

The Big Possible Future Use of Military Power in ASEAN

Hendra Maujana Saragih
Universitas Nasional Jakarta
hendramaujana@gmail.com

Ramlan Siregar
Universitas Nasional Jakarta

Zainul Djumadin
Universitas Nasional Jakarta

Abstract. This paper will predict and describe the possibility for ASEAN to provide an important mandate and full trust in its members to use military force in total against conflicts that occur between member countries in this regional organization or outside members of this organizations which of course can be useful to reduce and resolve conflicts effectively and quickly by paying attention to the factors that are more favorable for ASEAN indeed. Due to intra and inter conflict in this region needs to be taken seriously and placed as a determinant factor around it until ASEAN dares to give full power to members in the use of military force. The main issue to be discussed is why the use of military power is seen as important by ASEAN as a tool to reduce conflicts between member countries and countries outside the region. The theory that will be used in this paper is Military power and the power of regional. The method to be applied is to try to describe the causality of conflict with all its dynamics and then explore data and interpret the data so that it finds important findings in the dynamics of ASEAN organizations called novelty.

Keywords: conflict, power, military power

INTRODUCTION

The ASEAN Security Community adheres to a comprehensive security principle that recognizes the interrelationships between political, economic and socio-cultural aspects. The ASEAN Security Community provides a mechanism for peaceful prevention and handling of conflicts. This was carried out, among others, through joint consultations to discuss traditional regional political-security issues such as maritime security, expansion of defense cooperation, and non-traditional security issues (transnational crime, environmental damage and others).

With the degree of maturity that exists, ASEAN is expected to no longer hide domestic problems that have an impact on regional stability by taking refuge in the principles of *non-interference*. To analyze this discussion from some literature that the author reads, the author decides to use two theories as a blade analysis. Among them are national power and maritime Fulcrum.

In the literature on security community order must protect all its members from conflicts that arise from internal and external threats. Second, the security

community needs to facilitate the prevention of inter-and intra-state conflicts. Third, the security community must strive to form a community spirit in regional membership to create a shared identity so that the community can be viewed by outside parties as a single entity, in other words having a *sense of we-ness*.

Collective identity is a central idea in the concept of the security community; identity is a component that distinguishes the security community from other forms of security architecture, such as security regimes or alliances. One of the definitive markers of the formation of the security community, in accordance with the definition of Karl Deutsch is the existence of a "*dependable expectation of peaceful change*"; this is a condition that can only be achieved by the building of *trust* among member countries, and that trust can be built if there is a "*sense of weess*" or a sense of belonging or *common identity*. Shared identity can be made possible by 2 (two) things. First, the awareness of a problem or a threat faced by all member states and kebahayaan emerging from divisions and conflicts between the members or in the member state is prolonged. It is this awareness that represses conflict and encourages cooperation, and it is forged by long experience of conflict and cooperation. Second, shared identity can arise from a *counter-distinction* with parties outside the "us" circle. In the second mechanism this is actually the case major countries play a role.

The ASEAN Political and Security Community (ASEAN Political and Security Community / APSC) consists of countries that have a variety of problems, population characteristics and levels of welfare among their members [1]. However, since the ASEAN Concord (Bali Concord II) Declaration at the October 2003 ASEAN Summit, member countries have committed to forming the ASEAN Community with its three pillars, namely the Economic Community (ASEAN Economic Community), Social and Cultural Communities (ASEAN Socio-Cultural Community/ASCC) and Political and Security Community (APSC).

The security community as initiated by Karl Deutsch and more recently by Emmanuel Adler and Barnett imagines a community that nullifies the use of violence (*use of force*) in the relations between its members through the socialization of members towards common norms. This socialization does not just happen, but through the role of the dominant actor (or actors) in the community. Through this socialization, member

countries familiarize themselves with the logic of decency, which is what can be expected and not expected as the behavior of member countries. From this process, *distinctiveness* or community identity explains the specific roles and issues of an institution and their institutional position on the issue.

In his theory of *security*, Barry Buzan stated that one of the main dimensions that contributed greatly to the development of security was the regional security dimension. In the study of security, Buzan argued that security is a relational phenomenon. Because of its relational character, an activist in international relations, especially security studies cannot understand the security that occurs in a country without understanding international patterns that have interdependence on security around it [2].

The concept of security cooperation and factors of interest between countries led to the theory of *security complexes* by Buzan conditioned as "*a group of states Whose primary security concerns link together Sufficiently closely that Reviews their national securities can not realistically be Considered apart from one another.*" [2].

With the intensification of globalization and the increasingly connectedness of each country through regionalism organizations, this has encouraged activists of international relations to revise the views of the Buzan. In the latest definition of Buzan written by Soderbaum stated that, not only perceptions and concerns surrounding a country alone are bound to each other, giving rise to *regional security complex* but is now also to be seen that all countries in a region experiencing *securitization* well as *de-securitization* and processes this can not be released between countries with one another in the same region [3]. This shows the reflection of Buzan to shift his assumptions which previously were *state-centric* giving space to other actors that could be in the form of countries, international organizations, and other actors. Besides, Buzan, through the definition, now wants to state that the *reginal security complex* is not something that is created suddenly but through the construction of a *securitization* process.

Cooperative security or *Cooperative Security* is an approach developed by Canada and Australia in the early 90s in an effort to find a new format for managing regional security to respond to changes in international security conditions as a result of the collapse of the bipolar system and the dissolution of one of the Soviet superpowers. This is because in the post-Cold War era, the hope of managing security conditions was not only limited to anticipating the occurrence of war but also how to build shared values internationally to achieve long-term peace and peace stability [4]. Meanwhile other Asia Pacific security experts Harry Harding in his writing on *Global Engagement: Cooperative Security in the Asia Pacific* underlined that the concept of *cooperative security* is a concept that is sensitive to military and non-military issues. Harding then raised an example of a case that is considered to be a real implementation of *cooperative security*, a dialogue forum developed by

the ASEAN Regional Forum and the *Council for Security Cooperation on Asia-Pacific (CSCAP)* which is also part of the ASEAN Regional Forum which is a meeting between *first track* and *second track*. [5].

The theory of more specific *cooperative security* actually refers to efforts to build a broader and reciprocal sense of security in an effort to realize long-term security guarantees more than just efforts to take action deterrence against the threat of the opposing party. That's why the concept of *cooperative security* attempted to construct than previously thought *security against adversary or enemy* or in an effort to ensure the safety of the opponent must be faced with resistance (using military force) with a new approach that more is *nature security with enemy* or manage security the region by embracing enemies or competitors through multilateral security dialogue [6].

The concept of *cooperative security* also combines military and non-military components in joint security management measures. That is why the steps in implementing regional security management through *cooperative security* patterns also develop a pattern of *multi-track dialogue* that not only involves state actors but also non-state actors, especially academics and epistemic communities.

From what has been formulated above, the subject matter of this paper is: "Is it possible to use ASEAN in the military power in future?". Urgency of this research is trying to know the possibility of ASEAN in using the military power in future?

METHOD

In this study, the type of method used by the author is descriptive qualitative method According to David Williams, as quoted by Lexy J. Moleong [2], research using the natural setting, with the intent to interpret the phenomenon that occurs and is done by involving various methods with the intention that the results can be used to interpret phenomena and which are utilized for qualitative research are various research methods. In qualitative research the methods usually used are interviews, observations, and utilization of documents.

RESULT

The understanding that ASEAN is a security community is based more on the fact that none of its members uses armed force or assumes the need to use military force to resolve conflicts in the region that ASEAN is indeed a security community because of its ability to prevent conflict from the possibility of escalating armed confrontation to become a political community, is the fact that the absence of war between ASEAN member countries since the organization was founded in 1967 is ASEAN's greatest achievement in regulating peaceful interactions within the region.[7]

The ASEAN security community or *ASEAN Political Security Community (APSC)* is basically formed as an

effort to maintain the stability of the Southeast Asia region. Political stability and security will support the economic sector so as to create a peaceful and prosperous region. In contrast, a healthy regional economic climate will support political and security stability due to reduced economic disparity between countries.

Theoretically it looks simple. But at the level of reality, the road to integration is quite steep and winding. Coupled with the fact that in terms of anything, the Southeast Asia region is a region that is extraordinarily plural. This community is expected to reduce the intensity of the conflict and even open war between ASEAN countries. This community was formed to provide a regional framework for its members to resolve security problems and disputes within them and improve and accelerate cooperation to a higher level. In addition, member countries are aware of how increasingly transnational security threats are being developed that cannot be resolved unilaterally. The Security Community aims to accelerate security political cooperation in ASEAN to bring peace to the region, including with the international community. This community is open, based on a comprehensive security approach and is not intended to form a defense pact / military alliance or joint *foreign policy*. This community also refers to various political instruments of ASEAN which has existed as the *ASEAN Regional Forum* (ARF) with its three pillars: building trust (confident building measure / CBM), of preventive diplomacy (Preventive Diplomacy), and the resolution of conflicts (conflict resolution), The Zone of Peace, Freedom and Neutrality (ZOPFAN), the Treaty of Amity and Cooperation in Southeast Asia (TAC), and the Treaty on the Southeast Asia Nuclear Weapon-Free Zone (SEANWFZ), and obeying the UN Charter and other relevant international legal principles [8].

ASEAN readiness in this community is not determined by the success of the delegations of member countries signing the Declaration of Bali Concord II in 2003, it will only be a symbol of consensus on paper if it is not actualized in the form of real action. Moreover, ASEAN's readiness to form a community is determined by the ASEAN process in peacefully resolving conflicts between its member countries in accordance with existing multilateral instruments.

The process of forming the ASEAN collective identity is not only limited to the "ASEAN way" norm

as stated in the Bangkok Declaration. ASEAN's collective identity will be seen from how much the willingness of member countries to treat ASEAN truly as a *code of conduct or rule of the game* in international relations in Southeast Asia, particularly those relating to regional security dimensions. So the key here is the practice, not the concept. If not, the ASEAN security community is only *de jure* because it is *de facto* still unable to implement the rules it agreed to itself.

CONCLUSION

The ASEAN Security Community was established not to decide on power, it was agreed to strengthen the ASEAN security community not to interfere in internal affairs in each country. There is small possibility of ASEAN in using military power. Because they still adhere in ASEAN Way that principled to non-intervention.

REFERENCES

- [1] Sukma, Rizal Indonesia's foreign policy since reformasi:change and continuity dalam South East Asia Buletin CSIS Juni 2012
- [2] Buzan, Barry. 1991. *People, State and Fear: An Agenda for International Security Studies in the Post Cold War Era* 2nd Edition, Harvester Wheatsheaf, New York.
- [3] Soderbaum,Fredrik dan Grant, J. Andrew, 2003. *The New Regionalism in Africa*, London: Ashgate Publishing
- [4] Dewitt, David, 1994. *Common, Comprehensive and Cooperative Security*, Pacific Review, Vol. 7 No. 1.
- [5] Capie, David dan Evans, Paul , 2007 *The Asia-Pacific Security Lexicon* (Singapore : Institute of Southeast Asia Studies).
- [6] Snyder, Craig A. 1999. *Contemporary Security and Strategy*, Deakin University. London.
- [7] Leifer, Michael , ASEAN as a model of a security community ?, dalam Hadi Soesastro (ed.), ASEAN in a changed regional and International Economy, Jakarta, CSIS, 1995,
- [8] Moleong, Ilexy J. 2004. *Metode Penelitian Kualitatif*. Bandung : Rosdakarya, Bandung.