

## Round Table on East Asian Regional Order and Experience of Central Eastern Europe

Co-organized by Seoul National University, Chung Ang University, Collegium Civitas University, and Cracow University of Economics

6-7 February 2014

Collegium Civitas University and Cracow University of Economics, Poland

### <First Meeting>

**Date: 6, February 2014**

**Venue: Room no 1222, Plac Defilad 1, Warszawa, Collegium Civitas University, Poland**

Time	Section	Speakers and Topics
10:00-10:10	Registration	-
10:10-10:20	Opening Remarks	Prof. Leszek Jesień(Collegium Civitas University) Prof. Chun Chaesung (Seoul National University)
10:30-12:00	Round Table	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>"Theorizing East Asian International Relations"</b> Prof. CHUN Chaesung (Seoul National University)</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>"Theory of International Relations in East Asia and Complexity"</b> Prof. MIN Byongwon(Ewha Womans University)</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>"Evolution of Institutional Dynamics in East Asia"</b> Prof. LEE Seungjoo(Chung Ang Univesity)</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>"The Matter of Hermeneutics in International Politics"</b> Dr. DOH Jong Yoon (Seoul National University)</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>"Political Interests of the China-Kazakhstan Oil Pipeline Construction "</b> Dr. KIM Songjuk(Incheon National University)</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>"Eurasia - crossing the barriers"</b> Prof. Maria Krzysztof Byrski (Asia and India specialist)</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>"The Council of the European Union in view of institutionalism"</b> Prof. Leszek Jesień(Collegium Civitas University) Prof. Krzysztof Debnicki, (Asia and Pakistan specialist) Dr. Dominik Smyrgala, (Global economy specialist) Dr. Tadeusz Diem (Former Ambassador of Poland</p>

		to Canada) Dr. Krzysztof Iwanek, (Asian Studies researcher)
12:30-14:00	Luncheon	tba

<Second Meeting>

**Date: 7, February 2014**

**Venue: Room 7, paw. G, Rakowicka 27, Krakow, Poland**

Time	Section	Speakers and Topics
09:00-09:10	Opening Remarks	Rector of the Cracow University of Economics
09:10-09:20	Welcome Remarks	Prof. Aleksander Surdej (Cracow University of Economics) Prof. Chun Chaesung (Seoul National University)
9:30-12:00	Round Table	<p><b>“Theorizing East Asian International Relations”</b> Prof. CHUN Chaesung (Seoul National University)</p> <p><b>“Theory of International Relations in East Asia and Complexity”</b> Prof. MIN Byongwon(Ewha Womans University)</p> <p><b>“Evolutionary Dynamics of East Asian Regionalism”</b> Prof. LEE Seungjoo(Chung Ang Univesity)</p> <p><b>“Hermeneutics and International Politics”</b> Dr. DOH Jong Yoon (Seoul National University)</p> <p><b>“National Interests of the China-Kazakhstan Oil Pipeline Construction ”</b> Dr. KIM Songjuk(Incheon National University)</p> <p>Prof. Aleksander Surdej (Cracow University of Economics) Prof. ARTUR WOLEK (Cracow University of Economics) Dr. Jan Brzozowski (Cracow University of Economics) Phd Researcher Marcin Kedzierski (Cracow University of Economics) Phd Researcher Hanna Kelm (Cracow University of Economics) Phd Researcher Sebastian Kossowsk (Cracow University of Economics)</p>
11:30-12:00		End Discussion

\* Those seminars are sponsored by the National Research Foundation Grants to Seoul National University (NRF-2012S1A3A2033665) and Chung-Ang University (2013S1A3A2053683).

# Theorizing East Asian International Relations

Chaesung Chun(Seoul National University)

## I. Questioning the origin of East Asian International affairs

- Aggravating blame games among East Asians
- Changing and flaring nationalism
- Competing visions for future regional architecture
- Foundering ground for East Asian collective identity, and lack of normative philosophy for peace and common prosperity

## II. Correcting visions for future East Asia

- Healing one-hundred years' humiliation for all East Asians
- Normalizing the status of nation and state
- Re-building East Asian regional *polis* and East Asians(not nation/state-building)
- Reunifying East Asia, not just individual state

## III. Different Conflicts with different origins

1. Sovereignty issues; territorial disputes, unification(Korea, China), normalization(Japan)
2. History issues; interpreting past history, memory politics, nationalism
3. Balance of power issues; alliance politics, security dilemma and arms building, great power politics
4. Network governance issues; building multi-layered governance of East Asia, regional civil society
5. Pre/post-modern vision politics; recovering empire?

## IV. Different cooperations with different origins

1. Economic interdependence
2. Collective identity with common historical legacy
3. BoP politics with security interests

4. Human security cooperation

**V. Complexity of East Asian conflicts and cooperations limiting Western Theories' applicability**

1. Real Asia paradox; complex nexus between security and non-security domain
2. State-oriented markets of East Asian countries, and different logics of economic interdependence
3. Different concepts of democracy and human rights, different types of democracy leading to democratic conflict
4. Multi-layered identity politics, both for competition and cooperation
5. Incomplete modern transition and games among divided and not-normal "billiard balls"

**VI. Meta-theoretical corrections**

1. ontology; post-Western turn
2. epistemology; post-positivist turn
3. axiology; normative turn
4. methodology; historical sociological turn

**VII. theory of complex organizing principles**

1. Not one but multiple organizing principles; overcoming *anarchophilia*
2. 1) traditional; 2) modern-transitional; 3) modern; 4) post-modern transitional
3. Hierarchy to anarchy continuum; formal direct empire – formal indirect empire - informal empire – hegemony/primacy – hierarchy – anarchy
4. Heterarchy; Hierarchy in anarchy, hierarchy with anarchy

**VIII. Normative and Practical visions**

- Attributing blames partly to structural principles, not wholly to agents
- Enhancing regional philosophy, mitigating nationalism
- Decoupling the inside from outside, containing domestic politics from East Asian affairs

### Periodization of Northeast Regional Order and Korean foreign relations

	<b>period</b>	<b>Constitutional features</b>	<b>Units</b>	<b>Main Actors</b>	<b>Korea's main goals</b>	<b>Major ideologies</b>
<b>Traditional order I</b>	- 1400	Anarchy under hierarchy	Territorial Dynasty	Emperor, King, aristocrats	Survival, autonomy, regional hegemony	Hegemonism, dynastic rivalry and balance of power
<b>Traditional order II</b>	1400-1876	Neo-Confucian societal order	Territorial Dynasty	Emperor, King, aristocrats	Survival, development, regionalization	Hegemonism, regional harmony
<b>Modern Transition</b>	1876-1945	Imperial order	Empires and Colonies	States, capitalists	Survival, state-building	Imperialism, balance of power
<b>Modern order</b>	1945-1991	Hierarchy with Anarchy	Nation-states, incomplete	States	Survival, state-building, ideological victory	Ideological bipolarity, balance of power
<b>Post-modern transition</b>	1991-	Neo-Heterarchy	Nation-states and others	States, societal actors, IOs	Unification, development as a middle power	Uni-muti polarity, balance of power, regionalism

# Theory of International Relations in East Asia and Complexity

Byoung Won Min (Ewha Womans University)

## Motivations for Indigenous Theories

1. IR scholars in Korea have looked for a *Korean-style* theory of IR... upon the recognition that the country has relied too much on American IR.
2. No substantial progress in developing an indigenous theory yet, why?
3. Any East Asian-version of IR theory is necessary? Is it available soon?

## Points before Discussion

1. What is *theory*? Why do we have to think about the scope of a theory? Is the IR theory problematic if it is cross-applied to other regions and contexts? ... A *meta-theory*
2. Regionally relevant theory? A suggestion for different levels of theory applicability
  - A. Global level: Waltz, Keohane and Nye, Wendt... are they still Western?
  - B. Regional level: What features would we develop? East Asia?
  - C. Micro-level: Domestic society and personal features
3. Ontology (with difference) vs. epistemology (without difference)
4. Cases of regionally relevant theories: Latin America, Communist IR, Africa?

## Arguments for a More Systemic Theory

1. We need a *grand theory* first before talking about regionally relevant theories
2. Ontological bases are multiple: state, region, earth... a system of systems
3. System theory: system, boundary, environment, elements, interactions... GST
4. IR on the system of earth, region, state etc. ... How do you define a system? East Asia as a system?
5. Complex systems theory applied
  - A. System and *difference*... East Asia as a system with distinguished features

- B. External limits... Living environments of the Earth composed both of human beings and *non-human* materials ... A complex system of *self-organization* and *emergence*
  - C. Non-linear, probabilistic worldview ... Beyond deterministic one (Not rational choice)
  - D. More focus on the *relationship* between actors than on their attributes ... networks
  - E. Beyond positivist approach ... The problem of methodology
6. What should be done from now on?
- A. Indigenous theories start from a *comprehensive* framework (a *systems* theory) ... Let's share the framework and meta-theories.
  - B. Extract the *distinguished* features (differences) of the region or society that are to be contrasted to the existing theories.
  - C. Do not try any *definitive* but plausible explanations or predictions... *Patterns* are important.



# The Matter of Hermeneutics in International Politics

Jong Yoon DOH

(Research Fellow, Center for International Studies, SNU)

## ● Given IR theory from American Scholars

1. Scientific approach from Karl Popper/Imre Lakatos
2. Positivism
3. Relations-centric between independent variables and dependent variables
  - Causality-centric
  - Explanatory power
4. American IR theory: (Neo) Realism/New Liberalism
  - Conservative approach based on ensuring given hierarchic international order.
  - Ignoring internal capability of subject
  - IR mainstream cannot any more provide an implication of changed world politics since the end of the Cold War. (In particular, Neorealism)

## ● Critical Approach

1. Ontology

What is making International Politics?

- Need to restore 'Subject' into International Politics<sup>1</sup>

(Subject rather than unit)

- Autonomous Subject : Holding Soul(Plato) / Self-Instituted (Nietzsche)/ Reflecting Subject (Decartes) / Responsibility(Levinas) / Indivisibility between subject-object (Heidegger)<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> On differences between 'Self' and 'Subject', see, Julia Kristeva *La révolution du langage poétique* (1974)

<sup>2</sup> Because Dasein is being-in-the-world. Subject is object. Therefore they are not fixed in the historic situations.

## 2. Epistemology

How do we know what know about IR?

- How to understand 'Subject' of IR
- Subject is understood through experience in the context of history and culture
- Phenomenology of *Dasein* (including IR) is absolutely to be hermeneutics.(Heidegger)<sup>3</sup>
- The way of understanding subject in IR is through interpreting their languages<sup>4</sup> (voice and text).

### ● Voice and Text

1. Voice:
2. Text: All of international politics is in text.

### ● For International Politics

1. Intellectual society has to understand subject but not analyze.
2. Understanding subject from text.
3. The first step for text is to approach metonym.

### ● Metonym<sup>5</sup> in International Politics (ex. Documents)

### ● International Politics in a better Understanding: Towards Insight

- Rather 'Politology' than Political Science

---

<sup>3</sup> *Sein und Zeit* translated to Korean (2012)

<sup>4</sup> Not analyzing 'subject' but understanding it.

<sup>5</sup> A kind of figure of speech in which a thing or concept is called not by its own name but rather by the name of something associated in meaning with that thing or concept.(Merriam-webster)