

Critical Perspective on ASEAN's Security Policy under ASEAN Political and Security Community¹

Irawan Jati²

Department of International Relations
Universitas Islam Indonesia
irawan.jati@uii.ac.id

Abstract

Despite economic integration challenges, ASEAN faces greater security challenges. It is obvious to assert that a stable economic development requires a secure regional atmosphere. The most probable threats against ASEAN are ranging from hostile foreign entities infiltration, intra and inter states disputes, radical religious movements, human trafficking, drugs and narcotics smuggling, cybercrimes and environmental disasters. In 2009, ASEAN established the ASEAN Political and Security Community as the umbrella of ASEAN's political and security initiatives. APSC slots in some significant fora; ASEAN Intergovernmental Commission on Human Rights (AICHR), ASEAN Foreign Ministers Meeting (AMM), ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF), ASEAN Defense Minister's Meeting (ADMM), ASEAN Law Ministers Meeting (ALAWMM), and ASEAN Ministerial Meeting on Transnational Crimes (AMMTC). The wide array of these forums signify ASEAN efforts to confront double features of security; the traditional and nontraditional or critical security. The traditional security considers state security as the primary object security. While the critical security tends to focus on non-state aspects such as individual human being as its referent object. Even though some argue that APSC has been able to preserve the stability in the region, it still lack of confidence in solving critical issues such as territorial disputes and irregular migrants problems. Therefore, this piece would examine the fundamental questions: How does ASEAN address beyond state security issues in its security policy through APSC? To search for the answer this paper would apply critical security studies approach. Critical security posits that threats are not always for the states but in many cases for the people. Based on the examination of ASEAN security policies, this paper argues that ASEAN's security policy has touched the non-traditional security issues but showing slow progress on its development and application.

Keywords: APSC, non traditional security, critical security, security policy

Abstrak

¹ The draft of this article has been presented in the 4th International Conference on International Relations and Development at Mahidol University, Thailand, 2015.

² The author wishes to thank to the Directorate of Research and Community Service of Universitas Islam Indonesia for its research grant in 2015.

Selain menghadapi berbagai tantangan ekonomi, ASEAN juga menghadapi tantangan keamanan besar. Merupakan sebuah fakta jika kemajuan dalam bidang ekonomi ditunjang dengan kestabilan lingkungan kawasan. Beberapa ancaman yang nyata mengancam ASEAN diantaranya adalah ancaman dari infiltrasi militer asing, konflik antara negara dan konflik domestik, gerakan keagamaan radikal, perdagangan manusia, penyelundupan obat-obatan terlarang, kejahatan siber, dan kerusakan lingkungan. Pada tahun 2009, ASEAN membentuk Masyarakat Politik dan Keamanan ASEAN (APSC) sebagai payung dari beberapa inisiatif politik dan keamanan ASEAN. APSC mewadahi beberapa forum penting diantaranya; Komisi HAM ASEAN (AICHR), Pertemuan antar Menteri Luar Negeri ASEAN (AMM), Forum Regional ASEAN (ARF), Pertemuan Menteri Pertahanan ASEAN (ADMM), Pertemuan Menteri Hukum ASEAN (ALAWMM), dan Pertemuan Tingkat Menteri ASEAN tentang Kejahatan Transnasional (AMMTC). Beragamnya forum yang dibentuk oleh ASEAN ini menunjukkan usaha ASEAN dalam merespon isu-isu keamanan tradisional dan non tradisional. Keamanan tradisional berfokus pada ancaman militer asing. Sedangkan keamanan non tradisional lebih fokus pada keamanan manusia. Meskipun APSC dianggap telah mampu berkontribusi terhadap kestabilan kawasan namun APSC belum maksimal dalam mengatasi isu keamanan kritis seperti terorisme dan masalah migran ilegal. Tulisan ini berusaha mendiskusikan pertanyaan bagaimanakah ASEAN merespon isu-isu keamanan non tradisional melalui kebijakan keamanan APSC? Dalam menjawab pertanyaan ini, tulisan ini menggunakan pendekatan studi keamanan kritis sebagai basis teori. Keamanan kritis menyatakan bahwa ancaman keamanan tidak hanya mengenai ancaman negara tapi juga juga manusia. Argumen utama dalam tulisan ini adalah bahwa ASEAN telah menyentuh isu-isu keamanan non tradisional tetapi perkembangan dan aplikasi kebijakannya masih sangat lambat.

Kata kunci: APSC, keamanan non tradisional, keamanan kritis, kebijakan keamanan

Introduction

Despite economic integration challenges, ASEAN faces greater security challenges. The leaders in Southeast Asia have been aware of the potential security threats to the Region. Threats may hail from inner and outer region, traditional and nontraditional, and state and non-state actors. The narration of colonialism, borders claims, minority question, and non-traditional menace are the highlight of all. Fierce clashes among major kingdoms in Southeast Asia in the past before the arrival of European entities were the dominant depiction of the region. The remaining of these clashes still gave effect until 1990's especially in continental Southeast Asia (Weatherbee, 2009).

Most of Southeast Asian nations were suffering during the colonialist occupation. Indonesia, Malaysia, Singapore, The Philippines, and Vietnam were occupied by European colonialists. The European colonialists descended one protracted intra-state conflict and the territorial disputes. Thailand, Burma, Laos and Cambodia have disputes over the territorial claims that have been prolonged until the 2000's. Some of these conflicts escalated to armed

conflicts among their military apparatus. Disagreements by Malaysia, Indonesia, Singapore, and the Philippines on their territorial sphere also connected to territorial formation by the colonialists (Gee, 2013).

At the end of the colonialist occupation, Southeast Asia became the battle ground of other Western powers during the 2nd World War. The United States Pacific military campaign against Japanese Imperial Army and communist ideology provoked the Vietnam War and let the U.S. to establish military bases in The Philippines which were closed down in 1991. The Vietnam War is the vivid depiction of the fragility of Southeast Asia region from foreign intervention. As indicated by Muni (2013), the foreign intervention to domestic or regional disputes may result to prolonged conflicts.

Other internal popular security threats encircling Southeast Asia are the radical terrorist movements, human trafficking, drug smuggling and haze problem. The radical terrorist movements probably the most perilous threat in the region and even the world. The so-called terrorism in this sense is the religious group-led (Islam) radical network groups that operate beyond state borders. Al Qaida was the one claimed by the world as the most responsible group for almost all terrors happening in five continents. The emergence of this radical movement for some experts is motivated by oppression against Muslim communities worldwide and ‘spiritual bankruptcy of the West’ (Kiras, 2011).

Despite those security challenges, Southeast Asia region is considered as a peaceful region. After the Cold War there was no significant interstate conflict that could interrupt the stability of the region. Albeit without obvious inter-state conflicts, intra-state conflicts overshadowed the future security. The main locomotive of Southeast Asia’s stability is its single regional organization, the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN). ASEAN is the institutionalization of Southeast Asia nation’s willingness to establish a peaceful and prosperous region. In its 48 years, ASEAN has enlarged its member states and its program activities. Recently, ASEAN has added five new member states and heading to an ASEAN Community.

In 2003, ASEAN leaders agreed to establish ASEAN Community in 2020 as declared in Bali Concord II. The Declaration states that ASEAN Community comprises of three pillars, the ASEAN Political-Security Community (APSC), ASEAN Economic Community (AEC), and ASEAN Socio-Cultural Community (ASCC). APSC is ASEAN’s effort to attain its political and security agenda. APSC established six major forums; The ASEAN Intergovernmental Commission on Human Rights, ASEAN Foreign Ministers’ Meeting (AMM), ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF), ASEAN Defense Ministers’ Meeting (ADMM), ASEAN Law Ministers’ Meeting (ALAWMM) and ASEAN Ministerial Meeting on Transnational Crimes (AMMTC). One pivotal forum of the APSC is The ASEAN Regional

Forum (ARF). ARF was formed as a consultative forum concerning defense and security issues, and contributing to confidence building and preventive diplomacy. This forum is said to be effective in maintaining security stability surrounding ASEAN and its neighbor. However, the ARF or APSC's efforts to secure ASEAN region are stumbled in territorial disputes as one of key security issues in ASEAN (Son, 2011). This significance territorial issue is not only an intra-ASEAN challenge but also an inter-ASEAN problem. The South China Sea territorial disputes for instance, would become potential "battle field" for the contrasting parties if the peace talks failed to offer permanent solution (Hongfang, 2011).

The establishment of AMMTC represents ASEAN's recognition of non-traditional security issues. The non-traditional security's object of study may range from human to environment. In International Relations, non-traditional security is studied under the term of Critical Security Studies (CSS). CSS is an exertion to broadening, deepening, widening, and focusing the concept of security (Peoples & Vaughan-William, 2010). It proposes that what should be secured is not necessarily always states but it should importantly securing humans. According to Buzan (1983), despite the threat from foreign military, security should be viewed from other different "Sectors", those are; environment, economic, political, and societal. To this perspective, the conception of CSS concerning security has effected ASEAN's security policy which is to include the transnational crimes as threatening factors for ASEAN security. However, other themes on human security such as environment, natural disaster and health are put under ASEAN Socio-Cultural Community (ASCC). Therefore it is worth to address a question: How does ASEAN address beyond state security issues in its security policy through APSC? Based on the inquiry, this paper would like to argue that ASEAN's security policy has touched the non-traditional security issues but showing slow progress on its development and application. Structurally, this paper is divided into two main parts. The first part discusses the security evolution from traditional Realist to CSS. The second part will discuss ASEAN/APSC non-traditional security security policies (CSS).

Literature Review

From Realist to Critical Security Studies

Security, in the term of academic context became one of popular international issues raised in the aftermath of World War II (Williams, 2013). In his earliest publication, Buzan notes that security is 'the pursuit of freedom from threat' (Buzan, 1983) and correspond to moral paradigm (Strachan, 2005). The threat is commonly derived from state's military actions (Sulovic, 2010). This narrowly conception of threat emphasizes states as the epicenter of security and military as the core threat for insecurity. In this context, security policy is the domain of state to secure its people from any hostile states. This bring security study onto

state-centric study as promoted by Waltz (2001). Unfortunately, the traditional definition of security is paradox. If states pursue the utmost freedom and secure for its people from hostile military raids then why majority of the states build up its armaments? This circumstance is better described as security dilemma (see Collins, 2000). In International Relations, the state centric approach to security is as traditional or Realist strand of security. As the initial theory in International Relations, Realist theory has been dominating the analysis of state's security. In further discussion, there are greater concern in security beyond the state which leads into evolution of security.

The evolution of security is in accordance with the transformation of threats. In 1900's until 1990's, inter-state wars were the primary object of security. In the after math of 9/11, terrorism was the main issue of security analysis. But, beyond these military or armed threats, there are more threats that endanger human life. The environmental disasters and transmissible diseases are some of serious dangers that could affect the 'safety' of human beings. These non-military dangers are not new and happened more often than military invasions or wars. A comprehensive narration of security evolution by Buzan & Hansel (2009) laid down the logic of this evolution. It started by posing four critical questions on state's capacity as the 'referent object'; the inclusion of external and internal threats, extension of security beyond military raids, and inseparability of security with the 'dynamic of threats, dangers and urgency'. The critics on traditional concept of security sprung broadening aspects of security such as human security (Newman, 2010) and environmental security. The security aspects beyond traditional state centric approach is known as non-traditional security approach. In the later development of security studies, there are two main influential "non-traditional schools"; the Copenhagen School and the Welsh School (Floyd, 2007, Sulovic 2010).

The Copenhagen School broadened the term of security beyond traditional state-centric and military heavy. It defines security as 'to be social and inter-subjective construction' (Floyd, 2007). It leads to the concept of securitization. Securitization is the 'extreme model of politization' that requires 'inter-subjective establishment of existential threats' (Buzan et. al, 1998). Simply put, threat is not a given phenomenon but more on social construct. Alexander Wendt, a modern constructivist accentuates the importance of social construction on international politics (Went, 1999). For Wendt, threats and security are the result of social construction. On the other side, the Welsh school also proposes the same notion that traditional security cannot render a true security for the people. As Ken Booth noted that the true security of the people could be obtained by people emancipation (Floyd, 2007). Emancipation is the term to represent the state of threat-free of the people which equal to security. As Booth (cited in Krause & Williams, 1997) defines emancipation as "freeing

people, as individuals and groups, from the social, physical, economic, political, and other constraints that stop them from carrying out what they would freely choose to do”.

The Copenhagen School and Welsh School are representing what is called by Critical Security Studies (CSS). According to Krause & Willims (1997) CSS is not a “precise theoretical label”. It is an alternative or orientation view which takes “the question of change as its foundation in both an explanatory and an evaluative sense” (Krause and Williams, 1997). The idea of CSS is –as implies by its critical term- criticizing the material and traditional approach of Realist on studying security. For Realist, security is the matter of state survival, nothing else matters (see Waltz, 2001). However, even though CSS disapproving the security logic of Realist, it does not necessarily ignoring the security of states and its potential military threats. But the difference is that CSS tends to look at other security aspects which have direct impact to the societies. In political praxis, the works of CSS have influenced many states and international organization like ASEAN to devote more attention on human and environment security.

ASEAN and ASEAN Political-Security Community

The primary reason of ASEAN integration in 1967 is security (Rools, 2012). Further explanation of ASEAN integration can be described in theoretical manner. There are three dominant theoretical framework to explain the integration of Southeast Asian nation into ASEAN namely; neo realism, neo liberalism, and constructivism (Simon, 2008). New realism favors states as the core actors in IR. It reduces the role of international institution in managing world security. For Neo Realist, institution such as ASEAN is the continuation of major power’s interests (Shaun, 1998). Neo liberalism emphasizes on the maximization of politics and economics cooperation to attain ‘absolute gain’. In other words, the cooperation of Southeast Asia’s states were merely motivated by economic gain. While the constructivism sees the foundation of ASEAN is ground of ‘we feeling’ where they share norms and values (Archarya, 2001).

One of ASEAN concerns in ensuring the stability in Southeast Asia is securing the region from any potential enmities. The most probable threats against ASEAN are ranging from hostile foreign entities infiltration, intra and inter states disputes (territorial border disputes), radical religious movements, human trafficking, drugs and narcotics smuggling, cybercrimes and environmental disasters. To tackle these security challenges, ASEAN should mingle its potential power and assign a communal efforts. Indeed ASEAN has commitment to integrate Southeast Asia into a prosperous community, not just a ‘political’ regional organization. Therefore, in 2003 ASEAN members declared its commitment to establish ASEAN Community. This came with the consensus to establish three pillars as the

backbones, namely ASEAN Political and Security Community (APSC), ASEAN Economic Community (AEC), and ASEAN Socio-Cultural Community (ASCC). In 2009, ASEAN established the ASEAN Political and Security Community as the umbrella of ASEAN's political and security initiatives. APSC slots in some significant fora; ASEAN Intergovernmental Commission on Human Rights (AICHR), ASEAN Foreign Ministers Meeting (AMM), ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF), ASEAN Defense Minister's Meeting (ADMM), ASEAN Law Ministers Meeting (ALAWMM), and ASEAN Ministerial Meeting on Transnational Crimes (AMMTC). APSC is a case of international institutionalization of political and security efforts involving particularly the ten ASEAN states and other ASEAN partners in greater Asia, such as Australia, China, Japan and, the United States. International institution such as ASEAN is claimed to provide conducive fora for state's interaction and dialogue (Phan, 2014).

ASEAN should have the confidence and trust in order to distinguish APSC from other types of security cooperation. According to Archarya (2001) there are four forms of security cooperation, the security regime, security community, collective defense, and collective security. The separation of those forms is characterized by the perception of external threat, the capacity to avoid war, the basis of commitment, and member's obligations. Accordingly to him security community is characterized by two fundamental elements. The first element is the absence of war and the second is no significant preparations for war among member states (Archarya, 2001). ASEAN has a high confidence on the first element but it left critical question to the second element. Since APSC formation there was no military engagement equals to interstate war happened in Southeast Asia. There were intra state conflicts erupted in some states like in Myanmar and The Philippines. On the other side, ASEAN countries, especially Indonesia are now building its defense capability. It includes procurement of new armament and development of domestic defense industries. The program as such may lead to regional arms races.

Research Method

The main methodological approach applied in this research is solely on qualitative method. Qualitative research refers to the works of naturalistic-interpretative Sociologist such as Max Webber (Somantri, 2005). Cresswell (2009) identified qualitative research as interpretative research due to its dominant assessment in interrelating the data. Since this research is aimed to explain the social phenomena which characterized by dynamic behavior of a social unit. Philosophically, the result of qualitative method will be in the form of

explanation which is supported by factual evidence. In this research, the evidence is understood as confirmative proposition which is derived from the result or effect of object's behavior.

Researcher's Role

Researcher is the one who organizes, conducts, and concludes the research. During the research, a researcher should not collide its professional value to the participants in the research. Accordingly, the role of the researcher in this research is as pure inquirer and data gatherer. Basic knowledge of researcher will be in analyzing data material. In the context of qualitative study, the researcher is also as the instrument of the research.

Research Procedures

Research procedures concern on the planning or steps in conducting the research. It may start from pre research until research report. The importance of these procedures is as a guide for the researcher in doing the research. Therefore, this research will be conducted through some procedures:

1. Pre Research

The pre research includes any activities for the preparation of the research. These includes: permission letter correspondence, preparing the instruments (interview's list of questions), and fixing schedule of the research.

2. Data Collection

As this is a qualitative research, data analysis may be taken from secondary data resources. During the research, the secondary data collected were dominated by periodicals and text books. While, it took only little media publication, either by ASEAN's official media release or any other press media.

3. Data Analysis

After gathering the data, the next important phase is analyzing the data. The steps in analyzing the data is taken from Cresswell's (2009) data analysis in qualitative research design. The steps are:

a. Organizing and preparing data

This first step focuses on gathering all collected data from all resources. All secondary data collected in this research were taken from online resources. Altogether, the total number of collected data and references (literatures) exceeded 100 materials. However, only selected literatures were used as the basis of analysis.

b. Reading through all data

To make sense of the categorized data, it needs to be read thoroughly. During this process it is possible to do adjustment of some elements of data. In reading the data, the first step is to quick-read the materials. The purpose of this process is to select related materials and identify related statements or arguments.

c. Coding

The coding process involves the efforts to labeling certain data in the research. At least the label of the codes are security threats, security policies, possible security effect, and APSC policy impact. However, the range of the codes may be developed during the analysis process. In practice, all collected literatures were separated in different folders with related labels.

d. Interrelating themes/description

This phase involves the process of describing the categories and the themes. The categories and themes are identified during coding process. This phase also aimed to find correlation among the themes and categories.

e. Interpretation the meaning

The last phase in analyzing the data that have been gathered in this research is to interpret the meaning of the data.

Discussion and Finding

The Traditional Security Threats

Taking into account of the complexity of traditional security facets in Southeast Asia and its surrounding, it can be understood by applying Buzan's Regional Security Complex Theory. Regional Security Complex (RSC) theory defends the pivotal role of regional security to international structure. The RSC sees that the dynamic of international security pattern is influenced by the regional security dynamic. It also suggests that security issues are interlinked to its process, as Buzan and Waever imply RSC is 'a set of units whose major processes of securitisation, desecuritisation, or both are so interlinked that their security problems cannot reasonably be analyzed or resolved apart from one another' (Buzan & Waever, 2003). Thus, the RSC develops further its theory by mapping the world into some regional security complexes. The unity of these complexes formed what RSC called as Supercomplex. In its identification, Southeast Asia region is develop into RSC. Together with South Asia RSC and Northeast Asia RSC it builds the Asian Supercomplex which represents the complexity of Asia's security structure. RSC then, is best to describe regional security model in any regions. The RSC in Southeast Asia is greatly in greatly influence by the dynamic of South China Sea territorial disputes.

The South China Sea disputes jeopardizes ASEAN security in two ways. The first is the possibility of Chinese military intrusion to ASEAN members (primarily on Vietnam, Malaysia, Brunei, and the Philippines) territorial sovereignty. Weighting from Chinese strategic stance that put South China Sea as its core interest with its nine dash lines and other rhetoric, the prospect to settle the disputes in the short coming time is still gloomy. As its core interest, Beijing would not offer many options to other claimants. Chinese recent provocative action in land reclamation and military presence surrounding conflicting zones has raised the tension and challenge ASEAN solidity. The second threat as the effect of South China Sea disputes is the possible disruption of ASEAN's member solidity. It was the Chinese who played the card to drag the South China Sea issue into bilateral level. In 2009 Chinese Ambassador to ASEAN stated that the territorial dispute in South China Sea is the matter of China and individual South China Sea coastal states.³This diplomatic strategy has lured ASEAN nerves tension and managed the Philippines to conduct unilateral action.

The Non Traditional Security Threats

³<http://search.proquest.com/docview/>, accessed on 15 May 2015

Despite the prominent traditional threats, Southeast Asia is facing a more challenging non-traditional threats. For the purpose of this paper the term of non-traditional security is equal to human security. Generally, the most widely accepted definition of human security can be taken from 1994 UNDP's Human Development Report, which defined human security as:

“... safety from the constant threats of hunger, disease, crime and repression. It also means protection from sudden and hurtful disruptions in the pattern of our daily lives-whether in our homes, in our jobs, in our communities or in our environment. (UNDP, 1994)”

Since its inception in 1994, many world governments use the term for their foreign policy campaign. Canada for instance, had been active in promoting human security that it defined the term as :

“... safety for people from both violent and non-violent threats. It is a condition or state of being characterized by freedom from pervasive threats to people's rights, their safety, or even their lives”. (Government of Canada in Jolly & Ray, 2006).

The UN and other proponents of human security concept were seemingly aware of the narrowly conclusion of security in which unable to grasp the wider aspects of human life. There are seven categories that related to human security, those are economic security, food security, health security, environmental security, personal security, community security, and political security (Jolly & Ray, 2006). The UN proposal on human security included endeavor to reduce world's military spending and to transfer them to humanitarian supports (Jolly & Ray, 2006). Thought it seemed logical and easily accepted, human security is not far from critics. The critics even come from the CSS analysts who concern on state (government) domination of the term and ill-use of the term to legitimize their military campaign (Newman, 2010). The case of The US global war on terror is one definite case to put this forward. The US claimed in defending its rights to secure its citizen from foreign non traditional threat of terrorism. In responding to this critics, UN has casted three main criteria in determining state's distortion of employing human security in their policies (Jolly & Ray, 2006). The first is it must elevate “people's capabilities and abilities to make choice”. The second is no overwhelmed “securitization” of threats that in turn could endanger the people. The third is the result of the policies must not weaken the security of other people in different states. These criteria are not solely to measure state's policies on the name of human security but also works for regional organization like ASEAN.

ASEAN has been aware on the issues of non-traditional security or human security particularly on illegal trafficking of drugs since 1976. At that time, ASEAN leaders agreed to diminish the illicit use and transfer of drugs (Pushpanathan, 1999). It then took other regional initiatives after 1997/1998 financial crisis (Cabarello-Anthony, 2010). Moreover, ASEAN's human security agendas were propagated after a series of natural disaster such as 2004 tsunami and 2008 cyclone Nargis (Gerstl, 2010) and strengthened by the 9/11 event. ASEAN's concerns on non-traditional security can be observed from its formal forums which are especially spread into two ASEAN's communities, the APSC and ASCC. APSC as the main community concerning politics and security establishing merely one non-traditional security forum which tackle the issue of transnational crimes (AMMTC). While other issues are under ASCC such as disaster management, environmental, trans boundary haze, and health. AMMTC was established prior to the creation of APSC itself, it was in 1997 ASEAN's Home Affairs Ministers concluded the Declaration on Transnational Crimes. The Declaration induces certain forms of transnational crimes namely; terrorism, trafficking in people, illicit drugs, arms and piracy (ASEAN, 1997). It then expanded to economic crimes, money laundering, cybercrimes, illicit trafficking in wildlife, illicit trafficking in timber, and people smuggling (Parameswaran, 2015). However, the improvement of ASEAN's capacity in dealing with non-traditional security issues has shown slow progress.

As a multicultural background organization, ASEAN's first hindrance is its diversity. Diversity may become attractive power but in many cases could cause protracted progress. ASEAN's diversity lies on the cultural, social, economic, and political dimensions. From these dimensions, the economic and politics dimensions are the most probable factors to slow ASEAN. The economic disparity of ASEAN members has made ASEAN to impose special treatment for the states like Vietnam, Myanmar, Cambodia and Laos to "catch up" with other senior members. As for example the ASEAN-Australia-New Zealand Free Trade Area in 2009 which gave flexibility in the forms of special and differential treatment (ASEAN, 2009). Politically, ASEAN's member states are varied in the way they govern their countries. Among the whole members of ASEAN, only Indonesia is considered as having a free democracy. The recent calamity of Rohingya showcases the Myanmar's Junta remains in its struggle to enter a new democracy.

ASEAN strategy in ensuring the security of its people security is by consolidating internally and externally with foreign partners. Terrorism particularly became the magnet for ASEAN non-traditional security cooperation. Since 2002, ASEAN has concluded at least 11 cooperation on combating terrorism. It includes the cooperation with the US (2002), China

(2002 & 2004), EU (2003), India (2003), Australia (2004), Russia (2004), Japan (2004), Republic of Korea (2005), New Zealand (2005), and Pakistan (2005) (ASEAN, 2012). While other sectors –transnational crimes, illicit drugs, and immigration- have paid little attention.

Critical Points on APSC Policy

ASEAN security policy has far been covering many aspects of non-traditional security. To some points ASEAN has been able to work together in dealing some issues including the tsunami, typhoon Nargis, aviation accident, illicit drugs, people smuggling, and terrorism. However, there are some critique to evaluate ASEAN performance in non-traditional or human security.

Non Traditional Security as Domestic Problems

Even though ASEAN members realized the serious danger of non-traditional threats, it still believe that those threats are categorized as domestic problems. This is especially related to human right issues. Since human rights are domestic problems, ASEAN would let the solution to be taken domestically. The typical explanation of this ambiguity is that for ASEAN the solidity of institution is the result of domestic stability and ability to overcome its own crisis. It assumes that domestic stability will provide a fundamental structure of regionalization in ASEAN. It seems an uncontested argument, but in reality it becomes a great barrier and has put ASEAN paralyzed. A clear example is ASEAN failure in protecting its own people from human rights abuses which are performed by the government. In this case, almost all of ASEAN members have story with their human rights issue. Indonesia, Thailand, the Philippines, Vietnam and Myanmar with their harsh military approach solution in eradicating and local insurgency movements. Another example on ASEAN's weak performance on human security issue is its unwillingness to entitled status of refugee to the Rohingya people who fled from Myanmar due to the threat of persecution. ASEAN limitation on its expected performance also effected by its believed non-interference principles.

Non Interference Principle

It is believed that ASEAN and its communities are managed to attain unprecedented solidity based on shared norms and values among its members. The fundamental norms and values of ASEAN can be found in its Treaty and Amity Cooperation in South East Asia (TAC) 1976 which stated (ASEAN, 2015):

1. Mutual respect for the independence, sovereignty, equality, territorial integrity, and national identity of all nations;
2. The right of every State to lead its national existence free from external interference, subversion or coercion;
3. Non-interference in the internal affairs of one another;
4. Settlement of differences or disputes by peaceful manner;
5. Renunciation of the threat or use of force; and
6. Effective cooperation among themselves.

These norms and values are considered as the fundamental principles for ASEAN. These principles have guided ASEAN to sail in troubled times which is still practices until today. Despite its idealistic language these principles in some cases become the constraint for the member of ASEAN.

The non-interference principle arguable is the most problematic principle. It may not take further negligence to understand this principle, but it can turn into some sort of disappointment. An obvious example is on 2014 Rohingya crisis in Myanmar. During the period between July and August, Rohingya people were forced to flee from their homes as the result of prolonged conflict between them and Myanmar government and people. Supposedly, ASEAN should lead the way to halt the crisis and not to wait until it escalated.

Rely on Dialogues

Dialogue has become ASEAN's mode of achieving political accords. The dialogue itself has been in practiced since its earliest initiation to form ASEAN. ASEAN reliance on dialogue is adopted almost in every issue from regular to complex issue such as South China Sea disputes. In responding to South China Sea issue, ASEAN relies on dialogue among its members and between ASEAN and China. The aim of these dialogues is in compliance of ASEAN's core principle to promote peace and stability through peaceful manner. In practical basis the dialogue approach attained its success in bringing all disputes in the table. However, the dialogue approach tends to time consuming and requires multiple meeting in which sometimes ended without vibrant solution. The South China Sea disputes is one of the primary sample of 18 years dialogues which is still looking for the conclusion until present.

ASEAN has established various dialogue with its wide range state and international organization partners. To strengthen its external relations, ASEAN recognizes some status of

dialogue such as Sectorial Dialogue Partner, Development Partner, Special Observer, Guest, or other status.⁴ By seeing these status, ASEAN tries to categorize its dialogue partner based on their significance role. However, the dialogue established with various strategic states mostly on economic substance. ASEAN dialogue with China for instance is dominated by economic topic and ‘undermine’ other issues including security. It is no surprise to find that the progress of economic and security go in different ways.

More Forums and Initiatives

The APSC basically is a forum to provide wider dialogue concerning security. Interestingly, APSC was established after the foundation of ASEAN’s regional security building forum, the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF). Before the APSC, ARF was the foremost forum for ASEAN to connect all states in wider Asian region to build confidence and trust each other on security matter. Since its initiation in 1993, ARF has 27 members including the states in South Asia states, East Asia, and the United States. ARF its capacity in broadening security aspects from traditional to nontraditional issues, ARF proved impotent in responding to South China Sea disputes and failed to play significant role in security crisis such as the Thai-Cambodia territorial dispute and Timor Leste problem.

The exclusion of South China Sea issue and growing concern on non-traditional security issues reflects ARF’s focus shift onto insensitive and non-traditional security challenge in wider Asia Pacific region. ARF’s focus shift also reflects APSC’s strong attention to nontraditional issues. This policy navigation is taken on the assumption that there is little possibility of inter-state arms conflicts in South East Asia and its surroundings. The most tangible threats for South East Asian region at present and future will be coming from non-state offenders such as terrorism, natural disasters, human rights violation, and environment degradation. Right now APSC has various forums to tackle those issues, it includes ASEAN Intergovernmental Commission on Human Rights, ASEAN Foreign Minister Meeting, ASEAN Defense Minister Meeting, ASEAN Law Minister Meeting, and ASEAN Ministerial Meeting on Transnational Crime.⁵ It might be true that non-traditional security threats are more tangible than traditional security, but this traditional security threats persist as state’s major concern in formulating its defense policy. This assumption is reflected on state’s military modernization which is developed to counter foreign military intrusion.

Conclusion

⁴<http://www.asean.org/asean/external-relations> accessed on 1 May 2015.

⁵<http://www.asean.org>, accessed on 1 May 2015

This article has discussed ASEAN's security policy through APSC. Firstly, it discussed the conceptual framework of traditional and non traditional security aspects. Secondly, it displayed the non traditional security issues facing ASEAN. Then it criticized APSC policies by pointing some arguments. From the discussion on APSC security policy using CSS perspective, it can be concluded that for ASEAN, non-traditional security is an evolving phenomena. ASEAN awareness of non-traditional issues in the 70's has helped ASEAN to accomodate more demanding challange. All in all, ASEAN security policy is characterized by some features. The first, it dominated by non-traditional security issues in which the issue effects the policy (issue based policy). It can be observed by various security cooperation which were dominated by terrorism issue. The second, it relies much on dialogues and forums. It is not to undermine the importance aspect of those forums, but in many occasions it slows the progress and the ending results are more statements minus implementation. Rohingya crisis is one example to confirm. The third, it clearly employing Neorealist paradigm rather than Constructivism. Even though ASEAN echoing the "community" spirit on its internal bonding, its security policies were formulated by Neorealist notion. The non-interference principle and domestication of human rights issues are evidence of argument. Therefore, it is arguable to state that the slow progress of ASEAN security is affected by its internal factors. Should ASEAN not to review its internal hindrance then it will be difficult for ASEAN to reap significant progress.

REFERENCES

- Archarya, Amitav. (2001). *Constructing a Security Community in Southeast Asia: ASEAN and the Problem of Regional Order* (2nd ed.). Routledge. Oxfam.
- ASEAN. (2012). *A Compilation of ASEAN Declaration, Joint Declarations, and Statements on Combating Transnational Crimes and Terrorism*. ASEAN Secretariat. Jakarta.
- _____. (2015). Treaty of Amity and Cooperation in Southeast Asia Indonesia, 24 February 1976. <http://www.asean.org/news/item/treaty-of-amity-and-cooperation-in-southeast-asia-indonesia-24-february-1976-3>. Accessed on 1 May 2015.
- _____. (2009). Agreement Establishing the ASEAN-Australia-New Zealand Free Trade Area. <http://www.asean.fta.govt.nz/assets/Agreement-Establishing-the-ASEAN-Australia-New-Zealand-Free-Trade-Area.pdf>. Accessed on 30 September 2015.
- Buzan, Barry. (1983). *People, State, and Fear* (2nd ed.). Wheatsheaf. Great Britain.
- _____, & Waever, Ole. (2003). *Regions and Power: The Structure of International Security*. Cambridge University Press. New York.
- _____, & Hansel, Lene. (2009). *The Evolution of Security Studies*. Cambridge University Press. New York.
- _____, Waever, Ole. & Wilde, Jaap de. (1998). *Security: A New Framework of Analysis*. Lynne Rienner Publishers. Colorado.
- Floyd, Rita. (2007). Toward a Sequentialist Evaluation of Security: Bringing together the Copenhagen and the Welsh Schools of Security Studies. *Review of International Studies*. 33. 327-350.
- _____. (2007). Human Security and the Copenhagen School's Securitization Approach: Conceptualizing Human Security as a Securitizing Move. *Human Security Journal*. 5. 38-46.
- Creswell, John W. (2009). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mix Methods Approaches* (3rd ed.). Sage. California.
- Gee, John. (2013). Clash in Sabah Testifies to Colonialism's Lingering Policy. *The Washington Report on Middle East Affairs*. 32. 7. 35-41.
- Gerstl, Alfred. (2010). The Changing Notion of Security in Southeast Asia: State, Regime, and "ASEANized" Human Security. *Pacific News*. 34. 4-8.
- Hongfang, Shen. (2011). South China Sea Issue in China-ASEAN Relations: An Alternative Approach to Ease the Tension. *International Journal of China Studies*. 2. 3. 585-600.
- Jolly, Richard. & Ray, Deepayan Basu. (2006). The Human Security Framework and National Human Development Report: A Review of Experiences and Current Debate. Human Development Report Office. *NHRD Occasional Paper 5*.

- Kiras, James D. (2011). Terrorism and Globalization. In Baylis, John., Smith, Steve., & Owens, Patricia (Eds), *The Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations*. (pp. 366-378)), (4th Ed). New York. Oxford University Press.
- Krause, Keith. & Williams, C. Michael. (1997). *Critical Security Studies: Concept and Strategies*. UCL Press. London.
- _____ (ed). (1997). *Critical Security Studies: Concept and Cases*. University of Minnesota Press. Minneapolis.
- Muni, Sukh Deo. (2013). Conflicts in South Asia: Causes, Consequences, Prospects. *ISAS Working Paper*. No. 170.
- Newman, Edward. (2010). Critical Human Security Studies. *Review of International Studies*. 36. 77-94.
- Peoples, Columba. & Vaughan-William, Nick. (2010). *Critical Security Studies: An Introduction*. Routledge. London.
- Phan, Hou Duy. (2015). Institutional Design and Its Constraints: Explaining ASEAN's Role in the Temple of Preah Vihear Dispute. *Asian Journal of International Law*. 5. 7-15.
- Pushphanathan, S. (1999). *Combating Transnational Crime in ASEAN*. Paper Presented at the 7th ACPF World Conference on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice. New Delhi.
- Rolls, Mark. (2012). Centrality and Continuity: ASEAN and Regional Security since 1967. *East Asia*. 29. 127-139.
- Parameswaran, Prashanth. (2015). *ASEAN to Step Up Fight Against Transnational Crime*. <http://thediplomat.com/2015/09/asean-to-step-up-fight-against-transnational-crime/>. Accessed on 30 September 2015.
- Shaun, Narine. (1998). Institutional Theory and Southeast Asia. *World Affairs*. Summer. 1. 161. 33.
- Simon, Sheldon. (2008). ASEAN and Multilateralism: The Long, Bumpy Road to Community. *Contemporary Southeast Asia*. 30. 2. 264-92.
- Somantri, Gumilar Rusliwa. (2005). Memahami Metode Kualitatif. *Makara, Sosial Humaniora*. 9.2.57-65.
- Son, Nguyen Hung. (2011). *The ASEAN Political Security Community: Challenges and Prospects*. Conference Proceeding: International Conference on ASEAN Vision 2015: Moving Towards One Community, Taipei, 24-25 May 2011.
- Strachan, Hew. (2005). The Lost Meaning of Strategy. *Survival*. 47:3. 33-54.
- Sulovic, Vladimir. (2010). *Meaning of Security and Securitization*. Balgrade Center for Security Policy. 5 October 2010.
- United Nations Development Program. (1994). *Human Development Report 1994*. Oxford University Press. New York.

- Waltz, Kenneth. (2001). *Man, the State, and War*. Columbia University Press. New York.
- Weatherbee, Donald E. (2009). *International Relations in Southeast Asia: The Struggle for Autonomy*. (2nd Ed). Rowman & Littlefield Publishers. New York.
- Wendt, Alexander. (1999). *Social Theory of International Politics*. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge. Collins, 2000.
- Williams, Paul D. (2013). *Security Studies: An Introduction* (2nd ed.). Routledge. New York.

Internet Reference

- ASEAN. (2015). Treaty of Amity and Cooperation in Southeast Asia Indonesia, 24 February 1976. <http://www.asean.org/news/item/treaty-of-amity-and-cooperation-in-southeast-asia-indonesia-24-february-1976-3>. Accessed on 1 May 2015.
- _____. (2009). Agreement Establishing the ASEAN-Australia-New Zealand Free Trade Area. <http://www.asean.fta.govt.nz/assets/Agreement-Establishing-the-ASEAN-Australia-New-Zealand-Free-Trade-Area.pdf>. Accessed on 30 September 2015.
- _____. <http://www.asean.org/asean/external-relations>. Accessed on 1 May 2015.
- _____. <http://www.asean.org>. Accessed on 1 May 2015.