conferences, including, for example at the 2019 Annual Conference of UACES in Lisbon, and we are grateful for valuable comments received on these occasions.[5]

The management of the wider project[6] which also involves other activities and publications has relied on the assistance of Aslak Busch (Maastricht University) and Lorenzo Mariani (IAI), and our sincere thanks are also due to them. The publication of this volume would not have been possible without the work of Susan Sydenham who managed the editorial process with great diligence, careful attention to detail and endless patience. Susan coordinated the communications between authors and editors, liaised with the publisher, proof-read, edited and formatted every chapter and—not the least burdensome task—reminded everyone (repeatedly) of the various deadlines that needed to be kept. Many thanks, Susan, for doing such an excellent job in making sure of both the quality and the timely delivery of the manuscript.

Finally, we also want to acknowledge the encouragement we received from Knud Erik Jørgensen, Sandra Lavenex, Philomena Murray and Sebastian Oberthür, the editors of the 'European Union in International

[4] Project Number 600612-EPP-1-2018-1-NL-EPPJMO-NETWORK.

[5] Special thanks in particular for their extensive feedback to Maxine David (Leiden University), Kwon Hae-Seog (Embassy of the Republic of Korea to Italy) and Michael Reiterer (former Ambassador of the European Union to the Republic of Korea).

[6] The 'EAST – EU-Asia Security and Trade' project; see http://east-jmn.eu for further details.

Affairs' series, who warmly accepted the publication of our volume in their series, and the support provided by Ambra Finotello and Balaji Varadharaju at Palgrave Macmillan which made the publication possible.

In sum, a great deal of thought and work has gone into the production of this volume, and it has been a large-scale team effort, much of which was carried out in the adverse context of the global pandemic (which also triggered the inclusion of an additional chapter on the security implications of public health and disease control). We are pleased to see the culmination of these efforts with the publication of this volume, and trust that our readers will consider it a valuable addition to the academic and public debate.

Rome, Italy — Thomas Christiansen
Colchester, UK — Emil Kirchner
Colorado Springs, US — See Seng Tan
October 2020

Contents

Notes on Contributors

Delphine Allès is Professor of Political Science and Director of the International Studies Department at the National Institute for Oriental Languages and Civilizations, Paris.

Elena Atanassova-Cornelis is a Senior Lecturer in International Relations of East Asia at the Department of Politics, University of Antwerp, The Netherlands.

Mark Beeson is Professor of International Politics at the University of Western Australia, Perth.

Sven Biscop is a Professor at Ghent University and Director of the Europe in the World programme at the Egmont—Royal Institute for International Relations in Brussels.

Hoo Tiang Boon is an Assistant Professor at the S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS), Nanyang Technological University in Singapore.

Raphael Bossong is an Associate at the German Institute for International and Security Affairs (Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik), Berlin.

Nicola Casarini is a Senior Research Fellow at the Institute of International Affairs (IAI) in Rome and a Fellow at the Wilson Center in Washington DC (academic year 2020–2021).

Thomas Christiansen is Professor of Political Science and European Integration at Luiss University, Rome. He is also Professor of European Institutional Politics (part-time) at Maastricht University.

George Christou is Professor of European Politics and Security at the University of Warwick, UK.

Alistair D. B. Cook is Coordinator of the Humanitarian Assistance and Disaster Relief Programme and a Senior Fellow at the Centre for Non-Traditional Security Studies (NTS Centre), S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS), Nanyang Technological University in Singapore.

Jean-Christophe Defraigne is a Professor in International Economics and European Economics at the Institute for European Studies of Université Saint-Louis Bruxelles and at the Louvain School of Management (UCLouvain).

Thomas Diez is Professor of Political Science and International Relations at the University of Tübingen, Germany.

Roberto Dominguez is Professor of International Relations at Suffolk University in Boston, Massachusetts.

Han Dorussen is Professor of Government at the University of Essex, UK.

Claire Dupont is Assistant Professor of European and International Governance, Ghent University, Netherlands.

Sebastian Harnisch is a Professor for International Relations at the Institute for Political Science, Ruprecht-Karls-University Heidelberg, Germany.

Felix Heiduk is an Asia Senior Associate at the German Institute for International and Security Affairs, Berlin (SWP).

Leslie Holmes is Professor of Political Science, University of Melbourne.

Nam-Kook Kim is a *Jean Monnet Chair* and a Professor in the Department of Political Science and International Relations at Korea University.

Emil Kirchner is a Jean Monnet Chair at the University of Essex, UK.

Harlan Koff is Professor of Social Sciences at the University of Luxembourg, GAMMA-UL Chair in Regional Integration and Sustainability at

INECOL, A.C. and Senior Research Associate in Politics and International Relations at the University of Johannesburg.

Margherita Matera is a Lecturer in the School of Social and Political Sciences at the University of Melbourne.

Prof. Philomena Murray is a Jean Monnet Chair *ad personam* in the School of Social and Political Sciences at the University of Melbourne.

Kaewkamol Karen Pitakdumrongkit is a Assistant Professor and Deputy Head of Centre for Multilateralism Studies; Deputy Coordinator of International Political Economy Programme, at the S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS), Nanyang Technological University in Singapore.

Michael Raska is Assistant Professor and Coordinator of the Military Transformations Programme at the S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS), Nanyang Technological University, Singapore.

Mason Richey is Professor of International Studies at the Hankuk University of Foreign Language Studies, Seoul, South Korea.

Stephen Roberts is a Lecturer in Global Health, UCL Institute for Global Health, University College London.

Martin Searle is an Associate Research Fellow at the S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS), Nanyang Technological University in Singapore.

Bhubhindar Singh is an Associate Professor at the S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS), Nanyang Technological University in Singapore.

Xinning Song is a Jean Monnet chair *ad personam* and Professor of Global Studies at Chinese University Hong Kong (Shenzhen).

Bjørnar Sverdrup-Thygeson is Senior Research Fellow at the Norwegian Institute of International Affairs, Oslo, Norway.

See Seng Tan is President and CEO of International Students Inc. (ISI), a faith-based organisation in the US, and concurrently Professor of International Relations at Nanyang Technological University in Singapore.

Michito Tsuruoka is an Associate Professor at Keio University, Japan.

Pascal Vennesson is a Senior Fellow and Head of Research of the Institute of Defence and Strategic Studies (IDSS) at the S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS), Nanyang Technological University, Singapore. He is also Professor of Political Science at the University Panthéon-Assas, Paris II (on leave).

Reuben Wong is a Jean Monnet Chair and Director of Studies at the College of Alice and Peter Tan, National University of Singapore.

Abbreviations

9/11	terrorist attacks in the US on 11 September 2001
AADMER	ASEAN Agreement on Disaster Management and Emergency Response
ACCT	ASEAN Convention on Counter-Terrorism
ACP	Africa Caribbean Pacific
ADMM	ASEAN Defence Ministers Meeting
ADMM-Plus	ASEAN Defence Ministers Meeting Plus (other dialogue partners)
AFP	Australian Federal Police
AHA Centre	ASEAN Coordinating Centre for Humanitarian Assistance and Disaster Management
AIDS	Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome
AIIB	Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank
AMMTC	ASEAN Ministerial Meeting on Transnational Crime
APEC	Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation
APSC	ASEAN Political-Security Community
ARF	ASEAN Regional Forum
ASEAN	Association of Southeast Asian Nations
ASEANAPOL	ASEAN Association of Chiefs of National Police
ASEM	Asia-Europe Meeting
ATHP	Agreement on Transboundary Haze Pollution
BRI	Belt and Road Initiative
BRIC(S)	Brazil, Russia, India, China (and South Africa)
CAP	Common Agricultural Policy
CBMs	Confidence Building Measures
CFSP	Common Foreign and Security Policy

COC	Code of Conduct
COP	Conference of the Parties
COVID-19	novel coronavirus disease 2019
CPC	Communist Party of China
CPTPP	Comprehensive and Progressive Agreement for Trans-Pacific Partnership
CSDP	Common Security and Defence Policy
CT	counterterrorism
CTBT	Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty
DG	Directorate-General (of the European Commission)
DG DEVCO	Directorate-General for International Cooperation and Development
DG ECHO	Directorate-General for Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid Operations
DG EXT	Directorate-General for External Relations
DG SANTE	Directorate-General for Health and Food Safety
DPRK	Democratic People's Republic of Korea (North Korea)
DSB	Dispute Settlement Body
EAS	East Asia Summit
EC	European Community
ECDC	European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control
ECHO	Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid
EEAS	European External Action Service
EEC	European Economic Community
EERC	European Emergency Response Capacity
EI2 or EII	European Intervention Initiative
EMA	European Medicines Agency
EP	European Parliament
EPA	Economic Partnership Agreement
ERCC	European Response Coordination Centre
ESS	European Security Strategy
ETA	Euskadi Ta Askatasuna (Basque Homeland and Freedom)
EU	European Union
EUGS	European Union Global Strategy
EUISS	European Union Institute for Security Studies
FTA	Free Trade Agreement
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GDPR	General Data Protection Regulation
GFDRR	Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery
GMOs	genetically modified organisms
HADR	humanitarian assistance and disaster relief
HIV	Human Immunodeficiency Virus

HR/VP	High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy and Vice-President of the Commission
IAEA	International Atomic Energy Agency
ICT	Information and Communications Technology
IMF	International Monetary Fund
IPR	Intellectual Property Rights
IRA	Irish Republican Army
ISIS	Islamic State of Iraq and Syria
JCPOA	Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action ('the Iran nuclear deal')
JCROK	Japan, China and Republic of Korea
KEDO	Korean Peninsula Energy Development Organization
KISA	Korean Internet Security Agency
MENA	Middle East and North Africa
Mercosur	Mercado del Sur (Southern Common Market)
MOU	memorandum of understanding
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
NPT	Treaty on the Non-proliferation of Nuclear Weapons
NSS	Nuclear Security Summit
OC/OCG	organised crime (group)
ODA	Official Development Assistance
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
OEI	Our Eyes Initiative
OEWG	Open-Ended Working Group
PD	preventive diplomacy
PESCO	Permanent Structured Cooperation on Security and Defence
PPE	personal protective equipment
PRC	People's Republic of China
RBIO	rules-based international order
RCEP	Regional Comprehensive Economic Partnership
RO	Regional Organisation
ROC	Republic of China (commonly known as Taiwan)
ROK	Republic of Korea (South Korea)
SAARC	South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation
SARS	Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome
SCO	Shanghai Cooperation Organisation
SDF	Self-Defence Forces
SDGs	(UN) Sustainable Development Goals
SEA	Southeast Asia
SLOC	sea lines of communication
SPA	Strategic Partnership Agreement
THB	trafficking in human beings
TPP	Trans-Pacific Partnership

TPP-11	Comprehensive and Progressive Agreement for Trans-Pacific Partnership
TRIMs	trade-related investment measures
TTIP	Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership
UN	United Nations
UNCLOS	United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
UNGGE	United Nations Group of Governmental Experts on Information Security
UNISDR	UN Office for Disaster Risk Reduction
UNOC-T	United Nations Office of Counter-Terrorism
UNSC	UN Security Council
USSR	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
WHA	World Health Assembly
WHO	World Health Organization
WMD	weapons of mass destruction
WTO	World Trade Organization

List of Figures

List of Tables

PART I

The Background to EU–Asia Security Relations

CHAPTER 1

The European Union's Security Relations with Asian Partners

Emil Kirchner, Thomas Christiansen, and See Seng Tan

Introduction

Asia is one of the fastest economic growth regions globally. It is also vitally important for Europe: as the EU's most significant trade partner region, Asia is critical not only for the prosperity of the European continent, but also for the secure flow of goods and services. Official declarations from EU institutions on Asia have repeatedly stated that the EU's essential interests are closely tied up with developments in Asia and with the

E. Kirchner (✉)
University of Essex, Colchester, UK
e-mail: emil@essex.ac.uk

T. Christiansen
Luiss University, Rome, Italy
e-mail: tchristiansen@luiss.it

S. S. Tan
RSIS, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore, Singapore
e-mail: issstan@ntu.edu.sg

T. Christiansen et al. (eds.), *The European Union's Security Relations with Asian Partners*, The European Union in International Affairs,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-69966-6_1

foreign and security policies of the region's main players (see, for example, Council of the European Union 2012; European Union 2016). The notion of the two regions' mutual interests is also reflected in a myriad of EU–Asia institutional channels that facilitate regular interactions between the EU and its Asian counterparts. Through these shared interests and frequent interactions, EU and Asian actors have advanced joint actions in a range of security areas such as non-proliferation, energy security or climate change. In Brussels, there is no doubt that Asia matters for European security.

However, actions based on this recognition remain largely piecemeal in nature and conceal the fact that EU security policy on Asia has been generally reactive rather than proactive in nature, is often short-term in its implications, and lacks a clear progression. There is also a perception among scholars and defence analysts that the EU is at best a minor player in Asia-Pacific security and not generally regarded in the region as a security actor in the traditional sense, unlike the US and China (Wong and Tay 2014).

Reasons for the absence of a clear EU strategy for Asia or strong security presence in Asia are manifold and have both internal and external reasons. Lacking essential military capabilities and projecting normative or civilian power tools impedes EU prospects for dealing with potential conflicts in the Taiwan Straits, the simmering conflict between India and Pakistan, or Chinese assertiveness in the East and South China Sea (where China is staking claim to roughly 80% of the territory), or for that matter for upholding the freedom of navigation in that region. These deficiencies make the EU largely subservient to or supportive of US leadership in Asian security matters. They also correspond to the neutral status the EU has adopted with regard to territorial maritime disputes in the East and South China Sea, such as those involving the Senkaku/Diaoyu Islands.[1]

A second reason is the fact that the EU is basically a regional organisation and, as such, primarily concerned with preserving stability in its geographic region. Subsequently, conflicts in Asia often take secondary importance to conflicts that directly threaten Europe's interests—like those in the Middle East and North Africa, the Balkans, the Caucasus

[1] This text makes reference to the Senkaku Islands, reflecting the official position of the Japanese government. When referring to the EU's policy of principled neutrality, reference is made to the Senkaku Islands in Japanese and Diaoyu Islands in Chinese. This will apply to all book chapters.

or areas where Europe feels a moral or historical responsibility to show the flag, like in sub-Saharan Africa (Wissenbach 2014, 141). Substantial resources and energy are hence devoted to EU enlargement and neighbourhood policies rather than to policy strategies in Asia. A third reason relates to the inability of the EU to free itself sufficiently from internal problems—such as those caused by the Euro crisis, the refugee crisis and the growth of populism—which affect the cohesion and effectiveness of its external action, including those towards Asia. For some observers, the internal problems are signs of an ongoing process of fragmentation, which also affects the so-called West generally, as evidenced in trans-Atlantic tensions and the erosion of the liberal order of international governance (Lind and Wohlforth 2019).

On the other hand, the prospect of Brexit and President Donald Trump's disengagement from multilateralism have triggered European interest and willingness to step up European defence cooperation outside of NATO, notably through Permanent Structured Cooperation on Security and Defence (PESCO), the setting up of the European Defence Agency and the European Intervention Initiative. These steps, in addition to promoting greater security in the EU's neighbourhood, might also allow the EU to become a more important security actor in Asia at a time when many Asian countries are increasingly wary of rising Chinese assertiveness and a potential US withdrawal or contestation in the region.

In addition to such improvements in the EU's security and defence capabilities, what is also required to boost the EU's influence as a security actor in Asia is the development of its external actorness. It is the latter aspect that will be explored in this chapter, starting with an assessment of how existing actions or guidelines of EU security policy towards Asia could be strengthened. This involves a review of the major security activities or engagements that the EU has established with Asian counterparts so far.

This volume is divided into parts, with the first being devoted to the background of EU–Asia security relations. Part II is theme-oriented and pursues a systematic analysis of eleven security dimensions. Part III examines the EU's bilateral security relations with four Asian countries and ASEAN as well as a chapter examining the role of third countries—the US, Russia and India—on the security relations between the EU and its partners in the Asia-Pacific. While exploring similar themes to those of Part II, a less rigorous analysis of the eleven different security dimensions will be applied there. Finally, Part IV includes the conclusion to

the volume, bringing together the findings from the various chapters and providing a future outlook on EU–Asia security relations.

In the following, the chapter will first conceptualise the meaning of Asia and its relations with Europe, before proceeding with a historical review of EU–Asia security relations. Having then developed a framework of analysis for security relations between the EU and its Asian partners, the chapter concludes with an overview of the manner in which the various contributions to this volume address the issues raised here.

Conceptualising EU–Asia Relations

Before approaching the systematic study of relations between Europe and Asia, the nature of each side as an actor in the international arena must be briefly considered. With respect to the EU, it must be recognised right away that the Union is of a hybrid nature, having actorness both at the level of the region and of the nation-state. In particular, in the area of foreign, security and defence policy, in which EU decision-making is still dominated by intergovernmental dynamics, the role of states is arguably more important than that of the EU institutions.

Against this background, the choice to focus in this analysis on EU–Asia security relations, rather than on the security relations of the EU's member states with Asia, or else on what is sometimes loosely referred to as 'Asia–European' security relations, may require some explanation. First of all, this volume is intended as a contribution to the literature on the EU's external relations and in particular on its evolving role as a security actor. From modest beginnings, the EU has developed a wide-ranging security policy (in particular with the Lisbon Treaty), and how this shapes up in relations with Asia is of considerable scholarly interest and political relevance.

The book does recognise that, undoubtedly, individual EU member states—and in particular Germany and France—have a longer and more involved security engagement with Asia than the EU as a whole does. In the case of France, this greater involvement is the result of a combination of factors such as its status as a nuclear power and permanent member of the United Nations Security Council, and its defence cooperation agreements with some Asian states, including the development of military equipment, as is the case with Japan (Ueta 2013, 2). Equally, Germany has a long tradition of economic and political ties with China and Japan and has shared interests on the basis of their strongly export-oriented

economies. However, while such bilateral security relations provide interesting and indeed important insights, the analysis of bilateral security relations would not constitute a full account of what security relations between Asia and the European Union as an institution entail in scope or degree.

Most importantly, focusing on individual member states rather than on the European Union and its common institutions and policies would downplay—and risks neglecting—the host of instances where the EU has demonstrated that it does indeed constitute a security actor in its own right when dealing with Asia. Examples are the anti-piracy operation in the Gulf of Aden, the climate change negotiations and counter-terrorism measures. However, this is not to deny the existence of a hybrid nature or coexistence of European and national foreign policies. Consequently, the choice in this book has been to focus predominantly on the European level as the main level of analysis while incorporating, where appropriate, the role of member states when examining the specific security dimensions which have been chosen for the analysis of EU–Asia security relations. In line with this choice, the following section turns to the theoretical and conceptual orientation of EU–Asia political and security relations.

There are at least two noteworthy concerns with respect to any reflection on the EU's security relations with Asia. The first is the very idea of Asia, which itself is fraught with ambiguity, complexity and contestation (Wang 2010). As a former top diplomat from the region once mused, "Asia is a political and not just a geographic concept; it is politics that defines geography" (Kausikan 2014). While there is no question that European colonialism has contributed significantly to shaping the idea of Asia,[2] others have argued the importance of premodern Euro–Asia relations. For example, according to Andre Gunder Frank, both regions were already profoundly entwined by the thirteenth or fourteenth century (Frank 1998).[3] For present purposes, Asia's complexity is also apparent in its myriad regionalisms, which alternately complement and compete with one another (Buzan and Zhang 2014; He 2017). It is also seen in the region's relatively under-institutionalised character; tracing

[2] Indeed, one does not have to fully subscribe to the logics of Orientalism to appreciate the notion that Asia was perceived and treated by Europe as its 'Other' (Nozaki 2009).

[3] Frank's claim is contested by others, less over its observation about the existence of premodern intraregional ties than over its allegedly flawed challenge against the primacy and relevance of modern Eurocentric interpretations of Asia (Arrighi 1999; Graham 2000).

the patterns of existing and emerging cultural, economic and political exchanges that define contemporary Asia, an interdisciplinary team of prominent scholars described Asia as weakly bounded, network-oriented, pluralistic and multitemporal (Duara 2013).

Nowhere is this more apparent than in Asia's 'noodle bowl' of multilateral security arrangements—such as the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF), the East Asia Summit (EAS) and the ASEAN Defence Ministers' Meeting Plus (ADMM-Plus), all of which are predicated upon the putative 'centrality' of ASEAN in the region's architecture (Tan 2017) and whose different yet overlapping memberships and potentially competing remits exemplify the ambiguity and complexity of the region and its brand of regionalism. Moreover, Asian regionalism remains highly susceptible to pressures exerted upon it by its non-ASEAN participants, whose strategic rivalries with one another threaten to hinder regional cooperation or, in the worst case, tear the region asunder (He 2019; Tan 2015, 2018a).[4] All of this stands in contrast, at risk of oversimplification, to the institutional singularity of Europe as embodied in the EU. As reflected by the chapters in this volume, there is no single 'Asia'—for that matter, 'Southeast Asia'—with which the EU engages but multiple actors and agencies at both national and regional levels at any given point.

Second, Asia's ambiguity and complexity does not mean the region has thereby been passive and lacking in political agency. Consider, for instance, the position taken collectively by the Asians at the World Conference on Human Rights held in Vienna in June 1993—a negotiated outcome of the Asian Group preparatory meeting held in Bangkok two months earlier—which contended that human rights, though universal in nature, need however to be considered in the context of an evolving normative milieu and different historical, cultural, religious and political backgrounds (Bauer 1996). If politics shapes regional idea and identity, then the normative ambivalence of the Asians at the Vienna Conference—a crucial pillar of the EU's human rights framework—was significant in terms of shaping the course of Europe–Asia intraregional ties at least

[4] Of the great powers, China, India, Japan and the US have been and remain the most active in Asia today (Goh 2013). Russia has also begun to turn towards Asia, but the hurdle to substantiating its economic turn remains the persistent political perception among many Russian elites that all good things for Russia stemmed from the West, and that it is with the West that Russia therefore ought to continue to engage (Karaganov 2016). For a dissenting view on this perception see (Diesen 2018).