CENTER FOR STRATEGIC STUDIES
INDONESIAN NATIONAL ARMED FORCES

**TRACK II NETWORK OF DEFENCE AND SECURITY INSTITUTIONS 12TH ANNUAL MEETING
ON
"ASEAN DEFENCE SECURITY FORESIGHTING IN THE NEXT 2 DECADES"**

SESSION II

Chiang Mai, 27th February 2019

TRACK II NETWORK OF DEFENCE AND SECURITY INSTITUTIONS 12TH ANNUAL MEETING ON
"ASEAN DEFENCE SECURITY FORESIGHTING IN THE NEXT 2 DECADES"

SESSION II

Background

      The future of ASEAN defense and security is one of the important points in the Vision of the Political-Security Society which has been formulated to anticipate the development of ASEAN until 2025. In this vision it is stated that outward looking approaches are agreed as one way to safeguard regional peace and stability. The strategic environment in the Southeast Asian region is much influenced by external forces because of its location which is geographically located in the middle of the territory of major countries (great powers). This makes ASEAN a crucial position in determining attitudes and policies towards major countries that increasingly want closer relations with ASEAN Member States. In this case, ASEAN's impartial position requires a more relevant, contemporary and responsive explanation to adjust the times, and to be able to imagine the development of ASEAN's position, especially in terms of defense and security in the next two decades (forward looking).

      To be able to see the challenges ahead, we need to pay attention to development trends in recent times to date. First, the development of technology on all fronts, currently continues to affect the industrial and economic world. Industry 4.0 which is full of computerization in the process of producing goods and services, makes the pattern of the economy more reliant on machines that are increasingly able to replace human positions. Artificial intelligence technology (Artificial Intelligence, AI) makes people increasingly unnecessary in menial jobs such as drivers, administrative managers, printmen, mail delivery, receptionists, travel agents, and so on. This condition also needs to be considered by ASEAN, because according to the International Labor Organization (ILO), it is estimated that around 137 million workers or 56% of the total workers will be at greater risk of losing their jobs due to the use of robots.

      In the aspects of defense and security, the development of industrial technology 4.0 manifests itself in the rapid development of communication, command and control systems centered on information technology. These developments can be seen in the C4ISTAR conception (Command, Control, Communication, Computer, Information / Intelligence, Surveillance, Targeting

Acquisition and Reconnaissance), which means that the use of computers and information technology has become full of command, control, intelligence and supervision. This indicates that war has become increasingly modern which is increasingly centered on the network (Network Centric Warfare). Even warfare has entered the cyber realm, namely the network used by the general public to access information from around the world via the internet. These attacks in cyber warfare can instantly cripple infrastructure in a country.

Second, the security dilemma that occurs in the South China Sea (LCS). Every country certainly wants to maximize its military strength to prevent threats from both state and non-state sources, but the aggressiveness of military forces often poses a threat to other countries. This dilemma occurs in China's claims to the South China Sea region. The emergence of China as a new superpower with increasing military power raises a security dilemma because it is accompanied by claims against parts of Southeast Asia. Some bases on islands made in China are considered to violate UNCLOS marine law. Claims of ownership and militarization in the LCS region made some countries express their disapproval and called for freedom of navigation. The United States (US) calls for the region to become a free sailing area for anyone because it is an international waters according to UNCLOS marine law. The clash between the two superpowers even led to an open conflict, where the Chinese fleet of Chinese Warships and the United States Warship almost collided around the Spratly and Paracel Islands.

On the other hand, the US, which does not want to remain silent, sees China's aggressiveness in the LCS, under the leadership of Donald Trump, which passed the Asia Reassurance Initiative Act. In the law, the US plans to strengthen the commitment of their security alliance with its allies and will allocate US $ 1.5 billion annually to increase influence in Asia in the next 5 years. The passing of the law is a series of US efforts to offset China's influence in Asia, especially in Southeast Asia. Previously the US together with India, Australia and Japan had formed a Quadrilateral Security Dialogue (QSD / Quad). QSD was formed on the initiative of Japan in 2007, and is a security alliance that has held several military exercises in Southeast Asia. From this alliance, the Indo-Pacific concept was born as part of geostrategy to stem China's influence in Asia. This concept presents India as a country that is also growing as a large country whose economy and military power is increasing. Unlike China, India in this regard was promoted as a more pacifist country and prioritized dialogue and freedom of navigation.

Problem

There are many ASEAN instruments and frameworks, but at the same time, there are doubts and reluctance by ASEAN member countries themselves to truly use the ASEAN Centrality instrument. The problem that is supposed to be discussed in this paper is how does ASEAN respond to the situation of the strategic environment with its centrality and neutrality capital, while reviewing the future?

Discussion

As an association of countries in Southeast Asia, ASEAN has an important meaning in determining the size of the influence of the increasingly complex strategic environment. ASEAN has the principle of centrality and neutrality which mandates not to side with any country. However, ASEAN Member Countries will face the competition of the two major countries in a complex manner, because the two countries both offer favorable economic cooperation when the two countries are the main actors driving the world economy. ASEAN is a buffer for its member countries, so they can focus on common real problems and problems.

On the other hand, the real security threat at this time needs to be considered is how ASEAN encourages more and more cooperation in counter-terrorism and disaster management. In the midst of competition for the big countries, the challenge of ASEAN is how to realize cooperation in overcoming the real threat. Since 2016, ISIS terrorist groups have recruited citizens of Indonesia, the Philippines and Malaysia to fight in Iraq and Syria, or to carry out attacks in their respective countries. The defeat of ISIS in Syria and Iraq made it necessary to spread its operations in other regions, including in Southeast Asia. In the case of natural disasters, Southeast Asia, especially Indonesia and the Philippines, is an area that is traversed by a ring of fire, making it prone to earthquakes and tsunamis. Other countries are also prone to natural disasters such as floods, whirlwinds, floods and forest fires. Both of these threats have a very high urgency to be addressed together.

The cooperation that has been built by ASEAN to overcome this threat has been carried out. ASEAN cooperation that has been formed to tackle terrorism is the establishment of the ASEAN Convention on Counter-Terrorism (ACCT) in 2007, followed by the action plan of the ASEAN Comprehensive Plan on Action on Counter Terrorism in 2009. The ASEAN Leaders viewed terrorism as a profound threat to international peace and security and "a direct challenge to the attainment of peace, progress and prosperity of ASEAN and the realization of ASEAN Vision 2020". They expressed commitment to combat terrorism in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, international laws and relevant UN resolutions. They also stated that "cooperative efforts in this regard should consider joint practical counter-terrorism measures in line with specific circumstances in the region and in each member country".

Despite the widespread fear of terrorist attacks in Southeast Asia terrorism has proven to be an exaggerated risk for ASEAN. Modern terrorism is truly a transnational threat, given the ability of radical groups to plan and execute attacks in several countries at the same time, operate across national boundaries, and secure funds and other forms of support sources worldwide. Part of the credit for this should be given to increasing vigilance and preventive actions by individual ASEAN governments. Also important were various forms of bilateral and multilateral—both intra-ASEAN and extra-ASEAN—intelligence sharing and counter-terrorism cooperation. Moreover, as noted, as with other transnational threats, especially pandemics, natural disasters and drug trafficking, the threats of terrorism and piracy have proven to be a catalyst for regional cooperation.

Cooperation in natural disaster management was initiated in 2005 with the establishment of ASEAN Agreement on Disaster Management and Emergency Response (AADMER). This initiative was then followed by the establishment of the ASEAN Coordinating Center for Humanitarian Assistance on Disaster Management (AHA Center) in 2011, with its strategic vision of "One ASEAN, One Response". Disaster resiliency is an important core component of sustainability for ASEAN because ASEAN and East Asia experienced various crises and disasters during the past two decades, and those shocks were utilized to improve resiliency in the region. Not to mention, strengthening regional cooperation in the fields of financial, trade, energy security, food security, and disaster management will pave the way for smooth development in the region. The region has experienced diverse forms of disasters, including floods, typhoons, earthquakes, epidemics, and the financial crises of the late '90s, which necessitates better regional organization for quick action. This is the very reason why there is a need for more effective insurance mechanisms against various kinds of disasters. When we consider the actual form of such insurance mechanisms, there are numerous issues involved, such as whether it would be an institutionalized system such as a disaster fund, or something more flexible such as a coordination forum. It is worth pursuing reforms that undertake comprehensive preparations against the risks of a variety of disasters in Asia.

On the regional cooperation, the existing schemes shall be improved to cover better system of financing and transfer. In developing countries, cost of preparation–response – post disaster is typically following a bell-shaped graph and also reflects cycle-related fiscal needs. Government and individuals spend small portion on preparation efforts therefore when the disaster occurs they are burdened by large financial consequence, some obligations usually filled by donors out of humanitarian considerations, and at later stage, reconstruction may face delayed and under-budgeted program. With appropriate design, the bell-shaped financing burden can be changed into upside down curve –even though not completely. The situation can be changed if there is sufficient fiscal allocation for preparation in pre-disaster, thus in the occurrence of disaster claims will close large part of fiscal needs, and can be used for the later stage as well

In essence, to stay relevant and perform effectively, ASEAN must commit centrality: the principle of ASEAN centrality implies that ASEAN must keep its seat at the "driver's table" of the most important existing Asian regional institutions, especially the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF) and the East Asian Summit (EAS), and that it should not allow itself to be sidelined or marginalized by the initiatives of others, especially the great powers, to develop new or competing regional bodies covering Asia as a whole. The principle of ASEAN centrality is not an accident of history, but rooted in past historical political conditions favoring Asia's weaker states in developing regional cooperation. ASEAN centrality is not a result of the generosity of the big powers, but a consequence of two other long-term factors.

Southeast Asia, in the last 50 years has been able to create an ecosystem of peace, not only peace enjoyed by ten ASEAN member countries, but also enjoyed

by almost half of the world's population living in the region around Southeast Asia. ASEAN is able to provide a platform through various ASEAN-led Mechanism, such as the ARF and the EAS, to help large powers meet and dialogue. This is where the centrality of ASEAN serves to bring together all the major powers, such as the US, Russia, China, India, South Korea, Japan and Australia at the same time.

ASEAN has become an organization that has a transformative impact, especially in the context of relations between member countries, relations between ASEAN countries and other broader regions, and also in building people-centered ways. ASEAN has succeeded in bringing economic growth and revival among its member countries, also linking the ASEAN economy with economic forces outside the region. In addition, ASEAN has also succeeded in making Southeast Asia an area that has a 'voice' at the global level.

Conclusion

The ASEAN-led mechanism is a form of crystallization from the principle of ASEAN centrality, which can therefore be applied in the face of a strategic environment full of contestation. The ASEAN-led mechanism must be seen as a mechanism that puts forward the resolution of the main problems of ASEAN as a commonwealth organization that houses Southeast Asian countries. The issue of terrorism, natural disasters, climate change, and other non-traditional issues must be a priority. By prioritizing this, ASEAN can be able to take advantage of the influence of the contestation, by promoting dialogue. ASEAN still has to apply centrality and neutrality in doing so.

With the existence of ASEAN cooperation in overcoming the real threat, it is expected that in the face of the complexity of external challenges, ASEAN is able to remain standing as a power that has its own position by prioritizing its centrality and neutrality. ASEAN needs to be a regional organization that is able to embrace anyone, even those who create threats, by strengthening the habbit of dialogue.

Recommendation

In order to encourage habbit of dialogue, ASEAN must be able to facilitate the development and strengthening of cooperation based on the ASEAN-led mechanism. The efforts that NADI made to realize this can be done by:

1. Promoting cooperation in handling terrorism based on capability and own resources, one of which is by strengthening supervision of the flow of immigration, especially within the Southeast Asia region.
2. Strengthening cooperation in managing natural disasters, prioritizing AH Center and other existing mechanism