

ASEAN Norms and Gender-Responsive Human Security

Kim Hyung-Jong

Yonsei University

**Lili Yulyadi Arnakim, Ella Syafputri Prihatini
& Galuh D.P. Dewi**

Bina Nusantara University

ABSTRACT

The Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) has instrumentalized gender equality to present itself as a responsible regional organization accommodating universal norms. However, there is an ontological gap between ASEAN and UN-led programs derived from the inconsistency between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation toward universal norms. This study argues that the inefficiency of ASEAN in pursuing gender equality is primarily attributed to the practice matter of ASEAN. Using primary and secondary data collected through various means, this paper finds that ASEAN efforts on gender equality were mainly raised in declarations and conferences. ASEAN is a particularly important agent in promoting gender-responsive human security, given the nature of challenges and the political and economic limitations of ASEAN member states. It also tends to be a good global citizen as a norm entrepreneur by promoting universal norms and involving global programs led by the UN, such as Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

Keywords: ASEAN norms, ASEAN community, gender equality, human security, and norm entrepreneur

Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) telah melembagakan kesetaraan gender untuk menampilkan dirinya sebagai organisasi regional yang bertanggung jawab mengakomodasi norma-norma universal. Namun, terdapat kesenjangan ontologis antara program-program yang dipimpin ASEAN dan PBB, yang berasal dari inkonsistensi antara motivasi intrinsik dan ekstrinsik terhadap norma-norma universal. Studi ini berpendapat bahwa inefisiensi ASEAN dalam mengejar kesetaraan gender sebagian besar dikaitkan dengan masalah praktik ASEAN. Dengan menggunakan data primer dan sekunder yang dikumpulkan melalui berbagai sumber, makalah ini menemukan bahwa upaya ASEAN dalam kesetaraan gender secara umum diangkat dalam deklarasi dan konferensi. ASEAN adalah agen yang sangat penting dalam mempromosikan keamanan manusia yang responsif gender, mengingat sifat tantangan dan keterbatasan politik dan ekonomi negara-negara anggota ASEAN. Hal ini juga cenderung menjadi warga dunia yang baik sebagai norm entrepreneur dengan mempromosikan norma-norma universal dan melibatkan program global yang dipimpin oleh PBB seperti Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) dan Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

Kata kunci-kata kunci: ASEAN norms, komunitas ASEAN, kesetaraan gender, keamanan manusia, dan norm entrepreneur

ASEAN has constantly paid attention to women's issues since its inception in 1967, including establishing a sub-committee and adopting gender-related declarations and action plans. In recent years, gender mainstreaming has been part of its efforts to commit to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), which incorporate universal norms concerning various issues, including peace, poverty, climate change, quality education, inequality, decent work, health and well-being, and gender equality. However, there is a considerable gap between adopting gender-oriented human security and its practice in ASEAN rather than a contradiction between universal norms and inscribed ASEAN norms.

Despite prolonged ASEAN attempts to incorporate gender equality into its community vision, ASEAN remains far from a gender-responsive community. Women in ASEAN remain in a vulnerable condition by any means. The pervasive threats of the COVID-19 pandemic are not limited to health security but also every aspect of human security, which has increased the vulnerability of women. In its regional governance, ASEAN has not yet proved its relevance in dealing with COVID-19 and mitigating its adverse impacts on women.

The development of the ASEAN Community has increasingly appeared with the adoption of universal norms, including human rights. ASEAN's approach to human rights has been issue-based, resulting from fragmented initiatives before pursuing the ASEAN Community. From a stocktaking point of view, the concept of human security is embedded in various declarations and statements. The ideas of human security are incorporated into the concept of a people-centered/people-oriented ASEAN Community. The primary goal of ASEAN is to build a sharing and caring community, which calls for major changes in ASEAN's practices.

Shaping and sharing ideas, norms, and common interests are necessary for achieving the ASEAN Community, which is comprised of three pillars, the ASEAN Political Security Community (APSC), the ASEAN Economic Community (AEC), and the ASEAN Socio-Cultural Community (ASSC). Securing regional peace, stability, and human rights in a harmonious environment is not only a necessary condition for the APSC but also for other pillars of the ASEAN Community, as the three pillars are connected.

With the establishment of the ASEAN Community, gender equality appears as a significant cross-sectoral element for achieving the community, which embraces the concept of peace, security, economic prosperity, health, employment, political development, and more. Gender has increasingly become a focal point of ASEAN's championing universal norm, 'human security', as it has now been recognized.

This study argues that the inefficiency of ASEAN in pursuing gender equality is largely attributed to the practice matter of ASEAN. ASEAN has instrumentalized gender equality to present itself as a responsible regional organization that accommodates universal norms. However, there is an ontological gap between ASEAN and UN-led programs derived from inconsistent intrinsic and extrinsic motivation toward universal norms. This paper tries to answer the following questions: how is gender equality relevant to ASEAN norms? What are ASEAN's motivations behind adopting gender equality? In addition, what impacts have the recent development of ASEAN had on gender equality? This article consists of three parts. First, it considers human security as the main conceptual framework, focusing on gender and norm transformation. Second, it reviews the evolution of ASEAN norms on gender equality's historical trajectory. Lastly, it evaluates the current ASEAN commitment to Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) with a focus on gender equality.

Discussions and Dimensions: ASEAN Norm and Human Security

The explanation for the transformation of ASEAN into a political security community, one of three pillars of the ASEAN Community, is based, in large part, on survival and normative development. The former is derived from strategic concerns over traditional security, including national and regional resilience from the interference of major powers, while the latter constitutes the norms and values in dealing with democracy, human rights, and non-traditional security.

There is no universal consensus on the definition of a 'security community'. Deutsch defined it as a group integrating into a sense of community that practices peace among group members over a long period. It can be either an 'amalgamated' community

with formal political integration or a pluralistic one based on the members' independence and sovereignty. Attaining a security community requires not only the absence of war but also arms race or organized preparation for war (Acharya 2001, 16). A security community also needs a "long-term convergence of interests while a security regime operated based on a balance of power or mutual deterrence" (Acharya 2001, 17).

There are other security concepts that have emerged, particularly since the end of the Cold War. One is a 'cooperative security', that is, the eventual attaining of peace mainly through cooperation and harmony among the members based on mutual respect for strategic interest but without high-level institutionalization. Another is 'comprehensive security', which appeared to offer an approach to various sources of security threats, including political, economic, social, and environmental issues. However, those securities are concerned with the security of the state. Initially conceptualized by the United Nations Development Program's report in 1994, human security is distinguished from other security concepts as it mainly focuses on the individual rather than the state as an object to be protected. It offers a rational base to ensure 'freedom from fear' and 'freedom from want' (Hoadley 2006, 22-24).

The development of the human security concept is related to a normative matter. It is about a responsibility to protect the security and well-being of communities and individuals, which needs to be in line with ethical standards. There is generally a lack of support for the idea that security is a socially constructed concept (Newman 2010, 89). The discussion of security and its ontological nature particularly concerns the 'security of being' based on 'social identity' (Giddens 1984, 375). The human security concept needs to include the main threats to women's security, namely violence against women and girls from violence and crime at various levels. It is important to ensure the community's and state's propensity toward violence (Parmar et al. 2014).

Understanding ideas of security embedded in the values deepens the approach to security. (Newman 2010, 84). Human security draws significant implications for regionalism beyond national sovereignty. Conceptually the legitimacy of the state can be sustained as long as it provides support and security for individuals. Meanwhile, practically, the various sources of human security are transnational. Thus, an individual state's responses are not adequate to transnational threats. Women and Children

are, in particular, vulnerable to modern conflicts. Human security is also considered a problem-solving approach as it is initiated as foreign policy; how the development of human security needs to be understood in the context of ASEAN's response to new challenges.

Beside material conditions and the shared perception of threats and security, inter-subjective factors, such as ideas, identity, and norms, are determining elements for a security community. In particular, in the case of ASEAN, norms in legal and social terms have played a significant role in its institutional development. The notion of security implies both formal and legal obligations and, more importantly, social and cultural relations. It is particularly evident in ASEAN, which has founded itself on a common adherence to conventional international norms and its own way of practicing norms: 'the ASEAN Way' (Acharya 2001, 25).

According to Finnemore and Sikkink (1998), a study of international organizations' norms assumes a single-linear life cycle of norms to explain their birth and death. However, this method misses the embedded local values, which may be limited by particular circumstances but inherently do not differ significantly from universal values. The conclusion that the development of norms in non-Western regions is a backup process with the practice of imitation was inevitably reached as a result of this narrow approach. It is argued that norms remain subject to change even after they are adopted through ongoing debate among actors and member states, in contrast to views on norms that assert that once norms are adopted, they remain in a static condition with little conflict (Finnemore and Sikkink 1998).

Both constructivists and rationalists have expressed concern about the ASEAN norms. However, the evaluation of the norms themselves is not widely accepted. In reality, the dichotomy is a problem of epistemology brought about by divergent perspectives on situations in which norms are broken. Several instances of norm violation are generally acknowledged. Even though realist approaches emphasize the pursuit of interests as the primary goal in international relations, they view the case of norm violation as evidence that these norms are not valid (Khoo 2004). Constructivists, on the other hand, emphasize that norms change over time and evolve as an organization maintains the norms' daily practice and views violations as isolated incidents. The norms may have become more firmly established as a result of these frequent breaches (Ba 2005). However, research on ASEAN has focused

solely on a static model without considering the dynamic nature of norms. They assume that norms are linear concepts that, once they are established, do not change until new norms take their place.

Acharya proposes a term for the relationship between international or universal norms and local or regional norms, describing a “localization” process in which local actors subjectively adopt the universal norm in order to reflect unique elements and conditions (Acharya 2004). According to Acharya, a crucial concept for comprehending the development of ASEAN norms is “the process of norms localization,” which places emphasis on local practices, initiatives, and active adaptation based on the “mutual constitutive relationship” between external and existing norms. According to him, localization and adaptation are distinct because the former is voluntary and the latter may be viewed as a tactical move (Acharya 2004, 250-2). His thesis supports the materialistic and, more importantly, the ideal portrayal of local conditions. As a result, localization places emphasis on indigenous initiatives as well as a process of evolutionary synthesis carried out by local actors who share a history and culture. This kind of argument shows that Southeast Asia isn’t worse off than any other region when it comes to values and norms. Additionally, it challenges the “universalist” contention that the “own way” is the only one that matters. It argues that this “one” cannot be judged by universal standards.

Nevertheless, local actors need to take a united stand at some point during the localization process. That condition is possible to happen only when the group of actors is symmetrical. But given the dynamic nature of domestic politics and the web of bilateral relations, it is hard to believe such a thing would happen. Instead of occurring sequentially, norm adaptation and norm resistance occur simultaneously as a development process. It is difficult to distinguish between indigenous and alien norms because the idea of localization is a process of synthesis. When discussing localization, the new arising norms that are practiced are viewed as significant. They do not consider that the new emerging norms might have been influenced by indigenous norms. Another contributing variable may be the native norms themselves. Competing norms remain constant over the long term, and the development of new ideas can be traced back to the past.

Contesting norms do not always take the place of old ones. For instance, in the world of nation-states, old norms remain universal, so the old principle of non-interference is unaffected by

outside values. The world system's legitimacy will be upheld if it remains unchanged. It is the new standard of a caring society and democratization, not the non-interference principle itself, that changes the norm. Second, it is erroneous to assume that there has been a unified position on ASEAN norms. In fact, ASEAN has had "norm violations" throughout its history, even of its fundamental norms of consensus and non-interference. There has been a growing lack of respect for ASEAN norms like non-use of force, regional autonomy, non-interference, and the ASEAN Way (Collins 2007; Khoo 2004; Lee 2007), despite the fact that the majority of incidents occurred between ASEAN members and the then non-ASEAN members (Ba 2005, 257).

When members of an institution or organization, or their institutions or organizations themselves face critical challenges, norms would be under strong pressure. Certain crucial changes, which are sometimes referred to as disjuncture, replacement, or transformation, are essential to the idea of change. The idea of a "life cycle" is one of the best ways, according to Finnemore and Sikkink, to describe this significant challenge to norms. According to Finnemore and Sikkink (1998), the emergence and demise of a norm are analogous to those of an organic unit. The conflicting tensions that arise between emerging norms and established norms are clearly articulated by this concept. New norms challenge established norms while maintaining their dominance. However, just because a norm is dominant does not mean that members of the organization where it is dominant do not disagree with it. When crucial shifts occur under certain conditions at the national and international levels, contention has the potential to trigger a paradigm shift.

When making the assumption of a peaceful and stable life cycle, Finnemore and Sikkink (1998) failed to take into account the fact that there are a number of cyclical changes and responses to them within the cycle of norms. The cyclical change symbolizes crises that must be resolved or that pass away over time, while norms remain "settled norms," which refers to the status of norm endorsement by states despite the fact that their behavior clearly violates the norms (Brown 2007, 65; Frost 1996), through adaptation and modification rather than fundamental change. Consequently, as they are processed, it is onerous to anticipate the natural changes in the future. Such change, for instance, can be derived from the "dialectical nature of institutional transformation and the relationship between political actors as objects and agents of history" (Beeson 2002, 17).

Some critical variables lead the fundamental changes of this process. First, the position taken by influential actors regarding norms due to actors' differing capacities to alter norms. Second, there is the factor of the changing environment over the long term, both domestically and globally. While these two factors are mainly derived from material conditions, equal attention should be given to normative developments. The actor is a real factor from the moment the definition of norms is set. As there are uneven capacities among actors to determine influential norms and social practices (Cox 1981), some members or actors have a greater influence on changing norms. This is even more true if the nation has a significant influence within the group. Fundamental changes may occur unexpectedly, but these changes do not occur right away; rather, they happen gradually over time as factors accumulate. Likewise, it is hard to notice the transformation process of ASEAN norms until it finally manifests. However, it is natural that such changes will often be led by the steady well-planned efforts of actors who wish to witness progressive changes. Many important aspects of human development are related to people's security. Human security is related to women's issues.

Constructivists have paid relatively less attention to 'agency' in international norms, which cannot explain the constitutive impact of norms varying across states (Checkel 1999, 84). While many studies on norm entrepreneur deal with non-governmental and transnational organizations and individuals, Florini (1996) takes 'states' as a norm entrepreneur. States are not the only actors playing with norms but form part of the environmental conditions for norms (Florini 1996, 377). Norms are most likely to obtain their initial foothold through the efforts of a norm entrepreneur, an individual or organization that sets out to change the behavior of others (Florini 1996, 375). However, the role of a norm entrepreneur is not always guaranteed. In particular, when there is a big gap between practice and claimed norms with the limited capacity and intention to play the role of a norm entrepreneur, norm diffusion or transformation is likely to reach a deadlock. Furthermore, when the agent has to involve a norm cluster consisting of interrelated norms, the role of a norm entrepreneur is limited. For instance, in the case of human security, there is a complexity of elements, which may result from a gap between practice and claimed norms, making the agent a 'message entrepreneur' as it does not reject universal norms or the norm cluster while also not really intending to accommodate it.

Mainstreaming of Gender Responsive Human Security in ASEAN

The Evolution of Human Security in ASEAN

There has been an increasing tendency toward creating a security community in Southeast Asia, mainly through the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN). The existence of regional cooperation began to gain prominence as a result of responses toward traditional security threats during the Cold War era. The emergence of a variety of non-traditional security issues following the Cold War, such as issues related to the economy, environment, health, and migration, have pushed for a response at a regional level and the adoption of human security. There are close relations between community-building and securing human security in Southeast Asia.

The initial motivation for the establishment of ASEAN in 1967 was mainly driven by security concerns, given the geopolitics in Southeast Asia. The member states of ASEAN were hesitant to view ASEAN as a regional military or security organization, concerned it could provoke an unintended reaction from non-member states in the region. Instead, for an ostensible reason, ASEAN emphasized economic and social cooperation. Without having operational arrangements for defense cooperation, ASEAN developed its norm for maintaining peace and stability in the region. In the 1970s, ZOPFAN, the Treaty of Amity and Cooperation, and other ASEAN-produced documents had articulated the rejection of external intervention into national and regional affairs for the sake of national sovereignty. It was not surprising, given the priority on 'peace and stability' in the region. ASEAN member states, which have undergone the nation-building process, were vulnerable to changing regional order under the Cold War.

With the end of the Cold War, ASEAN has shifted its cooperation from traditional security to non-traditional security. However, this occurred without adopting the term of human security in the ASEAN-related documents. The discussion of human security has been segregated into related components. In 1992, the ASEAN Free Trade Area agreement signaled the importance of economic development for sustaining ASEAN unity. In 1997, the ASEAN Vision 2020, adopted amid the economic crisis in 1997 to 1998, inscribed human security elements by envisioning a caring and sharing community. The vision 2020 formulated a caring society

as one with “equitable access to opportunities for total human development regardless of gender, race, religion, language, or social and cultural background.” It also envisioned an ASEAN as a region that is free from hunger, malnutrition, deprivation, and poverty. It emphasized the significance of the family as the basic unit of society for the caring of children, youth, women, and the elderly. The vision embraced the civil society tending to the disadvantaged, disabled, and marginalized and where social justice and the rule of law reign. Though it seemed to shift the responsibility to family and civil society, leaders acknowledged social justice and the rule of law. The leaders of ASEAN member states envisioned ASEAN to be evolved into a functional regional entity of agreed rules of behavior and cooperative measures at the regional level to tackle problems, including environmental pollution and degradation, drug trafficking, trafficking in women and children, and other transnational crimes (ASEAN 1997). ASEAN Vision 2020 emphasized the importance of people’s participation to achieve welfare and dignity for humankind and the greater community (ASEAN 1997). The goals of the ASEAN vision generally cover the elements of human security despite the absence of ‘human security’.

The vision of ASEAN should be seen as a consequence of the accommodation of new demands for regional cooperation. The Asian economic crisis in 1997–1998 severely hit the ASEAN nations and then quickly spread out to political instability and various social problems, which inherently challenged human security in the region. Indeed, the outbreak of cumulative severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS) in 2003 and avian influenza emerged as transnational problems that posed non-traditional security threats to people in the region and called for ASEAN to respond in a more effective manner.

When Indonesia assumed ASEAN’s chair in 2003, the concept of an ASEAN Political Security Community (APSC) was officially proposed. Normally, the host of the ASEAN Summit would attempt to take the opportunity of its leadership to reinforce its role and position in ASEAN by proposing new initiatives. The APSC’s concern is not just to strengthen regional security. Instead, Indonesia suggested that ASEAN’s focus should shift from economic cooperation to political cooperation, where Indonesia could play a larger role. The role of Indonesia had been restricted because of its limited economic power. When pursuing leadership, Indonesia’s political power would be derived from normative

matters rather than military power. With Indonesia taking the leadership role in ASEAN, the country's strong democratic values would be able to enhance the region's democratic values and thus give a fresh perspective for ASEAN. The then minister of foreign affairs of Indonesia, Hassan Wirayuda, mentioned that "in the past five years, we have been concentrating more on economic cooperation, while to have a strong ASEAN, we need to balance that with political cooperation" (The Jakarta Post 2003a).

Even after a year of its introduction, it appeared that the member states did not fully comprehend the APSC concept. To explain this, Rizal Sukma pointed out that the concept was ambiguous due to Indonesia's reluctance to adopt the non-interference principle, while the country has proposed a reformative concept with the intention of establishing mechanisms for conflict resolution and peacebuilding through the APSC (The Jakarta Post 2003b).

As the summit's chair, Indonesia put a strong emphasis on APSC. Human rights must be protected and respected in order to create a security community, at least conceptually. The Indonesian government, on the other hand, stressed on safety and stability as a result of the emerging terrorist threat posed by a series of terror attacks in the region, which may, to some extent, violate human rights. Human rights issues in Indonesia have been steadily improving since President Suharto's downfall, but the reorientation of Indonesia's policy agenda toward security and the fight against terrorism is expected to contradict this trend (Juwana 2004). Even though the human rights mechanism and the APSC are complementary, the introduction of the APSC and its acceptance inevitably slowed down the progress in raising awareness of human rights issues in Myanmar and the need for a regional mechanism.

However, the recent trajectory of ASEAN has provided little confidence in achieving human security as it was not included in the concept of the envisioned APSC. Indeed, there is yet another form of non-interference that forbids non-governmental actors from interfering with government operations. The ASEAN Intergovernmental Commission on Human Rights was established in 2009 by ASEAN member states. Nevertheless, the human rights organizations withdrew from the meeting in February 2009, which came as no surprise given its existence as a powerless body. Prior to the summit, a meeting between ASEAN leaders and representatives of civil society was held as part of the democratization process in

ASEAN that embraces the idea of a people's community. However, civil society participation in the ASEAN process was disrupted in October when half of the ten NGOs' representatives were kicked out by some leaders of ASEAN from the meeting¹ while the remaining ones stayed silent. This event, although it was quite expected, was still viewed as a frustrating one by civil society.

As stipulated in the ASEAN Charter, the purpose of ASEAN is "to strengthen democracy, enhance good governance and the rule of law, and to promote and protect human rights and fundamental freedoms, with due regard to the rights and responsibilities of the member states." It incorporates the idea of comprehensive security to address transboundary challenges, transnational crimes, and all forms of threats (ASEAN 2007). In addition, the charter mentioned the establishment of an ASEAN human rights body, which paved the way to form the ASEAN Intergovernmental Commission on Human Rights in 2009.

In 2015, ASEAN transformed itself into a people-centered and people-oriented ASEAN Community of three pillars: the ASEAN Political Security Community (APSC), the ASEAN Economic Community (AEC), and the ASEAN Socio-Cultural Community (ASSC). However, there was no official inclusion of human security as APSC still deals with various threats to states. Paradoxically, the community body dealing with elements of human rights is ASSC. It addresses a wide range of regional issues, including promoting a high quality of life and equitable access to opportunities for all. In addition, it promotes and protects the human rights of women, children, youth, the elderly/older persons, persons with disabilities, migrant workers, and vulnerable and marginalized groups. ASSC states its purpose as a regional institution that "promotes social development and environmental protection through effective mechanisms to meet the current and future needs of our peoples". It aims to build "a resilient community with enhanced capacity and capability to adapt and respond to social and economic vulnerabilities, disasters, climate change as well as emerging threats and challenges" (ASEAN 2015).

¹ The five states were Singapore, the Philippines, Cambodia, Laos and Burma

Gender Mainstreaming in ASEAN

Setting the agenda approach intends to change the normative set by projecting gender streaming as a major goal of an international organization. It is not likely to fully adopt gender mainstreaming but adapt by (Lombardo 2005) “redressing gender-blind peace and security processes” (Barrow 2009, 66). There was no resistance from male and non-committed decision-makers.

The development of human security in ASEAN has been related to the gender issue. The human rights agenda were largely instrumented to promote women’s rights. In particular, women and children have been referred to as a vulnerable group that needs to be protected from various human security threats. As shown above, ASEAN has been rather reluctant to incorporate the full range of requirements for human security; instead, ASEAN addresses broadly segmented elements of human security based on the concept of comprehensive security. ASEAN’s limited approaches to human rights were based on strict adherence to the principle of non-interference and the consensus-based decision-making mechanism. ASEAN has justified its norms as being generally in line with its commitment to universal norms enshrined in the United Nations (UN) Charter. ASEAN member states made an agreement at a level comfortable for all to avoid sensitive issues. Its stance on human rights was formed by appealing to the lowest common denominator. ASEAN has paid particular attention to women and children while addressing its commitment to internationally recognized human rights issues. In this sense, ASEAN’s concerns on women’s security have served as a common denominator to relate its commitment to internationally recognized norms.

ASEAN has recognized the significance of women’s issues in developing regional cooperation. The first institutionalized channel to discuss women’s issues was the ASEAN Women Leaders’ Conference held in 1975, which paved the way for establishing the ASEAN Sub-Committee on Women (ASW) in 1976. There was a Meeting of the ASEAN sub-Committee on Women under the Permanent Committee of Socio-Cultural Activities of the ASEAN. It was a major concern of the sub-committee to implement the World Plan of Action to carry out the objectives of the United Nations International Decade for Women, 1975–1985. The first meeting of ASW formed a working group that drafted the constitution of the ASEAN Confederation of Women’s Organizations (ACWO). It

was later renamed as the ASEAN Women's Program (AWP) and was placed under the ASEAN Committee on Social Development (COSD) in 1989 when it adopted ACWO's constitution and developed a plan of action between 1981 and 1986. For further institutionalization, the AWP regained its original name as the ASEAN Sub-Committee on Women in 1996 and became a full committee, presently known as the ASEAN Committee on Women (ACW). The ACW led to the launch of the convention of the ministers in charge of women convened in 2011, which became the ASEAN Ministerial Meeting on Women (AMMW).

ASEAN's commitment to women's advancement was reiterated in the adaptation of the Declaration on the Advancement of Women in ASEAN in 1988. The declaration recognized women as active agents in and beneficiaries of development. The declaration entailed the notion of gender equality by emphasizing the goal of promoting and implementing women's effective and equitable participation. The ASEAN Commission on the Promotion and Protection of the Rights of Women and Children (ACWC) was created to act as a 'precursor' to the AICHR (Muntarbhorn 2003).

The Declaration on the Elimination of Violence Against Women in ASEAN was adopted in 2004. It was a regional initiative to implement universal programs, including the Declaration on the Elimination of Violence Against Women adopted by the United Nations General Assembly in its Resolution 48/104 of 20 December 1993. The declaration stated that it is also in line with the regional cooperation development reflected in the ASEAN Declaration (Bangkok Declaration) of 1967, the Declaration of ASEAN Concord of 1976, the Manila Declaration of 1987, the Declaration of the Advancement of Women in the ASEAN Region of 1988, and the Ha Noi Plan of Action of 1998. At the national level, to enact, reinforce or amend domestic legislation was stated. Gender mainstreaming appeared in the regional conceptual framework to annihilate all kinds of violence against women through policies and programs as well as systems, procedures, and processes. The declaration includes the concept of human rights, which promotes the full enjoyment of all human rights and fundamental freedoms in order to enable women and girls to protect themselves from violence. It also embraces various actors as it attempts to support initiatives undertaken by women's organizations and non-governmental and community-based organizations. However, an implementation mechanism was not explicitly included. The special measures proposed were mainly research-related programs (ASEAN 2004a).

The process of gender mainstreaming in ASEAN has been related to development in the world. The 1995 Beijing Declaration appeared to be a turning point, requesting distinctive actions for protecting women who have been severely affected by the changing nature of conflicts and wars since the 1990s. It was a turning point and a call to action for women in conflicts. Unfortunately, the ASEAN Vision 2020 did not reflect the emerging norms on protecting women in conflicts and wars by merely mentioning that women to be protected from the crime of human trafficking.

The ASEAN summit in 1998 became a critical juncture for ASEAN to recognize regional human rights concerns. Through the summit, ASEAN member states were committed to promote and protect human rights and fundamental freedoms of all peoples in line with the UN Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and the Vienna Declaration and Program of Action of the World Conference on Human Rights. The leaders of ASEAN reaffirmed their will to work toward the full implementation of the CRC, CEDAW, and other international instruments on women and children.

The ASEAN Declaration Against Trafficking in Persons Particularly Women and Children adopted in 2004 was a regional initiative to protect women's rights in a specific field. After the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime and the Ha Noi Declaration of 1998 and the Ha Noi Plan of Action, the declaration defines the trafficking of persons, particularly women and children, as an emerging regional human rights problem. It was seen as crucial to promote the importance of human rights and human development. However, the implementation measures were in large part limited to regular exchanges of views and information sharing, although it emphasized the importance of undertaking coercive actions/measures (ASEAN 2004b).

The ASEAN Declaration on the Protection and Promotion of the Rights of Migrant Workers of 2007 was another example of regional norms with particular references to gender equality and women's rights in the region. Migrant workers' rights were seen mainly as the problems of women and children in the context of human rights as it recalls the Vientiane Action Program and emphasizes the promotion of human rights and obligations to realize an open, dynamic and resilient ASEAN Community (ASEAN 2007).

The adoption of the Ha Noi Declaration on the Enhancement of Welfare and Development of ASEAN Women and Children in 2010 was encouraged by the establishment of the ASEAN Commission on the Promotion and Protection of the Rights of Women and Children (ACWC). The welfare and development of women and children is seen as a crucial element to promote a people-oriented ASEAN. It explicitly embraces the terminology of promoting gender equality, women's empowerment, and gender mainstreaming to promote the rights of women and children, especially those living in disadvantaged and vulnerable conditions, including those in disaster and conflict-affected areas. UN agencies and Dialogue Partners are recognized as important agents in enhancing the welfare and development of women. However, implementation measures were mostly limited to academic activities rather than enforcement measures, including establishing a regional knowledge management system and an ASEAN Social Work Consortium. In addition, strengthening gender-sensitive legislation and action plans was suggested without specific measures (ASEAN 2010).

The Roadmap for an ASEAN Community (2009–2015) is also one of the prominent documents that considers gender equality in ASEAN. It places gender issues under both pillars of the ASEAN Community, the APSC and the ASSC. Under the APSC, the promotion of capacity building for CLMV countries in the implementation of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) was emphasized, along with respect for human rights and gender equality. In the section of ASSC, the promotion and protection of women's rights and welfare, the children, the elderly, and the disabled from gender-responsive aspects was reiterated. It was stated that comprehensive human rights mechanisms and equivalent bodies, including sectoral bodies promoting women's and children's rights, needed to be carried out by 2009 (ASEAN 2009a).

The Terms of Reference of the ASEAN Intergovernmental Commission on Human Rights (2009) recognize gender equality to commit human rights in ASEAN. Furthermore, the terms urge that in appointing their Representatives to the AICHR, member states shall give due consideration to gender equality (ASEAN 2009b).

The ACW Work Plan is contextualized in a recent development toward a new ASEAN. The AICHR and the ACWC were considered major elements. In addition, the ASEAN Ministerial Meeting on

Women, established in 2002, has become a key entity in monitoring and coordinating the implementation of ASEAN's commitment to women's issues.

Since the UN Security Council Resolution 1325 (UNSCR 1325) in 2010, the WSP perspective has become a priority in the peacebuilding process within ASEAN. ASEAN adopted the Statement on Promoting Women, Peace, and Security at the meeting of the ASEAN Committee of Women and the ASEAN Commission on the Promotion and Protection of the Rights of Women and Children (ACWC) in 2017. The statement attempts to redefine security by including various threats, such as economic security, pandemics, disaster, and climate change. As the first WPS-related statement of ASEAN, it showed its commitment to solving gender issues, including gender inequality, discrimination, and poverty, as these are viewed as the root causes of armed conflicts (ASEAN 2017a).

ASEAN's concern in the WPS is in line with its commitment to the UN resolution. In addition, ASEAN adopted the ASEAN–UN Plan of Action (POA) 2021–2025 in 2020 to promote WPS as a multilateral strategy for maintaining peace and security across the globe and in the region. The WPS agenda based on the comprehensive approaches, in the context of ASEAN, is relevant to women's political participation, climate change, natural disasters, communal conflicts, violent extremism, transnational crime, irregular migration and displacement, and pandemics (ASEAN 2021)

With no institutional momentum to drive national responses to UNSCR 1325, the resolution's successful implementation relies on individual countries' political will. The UNSCR 1325 on Women, Peace, and Security in 2010 proposal on the transformation of women from victims to peacebuilders has not yet been implemented in the region. Its implementation remains possible at the national level while there is yet a national-level mechanism within ASEAN. Thus, it is very much dependent on the political will at the national level.

The incident during the ASEAN Intergovernmental Commission on Human Rights meeting held in 2009, which supposedly created a dialogue between civil society and ASEAN leaders, became a frustrating one for the civil society representatives after they were

kicked out of the forum by five leaders from ASEAN² while the others remained silent. The forum should have been the one that supports the democratization process in ASEAN. However, the unsupportive actions by the ASEAN leaders proved that ASEAN still has a long way to achieve the envisioned gender equality.

The 2012 ASEAN Declaration of Human Rights was rooted in previous attempts to improve women's rights in ASEAN, such as the Declaration of the Advancement of Women and the Declaration of the Elimination of Violence against Women in the ASEAN region.

Article 36. protects the human rights of women, children, youth, the elderly/older persons, persons with disabilities, migrant workers, and vulnerable and marginalized groups.

The difficulties encountered during implementation further intensify the demand for revisions to the ASEAN Norms. Despite the different nature of the suppression in 2007 and the disaster in 2008, the general public's perception of Myanmar was unquestionably damaged. There have even been louder voices calling for Myanmar's membership in ASEAN to be suspended, especially from Indonesia, the Philippines, and Thailand.

In 2012, the leaders of the ASEAN adopted the ASEAN Human Rights Declaration (AHRD). Not surprisingly, the declaration did not come out without weakness. It has been criticized for having failed to embrace universalism in human rights and major basic rights and freedoms, such as the freedom of association and the right to be free from enforced disappearance.³ The drafting work of the declaration was done by the AICHR without consultation with civil society or international human rights organizations. However, given the diversity of political systems among ASEAN member states, the declaration should be seen as a cognitive evolution of human rights in the context of the APSC. As a way of depicting the ASEAN norms, the principle of non-interference did not appear in the declaration. It states human rights for every person, including migrant workers and vulnerable groups, who remain politically sensitive groups in some member states. The declaration affirms

² These five states were Singapore, the Philippines, Cambodia, Laos, and Burma.

³ The ASEAN Human Right Declaration states that "the realization of human rights must be considered in the regional and national context bearing in mind different political, economic, legal, social, cultural, historical and religious backgrounds." (ASEAN 2012a)

not only political rights but also social, economic, and cultural rights as well. It should be noted that universal institutionalized norms did not gain that status overnight. These were rather the result of long-term cognitive evolutionary development.

ASEAN's human rights practices, which are based on a non-binding declaration for accomplishing the APSC, will be tested as it faces a critical challenge in dealing with the refugee crisis of the Rohingya. The APSC Blueprint addresses several actions for strengthening ASEAN humanitarian assistance, such as "providing basic services or assistance to bring relief to victims of conflict in consultation with the receiving State and promoting cooperation for orderly repatriation of refugees/displaced persons and resettlement of internally displaced persons" (ASEAN 2009). In addition, the AHRD states various rights that need to be protected, including the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion, and to seek and receive asylum in another state in accordance with the laws of such state and applicable international agreements. According to the ASEAN Charter, all member states of ASEAN share a common interest and are committed to promote and protect human rights and fundamental freedoms by establishing mutual cooperation internally as well as externally with relevant national, regional, and international institutions/organizations (ASEAN 2012a).

In the ASEAN Community Vision 2025, it was envisioned that people would have access to fundamental freedoms and human rights. For example, APSC tried to envisage an inclusive and responsive community that ensures people can exercise their human rights and fundamental freedoms and able to thrive in a just, democratic, harmonious, and gender-sensitive environment. Under the ASSC, ASEAN safeguards the human rights of women, children, youth, the elderly/older persons, people with disabilities, migrant workers, and other vulnerable and marginalized groups.

ASEAN has attempted to commit to good global citizenship, which claims to comply with international agreements and promote peace and (sustainable) development. The mainstreaming of gender in ASEAN has been pursued by incorporating it into multilateral arrangements, such as the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). ASEAN set out their target of gender equality along with these goals. The Work Plan of the ASEAN Committee on Women (2011–2015) stipulates its goal of social welfare and social protection with particular reference to the gender perspective is mainstreamed in the implementation

of the ASEAN Roadmap for the Attainment of MDGs and put ASEAN Secretariat as a 'lead country'." The key result area 3 for social justice and rights was particularly designated for women's rights and included the elimination of violence against women in ASEAN, the improvement of sex-disaggregated data collection, the enhancement of women's participation, the upgrade of the capacity of the AMS in gender analysis and coordinative work for intersectoral women's rights and gender mainstreaming. However, the details of activities to achieve these goals were mainly in the form of conferences, workshops, and the development of an advocacy tool (ASEAN 2012b).

It also draws attention to the SDGs and the indicators and targets to eliminate violence against women. The 2030 Agenda embraces the very comprehensive 17 agendas, including gender equality and agenda no.5 (SDG 5). Given the issue's complexity, the implementation of SDG 5 requires a comprehensive approach, including national, regional, and global reactions. ASEAN reaffirmed that "gender equality is recognized and affirmed as a precondition for the realization of sustainable development" (ASEAN 2017b). In 2017, ASEAN explicitly presented how ASEAN Community and the 2020 Agenda for Sustainable Development complement each other (ASEAN 2017c). One of the strong congruent points was gender equality. ASEAN and the United Nations agreed in the 2016–2020 Plan of Action among others, to enhance cooperation, share best practices, promote social development, gender equality and women's empowerment, and eliminate violence and discrimination, which also means ensuring everyone has equal access to care, protection, services, and opportunities, especially for the vulnerable groups like children, the elderly, the disabled, and migrants (UN and ASEAN 2016).

However, in the ASEAN Complementarities Initiative between the ASEAN Community Vision 2025 and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, ASEAN priority areas, including poverty eradication, infrastructure and connectivity, sustainable management of natural resources, sustainable consumption and production, and resilience, do not include the agenda five gender equality. Instead, the priorities were given to other goals, except goals 4, 5, 10, and 16: quality education, gender equality, reduced inequality, peace and justice, and strong institutions. These not given priorities are inherently related to each other and are crucial elements for achieving gender equality (ASEAN 2017c).

Although ASEAN Norms have been a core element in binding ASEAN members, there has been a lack of a collective role in implementing gender mainstreaming policies. At the inter-governmental level, there is currently no system in place to accept complaints of violations of women's, children's, or other rights or to provide effective remedies; In the ASEAN setting, women and children do not have access to a system that can assist them in investigating allegations of violations of their rights. There is some monitoring of the issue under the current structure, but it is more focused on welfare and general development rather than human rights.

COVID-19 and Gender-Responsive Human Security

In responding the COVID-19, ASEAN adopted the ASEAN Comprehensive Recovery Framework (ACRF). The term "human security" was officially adopted by ASEAN for the first time because of the severity of the pandemic. Gender equality was emphasized as a crucial component of human security (ASEAN 2020a). According to the framework, all response and recovery efforts to safeguard human security must recognize the gender-specific impact of the pandemic (ASEAN 2020b). Gender equality was acknowledged as a concern for human security in the action plan. There are three initiatives and programs included in ASEAN's recovery plan and actions that tried to incorporate gender equality, namely: 1) incorporating gender equality into all government institutions' policy strategy, planning, and monitoring processes, as well as enhancing human resources, knowledge, and capacity; 2) enhancing gender-specific data and evidence regarding the COVID-19 pandemic's effects on girls and women; 3) advancing women, promoting peace and security in the region. However, these programs are still far from practically being implemented. Ideally, the programs would be able to produce practical guidelines and gendered statistics on COVID-19 that will be used to make policies and programs on recovery, regional studies, and identification of priority areas, including economic recovery, conflict, as well as humanitarian emergencies. During COVID-19, WPS efforts in member states have been weakened (ASEAN 2021).

In reality, women's rights are at risk of shrinking due to the persistent structural weakness of political, economic, and social systems, further exacerbated by the complex crisis caused by

COVID-19. The ASEAN Gender Outlook (2021) presents the current status of ASEAN's commitment to gender equality. The outlook relates the element of gender equality with all agendas of SDGs. However, the statistical findings show that the most deprived group of women are "those li[vi]ng in rural areas, in poor households, ethnic minority women, women with disabilities and migrant women" (ASEAN 2021).

The impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic are pervasive. The pandemic, a global health threat that seems to be equally distributed globally, soon appeared to bring economic, social, and political challenges across regional and national boundaries. The social impacts of COVID-19 have, however, developed unevenly to vulnerable groups, particularly women, as the economic growth rate is expected to shrink in many countries in the region. In many ASEAN member states, women's rights have been challenged seriously during the pandemic. The economic toll of COVID-19 on women has increased as they have been easily targeted for layoffs. In addition, there are increasing reported cases of domestic violence. The public campaign often spread wrong images of women by describing their presence to be relied on man.

According to the Outlook (2021), women's experience and the impacts of COVID-19 differs from that of men in terms of health, domestic workload, job security, and disadvantage in daily life. The proportion of women whose mental and physical health were more severely affected by COVID-19 was higher than men, particularly in Indonesia and the Philippines, which experienced greater spread of COVID-19. Unpaid domestic and care work has increased disproportionately, as women bear at least three times more than men. Women's domestic workload would have increased at the expense of their opportunities for formal and informal work during the pandemic.

The Outlook presented the mixed state of gender equality. The ASEAN member states now have better women's political participation and more women hold managerial positions. However, there are also indicators showing women are lagging far behind. For instance, the proportion of women aged between 18 and 49 who married before 18 years of age are still high, above 15 percent in six countries in the region. In addition, violence against women remains a crucial concern, although the prevalence in the region is relatively lower than in other regions. During COVID-19, more domestic violence against women were reported, while the

opportunities for getting help were constrained due to restricted movement in many countries in the region.

Women's rights in ASEAN had developed with certain limitations in terms of legislation and practices. However, the actual problems are not whether women should be prioritized in responding to COVID-19. Rather, it is critical to determine whether women's vulnerability is badly affected due to the lack of systemic political and social protections.

Conclusion

There have been parallels in the development of ASEAN. First, the concept of security has long been dominated by a state-oriented approach in ASEAN, mainly supported by ASEAN norms. ASEAN has responded in their own distinctive styles to emerging non-traditional security, but it does face limitations to its conceptual framework and practical application. It is difficult to respond to transboundary issues drawing on an understanding of the aspect of human security. Second, the evolution of security in ASEAN norms has been absorbed by a gender-blindness approach. ASEAN's efforts on gender equality were mainly addressed in declarations and conferences. This paper argues that there is now a call for a congruent point for these parallels by adopting gender-responsive human security in the global crisis of COVID-19, a human security crisis that severely affects women.

ASEAN is a particularly important agent in promoting gender-responsive human security, given the nature of challenges and the political and economic limitations of ASEAN member states. ASEAN claims that its norms are in line with internationally recognized norms. It also tends to be a good global citizen as a norm entrepreneur by promoting universal norms and involving global programs led by the UN, such as MDGs and SDGs. However, the role of the norm entrepreneur has been in large part constrained by the ambiguity of its security concept and gender approach, which resulted in fragmented activity. ASEAN would remain a message entrepreneur if such parallels between practice and conceptual framework continues.

There is also a lack of effective measures to deal with gender-responsive human security. As for resilience-community building, women's empowerment should be strengthened, particularly through socio-economic capability that may involve digital and financial inclusion while addressing social protection to enable women to be drivers of the recovery process. ASEAN needs to incorporate gender-responsive human security into its vision for the ASEAN Community and the related framework and action plan. ASEAN also requires its member states to adopt and put into practice this normative structure. Greater women's participation in decision-making should drive it at various levels, and there is a need for a cross-sectoral approach to attract greater investment in gender-responsive public and social infrastructure in the region.

Acknowledgment

This work is supported by Research and Technology Transfer Office, Bina Nusantara University, as a part of Bina Nusantara University's International Research Grant entitled "Gender Representation and Development in Southeast Asia" with contract number: No.026/VR.RTT/IV/2020 and contract date: 6 April 2020.

About the authors

Kim Hyung-Jong is an associate professor at the Department of International Relations, Yonsei University, Wonju, South Korea. He obtained his bachelor's degree in South Korea, his master's degree in 2006, and his Doctoral degree in 2011 from Universiti Malaya, Malaysia. He can be reached via email: kimsea@yonsea.ac.kr

Lili Yulyadi Arnakim is a Senior Lecturer at the Department of International Relations, Bina Nusantara University. He obtained a bachelor's degree in 1997 and his master's degree in 2000 from International Islamic University, Malaysia, and his Doctoral degree from Universiti Malaya, Malaysia in 2011. He can be reached via email at lili.yulyadi@binus.edu

Ella Syafputri Prihatini is a senior lecturer at the Department of International Relations at Bina Nusantara University. She obtained her bachelor's degree from Universitas Gadjah Mada in 2004, her master's

*Kim Hyung-Jong, Lili Yulyadi Arnakim,
Ella Syafputri Prihatini & Galuh D.P. Dewi*

degree in development studies from the University of Queensland, and a doctoral degree in Political Science and International Relations from the University of Western Australia. Ella is researchable via email at ella.prihatini@binus.edu.

Galuh Dian Prama Dewi is a lecturer at the Department of International Relations, Bina Nusantara University. She obtained her bachelor's degree from Universitas Muhammadiyah in 2010, her master's Degree from Universitas Gadjah Mada in 2012. She can be reached via email at galuh.dewi@binus.edu

References

Books and Chapters in Book

Acharya, Amitav, 2001. *Constructing a Security Community in Southeast Asia: ASEAN and the problems of regional order*. London: Routledge.

Beeson, Mark, 2002. "Theorising International Change in East Asia", in Beeson, Mark (ed.), 2002. *Reconfiguring East Asia: Regional Institutions and Organizations after the Crisis*. New York: Routledge.

Brown, Chris, 2007. *Sovereignty, Rights and Justice: International Political Theory Today*. Cambridge: Polity.

Frost, Mervyn, 1996. *Ethics in International Relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Giddens, Anthony, 1984. *Constitution of Society: The Outline of the Theory of Structuration*. Cambridge: Polity Press 1984.

Hoadley, Stephen, 2006. "The Evolution of Security Thinking: An Overview", in Stephen Hoadley and Jurgen Ruland (Eds.), 2006. *Asian Security Reassessed*. Singapore: ISEAS.

Journals and Online Journals

Acharya, Amitav, 2004. "How Ideas Spread: Whose Norms Matter? Norm Localization and Institutional Change in Asian

- Regionalism”, *International Organization*, **58** (2): 239-275.
- Ba, Alice D., 2005. “On norms, rule breaking, and security communities: a constructivist response”, *International Relations of the Asia-Pacific*, **5**(2): 255-266.
- Barrow, A., 2009. “[It’s] like a rubber band. ‘Assessing UNSCR 1325 as a gender mainstreaming process’”, *International Journal of Law in Context*, **5**(1), 51-68.
- Checkel, Jeffrey T., 1999. “Norms, Institutions, and National Identity in Contemporary Europe”, *International Studies Quarterly*, **43** (1): 84-114.
- Collins, Alan, 2007. “Forming a security community: lessons from ASEAN”, *International Relations of the Asia-Pacific*, **7** (2): 203-225.
- Cox, Robert W., 1981. “Social Forces, States and World Orders: Beyond International Relations Theory”, *Millennium-Journal of International Studies*, **10** (2): 126-155.
- Finnemore, Martha, and Kathryn Sikkink, 1998. “International Norm Dynamics and Political Change”, *International Organization*, **52** (4): 887-917.
- Florini, Ann, 1996. “The evolution of international norms”, *International studies quarterly*, **40** (3): 363-389.
- Khoo, Nicholas, 2004. “Deconstructing the ASEAN security community: a review essay”, *International Relations of the Asia-Pacific*, **4** (1): 35-46.
- Lee, Jones, 2007. “ASEAN intervention in Cambodia: from Cold War to conditionality”, *The Pacific Review*, **20** (4): 523-550.
- Lombardo, E., 2005. “Integrating or Setting the Agenda? Gender Mainstreaming in the European Constitution-Making Process”, *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State & Society*, **12**(3): 412-432.

- Newman, Edward, 2010. "Critical human security studies", *Review of International Studies*, **36** (1): 77-94.
- Parmar, Parveen Kaur, et al., 2014. "Need for a gender-sensitive human security framework: results of a quantitative study of human security and sexual violence in Djohong District, Cameroon", *Conflict and Health*, **8** (1): 1-12.
- Van Kersbergen, Kees, and Bertjan Verbeek, 2007. "The Politics of International Norms: Subsidiarity and the Imperfect Competence Regime of the European Union", *European Journal of International Relations*, **13** (2): 217-238.

Official Documents

- ASEAN, 1997. ASEAN Customs Vision 2020: Vision Statements.
- ASEAN, 2004a. Declaration on the Elimination of Violence Against Women in ASEAN.
- ASEAN, 2004b. ASEAN Declaration Against Trafficking in Persons Particularly Women and Children.
- ASEAN, 2007. ASEAN Declaration on the Protection and Promotion of the Rights of Migrant Workers.
- ASEAN, 2010. Ha Noi Declaration on the Enhancement of Welfare and Development of ASEAN Women and Children 2010.
- ASEAN, 2009a. The Roadmap for an ASEAN Community, 2009-2015.
- ASEAN, 2009b. Terms of Reference ASEAN Intergovernmental Commission on Human Rights 2009.
- ASEAN, 2012a. ASEAN Human Rights Declaration.
- ASEAN, 2012b. ASEAN Committee on Women (ACW) Work Plan (2011-2015).
- ASEAN, 2017a. Joint Statement on Promoting Women, Peace and Security in ASEAN.

ASEAN, 2017b. ASEAN Declaration on the Gender-Responsive Implementation of the ASEAN Community Vision 2025 and Sustainable Development Goals.

ASEAN, 2017c. ASEAN Complementarities Initiative between the ASEAN Community Vision 2025 and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

ASEAN, 2020a. ASEAN Comprehensive Recovery Framework.

ASEAN, 2020b. Implementation Plan for ASEAN Comprehensive Recovery Framework.

ASEAN, 2021. ASEAN Gender Outlook.

UN and ASEAN, 2016. ASEAN-UN Plan of Action: To Implement the Joint Declaration on Comprehensive Partnership between ASEAN and the United Nations. ASEAN and United Nations.

Online Articles

ASEAN, 2009. “The ASEAN Political Security Community (APSC) Blueprint. Retrieved from https://asean.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/APSC_BluePrint.pdf [accessed on 16 November 2022]

Others

Muntarbhorn, Vitit, 2003. “A Roadmap for an ASEAN Human Rights Mechanism”, in the Third Workshop for an ASEAN Regional Mechanism on Human Rights, Bangkok, Thailand. May 28–29, 2003.

The Jakarta Post, 2003a. May 27.

The Jakarta Post, 2003b. December 11.