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Asia-Europe relations have long been overshadowed by the predominance of the United States in the Asian region. The New Asia Strategy and the “Global Europe” strategy of the EU, which are adopted in 1994 and 2006 respectively, however, have changed the posture of the EU towards East Asia. The EU, which was extremely cautious in concluding a full-fledged FTA with non-European countries, has since then been negotiating a number of FTAs with Asian countries. This opens up a series of new opportunities for East Asia to enhance its relationship with the EU. The paper recommends the East Asian countries to pursue a two-track approach in order to fully materialize the potential for strengthening the bilateral relationship.
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아시아와 유럽의 관계는 오랫동안 아시아 지역 내 미국의 주도권으로 인해 제대로 발전할 기회를 갖지 못했다. 그러나 유럽연합(EU)이 1994년과 2006년에 각각 제정한 대아시아전략과 글로벌 유럽 전략은 이제까지의 두 지역 관계에 커다란 변화를 가져왔다. 그동안 역외국과의 자유무역협정 체결에 매우 신중했던 유럽연합은 공동통상정책을 배경으로 회원국을 대신하여 아시아의 여러 나라들과 FTA 협정 체결을 위한 협상을 동시에 진행할 정도로 아시아에 대한 접근을 강화하고 있다. 이에 따라 경제·무역을 비롯해서 양자관계가 증진될 수 있는 기회와 가능성이 크게 확대되었다. 본 논문은 이러한 상황에서 급속하게 변화하고 있는 여건을 최대한 활용하기 위해서는 동아시아 국가들이 유럽의 개별 국가들을 대상으로 하는 접근과 함께 유럽연합을 한 단위로 접근하는 양면전략을 적극적으로 추구할 필요가 있다는 점을 강조하고 있다.
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I. Introduction

The Asia-Europe relationship has undergone a series of ups and downs over the past several centuries since Marco Polo discovered Asia late 13th century. More recent bilateral relationship had been influenced by both the dominance of the United States as a hegemonial power and Asia’s strong orientation to the United States as the primary destination of its export products.1) Since the beginning of 1990s, however, there have been a number of positive developments. The European Union has become more proactive in approaching Asia as a potential partner for discussing global issues, and published a series of concept papers on its strategic approaches to Korea (1993), Asia (1994) and China and Japan (1995), as well as ASEAN (1996). Asia also has responded more progressively to this new initiative of the EU during the 1990s. The 1994 New Asia Strategy paper of the EU, indeed, has marked a meaningful turning point in EU’s strategic partnership with Asian countries, culminating to the launch of Asia-Europe Meeting (ASEM) in 1996.

The “Global Europe” strategy of 2006, which is regarded as a new commercial policy concept of the EU, has been the vehicle of EU’s most recent external trade policy. Together with newly adopted trade policy instruments, the Global Europe strategy has been put to the centre of EU’s renewed interests in global market opening, and more specifically in the Asian region. With the free trade agreement (FTA) being the key instrument, the EU has been attempting to open the markets of Asian countries with stronger vigor than shown in the past. This new EU initiative may be attributed to the fact that Asia since mid-1990s has been regarded as the most dynamic economic region with the potential of becoming the engine of world economic growth, as manifested in the recent publication of the ADB (2011).

This article is an attempt to scrutinize the new developments in EU’s common commercial policy (CCP), and draw some meaningful implications for

1) For details, see Park (2004).
II. New Developments in EU’s Common Commercial Policy

1. Evolving Characteristics of the EU’s Common Policies

Today, the EU is considered to be the most advanced economic integration that moves further into a stage of full economic union with common policies covering a comprehensive range of socio-economic areas. True, such integration did not yet bring about a Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) and a Common Justice and Home Affairs (CJHA) stipulated in the Maastricht Treaty that introduced the name “EU” with its entry into force in 1993. These two policies were built on firm political agreement among the member states, but still languish at the level of simple “cooperation” or “concertation”.

Meanwhile, the EU made it clear from the beginning that “economic integration” is basically different from “economic cooperation”. The key to such distinction lies in lifting “market distortions” as much as possible beyond simply granting national treatment and most favored nation treatment between the member countries. The reasoning behind rectifying market distortions stems from the assumption that a common market - one large, single market - as targeted by the EU, requires member countries to create the same conditions for competition in the intra-EU market. Market distortions reflect differences in institutions or policies between member countries. Consequently, the introduction of “common policy” at the level of the EU is considered inevitable in order to
correct possible market distortions.

Concerning the adoption of common policies at the EU level, the following two issues deserve some attention. First, the allocation of competences between the EU and its member countries in economic policies changes with time. Depending on their characteristics, both national policies and the pattern of policy cooperation between the EU and its member states are subject to change, which makes the EU a “moving target”. Second, even under the title of a “common policy” the degree of EU’s competence and its role varies by sector. For instance, agriculture, trade, and monetary policies are the three main fields, over which the EU exercises an exclusive competence representing member states. As far as those three sectors are concerned, economic sovereignty of member countries has been fully transferred to the EU. In other socio-economic fields, the member states still retain their responsibilities when conducting policies, and are supposed to cooperate not only with other member countries but also with the EU as a whole. In terms of EU’s competence, trade, agricultural and monetary sectors are considered to be the most advanced for pursuing common policy, whereas diplomacy and security are the fields where policies are least integrated. Thus, the more integration is advanced and the competence of the EU enlarges, the less autonomy member states can exercise in national policies. Such zero-sum relations between the EU and its member states remain a constant source of potential conflict. Considering this, J. Delors, the former President of the European Commission, once argued that more than 80% of economic policies conducted by the individual member states would fall into the realm of EU’s common policy.2) The actual state of economic integration of the EU can therefore be described as “partial economic federation”.

2. New Features of EU’s Common Commercial Policy

Among EU’s common policies, the common commercial policy exercises

2) Jacques Delors(1988), Debates of the European Parliament (6 July).
direct influences on economic relations between Asia and Europe. The EU itself is the product of regionalism, and does implement a common commercial policy towards third countries. In other words, the EU has, as stated before, an exclusive competence in establishing and carrying out common commercial policy, representing its member states.

Traditionally, the EU has applied differentiated trade policies to different trade partners, which stemmed mainly from the necessity for the EU member states to transform relations with their former colonies into a trade partnership after the latter have attained independence. The EU member states wanted to maintain preferential relations with the newly independent countries, and at the same time needed to comply with GATT/WTO requirements. Such complicated preferential trade agreements have made the EU a target of frequent criticism by the international trading community. To be more specific, the EU, for example, has long maintained an FTA policy containing “aid-cum-trade” with the ACP (African, Caribbean and Pacific) states. Additionally, with the neighboring regions including the Mediterranean region and the Middle East, the EU has concluded or extended many non-reciprocal trade agreements, such as free trade areas and customs unions. Such preferential trade agreements of the EU with developing countries resulted in a complicated multilevel (pyramidal) structure.

On the other hand, trade relations of the EU with developed countries, including the United States and Japan, have been based strictly on the principle of non-discrimination in compliance with WTO rules. Since the Kennedy Round, the 6th multilateral trade negotiation under GATT, the EU has been playing a leading role in multilateral negotiations along with the United States. This is attributable to the fact that the EU is one of the largest trade markets in the world and has the European Commission as a single representing body.

Since the beginning of 1990s, although FTAs spread exponentially around the globe, the EU adhered to multilateralism right up to the creation of the WTO.

---

3) Cf. Kim(2007b).
From the perspective of the EU, FTAs were much too burdensome, given its entanglement in a tense network of preferential arrangements committed already with its traditional trading partners in ACP and Mediterranean region. It was not before the mid 2000s when the EU would turn its strategy around, and started a more proactive FTA policy. As noted before, the “Global Europe” strategy adopted by the EU in 2006 and the corresponding change in external trade policies that culminated to the adoption of “new commercial policy” in the same year have been instrumental in this policy shift. The new commercial policy of the EU indeed has paid increasing attention to growth and jobs, and therefore focused on aggressive opening of third-country markets. At the same time, this new policy was also used as an instrument to address many structural problems facing the EU economies, mainly aiming at building a competitive environment so as to improve the international competitiveness of European industries. The recent policy initiatives of the EU to reform its GSP (generalized system of preferences) scheme and to change the status of ACP countries as partners of a non-preferential FTA also can be regarded as being in the same policy line. In fact, the main characteristics and purposes of EU’s trade agreements with third-countries have been changing over time.

III. EU’s Global Europe Strategy and East Asia

1. New Asia Strategy of the European Union

The New Asia Strategy (NAS), which was adopted in 1994 and upgraded in

4) See Lamy (2002).
5) European Commission (2010c).
6) This was reconfirmed through the author’s interview with Karel De Gucht, EU’s Trade Commissioner, which was organized by the Maeil Business Newspaper at the occasion of World Knowledge Forum on Oct. 12, 2011.
7) This part draws strongly on Park (2004).
2001, was the first-ever grand strategy of the EU in its approach towards Asia. The NAS was developed in the midst of both deepening of European integration and prolonged UR negotiations. In some sense, the EU – with the NAS – had been preparing for the governance of the global political and economic order after these two major events. The then observed increasing

Table 1. Main Contents of NAS and Country Strategy Papers adopted by the EU during 1993–1996

| Date of Issue | Country/Region | Main Contents |
|--------------|----------------|---------------|
| August 1993  | Korea 1)       | - Welcomes the democratisation and market opening  
- Expects to promote bilateral economic relations that are not matching the economic powers of the two regions  
- Wants to establish equal partnership |
| July 1994    | Asia 2)        | - Wants to participate in the market expansion in Asia that has the potential to become the growth-centre of the world economy  
- Specifies differentiated strategy towards three sub-groups (East, southeast and South Asia) in the region  
- Wants to promote the presence of EU firms and products |
| March 1995   | Japan 3)       | - Wants to maintain and strengthen the existing economic and political dialogue channels  
- Making efforts to dismantle barriers to market access  
- Continuing the Trade Assessment Mechanism and Cooperating in Respecting the WTO Rules |
| July 1995    | China 4)       | - Strengthening the support for China in transition  
- Supporting the Chinese accession to the WTO  
- Promoting EU firms market and investment access to China |
| June 1996    | ASEAN 5)       | - Taking part in the dynamism of ASEAN economies  
- Enhancing the direct investment into ASEAN countries  
- Upgrading the bilateral relationship |

Sources: 1) European Commission(1993).  
2) European Commission(1994).  
3) European Commission(1995a).  
4) European Commission(1995b).  
5) European Commission(1996).
strategic value of East Asia provided a timely and welcome additional impetus to intensified EU approach towards East Asia. Table 1 provides an overview of EU’s NAS and other individual country strategy papers and their main contents.

The original NAS strategy identifies the Asian region as a group of most dynamic countries that have the potential to lead the 21st century world economic growth and development, which was recently reiterated by the ADB (2011). Categorizing the Asian countries into three subgroups – Northeast Asia, Southeast Asia and South Asia – the EU elaborated on ways and modalities to promote the presence, profile and influence of Europe in Asia. 8) The NAS strategy focused especially on the East Asian sub-group – comprising of Southeast and Northeast Asia – as major cooperation partners for the EU. In this regard, it is noteworthy that prior to and after the adoption of the NAS the European Union had adopted several strategy papers for relations with individual East Asian countries, as shown in [Table 1].

In this context, the timing of the series of EU’s strategy papers towards the new relationship with Asia deserves some attention. Until the beginning of the 1990s, the EU did not have sufficient energy and resources to design and implement a new-generation external economic strategy due to their strong involvement in internal integration and external trade policy programs. Internally, the EU finally completed the 1992 Program to officially launch Single European Market, allowing goods, services and various factors of production to move freely within the EU territory. And externally, the EU had been in clinch with the US to complete the UR negotiations under the auspices of GATT, which took place during the period 1986-1993. With these programs completed in the beginning of the 1990s, the EU started taking a proactive stance in its external economic relations, leading eventually to a stronger-than-ever focus on the Asian region.

In reality, East Asia had been attracting growing interest from the

---

8) The follow-up NAS concept paper of the EU, which was adopted in 2001, includes Australasia (Australia and New Zealand) as an additional sub-region of East Asia. See European Commission (2001).
international community, especially since the mid 1980s. Around that time, four East Asian countries – Korea, Singapore, Taiwan and Hong Kong – had emerged as Newly Industrialized Countries (NICs), which earned them the title of Asian Tigers (Dragons). In addition, many Southeast Asian countries began liberalizing their trade and investment regime, which led to increasing influx of FDI into the region, contributing to a dynamic economic growth process. Furthermore, the region also experienced major policy changes in the economy that possesses the biggest population – China. The open-door policy and economic reform in China, also contributed to enhancing the overall strategic value of the whole region.

In summary, the East Asian region had been regarded as “miracle economies”, as the World Bank noted in its study of growth potential of the East Asian countries. ⁹ All these developments have prompted major trading nations to take a more proactive approach in their bilateral and inter-regional relations with East Asia as a whole, on the one hand, and individual countries in the region, on the other. The adoption of the NAS by the EU was one example of this new development in the 1990s. It is also noteworthy that the EU in its NAS strategy paper acknowledges the unique and predominant role of the US in the field of regional security in East Asia. Thus, the EU’s new approach towards East Asia can be interpreted as a balanced pursuit of strengthened political and economic cooperation with this region. ¹⁰

2. EU’s Global Europe Strategy

The EU has upgraded its Asia Strategy by revising its strategic concepts that are stipulated in the new version of NAS published in 2001. ¹¹ Seeking for

⁹) World Bank(1993).
¹⁰) European Commission(2001), for example, identifies “… strengthening the EU’s political and economic presence across the region, and raising this to a level commensurate with the growing global weight of an enlarged EU” as core objectives in its relationship with Asia.
¹¹) European Commission(2001).
more aggressive market opening in Asia and elsewhere, the EU adopted the Global Europe Strategy in 2006. European Commission (2006) regards economic growth and job creation, as well as the opportunities offered by these recent changes in international economic circumstances as most important motivation for the EU to launch this Global Europe initiative. With the expectation that this will contribute to the “economic prosperity, social justice and sustainable development,” the European Commission adopted this strategy to address the “need to ensure open markets around the world.” In fact, the latter is considered as the external policy counterpart of the Lisbon Treaty, which is adopted as an internal instrument to enhance the economic growth and job creation.

Thus the Global Europe Strategy is targeting at progressive market opening as a policy instrument ensuring productivity gains, growth and job creation. Given the level of liberalization of the world economy as whole heightened through a series of multilateral trade negotiation, the EU has shown stronger interest in (i) reducing non-tariff barriers (NTBs), (ii) securing access to resources, and (iii) properly addressing new areas of growth, such as intellectual property rights, services, investment, public procurement and competition.

The intention of the EU is to promote high-level FTAs, and is especially keen to remove non-tariff barriers still maintained in markets of the new FTA partners. In contrast to the development of tariffs that had been reduced to a great extent through a series of international trade negotiations in the past, many NTBs are still frequently used to protect domestic markets. In reality, several attempts to address the visible and invisible NTBs have so far been ineffective, mainly because they are often entangled with domestic institutions and policies. The strong attention of the EU on the ‘regulatory convergence’, which is manifested in the European Commission (2006 and 2010b), should be interpreted in the same direction. The EU, in fact, regards an effective policy cooperation and coordination between negotiating parties as a pre-condition for FTA’s successful contribution to trade liberalization.

With this policy intention, the Global Europe strategy pays a special attention
to free trade agreements with a number of trading partners, including ASEAN, Korea, Mercosur, India, Russia and the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC). It is indeed a turning point in the EU’s external trade policy, which had long been preferring multilateralism in the post-World War II period.

3. East Asia in EU’s Global Europe Strategy

Based on the concepts stipulated in the “Global Europe” strategy, the EU started full-fledged negotiations on FTA with a number of Asian countries over the past five years since the adoption of the Global Europe strategy, including those with Korea, ASEAN and India. Whereas EU’s FTA negotiations with ASEAN countries and India are facing some difficulties, the one with Korea was successfully completed within 1 1/2 years. And, with the FTA agreement between the EU and Korea as the first case in Asia having been brought into force as of July 1, 2011, the EU-Asia trade relations appear to have entered into a new era. The Korea-EU FTA agreement, in particular, is the first major FTA of the EU with the non-member industrial countries within the rank of 15 largest economies in the world. With the on-going Eurozone crisis and the consequent fall in the purchasing power of most of its member states’, the Korea-EU FTA during the first four months of its implementation so far has turned out to be more beneficial for the EU in terms of trade balance.

Though facing a number of obstacles, the ASEAN (countries)-EU FTA, if it could be negotiated successfully in a near future, would forge a much closer relationship between the two regions. Because FTA implies more than just a policy instrument for trade liberalization, ASEAN-EU FTA is expected to provide East Asia and Europe with a stronger institutional underpinning for the Asia-Europe relationship. Thus it will lead to a more substantive and upgraded level than the biannual summit meetings under the heading of Asia-Europe Meeting (ASEM) achieved so far. For example, an FTA between the two parties would both provide higher transparency through stronger dissemination activities and secure stronger commitments of Asia and Europe through binding
forces entailed in the FTA agreements.

In addition to the Korea-EU FTA already in force and India-EU FTA and ASEAN (countries)-EU FTA under negotiation, the EU is preparing for an FTA negotiation with Japan while testing the feasibility of the one with China. Also, there are already a number of FTA initiatives among the countries in the Asian region. For instance, Korea, Japan and China have already concluded an FTA negotiation with the ASEAN and some of ASEAN member countries, respectively, and have implemented most of them for the past five years or so. An FTA among Korea, Japan, and China has long been discussed and feasibility-studied through the process of government-business-academia forums. Furthermore, two major bilateral FTAs are under serious elaboration between Korea and China on the one side, and between Korea and Japan on the other. Considering these new developments in East Asia, an ASEAN(countries)-EU FTA would have, if successfully concluded, the potential to pave the fundament for establishing a “Grand East Asia-Europe Free Trade Area” from a long-term perspective. In this prospective evolution of regionalism in Asia and Europe, the EU is expected to function as a bridge between the Southeast and Northeast Asian region.

IV. Remaining Issues

The European Union, which started its regional integration with six founding members in the 1950s, has grown to a 27-member economic integration body. Over the process of the past more than fifty years, the policy areas falling into the competence of the Community have continuously expanded, with the commercial, agricultural and monetary policies being the most integrated policy areas. These remarkable achievements notwithstanding, a variety of policies are still in the hands of member states. Notably, the EU so far has not been successful in adopting security and diplomacy, as well as fiscal policy area as
common policies. When approaching the European Union, therefore, East Asian countries are well advised to adopt a dual approach. They have to devise policy concepts both towards the EU itself and to individual member countries, depending on the characteristics of the involved policies.

It is observed also that promoting exchanges of young people, and especially of university students is instrumental in shaping, enhancing and deepening Asia-Europe relations in the long run. In order to do so, it would be a highest priority to facilitate active interactions between research institutes in East Asia and Europe, thereby promoting the development of joint projects. European embassies, chambers of commerce and other public organizations residing in East Asian countries and their Asian counterparts residing in Europe could play an instrumental role in stimulating such mutual cooperation.

It will also be an excellent way for strengthening Asia-Europe relations that East Asian governments and public corporations intensify their efforts to cooperate with their European counterparts in EU’s common policies. In fact, such common policies of the EU as SMEs policies, R&D sectors, government procurement, environment and energy and so forth are more or less open for third-countries’ participation. An increasing R&D cooperation of Asian universities and firms with their European partners within the framework of EU’s 7th Framework Program (FP 7) is a good example of this kind.

All in all, East Asia needs to make a full use of new opportunities opened up by both the new developments of EU’s commercial policy and EU’s more progressive approach towards East Asia.
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김세원(金世源)

현재 서울대학교 경제학부 명예교수이며, 서울대학교 법과대학을 졸업한 후 벨기에 브뤼셀 자유대학교에서 유럽경제통합을 전공하여 석·박사학위를 취득하였다. 서울대학교 경제학부에서 국제경제학 관련 과목을 강의하였으며(1971~2004년), 사회과학대학 학장을 지냈다. 한국경제학회, 한국국제경제학회 및 한국EU학회 등 여러 학회의 회장, 그리고 정보통신정책연구원 초대원장, 금융통화위원, 금융감독위원, 경제·인문사회연구회 이사장 등을 역임하였다. 최근의 주요 저서로는 “EU경제학”(2004), “동북아시장 통합은 가능한가?”(2005), “동아시아 자유무역지역의 성공조건”(2006) 및 “EU의 세계통상전략”(2007) 등이 있다.
