

# ASEAN opportunity as a global human rights actor: prospect and challenges

**Manotar Tampubolon<sup>1</sup>**

Faculty of Law, Universitas Kristen Indonesia,  
Jakarta

[manotar.tampubolon@uki.ac.id](mailto:manotar.tampubolon@uki.ac.id)

## Abstract

ASEAN's existence as an international organization, both at the regional and international levels, has been unsatisfactory since its introduction in 1967. In contrast to other regional organizations such as the European Union, the international personality and integrity level is low. ASEAN has instruments in way to set international disputes between its members. Nevertheless, this institution has never been used to solve problems within ASEAN. For example, in the Sipadan-Ligitan dispute between Indonesia and Malaysia, both parties prefer to settle through the International Court of Justice. ASEAN has never taken human rights issues in Myanmar seriously. The non-intervention principle is rigid, as is the lack of regional human rights courts such as those of the EU, America, and African organizations. The purpose of this article is to examine ASEAN's future role in promoting and protecting human rights on a global scale. The paper examines ASEAN's opportunities as a global human rights actor in terms of integrating human rights into foreign policy, as stated in the ASEAN CHARTER. According to the author, ASEAN will remain as it has ever been, with no chance to become a global human rights actor if it does not take action against its member countries that violate international law.

## Keywords

ASEAN; human right; global actor.

**To cite this article:** Tampubolon M. (2021). ASEAN opportunity as a global human rights actor: prospect and challenges. *Review of International Geographical Education (RIGEO)*, 11(5), 2078-2087. Doi: 10.48047/rigeo.11.05.114

**Submitted:** 18-11-2020 • **Revised:** 15-02-2021 • **Accepted:** 15-03-2021



## Introduction

The end of World War II heralded a shift in the international community's attitude toward human rights. Many human rights and freedom instruments came into play following the enactment and adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) in 1948. (Hey, 2018). The United Nations General Assembly was the organ that adopted the UDHR, from which other instruments of international human rights law arose (Smith, 2018). The Asian continent created a body to fight for human rights and other Asian country's interests. The Association of Southeast Asian Nations, or ASEAN, was established on August 8, 1967, in Bangkok, with five founding members: "Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore, and Thailand" (Usman, 2017). On August 8, ASEAN celebrated its 53rd anniversary (Menon & Lee, 2019). The primary goal of forming the Association of Southeast Asian Nations was to achieve political and economic objectives (Baviera & Maramis, 2017). Similarly, ASEAN was established to promote economic development, social progress, and cultural development in Southeast Asia through multilateral cooperation among member countries (Syarip, 2020). It is also worth noting that the five countries agreed to mutually assist each other on issues of mutual interest and to maintain close relations with existing Asian and global organizations with similar goals and objectives.

The ASEAN Declaration of 1967, also known as the Bangkok Declaration, includes seven major objectives. Among them are: (a) "to accelerate economic growth, social progress, and cultural development; and (b) to promote regional peace and stability through ongoing respect for justice and the rule of law in the region's relationships, as well as adherence to the principles of the United Nations." (Menon & Lee, 2019). The term "human rights" does not appear in the Bangkok Declaration, but the founding member states affirmed their commitment to the principles enshrined in the UN Charter. The five ASEAN members agreed to the UN Charter's purposes and foundational principles (Yamakage, 2017). In 2009, the Association of Southeast Asian Nations established a human rights commission as an advisory body for the promotion and protection of human rights (Hara, 2019). The Intergovernmental Commission on Human Rights (AICHR) is the advisory body (Hara, 2018), and the primary goal of the organ is to protect human rights.

Since its initial conception, ASEAN has encountered multiple financial crises. The end of the 1997 financial crisis represented as a started waking call for non-governmental and government actors who arose, determined to revitalize Southeast Asia's economy (Khoo & Tsunekawa, 2017). The event also drew the countries' importance to human rights, which has become a focus area for ASEAN to work on. The areas of opportunity opened new doors for programs, ushering in more progress both domestically and regionally. Despite high expectations from various sectors in Southeast Asia, these programs have not resulted in much progress toward ASEAN's goal of meeting all of its objectives.

ASEAN has made significant strides toward human rights adoption in the previous ten years, including the establishment of the ASEAN Intergovernmental Commission on Human Rights and the adoption of the ASEAN Human Rights Declaration in 2012 (Hadiprayitno, 2018). Human rights are a fundamental phenomenon that remains a major source of concern in ASEAN politics. Several member countries have formally stated their commitments to upholding and advocating for global human rights values, as well as incorporating them into their domestic legal structures.

Apart from Singapore, Brunei, Myanmar, and Malaysia, the other six ASEAN countries are signatories to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights, according to Ahdanisa and Rothman (2021). Furthermore, international human rights values are incorporated into the national constitutions of many Southeast Asian countries. For example, the Kingdom of Thailand's Constitution of 2007 guarantees their people's equality, freedoms, and rights (Human Rights Watch, 2016). Human rights are also important in the Philippines' national legal structure, with the country becoming one of the first to ratify the two agreements. According to Tampubolon and Silaban (2020), the Indonesian constitution was also amended to reflect significant changes in human rights protection. Lawansiri (2020) ASEAN is an important player in the protection and promotion of human rights. Human rights are one of ASEAN's goals, as stated in the ASEAN Charter.

These ASEAN developments, particularly in human rights protection, have elicited a range of reactions from various stakeholders. Nonetheless, despite the global commitment and incorporation of human rights values into ASEAN member constitutions, member states have not done much to pursue a stronger purpose to realize human rights protection in Southeast Asia.

Scholarly research on the subject has widely criticized the role of the AICHR and the essential contents of the Declaration in promoting and safeguarding the human rights of Asian citizens. The mechanism for developing a regional human rights plan in Southeast Asia cannot be divorced from the local events taking place in each country, particularly across the region (Deinla, 2017). The boost in human rights awareness and the establishment of institutions promoting human rights values in local political spaces are regarded as critical factors determining how effective a regional mechanism becomes (European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, 2020). When a country achieves an exemplary human rights record, having strong regional human rights structures will strengthen the gains and provide additional support for other state mechanisms. The challenges may be closely related to existing legal, economic, social, and political structures, as well as ongoing debates about human rights at both the regional and national levels.

## Literature Review

### Critical evaluation of global human rights actor

Deficiencies in international laws or the provision of assistance to people who face discrimination on international platforms. Following World War II, international laws were not helpful in resolving issues or protecting rights associated with early human rights treaties, as well as protecting, *inter alia*, religious rights. According to Alston (2017), after World War II, changes in international law were considered to protect individuals' rights. During World War II, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) is drafted to protect the rights of prisoners. During World War II, non-state powers began to violate human rights-related regulations due to a lack of monitoring as well as a lack of awareness about human rights-related regulations and the application of human rights. The need to protect people's religious rights, as well as other human rights, and to avoid discrimination in society has led to further strengthening of human rights (Tampubolon, 2016). Legal consequences, as well as discrimination on international platforms, all have had an impact on global human rights.

### Critical evaluation of challenges that can be faced by ASEAN as a global human rights actor

The ASEAN human rights principles are focused on ensuring the general principles for the protection of people's human rights. According to De Schutter (2016), general ASEAN principles include maintaining a person's equality and dignity, and every person is entitled to the right to freedom. Other ASEAN principles include the protection of women's, children's, older people's, and migrant workers' rights. According to Koh (2017), challenges that can be encountered while implementing ASEAN principles include legal consequences, as well as a lack of awareness and monitoring for the continued application of global human rights. The primary challenges in implementing ASEAN human rights include power dominance reflected in the inability to express oneself, as well as discrimination in accessing legal aid.

### Critical evaluation of the application of ASEAN

ASEAN Human Rights Corporation focuses on maintaining human rights-related specifications at the international level by ensuring individual equality and dignity. The ASEAN human rights body is concerned with ensuring that people's fundamental freedoms are protected. However, according to Neo (2017), this human rights body ensures the dignity of people from various social and cultural backgrounds. It focuses on maintaining human rights regulation at the local, state, and state and national level.

## Methods

A secondary research method was used in this research paper to identify the challenges associated with considering ASEAN as a global human rights actor. In this research paper, positivism philosophy and a deductive approach were taken into account. Positivism philosophy was considered in this research because it aids in identifying the relationship between research phenomena using empirical evidence. The deductive approach was considered in this research

because it aided in the development of themes based on the research objectives and purpose. This research paper considered descriptive research design. The descriptive research design has aided in the successful evaluation of secondary information under the themes that have been developed based on research objectives (Sik,2015). The method with secondary qualitative research has been considered. Thematic analysis was included in this research paper to identify the challenges that ASEAN is going to face. Thematic approach is essential for meeting the purpose of a research paper through using themes generated based on research objectives. Thematic analysis focuses on developing themes based on both research purpose as well as the research objectives. Secondary information, such as information from journal articles, has been considered in order to reach the themes' objectives.

## Findings and Results

### ASEAN Prospects as a Global Human Rights Actor

The Association of Southeast Asian Nations is working to build long-term infrastructure through its member states. The primary objective of this prospect will be to synchronize resources available for the provision of support across the full life cycle of all ASEAN infrastructure improvements, such as project preparation, infrastructure productivity improvement, and capability building. This future prospect will also include the sharing of ideas concerning smart urbanization plans in all ASEAN member countries. These prospects aim continue providing economic growth and a good life for present and future generations.

Another opportunity for ASEAN is to be technologically innovative. According to Anbumozhi and Kimura (2018), digital technology in ASEAN could be worth US\$625 billion by 2030, accounting for 8% of ASEAN's GDP in that year. Increased efficiency and new products and services can lead to digital innovation (Kellermann, 2019). To seize this opportunity in the future, ASEAN will need to establish regulatory structures for the provision of modern digital services and data management. These opportunities will make it easier to implement best practices while also empowering micro, small, and medium-sized enterprises (MSMEs) by improving accessibility to the newly proposed technological resources and activities.

Similarly, there is a plan in ASEAN member states and the Human Rights Process to include and engage civil society. However, according Baviera and Maramis (2017), another significant prospect is the potential of civil society organizations encompassing ASEAN human rights organs in their plans. Civil society organizations have played a significant role in promoting human rights and human safety.

Nonetheless, ASEAN is currently a state focal organization. The absence of civil society and other partners is visible in a variety of ways. To begin, the 1986 ASEAN guidelines for ASEAN relations with non-governmental organizations state that "approval of an NGO's application for affiliation with ASEAN shall be based primarily on an assessment of the positive contribution which such an NGO could make to the enhancement, strengthening, and realization of ASEAN's aims and objectives" (Rahman, 2016). With this stance, Chapter V of the ASEAN Charter became more lenient, with article 16 stating that ASEAN can engage with bodies and organizations that support their charter, particularly their goals, purposes, and principles (Baviera and Maramis, 2017). These related entities are still limited, particularly to business or technical groups, since there are only a few of them which work with human rights issues.

Significant efforts are also being made to achieve seamless logistics by improving ASEAN Connectivity and assuming excellent logistics. Even so, logistics efficiency continues to struggle. It has not improved at the rate indicated by MPAC 2010 in specific instances of duration and transportation costs in the region. Effective alternatives between state departments, and therefore a lack of sharing best-practices, present a challenge to this prospect. There is an opportunity to develop mechanisms to promote better collaboration by many logistics companies, academic institutions, and ASEAN members (Wongwuttivat & Lawanna, 2018). The opportunity will aid in understanding the limitations in all critical areas of Southeastern Asia's supply chains, storing and interpreting best practices besides dealing with those issues in the region, and identifies key policy situations that require attention.

Furthermore, ASEAN continues to strive for regulatory excellence in their functions and relationships with member states. Even before developing, adopting, and implementing rules, guidelines, and procedures in ASEAN jurisdictions, good regulatory practice must be preceded.

The main objective of this prospect is to acquire support for implementing critical policies for the ASEAN Connectivity Plan, with such a special emphasis on uniformity (Aritenang, 2017). The discussion of human rights in the ASEAN region has increasingly focused on the values and normative structures which perform inside of ASEAN.

In addition, advocates will look at democratization processes in all ASEAN members to ensure the right starting point for the success of the fight for human rights and to provide a policy target. There has been a push for ASEAN to work with others and collaborate with other international institutions. However, not much has been done except to move forward. There are numerous opportunities to be actively involved in foreign affairs, primarily from Indonesia and the Philippines, in order to push for change. Such a transformative leadership initiative could come from non-governmental institutions or other organizations.

ASEAN's objectives include, among other things, economic development. ASEAN member states have recently sought to transition to local-based production and regional hub development agendas that will serve ASEAN consumers, such as in the automotive and health device industries (Syarif, 2020). Similarly, member states seek to adopt digital capabilities for the production and transportation of consumer goods in order to serve and communicate with consumer states and businesses in various sectors such as financial services and telecommunications. Furthermore, ASEAN anticipates developing partnerships and coalitions with vertical integration, as well as cross-sector and industry changes, such as Fintech (Anbumozhi & Kimura, 2018). Partnerships and collaborations are designed provide the organizations with a competitive advantage over their rivals, to keep engaged, and to meet consumers' expectations advantageously, as it is in the fuel refining industry.

The best alternative for ASEAN member states is to fully implement the Core International Human Rights Instruments. The concept here means that ASEAN is looking forward to forming a regional human rights regime of enhancing human rights standards and endorsing global human rights agreements, which are critical factors since they exemplify a strict liability acceptance of a set norms and rules of human rights. Even though mere ratification does not guarantee approval or implementation of global human rights values, more efforts are obliged to bring out all the agreements (Ahdanisa & Rothman, 2021). Furthermore, when combined with reservations and declarations against various treaties, it can shed light on states' underlying outlook, imperfections, and understanding of national interest in dealing with human rights obligations (Syarif, 2020). More global human rights treaties, including those ratified by ASEAN, will make a significant contribution to the more coherent knowledge and implementation of human rights norms. The steps will be essential in the future endeavour of an ASEAN human rights instrument.

## **ASEAN Challenges becomes a Global Human Rights Actor**

With all of the advantages and past achievements which ASEAN has made over the years, there are still significant challenges forward with. The 1990s were really a critical decade for ASEAN, significantly contributed to the end of the Cold War, that further did end ASEAN's involvement in Vietnam (Trihartono, 2016). The most notable of these is the invasion and subsequent occupation of Cambodia in 1978. (Path, 2020). The event compelled ASEAN to devote all of its resources for more than ten years. According to Chaponnière and Lautier (2016), ASEAN needed new commitments following the dispensation, which can be found by promoting Southeast Asian regional economic integration through the ASEAN Free Trade Agreement (AFTA). At the late 1990s, the newly established ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF) and the organization expanded ones membership to include Vietnam, Laos, Myanmar, and Cambodia (Aisarieva, 2015). However, ASEAN's efforts and plans to restructure ended in failure in 1997, and major problems emerged.

The first challenge is technology adoption, which varies significantly across ASEAN member states. Southeast Asia is regarded as the global epicenter of the fastest growing population of Internet users (World Bank, 2018). In the coming years, more new users are set to attend online platforms and markets (Asian Development Bank, 2018). The majority of economic growth and development can indeed be attributed to mobile use, which has the opportunity to initiate and create new industries, best business models, and ultimately change the lives of many people. Nonetheless, technological adoption necessitates the ASEAN countries developing regional internet infrastructure.

The problem is economic integration. Even with the formation of ASEAN Economic Community (AEC) in 2015, economic integration remains a major challenge (Wignaraja, Collins &

Kannangara, 2019). ASEAN is a more cohesive and integrated organization. The AEC aims to create a single market and industrial-based production capability, boost competitiveness, fight for inclusive growth, and integrate ASEAN countries into the global economy. Some of the obstacles these nations have confronted entail trade and investment barriers—especially foreign direct investments, and even some huge development gaps. ASEAN members are obviously geographically strategic to one another and close to the world's most populous economic giants, China and India. Because more emphasis is placed on the two countries, these two economic powers (China and India) facilitate ASEAN to keep competing in economic growth and development (Ting, 2016). Many overseas investors will be keen to invest in China and collaborate with the country on development and economic problems. Another challenge is that ASEAN countries are embroiled in territorial squabbles and wranglings with intriguing powers. According to Storey and Lin (2016), China claimed ownership of the southern part of the China Sea territories. The argument ran counter to assertions made by Vietnam, Brunei Darussalam, Malaysia, and the Philippines. In the circumstance of such conflicts, goodwill, closer coordination, and common interests among ASEAN governments will assist in settling those in order to encourage reliability and prevent dispute uncertainties.

Another major issue among ASEAN member states is rigidity. Corruption, demographic changes, uneven social development, disparities in economic development and technology adoption, environmental degradation, and other ideological and authoritarian issues are also major challenges for ASEAN (Heng, 2020). According to Ahmed and Mohiuddin (2019), the ASEAN leaders did not fix the Rohingya crisis in a meaningful manner; instead, they used the Summit to pursue regional trade agreement talks which were held in direct contravention of the values of sustainability and economic development for all. ASEAN, as a political entity, has failed to follow through with its defined aims (Cheok & Chen, 2019). The leaders of the nations have been unable to effectively deal with the members' challenging and critical issues.

Interestingly, the rise of authoritarianism and threats to democracy in Southeast Asia has never been fully addressed, and as a result, the events go unnoticed. For a long time, South-East Asia has been ruled by autocratic regimes, with hardly liberal democracy in the region (Renshaw, 2019). Brunei, Malaysia, Cambodia, and Vietnam are the Southeast Asian countries most affected by this type of rule (Morgenbesser, 2020). Brunei, which, like China, appears to lack national elections, is a prime example of a threat to democracy. Many authoritarian governments, including China and Singapore, have devised a competitive leadership model that includes competitive elections (Bell, 2016). Following the Cold War's end, some powerful leaders were influenced by election results that were favorable to them.

Furthermore, most democracies in Southeast Asian countries are weak and in the initial phases of consolidation, finding it challenging to advance plans for promoting democracy in the region. In the Southeast Asia region, Indonesia and the Philippines are considered as democratic, but they experience difficulties and shortcomings in order to pursue of real democracy (Ruegg, 2020). Also because two countries have not yet gained full democracy, those who will find it difficult to encourage other nations to pursue democracy and freedom.

ASEAN, for example, has also failed miserably during the Rohingya crisis. According to Selth (2018), ASEAN waited for Myanmar's Independent Commission of Inquiry to investigate and report on the unaccountability seen during the Rohingya crisis. Myanmar is well-known for failing to adequately investigate its abuse (Bergsmo, 2019). The United Nations and human rights non-governmental organizations have questioned the Commission's ability to carry out its work and mandate. As a result, understand perfectly something to Myanmar's failure and ineffectiveness, ASEAN countries took initiative and delegated a critical case to the Commission to investigate (Hara, 2019). The move illustrates how ASEAN has failed to recognize the Commission's failure and the lack of accountability in constructing a commission to investigate the crisis. Independent Inquiry Commission, as per the ACHR, the global community is meant to ensure justice for the killings in Myanmar. According to Gunnarsson (2020), the ACHR has asked UN Security Council members to refer the Myanmar case to the International Criminal Court (ICC). The move was regarded as critical.

Another failure or challenge for ASEAN is the creation of a judicial body. The AICHR has consistently lacked the ability to establish a judicial body comparable to those found in Europe and Africa (Ahdanisa & Rothman, 2021). Judicial bodies are supposed to hear cases and issue verdicts against member countries found to be in violation of human rights. Due to the fact most of these judicial bodies are not perfect, amounting to their limited powers to act and inability to make domestic law, they are still important bodies for promoting respect for human rights and

freedoms. Furthermore, if these judicial organs are effective, they can ensure that those affected by human rights violations committed by governments are adequately compensated for the losses. As a result, ASEAN, as a regional organization, should commit to the establishment of a regional human rights court.

The organization's actions are characterized by one method of decision-making. According to Idris and Kamaruddin (2019), AICHR's overreliance on consensus decision-making has caused more problems than solutions for ASEAN member states. This decision-making technique slows down action and gives countries the ability to veto criticisms of their human rights records (Carter, 2018). A closer examination of the Rohingya case study, for example, reveals many of the issues related to ASEAN's reliance on consensus decision-making. Without the use of consensus, Myanmar would have had to accept condemnation and criticism of how it operates, as well as substantive action to address the crisis, but that was not possible. In the event that this decision-making was removed, the AICHR would make more sound decisions, and actions would be needed to overcome human rights crises, since a state (s) would not hinder or block measures put in place to prevent violations of civil, political, and other citizens' rights.

Seeing as ASEAN's primary goal is to ensure human rights are respected, the organization is bound to receive multiple complaints and resolve the conflict through its organs. Generating a formal complaints process has been a major challenge for ASEAN (Duxbury & Tan 2019). It is widely agreed that the AICHR should establish an official complaint mechanism so that individuals, states, and civil society groups can easily report human rights violations. Currently, the AICHR lacks such a mechanism, making it nearly impossible to take appropriate action in response. As a result, establishing a platform for raising concerns would strengthen the AICHR's viability even in the future.

There is also a tendency for one set of rights to be prioritized over another. Some ASEAN state regimes are opposed to the concept of human rights indivisibility (Smith & Molloy, 2020). Instead of focusing on human rights issues, they prefer to promote and fight for economic, socio-cultural, and cultural rights rather than political and civil rights. ASEAN contends that political and civil rights can stymie economic development and social order. There has long been a trend in which economic, social, and cultural rights have taken precedence over political and civil rights. ASEAN leaders agree with Jiang Zemin, a former Chinese president. They once stated that rights and freedoms that will ensure China's population's survival are more important than political rights (Freedom House, 2020). The leaders are adamant that when one category of rights is violated, it affects other categories of rights. A plausible scenario is that economic, social, and cultural rights are violated as a result of political rights violations.

ASEAN member states, like any other organization, have prioritized order, discipline, and duties over various human rights. Citizens have obligations to their communities. Many ASEAN regimes believe that personal or personal rights must be prioritized after national security and economic development, which is an incorrect approach (Thomson 2017). The nations believe that responsibilities to the country and its citizens are more important than respect for individual human rights and freedoms. In this regard, Singapore's former Premier, Lee Kuan Yew, stated that "the society has always been more important than the individual" (Nishikawa, 2010). That statement salvaged Asia from problems that might have effected future generations. Lee Kuan Yew acknowledged that having compassion for society would benefit the country rather than the individual.

Following the formation of ASEAN, some fundamental working principles were established, some of which are sound, while others require reconsideration. The policy of non-intervention and freedom 'from external interference in any form or manifestation to preserve their national identities' is one of the unfortunate principles to be established (Lombok, 2016). According to Noor (2019), Article 2 of the Treaty of Amity and Cooperation in South East Asia guides ASEAN members in their interactions with one another as they adhere to: "(a) mutual respect for the independence, sovereignty, equality, territorial integrity, and national identities of all nations; (b) the right of every state to lead its national existence free from external interference, subversion, and coercion; and (c) non-interference in one another's internal affairs." Non-interference may lead to atrocities and violations of human liberties and rights by some rogue leaders. It is past time for ASEAN's cherished principle of non-interference to be modified so that it can play a constructive role in preventing or resolving domestic issues with regional implications.... when a domestic issue threatens regional stability, a dose of peer pressure or friendly advice at the right time can be beneficial (Hunt & Morada, 2018). Some ASEAN countries have remained staunchly opposed to the aforementioned ideas. Petcharamesree (2016) stated during a presentation in 1999 that the "ASEAN way would



continue to adapt to the changing situation, but its key principles, specifically non-intervention, will not change, there is no valid reason to change something that has worked successfully for over three decades."

Considering what other international organizations do, the challenge of limited financial support from member states indicates that ASEAN can only provide a limited organizational structure for the establishment of a human rights government. Due to limited support from its secretariat, the ASEAN human rights category has done less in member states (Nandyatama & Rum, 2020). Finally, the global economic slowdown, low labor force productivity, an aging population, and an over-reliance on external trade have all played a significant role in ASEAN's failures, ineffectiveness, and sustainability of the organization's growth and track record of respecting human rights and liberties.

## Conclusion

Since its inception, ASEAN has made some visible contributions. However, there are ample opportunities to restore human rights and freedoms even within member states and on a global scale. With these prospects, there are numerous challenges and inefficiencies that the organization should first address in order to achieve organizational objectives. ASEAN's social space is far from perfect, and the leaders of these countries are the least likely to support or tolerate liberal democracy in their countries. Such an approach precludes going to have to pay attention to this issue that limiting democracy infringes the rights of millions of citizens; thereby, political transparency and respect for human rights are necessary. Human rights enshrined in the ASEAN Declaration and other agreements must be respected and upheld at the domestic level before ASEAN can be fully accepted at the regional level. The progress made at both the state and regional levels suggests that positive change is possible, which can pave the way for the initial push to have more developments. These changes are conceivable if various stakeholders engage in calling for the respect and promotion of human rights in the region while still not dissociating from the call to action.

It is open to ASEAN to exemplify that it can convey out Article 14 of the ASEAN Charter. If ASEAN member states implement the non-interference principle, the human rights process will be rendered irrelevant. ASEAN may lack effectiveness and success when it does not rectify state sovereignty with human rights obligations and citizen sovereignty. As a consequence, it is disingenuous for ASEAN leaders to enable the ASEAN human rights organ to reside whilst also attempting to deny power to protect its citizens. To accomplish its objectives of making sure human rights are upheld and respected, the ASEAN human rights organ must be operating effectively under its mandate.

## References

- Ahdanisa, D. S., & Rothman, S. B. (2021). Revisiting international human rights treaties: comparing Asian and Western efforts to improve human rights. *SN Social Sciences*, 1(1), 1-41.
- Ahmed, K., & Mohiuddin, H. (2019). *The Rohingya Crisis: Analyses, Responses, and Peacebuilding Avenues*. Lexington Books.
- Aisarieva, A. (2015). *ASEAN and Security Institution: Focusing on ASEAN Regional Forum and the ASEAN Political-Security Community*. Master Thesis. Retrieved from <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/60541204.pdf>
- Alston, P. (2017). The populist challenge to human rights. *Journal of Human Rights Practice*, 9(1), 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jhuman/hux007>
- Amador, J. S., & Tedoro, J. A. (2016). *The role of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations in post-conflict reconstruction and democracy support*. Stockholm: International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance. Retrieved from <https://www.idea.int/sites/default/files/publications/the-role-of-asean-in-post-conflict-reconstruction-and-democracy-support.pdf>
- Anbumozhi, V., & Kimura, F. (2018). *Industry 4.0: Empowering ASEAN for the circular economy*. Jakarta: Economic Research Institute for ASEAN and East Asia.
- Aritenang, A. (2017). *The Potential Development Effect of ASEAN Connectivity: The Case of Riau Corridor*. Bandung: Bandung Islamic University.
- Asian Development Bank. (2018). *Embracing the E-commerce Revolution in Asia and the Pacific*.

doi:10.22617/tcs189409-2

- Bajaj, M. (2011). Human rights education: Ideology, location, and approaches. *Human Rights Quarterly*, 481-508.
- Baviera, A., & Maramis, L. (2017). *Building ASEAN Community: Political–Security and Socio-cultural Reflections*. Jakarta: Economic Research Institute for ASEAN and East Asia.
- Bell, D. A. (2016). *The China model: Political meritocracy and the limits of democracy*. Princeton University Press.
- Bergsmo, M. (2019). *Myanmar, Colonial Aftermath, and Access to International Law*. Torkel Opsahl Academic EPublisher.
- Carter, G. J. (2018). *Multilateral consensus decision-making: How Pacific island states build and reach consensus in climate change negotiations*. (Australian National University Thesis), ANU Library Repository. <https://openresearch-repository.anu.edu.au/handle/1885/157008>
- Chaponnière, J. R., & Lautier, M. (2016). By chance or by virtue? The regional economic integration process in Southeast Asia. In *ASEAN Economic Community* (pp. 33-57). Palgrave Macmillan, New York.
- Cheok, C. K., & Chen, Y. C. (2019). Assessing ASEAN'S Relevance. *Journal of Southeast Asian Economies*, 36(1), 11-24.
- Deinla, I. (2017). The Development of the Rule of Law in ASEAN. In *The Development of the Rule of Law in ASEAN: The State and Regional Integration* (pp. I-II). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- De Schutter, O. (2016). Towards a New Treaty on Business and Human Rights. *Business and Human Rights Journal*, 1(1), 41-67. doi:10.1017/bhj.2015.5
- Duxbury, A., & Tan, H. (2019). *Can ASEAN Take Human Rights Seriously? (Integration through Law: The Role of Law and the Rule of Law in ASEAN Integration)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/9781108566414
- European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, (2020). *Strong and Effective National Human Rights Institution, Challenges, Promising Practices and Opportunities*. Report. [https://fra.europa.eu/sites/default/files/fra\\_uploads/fra-2020-strong-effective-nhris\\_en.pdf](https://fra.europa.eu/sites/default/files/fra_uploads/fra-2020-strong-effective-nhris_en.pdf)
- Freedom House. (2020). *Freedom in the World 2021: China*. <https://freedomhouse.org/country/china/freedom-world/2021>
- Hadiprayitno, I. (2018). Deadlock and Denial: Domestic Challenges and the Institutionalization Human Rights in ASEAN. *Global Jurist*, 19(1). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/gj-2018-0001>
- Hara, A. E. (2019). The struggle to uphold a regional human rights regime: the winding role of ASEAN Intergovernmental Commission on Human Rights (AICHR). *Revista Brasileira de Política Internacional*, 62(1). <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/0034-7329201900111>
- Hara A.E. (2018) The Concerns and Sustainability of ASEAN Intergovernmental Commission on Human Rights (AICHR). In: McLellan B. (eds) *Sustainable Future for Human Security*. Springer, Singapore. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-5433-4\\_4](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-5433-4_4)
- Heng, K. (2020). ASEAN's Challenges and the Way Forward, *The Diplomat*, August 15. <https://thediplomat.com/2020/08/aseans-challenges-and-the-way-forward/>
- Hey, E. (2018). The Universal Declaration of Human Rights in "The Anthropocene." *AJIL Unbound*, 112, 350-354. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/aju.2018.87>
- Human Rights Watch. (2016). *World Report 2016: Events of 2015*. Policy Press. [https://www.hrw.org/sites/default/files/world\\_report\\_download/wr2016\\_web.pdf](https://www.hrw.org/sites/default/files/world_report_download/wr2016_web.pdf)
- Hunt, C.T., & Morada, N., M. (2018). *Regionalism and Human Protection: Reflections from Southeast Asia and Africa*, Koninklijke Brill, Leiden.
- Idris, A., & Kamaruddin, N. (Eds.). (2019). *ASEAN Post-50: Emerging Issues and Challenges*. Springer. [https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-981-13-8043-3\\_1](https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-981-13-8043-3_1)
- Jones, D. (2019). *ASEAN'S Human Rights Conundrum: An Analysis of the Failures of the ASEAN System for Promoting Human Rights*. University of Pennsylvania Repository. [https://repository.upenn.edu/ppe\\_honors/36/](https://repository.upenn.edu/ppe_honors/36/)
- Kellermann, M. (2019). Ensuring quality to gain access to global markets: a reform toolkit. The World Bank. <http://pubdocs.worldbank.org/en/249621553265195570/Full-QI-Toolkit-Report.pdf>
- Khoo B.T., Tsunekawa K. (2017) Southeast Asia: Beyond Crises and Traps. In: Khoo B., Tsunekawa K., Kawano M. (eds) *Southeast Asia beyond Crises and Traps*. Studies in Economic Transition. Palgrave Macmillan, Cham. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-55038-1\\_1](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-55038-1_1)
- Koh, T. (2017). ASEAN and the EU: Differences and Challenges. *The Straits Times*.1(1), 34-70. Retrieved from <https://cil.nus.edu.sg/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/2017.08.22-Asean->

[and-the-EU-Differences-and-challenges.pdf](#)

- Lawansiri, P. (2020). *Human rights and participatory politics in Southeast Asia*: by Catherine Renshaw, Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 2019, viii+ 247 pp., \$75.00 (hardback), ISBN 978-0-8122-5103-6.
- Lombok, L. L. (2016). The Character of Sovereignty in the Framework of International Economic Law and Its Progress in Asean Community, Conference Proceedings, [KnE Social Sciences / The 1st International Conference on South East Asia Studies \(ICSEAS 2016\)](#)
- Menon, J., & Lee, C. (Eds.). (2019). *An Evolving ASEAN: Vision and Reality*. Asian Development Bank. <https://www.adb.org/sites/default/files/publication/528626/evolving-asean-vision-reality.pdf>
- Morgenbesser, L. (2020). *The rise of sophisticated authoritarianism in Southeast Asia*. Cambridge University Press.
- Nandyatama, R., W., & Rum, M. (2020). Is ASEAN Doing Enough to Address Business and Human Rights? *Melbourne Asia Review*, August 18. DOI: 10.37839/MAR2652-550X3.7
- Neo, J., L. (2017). Realizing the Right to Freedom of Thought, Conscience and Religion: The Limited Normative Force of the ASEAN Human Rights Declaration. *Human Rights Law Review*, 17(4), 729-751. <https://doi.org/10.1093/hrlr/ngx028>
- Nishikawa, Y. (2010). *Human security in southeast Asia* (Vol. 16), 1<sup>st</sup> ed. Routledge.
- Noor, A. N., Zakuan, Z. Z., & Noor, S. M. (2019). *Proceedings of the Second International Conference on the Future of ASEAN (ICoFA) 2017 - Volume 1: Business and Social Sciences*. Basingstoke, England: Springer.
- Path, K. (2020). *Vietnam's Strategic Thinking During the Third Indochina War*. The University of Wisconsin Press. <https://uwpress.wisc.edu/books/5797.htm>
- Petcharamesree, S. (2016). ASEAN human rights regime and mainstreaming the responsibility to protect: Challenges and prospects. *Global Responsibility to Protect*, 8(2-3), 133-157. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1163/1875984X-00803004>
- Rahman, S. (2016). *Orienting ASEAN Towards Its People: Enabling Engagement with Local NGOs*, Working Papers No. 298, S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies, Singapore. <https://www.rsis.edu.sg/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/WP298.pdf>
- Renshaw, C. (2019). *Human rights and participatory politics in Southeast Asia*. University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Ruegg, K., O. (2020). *The Philippines vs. Indonesia: A Tale of Two Leaders*, Thesis, New York University.
- Selth, A. (2018). *Myanmar's Armed Forces and the Rohingya Crisis*, United State Institute of Peace, <https://www.usip.org/sites/default/files/2018-08/pw140-myanmars-armed-forces-and-the-rohingya-crisis.pdf>
- Sik, K. (2015). Tradition or modernism in grammar teaching: deductive vs. inductive approaches. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 197(1), 2141-2144. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.07.340>
- Smith, R. K. (2018). *International human rights law*. Oxford University Press.
- Smith, R., & Molloy, S. (2020). Navigating Human Rights in a 'Post-Human Rights' Era, *Asia-Pacific Journal on Human Rights and the Law*, 21(2), 139-194. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1163/15718158-21020001>
- Storey, I., & Lin, C. Y. (Eds.). (2016). *The South China Sea Dispute: Navigating Diplomatic and Strategic Tensions*. ISEAS-Yusof Ishak Institute.
- Syarip, R. (2020). Defending Foreign Policy at Home: Indonesia and the ASEAN-Based Free Trade Agreements. *Journal of Current Southeast Asian Affairs*, 39(3), 405-427. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1868103420935556>
- Tampubolon, M. (2016). From Protector to Violator: Assessing the State's Role in Protecting Freedom of Religion in Indonesia, *Journal of Human Rights and Peace Studies*, 2(1), 45-66. <https://so03.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/HRPS/article/view/163847/118629>
- Tampubolon, M. & Silaban, P. (2020). Juridical Analysis of the Enactment of Government Regulation on the Right of Assembly in Indonesia, *International Journal of Law and Society*, 3(3), 123-139. doi: 10.11648/j.ijls.20200303.17
- Thompson, S. (2017). The Evolution of Southeast Asian Regionalism: Security, Economic Development and Foreign Power Support for Regional Initiatives, 1947-77, *Journal of ASEAN Studies*, 5(1), 1-22. DOI: 10.21512/jas.v5i1.4160
- Ting, W. (2016). Increasing Economic Interdependence between China and ASEAN and Its Implications, *Journal of ASEAN Studies*, 4(2), 127-141. DOI: 10.21512/jas.v4i2.1524.g1745

- Trihartono, A. (2016). *The Evolving ASEAN Security Community: Background and Rationales*, LAP LAMBERT Academic Publishing, Germany.
- Wignaraja, G., Collins, A., & Kannangara, P. (2019). Opportunities and Challenges for Regional Economic Integration in the Indian Ocean. *Journal of Asian Economic Integration*, 1(1), 129–151. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2631684619829958>
- Wongwuttawat, J., & Lawanna, A. (2018). The digital Thailand strategy and the ASEAN community. *The Electronic Journal of Information Systems in Developing Countries*, 84(3), e12024. <https://doi.org/10.1002/isd2.12024>
- World Bank. (2018). *World Bank East Asia and Pacific Economic Update, October 2018: Navigating Uncertainty*. The World Bank. <http://hdl.handle.net/10986/30447>
- Yamakage, S. (2017). *Evolving ASEAN and Changing Roles of the TAC. Building ASEAN Community*, 39. [https://www.eria.org/ASEAN\\_at\\_50\\_4A.3\\_Yamakage\\_final.pdf](https://www.eria.org/ASEAN_at_50_4A.3_Yamakage_final.pdf)