

Role of ASEAN in Promoting Peace

Taha Husain

¹ Author completed both bachelor of social science and master of social science with major in peace and conflict studies from University of Dhaka, Bangladesh.

E-mail: ahmthusain@gmail.com

Abstract

ASEAN role in promoting peace in Southeast Asia as regional organization is my dissertation. ASEAN was established during cold war period with six countries and expands its membership to ten countries in post cold war era. Starting with economic integration earlier, ASEAN plays role in peace also. Every one now astonished at ASEAN's economic progress but overlooks its role in promoting peace not only by development but also by lessening, mitigating or even managing interstate confrontation, conflict, and violence. I use qualitative methodology, specifically qualitative case analysis to accomplish my research monograph. ASEAN way, soft diplomacy, socialization, social interaction, joint economy and industrialization, impressive leadership, non coercive and non intervention policy that all helps ASEAN to minimize their internal conflict. ASEAN regional integration goes through Ernst Haas Leon Lind burg's neo-functionalism's way; starting with economic integration and spillover into security issues. ASEAN also

promotes both negative and positive peace as John Galtung defined through its regional integration process.

Key Words: ASEAN, Peace, Neo-functionalism, Qualitative, Inter-state Conflict, ASEAN Way,

Introduction

In the aftermath of the World War II, there came out a wave of regional institutionalization movements in different parts of the world. Having witnessed the end of notorious wars the surviving countries launched the foundations of regional institutions for the purpose of assuring stability and peace in the long run, there have been some initiatives also in the Asia Pacific region, such as the Southeast Asia Regional Organization. The Southeast Asian region is region that was colonized by superpowers such as Britain, the United States, France and Spain. In the early ages before World War II, countries in Southeast Asia were not recognized as a region. The word

Southeast Asia was used in Quebec Conference in August 1943, where the allied parties have placed Malaya, Sumatra, Thailand and Burma under the Southeast Asia Command to protect the colony in the Southeast Asian region. In July of 1945 during the Potsdam Conference, SEAC was expanded by adding Netherlands East Indies i.e. Indonesia and several countries of Indochina, which were Southern Vietnam and Cambodia (Turnbull, 1999:258-259). ASEAN was established on 8th August, 1967 with the Bangkok Declaration. Indonesia, Philippines, Malaysia, Singapore and Thailand were the founding signatories. Later Brunei and Vietnam joined the association on 7th Jan, 1984 and 28 July 1995. Lao PDR and Myanmar Joined together on 23 July 1997 and Cambodia became tenth and last member of ASEAN after joining it on 30 April 1999 (see history 2015)¹

Chronology

1954	South East Asia Treaty Organization
1959	South East Asia Friendship and Economy Treaty
	MAPHILINDO
1961	Association of South East Asia

1976	Treaty of Amity and Cooperation in South East Asia
1992	ASEAN Free Trade Area
1993	ASEAN Regional Forum
1997	ASEAN Vision 2020
2002	ASEAN Economic Community within 2020
2007	ASEAN Community
2008	ASEAN Charter

The Idea of SEAFET came in focus after the official visit of Tunku Abdul Rahman to Philippines. It was a narrow concept of organization, with focus on economy, trade and education between the member nations. (Nathan: 1988, 515) it laid the foundation stone for the development of ASEAN. (Thambipillai and Saravanamuttu 1985, 42-43). The ASA comprises with three nations; Malaya, Thailand and Philippines. The purpose of its foundation was to establish the regional stability and create the peace within the region. It also aimed towards “cultivating cooperation in the field of economic, social science and culture as well as to provide training facility and research for the benefit of everybody” (Keling et al.: 2011, 171), this association also failed because of the conflict between Malaya and Philippines. Maphilindo, is comprises of Malaysia, Philippines and Indonesia. The objectives were to create the cooperation in the field of economy,

¹ available at <http://www.asean.org/asean/about-asean/history>, (last accessed 1 November, 2015)

culture and social science. But due to emphasize upon the self-interest of the member nations and their priority upon fulfilling it led the fall of MAPHILINDO (Patmanathan, 1980:23). SAETO was an international organization for defense collaboration although it was focused on South East Asia, only two countries from the region the Philippines and Thailand were the members of this organization. Other members; the United States, Great Britain, France, Pakistan, New Zealand, and Australia became the part of SAETO because of their interest in the region. SEATO was dissolved in 1977 due to the lack of agreement between member nations. ASEAN Charter is drafted to provide a legal status and institutional framework for ASEAN. It codifies the norms, rules and values of ASEAN. It sets clear goal and presents the accountability and compliance for ASEAN.²The TAC was signed at the first ASEAN Summit, declared that the member countries will be guided by fundamental principles of ASEAN. ASEAN wants to create free, peaceful and neutral environment in Southeast Asia assisting all the superpower to avoid their interference in the region. It is a vision of seeing ASEAN as a zone of

peace, freedom and neutrality³. The member nations affirmed the commitment on establishing ASEAN Community by 2015 with Cebu Declaration. The focus of AEC was to create a community with free flow of goods, services, investment and freer flow of capital, equitable economic development and reduced poverty and socio economic disparities by year 2020 (Guerrero: 2009, 54). The concept of AFTA was at first proposed officially by then Thai Prime Minister Anand Panyarachun in the ASEAN Summit at Singapore (Khoman: 1992). The concept of ARF was developed to maintain the security and to prevent the regional disorder in a region (Antolik: 1994).

This paper seeks to examine the ASEAN efforts to bring peace in Southeast Asian region through regional organization by using very simple methods and diplomacy which is known as ASEAN way. More specifically this thesis seeks to understand why and how these soft diplomacy and idea of regionalism with less coercive methods bring peace in states of Indonesia, Malaysia Singapore, Philippine, Cambodia and Vietnam and what has led to the increased levels of cooperation between

² See also ASEAN charter available at <http://www.asean.org/asean/asean-charter/asean-charter>, last accessed on 5 October 2015

³ available at, <http://www.asean.org/news/item/asean-vision-2020> (last accessed 12 November 2015)

these states where in the past cooperation was non-existent. In this paper I will present case study to examine conflict and later cooperation in general to determine what has changed over time that would compel these states to cooperate. Furthermore, case study is important in order to determine if ASEAN have had any effect on cooperation prior to and after its establishment, as well as to add to the knowledge on the successful conflict management of these states. Studying ASEAN and its role on peace can contribute to the current literature on regional cooperation between these states because information on ASEAN regionalization and its role on promoting peace is lacking.

In determining why ASEAN has changed, it is important to understand not how the norms and international environment have changed over time, and also to understand how the ASEAN way, economic integration and the leadership plays a role. It argues that ASEAN with its weak formal mandate has been more effective in enhancing regional security, order and economic development, as well as peace. Now the question is why ASEAN get much more success in promoting peace, when it was emerged after getting

independence from colonial rule. Thus this paper touches upon the ASEAN from the perspective of neo-functionalism theory. The question that this paper revolves is, whether ASEAN is on the way of promoting peace or not. The two main objectives of this paper are; to find out the role of ASEAN in promoting Peace in Southeast Asia and to identify the key factors contributes to become success for ASEAN in promoting peace in that region. And this is why this paper seeks to answer questions like does ASEAN play significant role in promoting peace?

Literature Review

While reading existing literature on the subject of ASEAN role in promoting peace, differences in conceptualizations and nuances of definitions are readily apparent. Scholars often use general or differing parameters, place different emphases on components, or place concepts in differing places in theory. For example Amitav Acharya (2003) reveals how ASEAN is coping with challenges that it faces and contributes to peace in Southeast Asia, by developing new theoretical insights into the rise and decline of security communities in international relations, and offers the first

serious investigation into the prospects for a security community outside the Euro-Atlantic region. This book contains the most comprehensive and critical account available of the evolution of ASEAN's norms and the viability of the ASEAN Way of conflict management. Amitav Acharya in another article made a comparison between ASEAN and EU for example European regionalism is older, much more institutionalized and legalized, and sovereignty-defying and on the other hand ASEAN regionalism is relatively recent, non-legalistic and sovereignty bound. He also articulated that the main differences between Europe and Asia rests on four main areas such as history, foundational objectives, domestic political structures, and pattern of security relationship with external powers. (Narine, 1998) This paper is a discussion and evaluation of ASEAN's efforts to manage its regional security environment. (Bulut, 2012) touches upon the recent developments in a regional institutionalization movement in Southeast Asia. Specific case of ASEAN is considered from the perspective of two integration theories, neo-functionalism and inter-governmentalism and main goal of the paper is to come up with final decision about the future of regional

institutionalization of ASEAN. (Amer, 2005) assess the role played by the ASEAN in the management and resolution of disputes between its member states in the South-East Asian region. As well as the achievements and challenges that ASEAN has faced and is still facing in the field of conflict management are identified here. (Kurlantzick, 2012) illustrated the success of ASEAN in last forty five years and also predicts its future, how the ASEAN countries benefited by regionalization, especially in economic area by managing internal conflict. Then author made a comparison between ASEAN secretariat and other regional organization's secretariat. Author predicts that ASEAN would be more effective in future for its massive population and economic potentiality, and that will also help to improve relation with USA. (Sukma) presents an analytical writing which describe about regional security in ASEAN region, describes about ASEAN's success in promoting peace, managing conflict, and growing strong sense that war is no longer possible in that area. (Guerrero,) emphasized on, regional integration through economic integration in ASEAN economic integration is not new rather it's begun through GATT, WTO, RTA and EU at last and ASEAN

Community by 2020. (Sridharan, 2008) the ASEAN and SAARC are two regional organizations in Asia. It argues that ASEAN with its weak formal mandate has been more effective in enhancing regional security and order, as well as economic development than SAARC. (Deacon et.al, 2007) three main parts in which the first part presents the conceptual case for regional social policies in terms of how the social dimension of regionalism can provide an alternative to the current pattern of globalization. The second presents the concept and dimensions of regional social policies. The third part reviews progress to date, which suggests that the time is right to pursue this agenda. (Keling, 2011) describes history and ASEAN life story and explain what and how ASEAN able to strengthen its role and existence, its ability to unite all the countries in Southeast Asia region.

Conceptualization

Peace

In the early years of peace studies, it was assumed that peace is the opposite of war. Peace was defined as the absence of war. It was Sugata Dasgupta who first went beyond the absence of war and proposed a new concept of peace. He proposed the notion of peacelessness, which refers to

the situations human beings are suffering from poverty, malnutrition, disease, illiteracy, discrimination, oppression and so on, as from war (Dasgupta 1968). Later the concept of peace was defined by Johan Galtung. Galtung brings a new formula which could deal not only with the issues of war, but also issues of poverty, disease and human rights violations, and this new definition of peace was a new concept of violence. Galtung defined peace as the absence of violence, and not as the absence of war (Galtung 1969: 167). What then is violence? According to Galtung, violence is anything which produces a gap between the physical and mental potentials of human beings and their actual conditions (Galtung 1969: 168). From this perspective of violence, poverty, underdevelopment, oppression and other social ills afflicting people can be seen as manifestations of violence. Peace by Peaceful Means in 1996, Galtung provides the idea of negative peace and positive peace. Johan Galtung points out that there are three types of violence these are direct violence, structural violence, and cultural. Negative peace would therefore mean the absence of direct violence, whilst positive peace would mean the absence of indirect violence, such as bliss and contentment of body and mind.

Regional Role

The Covenant of the League of Nations⁴ Article 21 noted the validity of regional understandings for maintenance of peace. The UN Charter⁵ also devotes in Chapter VIII to regional arrangements for dealing with matters relating to the maintenance of international peace and security. So the ASEAN role is integration first, economic development then, and cooperation among member states later. The member states keep touch through dialogue, social interaction, trade, soft diplomacy, track ii diplomacy and ASEAN way. These are all the role of ASEAN. So, ASEAN as regional organization has a role to maintain peace; where peace means the absence of war among ASEAN states, absence of violence and absence of indirect violence known as positive peace, through regional integrations; the spillover. The proposed will provide a clearer model on which to test and study the phenomenon of ASEAN role in promoting peace could be easier.

Methodology

⁴ Available at http://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/leagcov.asp, last seen 5 August 2015.

⁵ See also at <http://www.un.org/en/charter-united-nations/>, last seen 5 August 2015.

The primary objective of my thesis monograph is to present a modified and testable theoretic conceptualization of the theory of ASEAN which was done earlier. To accomplish this paper specific case relevant to ASEAN role in peace is needed. A set of systematic empirical methodologies will need, so the principal methodology of my thesis monograph will be comparative case study. Thus, my methodology will be qualitative in nature. The comparative historical approach, through the use of case studies is the approach of qualitative discovery that will be employed. Qualitative methods can be useful when the unit of analysis is categorical rather than numerical, the thesis monograph agenda contains historical components, thesis monograph puzzles are philosophical rather than empirical, samples are insufficient for a large-N study, or when the goal of inquiry is in understanding the larger implications rather than gaining insight in one aspect of a phenomenon (Agresti and Finlay, 2009, 12).

Qualitative approaches can build, reject, modify, clarify, or fill gaps or omissions in theory (Babbie, 2006, 298). As such, the qualitative, an historical case study approach can provide significant utility to the thesis goals of my dissertation.

Historical analysis can be used to gather information to test theories across and within historical cases. The historical macro analysis method seeks to comprehend and explain the causal mechanisms of political phenomena (Büthe, 2002, 481). This approach provides valuable contextual and inferential insight as to the causal and sustaining mechanisms of a phenomenon. Because of this, an historical approach combined with comparative case analysis is useful in investigating the theoretic aspects of ASEAN role in peace. Because the extended case method is used to test the theoretic components of regionalism and peace. The extended case method is where case study observations are used to discover flaws in and to improve existing social theories and this method also will fill theoretical gaps and silences. So that is the reasons why I am using case based methodologies. The study has some limitations such as: shortage of time, lack of available data about the ASEAN implication in the peace process, lack of experience, and Resource constrain. So my research design cannot accomplish the scope of the project, because of time and resources shortage, I am not able to collect data from the entire recommended

population sample, so my study is also limited by number of cases.

Case Selection

In this section I take four cases of conflict, three cases of conflict which started in pre ASEAN ages and ended peacefully in post ASEAN era such as Malaysia vs Indonesian conflict, Malaysia vs Philippine conflict and Strait of Malacca conflict. Another case of conflict which started in post ASEAN era and end up with expanded ASEAN era such as Cambodian conflict. I select these cases because there was significance indication of peace creation by ASEAN. These cases will help me to prove role of ASEAN in promoting peace.

Case 1: Malaysia vs. Indonesia Conflict

During 1961 -1965 the relations between Malaysia and Indonesia were hostilities, conflict and confrontation. The Malaysian Federation proposal was given by Tunku Abdul Rahman in 1961 amalgamation of Federation of Malaya, Singapore, Sarawak, Brunei and Sabah. Which raised new issues and conflict in the Malaysia Indonesia relations? The Sukarno Government said that, the Federation of

Malaysia was a form of neocolonialism, he preferred pure independence and specifically free from all domination such as Britain in Malaysia and the Netherlands in Indonesia, other Western powers also should not interfere. So the Sukarno's confrontation policy towards Malaysian Federation did not only confront with Malaysia, but also with Great Britain and the Americans because they have political and strategic interests in that region. China and Soviet Union gave strong support to Indonesian government. So that Sukarno launched the confrontation policy towards Malaysia in September 1963. The internal situation and political structure had also influenced Sukarno to launch the confrontation policy towards Malaysia. His government hoped that they could increase another territorial boundary. Sukarno made another promise to his people that Indonesia's economic and social problems could be settled in better way once the Malaysian issue ended. On the other hand The Federation of Malaysia was seen as a pro west block and that also influenced Sukarno to launch the confrontation against the new Federation. PKI Indonesian was the first party in Indonesian to condemn the Malaysian Federation, the objection started after the PKI raised the Malaysian issue as an

important issue in Indonesian foreign policy. During the confrontation period 1963-1966 Malaysia was fully supported by Great Britain, the Commonwealth Countries especially Australia, New Zealand and Canada and then the United States. The conflict between both countries during the years 1963-1966 was not solely the conflict between the two Southeast Asian neighbors, but was an international conflict that involved both sides of hegemonic powers the Americans and Soviet Union and China as China and Soviet Union give their support to Indonesia. However the Malaysia is one of the richest Asian countries. It is rich with natural resources rubber, timber, palm oil, tin, petroleum and other minerals, has a strategic location and is an important international centre for business and trade. Singapore, apart from being an international trade and business centre has the fourth largest port in the world. So both east and west has their own interest in this conflict.

Case 2: Malaysia vs. Philippine conflict

The Malaysian-Philippines territorial dispute, also known as the North Borneo dispute was a result of the Sulu Sultanate's division. The British gaining control of

Northern Borneo, while the remainder of the Sulu land fell under Spanish rule. The problem at hand refers to the state of Sabah, which both parties lay claim on, Malaysia because of the Sabah's vote on joining the Malaysian federation, and Philippines, because of their presentation as the successor state of Sulu. Because of the connections between people living on both sides of the border, illegal immigration, incidents of cross border raiding and kidnappings have become a commonplace. The North Borneo dispute refers to the dispute between Malaysia and the Philippines over eastern Sabah. Prior to the foundation of the Malaysian Federation, Sabah was known as North Borneo, and was under the rule of the Sultanate of Sulu. The Sultanate of Sulu was dissolved in 1915, and as previously stated, was separated into sectors. The British had control over North Borneo, whilst the Spanish had initial control over the remaining Sulu land. Malaysia, however, believes that the dispute is futile, as the residents of Sabah had willingly joined the Malaysian Federation in 1963. Malaysia's stance on the dispute is simple; they believe that there is no dispute, seeing as Sabah was one of the 13 states that signed onto the Malaysian Federation in 1963. The Philippines has laid a dormant

claim on the state of Sabah, and as the presented successor state of the Sultanate of Sulu, the 1878 agreement translation stated that North Borneo was only leased to the British. The British version, however, states that North Borneo was "grant and cede" to the British. The North Borneo dispute has been presented to the United Nations multiple times, such as at the Manila Summit. Since the United Nations General Assembly passed Resolution Number 1514 in December 1960 on the Declaration of the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, Great Britain had handed North Borneo over to the Malaysian Federation. The ICJ had taken up the case regarding the dispute, and it had ruled in favor of Sabah being part of Malaysia. The United Nations does recognize Malaysia as being compromised of the Peninsula, Sabah, and Sarawak. If Malaysia were to agree to bring the matter to court again, that means that the claim made by the Philippines would be acknowledged.

Historical chronology of dispute

- 1704 Sultan of Sulu is given sovereignty over much of North Borneo from the Sultan of Brunei, whom he had helped suppress a rebellion.
- 1824 Certain territories of the Malay

- archipelago are allocated to the Dutch East Indies i.e the United Kingdom and the Netherlands.
- 1845 The uncle of the Sultan of Sulu has been announced as the successor to the Sultanate, with the Malay term for “Crown Prince”.
- 1846 A proclamation was issued by the Royal Navy stating for the cease of hostility if the Sultan of Sulu would govern lawfully, and respect his engagements made to the British Government. The penalty for failure to engage in the proclamation would result in the Sultanate’s capital being burned down.
- 1849 The Sultan of Sulu must now have the consent of the British to cede any territory.
- 1851 The Sultanate of Sulu is now part of the Spanish Monarchy.
- 1878 The commercial house of Dent Brothers and Co. Obtains sovereign control over the northern part of Borneo for 5,300 Ringgit.
- 1879 The Governor writes to the Colonial Office, objecting to hoisting of Spanish flag over North Borneo.
- 1885 Spanish supremacy over the Sulu Archipelago was recognized under the condition of their abandoning of all claims to the portions of North Borneo.
- 1878 An agreement was signed between the Sultanate of Sulu and a British commercial syndicate, which stipulated that North Borneo was either ceded or leased to the British company.
- 1898 The Treaty of Paris is signed; however, the lines of the treaty did not include North Borneo.
- 1937 The British resume their lease payments for the land of North Borneo.
- 1948 The Federation of Malaya was created, with the Malay States as British Protectorates, while Malacca and Penang remained as British Colonies.

Case 3: Strait of Malacca Conflict

Oceans dominate the Southeast Asia region and cover almost 80 percent of its area. Within Southeast Asia, the Strait of

Malacca is geographically important and is used as a gateway for many ocean moving commercial, private and military vessels. The strait lies between the littoral states of Indonesia, Malaysia and Singapore just north of the Indonesian island of Sumatra and south of Malaysia. It is 600 miles in length and is the main corridor of passage between the Indian Ocean and the South China Sea. Approximately 60,000 ships traverse the strait each year, transporting more than 80 percent of Northeast Asia's oil. One quarter of the world's commerce passes through the Strait of Malacca. This strait is important as the China, Japan and the United States have reliance on the strait for their economic livelihoods and security. For the China the strategic importance of the strait increases every year with approximately 60 percent of its oil imports originating from the Middle East and traveling through the Strait of Malacca. Japanese concerns originate from the fact that it is dependent on the sea for both its military and economic security. 90 percent of Japan's imports are carried to it by way of the sea. Like China, much of its oil also travels to it from the Middle East. The United States, as the world's dominant military power, uses the straits for the transit of its naval vessels to keep the oceans open for the safe passage of all

vessels. **Piracy**, the Strait of Malacca has been home to a number of types of transnational crime such as piracy. The standard definition of piracy is often taken from the 1982 United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea and is defined as violence that is conducted on the high seas beyond any state's particular territorial waters. Specifically, it is any "illegal acts of violence or detention, or any act of depredation, committed for private ends by the crew or the passengers of a private ship or a private aircraft, and directed on the high seas against another ship or aircraft, or against person or property on board such ship or aircraft." This definition can be interpreted differently by different states because it does not reflect passages such as the Malacca Strait as its waters are not considered part of the high seas. The International Chamber of Commerce's International Maritime Bureau (IMB) has created its own definition of piracy so that violent acts that occur in the strait can be considered piracy. The IMB defines piracy as "an act of boarding or attempting to board any ship with the intent to commit theft or any other crime with the intent or capability to use force in furtherance of that act." Southeast Asian governments, other than Singapore, have consistently denied that piracy is a problem in their

region. However, in recent years, the region has accounted for nearly 50 percent of all attacks worldwide, and the waters surrounding Indonesia continue to be the most frequent area for recurrent piracy attacks. Acts of piracy have ranged from stealing a ship while it is anchored to the classic boarding and hijacking of a vessel on the high seas. Piracy attacks, both actual and attempted, vary from year to year in the strait. At the height of the attacks in 2003 there were a total of 154 and recently in 2006 there were a total of 71. The reasons for the increase of piracy are interesting, after the Asian Financial Crisis in 1997 the numbers increased dramatically and did not begin to decline until 2004. In fact, at that time there already were bilateral agreements between Singapore, Indonesia and Malaysia on maritime security but in all cases they were widely criticized for being only an exchange of schedules. As the number remained steady compared to previous levels, approximately 150, from year to year this would provide users such as the United States and Japan ammunition for calls of greater cooperation between the littoral states, or even more appalling to the littoral states, outside intervention. After Operation MALSINDO was instituted in 2004, it can be considered a

success with a noticeable fall in the number of attacks the next year. **Maritime terrorism**, coupled with piracy, is an issue that consistently gets brought up in discussions concerning the safety of the strait from year to year though no incidents of maritime terrorism are known to have occurred. Despite this, acts of maritime terrorism in the Strait of Malacca are possible and there are terrorists groups that are known to have maritime capabilities with plans to use the Strait of Malacca as a target. Acts of maritime terrorism have a number of possible objectives and “may seek to cause human casualties, economic losses, environmental damage, or other negative impacts, alone or in combination, of minor or major consequence.” There have been a rash of maritime terrorist attacks elsewhere in Southeast Asia, and these enhance concern among users of the Malacca Strait. In 2000 the Philippine ferry *Our Lady Mediatrix* was bombed by the Moro Islamic Liberation Front killing forty people and wounding fifty more. In 2000 a suicide boat in Aden attacked the USS *COLE* and the Abu Sayyaf Group has kidnapped a number of Western tourists from resorts in Malaysia in 2000 and the Philippines in 2001. While maritime terrorist attacks have not occurred in the Strait of Malacca, *Jemaah Islamiyah* is

known to have planned to attack U.S. Navy vessels visiting and passing through it. Many security analysts point to these straits as a possible focus of various terrorist groups with maritime capabilities. In June 2005, based on their assessment of the Strait of Malacca Lloyd's Joint War Committee added the Strait of Malacca to its list of dangerous waters.

Case 4: Cambodian Conflict

For almost 30 years, the people of Cambodia have been the victims of conflicts and violence. Death and devastation have been their constant companions. Civil wars, a foreign invasion, the slaughter of citizens by their own government and gun battles in the streets of the capital have together produced suffering. Cambodian attitudes towards war started from 1975 to 1979, when the Khmer Rouge ruled in Phnom Penh, Cambodians learned that the enemy need not come from outside one's rather they had to wage war against its own people. When the Vietnamese invaded in 1979 and occupied Cambodia, people realized that foreign invaders deserve worse treatment than one's countrymen hold. So the Cambodians have developed a deep distrust of their government,

outsiders. They conducted attacks that threaten civilian lives and property. There are three features of the Cambodian conflict. The first is during the years of Khmer Rouge rule, in which civilians were not only casualties of conflict but the targets of a homicidal regime that buried its victims in the "killing fields". These deliberate attacks on civilians not only ripped apart millions of Cambodian families but created an atmosphere of acceptance for revenge. The second element was anarchy, a natural and often deadly aspect of all wars, but especially of the guerrilla wars that were fought in the villages and jungles of Cambodia. In such cases, distinguishing between combatants and civilians becomes nearly impossible. Casualties among innocent, unsuspecting civilians are seen as inevitable. "The bullets have no eyes," people explained as they bent over backwards to defend the combatants who had fired the shots. Lastly the character and background of the combatants in Cambodia served to ensure that many civilians would find themselves caught in the crossfire. While war promises safety for no one and even the most skilled and disciplined armies can lose control of a situation the presence of young, untrained and impressionable combatants dramatically increased the

potential for attacks on civilians. These elements combined to foster an era of conflict that has left the Cambodian people eager, indeed desperate, for stability.

Conflict management in the formation of ASEAN

The creation of ASEAN is seen as to handle existing and potential inter-state disputes through peaceful measures and minimize the risk of militarized conflicts. There was desire to secure a peaceful and co-operative environment in the Southeast Asia. During the first half of the 1960s deep conflicts erupted between Indonesia and Malaysia and between Malaysia and the Philippines (Jones, 2005). If conflict management within ASEAN is examined from the perspective of the prevention of inter-state military conflicts the track record of ASEAN is impressive since no dispute has led to such conflicts between the original member-states since 1967.

ASEAN's responses to Malaysia vs. Indonesia Conflict; Argument

The period after 1965 was totally different in the field of political relations between Indonesia and Malaysia marked by friendship, harmony and co-operation. The new regime in Indonesia in 1967 reversed

the old policy and type of political relationship with Malaysia. The new government under President Suharto took the initiative to end the confrontation with Malaysia, and actively sought co-operation with Malaysia and other neighboring Southeast Asian countries. The formation and successful launching of a regional organization in Southeast Asia was largely on account of the initiative and leadership role taken on by the new order leaders of Indonesia, under President Suharto. ASEAN with Indonesia as an important member, contributed to the success of ASEAN. Without Indonesian support, it would not have been possible to achieve harmony, co-operation and stability in the Southeast Asian region.

Indonesian domestic politics under President Suharto was totally different with the period under the President Sukarno administration. The political philosophy and internal Indonesian political party alliances between President Suharto and President Sukarno were entirely different. Suharto was an anti communist and a more pragmatic person. New order administration under President Suharto improved relations with American and other Western powers. The United States and Japan drew closer to Indonesia after 1966. The motive behind the close

relations with Japan and The United States was to achieve a more rapid economic recovery and national development (Jons, 2005). Indonesian domestic political stability under President Suharto after 1965 and the new direction of foreign policy were responsible for the new pattern of improved relationships between Indonesia and Malaysia. It encouraged co-operation not only between Indonesia and Malaysia, but also among all of the ASEAN members and also improved economic achievement between both countries and other ASEAN nations (Jons, 2005).

ASEAN's response to strait of Malacca conflict; Argument

The littoral states of Indonesia, Malaysia and Singapore have recently begun to actively engage in maritime security cooperation in the Malacca Strait in 2004 on a trilateral basis. This runs counter to the norms of the greater Southeast Asian region. By being able to deduce and determine what has allowed for increased cooperation between these states it may point to how they may cooperate more in the future and reduce the instances of piracy in the Strait of Malacca (Teo, 2007). This policy will spill over in Southeast Asian states and may cooperate

in other areas of terrorism, piracy or insurgencies more generally in a regional context. As one of the most important transit passages in the world, the unimpeded transit of merchant vessels is important to the international community, especially to those states who rely on food, energy and goods that are moved by way of the sea through the Malacca Strait (Teo, 2007). Regional states in East and Southeast Asia that have specific interests in traffic of the strait include China, Taiwan, Japan and the littoral states of Southeast Asia including Indonesia, Malaysia and Singapore.

Conflict management in an expanded ASEAN

The expansion of ASEAN membership in the 1990s brought additional disputes into the Association. In terms of conflict management strategy the member states of ASEAN have displayed a preference for bilateral talks and dialogue on the disputes with other members of the Association (Amer, 1998: 33-56). The bilateral efforts to manage and settle disputes can be related to ASEAN's role as facilitator rather than as an active third-party mediator in the disputes. However, in the 1990s Indonesia and Malaysia agreed to refer the sovereignty disputes over Pulau

Sipadan and Pulau Ligitan to the International Court of Justice and Malaysia and Singapore did too with regard to the sovereignty dispute over Pedra Branca (Amer, 1998: 43). This displays a willingness among some ASEAN members to seek international arbitration when bilateral efforts to resolve disputes are not sufficient to bring about a solution to the disputes. By adopting the rules of procedure the ASEAN member-states have mitigated the earlier fears among them. In this context it is necessary to clarify that ASEAN is not intended to formally act as a third-party mediator in the disputes involving its member-states unless it is ascribed to do so or asked to do so by the member-states. Instead the Association is intended to serve as a vehicle to promote better relations among its member-states. This is done by creating conducive conditions for increased interaction through the overall co-operation carried out under the ASEAN-umbrella. ASEAN also establish principles for how its member-states should behave towards each other and this has been done through the Declaration of ASEAN Concord and the TAC of 1976 and the Declaration of ASEAN Concord II of 2003. These mechanisms are also in evidence in the ASEAN Security Plan of Action and in its

Annex. Also of relevance is the strong emphasis put on dispute settlement in the ASEAN Charter. This implies that in order to achieve peace and stability in the region the member states of ASEAN must act in such a way as to peacefully manage the existing and potential inter-state disputes among them. Consequently, failure to do so can be attributed to the member-states involved in the disputes and not to the Association as such. The ASEAN Charter not only reiterates the continued relevance of prior documents but also puts strong emphasis on the peaceful settlement of disputes among the member-states of ASEAN.

Mitigation of Interstate Conflicts; the ASEAN Role

ASEAN was formed in 1967, from the beginning there was dispute among the ASEAN states including Indonesia and Malaysia confrontation in 1963. And dispute between Malaysia and the Philippines over their claims on the North Borneo territory of Sabah (Sukma, 2010). Declaration of ASEAN Concord and a Treaty of Amity and Cooperation in Southeast Asia was a preventive strategy by which the ASEAN states managed to solve the disputes among themselves

effectively. They agreed not to pursue their disagreements by force. Thus by the 1990s, ASEAN had managed to incorporate former enemies such as Vietnam and Laos into the grouping (Sukma, 2010). In 1980s, ASEAN made its mark in the diplomatic field during the Third Indochina War. ASEAN states kept up the diplomatic pressure on Hanoi to undo its invasion of Cambodia. This impressive diplomatic effort led to the withdrawal of Vietnamese troops from Cambodia in 1991. ASEAN's ability to speak with one voice on the Cambodian conflict brought ASEAN's international recognition as the most successful regional organization in the Third World (Narine, 2002).

On the other hand in 1995, some of the islands created tension in this region. Then the Declaration on the Conduct of Parties in South China Sea was adopted in 2002 has kept way the parties from resorting to force and settle the conflict peacefully in line with the principles of international law. It was a victory for ASEAN to get China away from its action. In order to manage interstate conflicts effectively in 2003 regional leaders signed the ASEAN Concord II, which established ASEAN Community (Ameer, 2005). It has also

avoided the use of coercive strategies to ensure regional order. This means that a de facto security community exists in ASEAN where the member states interactions are similar to those of members of a society of states. There was a problem in the straits of Melaka (Teo, 2007) such as pirates, border dispute, waters security, border invasion, sovereignty, illegal immigrants and illegal fishing among three ASEAN member countries Malaysia, Singapore and Indonesia and they have agreed to cooperate and made the Straits of Malacca Cooperation in 2005. This cooperation brings the security of straits of Malacca is under control. Thus ASEAN become able to mitigate their conflict.

Reason behind it

Indonesia is the ASEAN's largest state but it has little influence toward its small states. So Indonesia is not as threatening as India in SAARC where the power differences between the largest state and the others is very wide. ASEAN does control the outside intervention such as ASEAN engages external powers formally through its dialogue mechanism. And largest state Indonesia is not unhappy to the presence

of external actors like China, Japan and USA (Sridharan, 2008). Rather ASEAN's diplomatic stand against the Vietnamese invasion of Cambodia in the 1980s and drew support from US and China in it. Working in tandem, ASEAN and these powers were able to bring the Cambodian crisis to an end. The culture of cooperation in ASEAN has created an environment for them to resolve their disputes through international arbitration and mediation (Sridharan, 2008).

Regional organizations are largely elite driven projects so leaders have contribution to be succeeded in that particular region. Like the ASEAN leader President Suharto's role and impact was positive on that association. Such as SAARC was not gain priority for South Asian states because the contribution of President Ziaur Rahman of Bangladesh, who wanted for regional cooperation but no other leader from this region emphasized strongly to take the organization forward. ASEAN is society like, not remain in system of state, members are willing to grip the practices of a society of states. This is why ASEAN has been effective as a regional organization (Sridharan, 2008).

Economic Attainment; the ASEAN role

Industrialization- ASEAN Industrial Projects was given after the Bali conference in 1976, in ASEAN economic committee meeting. The committee decided that every member states will be given specific project allocation that involve investment between USD250 million to USD350 million. Under this program, Malaysia and Indonesia was given the responsibility to handle urea fertilizer. Philippines were given the phosphate alphon project, soda ash project to Thailand and Singapore was assigned to run the diesel engine thus ASEAN enhanced its industrialization cooperatively (Guerrero: 2009).

Free Trade Area - Next initiative was taken by ASEAN at Kuala Lumpur in 1991 where they agreed to establish the ASEAN Free Trade Area. That means all ASEAN goods can be traded to member states with a minimum tariff or without tariff. Priority is given to 11 industries, where tariff elimination is for goods in 11 sectors including the automotive sector thus ASEAN brings their economy one step ahead (Guerrero: 2009).

AIA- Another initiative was the framework agreement for ASEAN Investment Area signed in Manila 1998. AIA is aimed to encourage direct flow from inside and

outside ASEAN that make a competitive, open and liberal investment area. At the same time, AIA also target to build the ASEAN region as a competitive investment area by 1 January 2010. By this policy ASEAN allowed foreign direct investment and advance their economy (Guerrero: 2009).

EAEC- The creation of East Asian Economy Caucus and regional economic negotiation council increase the seriousness of economic cooperation between East Asia and ASEAN. When China, Japan and South Korea agreed to participate in ASEAN+3, commitment of East Asian and Southeast Asian countries in economy was established, and this is also a success for ASEAN in economic area(Guerrero: 2009).

Socialization; the ASEAN Role

ASEAN has a Social Charter⁶ including various commitments undertaken by member countries. And in educational arena we can mention to Indonesia Malaysia bilateral cooperation in the field of education that started since 1980s in

various fields such as medical, housing, information, agriculture. ASEAN socialized itself through SEA Games, aimed to maintain the existing good relationship among regional states and as a platform for local athlete to increase their capabilities in Olympics. ASEAN also socialized itself by resolving illegal migrant’s problem. ASEAN used the Amnesty program which administered by Malaysian government to treat 1.2 million illegal immigrant in 2004. The program helps to return their own country without imposing legal action or allowing them to enter Malaysia legally (Deacon et.al, 2007). ASEAN members agreed to eradicate drug abuse by cooperating with relevant parties. ASEAN also attempted to eliminate border crimes, organized crimes and the eradication of smuggling and termination of crimes in borders between regional countries, so that they can be more socialized and live with peace and tranquility (Deacon Et.al, 2007).

ASEAN Way; An effective approach in promoting peace

Non-interference- The non interference policy has become the principle of ASEAN based on the Bangkok Declaration 1967, and Kuala Lumpur Declaration 1971 which produced

⁶ Availabe at <http://aseantuc.org/2015/02/222015-asean-2015-and-the-asean-social-charter/>, last seen at 25 November 2015

ZOPFAN and further reinforced with the Cooperation and Friendship Treaty in 1976. Because they believed that interference is the impediment to freedom, independence, sovereignty and standpoint of SEA countries. Article 2 of the Treaty of Amity and Cooperation touched on several government principles of ASEAN countries, among them was the mutual respect of independence, sovereignty, similar territories and respect national identity, these principles helps to get success as regional organ and promote peace in that region (Acharya, 2003).

Non-Intervention- Another principle is the non intervention policy in internal affairs among ASEAN member countries. This principle is the major content of ASEAN such as ZOPFAN and TAC aims to avoid political and military intervention from superpowers like the US, China, and Russia in that region (Acharya, 2003). With this agreement the country members should not involve in the political arena of superpowers and create friendship with every country in the world regardless of political ideology so that peace and security in this region is guaranteed.

Nonproliferation of Nuclear weapons- ASEAN try to enhance peace stability in this region by doing SEANWFZ

agreement in 1995 that's aims to avoid member countries of possessing, placing and utilizing nuclear weapon. Thus the ASEAN countries are prohibited of owning, manufacturing, transporting and using nuclear weapon (Acharya, 2003).

Diplomacy- Diplomacy is a policy based on negotiation to achieve specific objective. Track 2 diplomacy is very well known among ASEAN, this is the second and informal method in creating confidence between regional countries. It involves informal visits, close door meetings; keep away of media from their activities, and bilateral agreement that enhance confidence among country member (Acharya, 2003).

Political Cooperation- Political Cooperation policy, which started by the Declaration of Singapore in 199 because of this ASEAN made ASEAN Regional Forum, ARF as the main medium to promote political and security issues between ASEAN and Asia Pacific. ARF is the center stage to solve dispute and security threat, as well as nuclear threat among country members in a peaceful manner (Acharya, 2003).

Non-coercion- The non coercion policy as a way to resolve any dispute among members is another vital point. Even they

assure that the formation of ASEAN security community is not only ensure preservation of peace but also believing that the non coercion approach is norm must be uphold by country members(Acharya, 2003).

Conclusion and recommendation

I divide these last parts with three respective portions such as summary of analyzing, summary of key findings and at last some recommendations. First, Analyzing part of this paper describes interstate conflict in ASEAN, mentioned confrontation of Malaysia and Indonesia in 1963 dispute in North Borneo territory of Sabah, Vietnam and Laos crisis, Third Indochina War, Vietnamese troops over Cambodia in 1991, Cambodian conflict, island crisis in south china sea in 1995, as well as problem in the straits of Melaka such as pirates, border dispute, water security, border invasion, sovereignty, illegal immigrants and illegal fishing among three ASEAN member countries Malaysia, Singapore and Indonesia. All of the cases are solved by ASEAN peacefully so this part also proves that ASEAN has positive role in promoting peace within it. Second, The key findings of this paper are, ASEAN's strategies and policies to tackle war, manner and principals to mitigate

conflict within regional area, ASEAN's social, cultural, economic and political manner, norms and values to manage conflict. As well as the role of ZOPFAN, ARF and SEANWFZ in security management within ASEAN, the economic role, role of soft diplomacy called ASEAN way, role of informality, and role of no hard leadership, are also discussed here. These all finding proves that ASEAN has a positive role in promoting peace within it. Third, to become more powerful ASEAN needs to do several things; these are first, avoiding dominance by regional powers such as china, Korea, Singapore, Japan, Indonesia and Malaysia. Second, ASEAN must have the ability to integrate a revived powerful Indonesia. Third and fourth, ASEAN's must have the ability to balance economic disparities and economic consensus among member states. Fifth, ASEAN's must have the ability to integrate new member states. Sixth, ASEAN's must have the ability to strengthen the secretariat which is the core element to function a regional organization. Seventh, ASEAN's must have ability to become the center of Asian institutions (Kurlantzick, 2012). Eighth and Ninth, ASEAN needs to become much more institutionalized and legalized, and sovereignty-defying (Acharya 2006).

ASEAN from the birth avoided sensitive issues in its agenda and focus on economic cooperation. But it does not mean that ASEAN ignored the political and security problems among member states. ASEAN states preferred a bilateral approach rather than a multilateral through quiet diplomacy, prefer informality in managing conflict and informality became more effective when leaders developed closer personal ties. ASEAN leaders continued to adopt a gradual approach to cooperation. So after analyzing all of these above we can abruptly say that ASEAN is much more successful as regional organization and ASEAN also mark its role in promoting peace as well.

References

- [1] Acharya, Amitav (2003) *“Constructing a Security Community in Southeast Asia; ASEAN and the problem of regional order”*. Taylor and Francis e-Library.
- [2] Acharya, Amitav. *“Regionalism and Integration: EU and Southeast Asian Experiences”*. Bertelsmann Sifting. Pp. 4-8
- [3] Acharya, Amitav (2009) *“Arguing about ASEAN: What Do We Disagree About?”* Cambridge Review of International Affairs 493–99.
- [4] Agresti, Alan and Barbara Finlay (2009) *“Statistical Methods for the Social Sciences”*, Pearson Prentice Hall.
- [5] Antolik, M. (1994) *“The ASEAN Regional Forum: The Spirit of Constructive Engagement.”* Contemporary Southeast Asia
- [6] Amer, Ramses, (2000) *“Managing Border Dispute in Southeast Asia”* Kajian Malaysia, Jld. XVIII, No 1&2.
- [7] Babbie, Earl R. (2006), *“The Practice of Social Research”* Wadsworth publication.
- [8] Bulut, Eduard Alan. *“Community-Building in ASEAN? A Theoretical Approach To Regional Institutionalization In Southeast Asia”*. Turkish Journal of Politics Vol. 3 No. 1 summer 2012.
- [9] Buthe, Tim (2002) *“Taking Temporality Seriously: Modeling History and the Use of Narratives as Evidence”* American Political Science Review vol.96 no.3, 481-494.
- [10] Deacon, Bob, Isabel Ortiz and Sergei Zelenev (2007) *“Regional Social Policy”*. United Nations Department Of Economic And Social Affairs, New York, Desha Working Paper No. 37. Pp. 14-16.
- [11] Deth, Sok Udom (2009) *“The Geopolitics of Cambodia During the Cold War Period”* Journal of Southeast Asian Studies Volume 9, Spring 2009.
- [12] Fernandez, Erwin S. (2007) *“Philippine-Malaysia Dispute over Sabah: A Bibliographic Survey”* Asia-Pacific Social Science Review Volume 7 Number 1 December 2007 De La Salle University Manila.
- [13] Galtung, Johan (1967) *“THEORIES OF PEACE; A Synthetic Approach to Peace Thinking”*, International Peace Research Institute, Oslo
- [14] Galtung, Johan (2009), *“Peace by Peaceful Means”*, SAGE Publication, Norway.
- [15] Guerrero, Rosabel B (2009) *“Regional Integration: The ASEAN Vision in 2020.”* In Economic and Financial Convergence En Route to Regional Economic Integration: Experience, Prospects and Statistical Issues amidst

Global Financial Turmoil, 32:52–58. Durban, South Africa: IFC Bulletin. <http://www.bis.org/ifc/publ/ifcb32c.pdf>.

[16] Haas, Ernst (1958) “*The Uniting of Europe*”, Stanford: Stanford University Press.

[17] Jian, Chen (1995) “*China's Involvement in the Vietnam War, 1964-69*” The China Quarterly, No. 142 (Jun., 1995), pp. 356-387

[18] Jones, Matthew (2005) “*Conflict and Confrontation in Southeast Asia, 1961-1965; Britain, the United States and the Creation of Malaysia*” Cambridge University Press.

[19] Keling, Mohamad Faisol, Hishamudin Md.Som, Mohamad Nasir Saludin, Md. Shukri Shuib and Mohd Na'eim Ajis. “*The Development of ASEAN from Historical Approach*”. Asian Social Science Vol. 7, No. 7; July 2011. Published By Canadian Center Of Science And Education. Pp. 169-189.

[20] Kierman, Ben (2002) “*Conflict in Cambodia, 1945-2002*”, Critical Asian Studies, 483-495.

[21] Khoman, Thanat (1992) “*ASEAN Conception and Evolution*.” In The ASEAN Reader. Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies. <http://www.asean.org/news/item/asean-conceptionand-evolution-by-thanat-khoman>.

[22] Kurlantzick, Joshua (2012) “*ASEAN's Future and Asian Integration*”. The Council on Foreign Relations, Inc United States of America.

[23] Lindberg, Leon (1963) “*The Political Dynamic of European*

Integration”, Stanford: Stanford University Press.

[24] Nathan, K.S (1988) “*Malaysia: Reinventing the Nation*.” Asian Security Practice: Material and Ideational Influences, edited by Muttiah Alagappa. New York: Stanford University Press.

[25] Narine, Shaun (2002) “*Explaining ASEAN: Regionalism in Southeast Asia*”. Lynne Reiner Publishers, Jan 1, 2002, USA. Pp.24-29.

[26] Patmanathan, M. (1980) “*Reading in Malaysia Foreign Policy*”. Kuala Lumpur: University Malaya Press.

[27] Sridharan, Kripa (2008) “*Regional Organisations and Conflict Management: Comparing ASEAN and SAARC*”. Crisis States Research Centre, Working Paper 33, London.

[28] Sukma, Rizal. “*ASEAN and Regional Security in East Asia*”. Journal of Security Politics in Asia and Europe. Pp. 109-120 Pdf.

[29] Teo, Yun (2007) “*Target Malacca Straits: Maritime Terrorism in Southeast Asia*”, Studies in Conflict & Terrorism, 30: 6, 541 -561.

[30] Thambipillai, Pushpa, and J. Saravanamuttu (1985) “*ASEAN Negotiations: Two Insights*”. Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies.

[31] Tregonning, H. G. “*The Philippine Claim to Sabah*” JMBRAS, Vol. 43. PDF.

[32] Turnbull, C.M. (1999) “*Regionalism and Nationalism*.” In The Cambridge History of Southeast Asia, edited by Nicholas Tarling, 258–59. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.