



 sciencedo

BALTIC JOURNAL OF LAW & POLITICS

A Journal of Vytautas Magnus University

VOLUME 15, NUMBER 1 (2022)

ISSN 2029-0454

Cite: *Baltic Journal of Law & Politics* 15:1 (2022): 618-633

DOI: 10.2478/bjlp-2022-00042

Myanmar and the Dilemma of Asean Interventions that Do not Find the Bright Spot

Yusa Djuyandi

Political Science, Universitas Padjadjaran, Indonesia,

Email: yusa.djuyandi@unpad.ac.id

Arfin Sudirman

International Relations, Universitas Padjadjaran, Indonesia,

sidra.raza@umt.edu.pk

Wawan Budi Darmawan

Political Science, Universitas Padjadjaran, Indonesia

sidra.raza@umt.edu.pk

Received: November 8, 2021; reviews: 2; accepted: June 29, 2022.

Abstract

The military takeover of Myanmar puts ASEAN in a difficult position, limiting the boundaries of the forum and areas that do not support democratization. ASEAN has refrained from directly criticizing Myanmar's military, in part because the Forum prioritizes national and political interests over regional interests. Consensus-based forum approaches and non-intervention policies undermine the effectiveness and legitimacy of decisions. As part of its non-interference principle, ASEAN can only act with the consent of all member states. The majority group cannot trigger action. ASEAN's limitations have shown that it cannot demonstrate unity or assert leadership in solving regional problems. ASEAN's failure shows how authoritarian norms can flourish across Southeast Asia. Massive nationwide protests and a campaign of civil disobedience against the military regime continued after the military toppled the civilian government in a coup and reserved power on February. The army brutally cracked down on the protesters and it seems that it would never end. This crisis poses many challenges for ASEAN, especially the role of ASEAN to solve the Myanmar conflict and rebuild democracy in Myanmar.

Keywords

Military, Coup, Non-Interference, ASEAN

JEL Classifications: J11, F43

1. Introduction

Democracy is an important thing in the life of every country. The existence of the military in a country's development sometimes becomes a separate obstacle in efforts to build democracy and democratization. As one of the countries in Southeast Asia that have had a large military role in its history, Myanmar is a country with great involvement in the implementation of state activities. Of course, with Myanmar's history in which the military played a major role in the efforts for Myanmar's independence, the tendency of the military to enter the government has become great.

From a historical point of view, the Japanese occupation was the starting point for the existence of the Myanmar military. The existence of *the Burma Independence Army* (BIA) from the beginning was accepted and gained popularity by the people of Myanmar (Dewi, 2005). The starting point for the Myanmar military to carry out the coup was due to the lack of strong consolidation between the civilian government and the military in making decisions and the opportunity for the military to take control of the government which caused the Myanmar military to have a strong political role which later overthrew the Myanmar civilian government.

Afterward, when the civilian government was successfully established under the government of Aung San Suu Kyi, efforts to stabilize the transition from military to civilian roles did not go well, this can be seen how the Tatmadaw (Myanmar military) was given a parliamentary seat of 25 % and to pass a law legislation, must be supported by 75 % plus one of all members of parliament. It causes the role of the military still be a determining factor in politics and the national legislation process (Barany, 2018). Under these conditions, the military's role has the power of a veto in the legislative process. If any legislation passes, it is certain that the law is in accordance with the wishes of the Tatmadaw.

The culmination of the Tatmadaw's influence in elite-level politics in Myanmar is the emergence of Tatmadaw dissatisfaction in the 2020 election results won by the National League for Democracy (NLD). The Tatmadaw accused Aung San Suu Kyi's party of cheating in the last election. The Myanmar military's next step was to stage a coup by arresting President-elect, Aung San Suu Kyi, and other NLD officials. After making the arrests, the Myanmar military declared a state of national emergency that would last for the next year.

It certainly invites international attention, especially in seeing this incident in the context of democracy and democratization. This is a concern because of how an authoritarian government has the potential to cause a setback in terms of political stability which has an impact on a decline in economic and social activities. The Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN) is the largest regional organization in Southeast Asia. Followed by almost all countries in the Southeast Asian region, ASEAN has a role to form a safe and stable region for member countries.

Along the way, there were several responses made by different ASEAN countries. Indonesia, together with Malaysia and Brunei, have expressed their condemnation of what is happening in Myanmar. If we look at the response from Thailand, it is the opposite which stated that it did not want to interfere in what was happening in Myanmar. From this condition, we can see how there is no one strong voice among ASEAN member countries. This will also have an impact on how issues will be raised by ASEAN to help solve problems that exist in Myanmar.

This paper will review the dynamics that occur in efforts to resolve conflicts in Myanmar and explain how ASEAN should have an active role in resolving conflicts in Myanmar. At least, there are two things that can be the main basis in principle and practically. In principle, it is in accordance with the ASEAN principle which seeks to maintain the stability of the Southeast Asian region. Practically, if the conflict in Myanmar is not resolved, this will have an impact on trade and social conditions that are getting worse, especially when viewed from the history of the military occupying the position of the Myanmar government after the 1962 coup, there were various economic problems that plagued the population of Myanmar.

Followed by why ASEAN is still unable to answer the challenges of regionalism in Southeast Asia, this paper will explain how regionalism in Southeast Asia can work and it will explain the current conditions in Myanmar, then continued with how ASEAN should act in answering the problems that exist in Myanmar.

2. Theoretical Framework

To answer the phenomenon raised, it is necessary for us to look at the characteristics of regionalism and how in principle ASEAN should be able to answer these challenges. According to Andrew Heywood, regionalism is a process in which a geographical area becomes a significant economic or political unit with the principle of cooperation, and even a common identity within the region (Heywood, 2011). According to Anwar in Maksum, regionalism is a relationship between countries or interest groups that are institutionalized within the scope of the region to achieve certain goals (Maksum, 2017). From these two definitions, we can see how regionalism becomes a region that has the power to bind to member states that are and join the region. The purpose of the existence of an organization with the concept of regionalism is to achieve a common goal in the region where the benefits can be felt by the member countries themselves.

At the institutional level, regionalism covers the development of norms, rules and formal structures through established coordination channels. Moreover, by entering into a regional organization, we can understand that the country is willing and submissive to the regional organization. According to Heywood, there are three types of regionalism, namely economic regionalism, security regionalism, and political regionalism (Heywood, 2011). Economic regionalism refers to greater economic opportunities through cooperation between countries within the same geographical area. Security regionalism refers to cooperation designed to protect countries from enemies, both enemies outside the region and between within the

region. Political regionalism refers to the efforts of every country in the same region to strengthen or protect values together, this is done to strengthen the image and reputation of each country to garner a stronger diplomatic voice.

If we look at the three types of regionalism, we can see how ASEAN is a regional organization that falls into these three categories. If we relate to the context of this problem, ASEAN has a political and economic function. Because Myanmar is a member of ASEAN, ASEAN has a role to maintain political stability in Myanmar. If Myanmar's domestic political conditions are still unstable, this will also have an impact on regional trade between ASEAN countries and Myanmar itself.

If we look at it in principle, we can also look into the goals of ASEAN which also has the task of maintaining regional stability. Reporting from the official ASEAN website, ASEAN's goals and targets include:

1. Accelerate the economic, social and cultural development of the region through a journey of equality and cooperation in order to strengthen the foundation for the prosperity and peace of the Southeast Asian community;
2. Promote regional peace and stability through respect for justice and the rule of law among regional countries and in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations (UN);
3. Actively promote mutually beneficial collaboration and assistance in terms of common interests in the economic, social, cultural, technological, scientific and administrative spheres;
4. Provide assistance to others in the form of training and research facilities in education, professions, technology and administration;
5. Effective collaboration for greater use of agriculture and industry in order to improve human living standards;
6. Promote Southeast Asian studies;
7. Provide close and fruitful cooperation with international and regional organizations that share similar goals and targets, and explore all parties for closer cooperation.

We can see how ASEAN has a role to ensure that all member countries have an economic interest in the Southeast Asian region. This is the main justification for democracy-supporting countries such as Indonesia to press for democratization in Myanmar. However, the opposite is also the fundamental principle of ASEAN as stated in the 1976 Agreement on Friendship and Cooperation in Southeast Asia, namely:

1. Respect for the independence, interests, equality, territorial integrity and national identity of all nations;
2. The right of every state to lead a presence that is free from external interference, subversion, or coercion;
3. Do not interfere with each other's internal affairs;
4. Settlement of differences or disputes by peaceful means;
5. Refusal to the threat or use of force; and
6. Effective cooperation between members.

With the basic principles of ASEAN, this can also be used by countries that have the same dependence or interests as Myanmar, such as Thailand using this as the main justification for not commenting on the Myanmar issue. It is also necessary to know because Thailand itself is also undergoing a military coup to enter the government, so if Thailand comments on this issue, it is like they are opening up their own internal problems.

What will then be investigated is which is more important, choosing not to interfere in the internal affairs of other countries because it is in accordance with the basic principles of ASEAN or participating in democratization with the hope of practically creating social and economic political stability in Myanmar which is also part of Southeast Asia and ASEAN members. In this paper, the author will try to explain how the dynamics of the journey that occurred and how ASEAN seems powerless in solving problems like this even though this will then have an impact on political and economic stability in the Southeast Asian region.

3. Method

This study uses a qualitative method, this method is suitable for analyzing social and political phenomena without looking at the test of the influence of the variables studied. Data research gained from secondary data, such as: news, research report and publication about conflict happened in Myanmar. Data which have been gained then validated through triangulation technique, this process is needed to make sure the data gained is valid and unbiased.

4. Discussion

4.1 Military Coup: A Government That Leads to Chaos

Since the military toppled the civilian government led by the National League for Democracy party, they have killed more than 800 people, claiming it provided peace and stability. This dark propaganda would be easy to ignore, were it not for the fact that regional diplomats seem to agree with it, at least follow the narrative as a key part of the negotiations. Most of Myanmar's neighbors are pushing for a solution to the crisis that includes the Tatmadaw, while the pro-democracy movement seeks to remove the military from politics. But involvement with the junta only strengthened the regime and legitimized its rule.

Southeast Asian officials admit to fearing the potential chaos that the removal of the Tatmadaw from power while ignoring the real chaos it has created. Philippine Secretary of State Teddy Locsin Jr. said in February that "The army is indispensable for Myanmar's unity" and that the Philippines is "aware of the army's role in safeguarding its territorial integrity and national security." Similarly, veteran Singaporean diplomat Bilahari Kausikan wrote in *Foreign Affairs* in April that the military has a "Severe post-colonial record of uniting the country" and that without it, Myanmar could be mired in conflicts like Iraq, Libya or Syria.

But the Tatmadaw itself appears intent on dragging Myanmar into a period of great instability. The protest movement against the coup was perhaps the largest in Myanmar's history, and was met with mass violence. According to Al Jazeera (2021), Yangon, the country's largest city, bomb blasts targeting military officials has become a common occurrence. Across Myanmar, local junta administrators and suspected informants are frequently the targets of extrajudicial killings. Armed conflict had broken out in areas that were peaceful before the military takeover, with pro-democracy civilians cooperating with armed ethnic groups in some areas.

The coup only reignited conflict between armed ethnic groups and the government, which threatens to destabilize swathes of Myanmar's borders with China, Thailand, India and Bangladesh. Myanmar's internal politics has been deeply divided with most of the conflict caused by the military's treatment of ethnic minorities. The Tatmadaw may be the "most powerful institution" in Myanmar, but that does not mean that the Tatmadaw unites the country. The Tatmadaw does not protect Myanmar but holds the country hostage, prevents economic and political development to maintain its own power and wealth and uses threats of violence against civilians to prevent foreign intervention. Although many of Myanmar's neighbors in the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) have vocally condemned the coup and subsequent violence, they are dragging their heels as the junta gradually cements control. Paralyzed by the false notion of non-intervention and the fact that most of its members are also authoritarian regimes. When ASEAN held an emergency summit in April to address Myanmar's political crisis, ASEAN invited Min Aung Hlaing. But the implicit threat of further military violence has largely held back the region's ability to pressure the Tatmadaw government.

Representatives of the civilian government continued to reject negotiations with the military regime, choosing instead to form a new armed group to confront the Tatmadaw. The junta has indicted civilian leaders and announced plans to dissolve the NLD, the party of former leader Aung San Suu Kyi, which faces six criminal charges. The military plans to hold new elections, possibly without the participation of the NLD and will almost certainly be inclined to support it to provide a layer of legitimacy to the illegal power struggle. Meanwhile, the top priority for many in Myanmar is not to end the violence but to achieve democracy (Reuters, 2021). Hundreds of protesters have died for this cause, and the armed insurgency shows many more are willing to risk their lives for it. The coup and subsequent crackdown have undermined the legitimacy of the Tatmadaw government and made compromise with the pro-democracy movement impossible. The people's wish now is that the highest leadership of the Tatmadaw must leave, the Tatmadaw must be reformed.

Myanmar's military has not been interested in politics since 2010. It was not long after that leader Aung San Suu Kyi won her 2020 election with a victory by the *National League for Democracy (NLD) party*. However, after being declared victorious Aung San Suu Kyi and several members of her parliament had been arrested by the Myanmar military. The military coup that has been running so far

has responded directly to a request by the United Solidarity and Development Party (USDP), which claims election fraud. They see that the election results show this NLD party has a big win with 346 seats in parliament by cheating. That's way ahead of the USDP party by around 21 seats.

However, this accusation of military fraud was later dismissed by the General Election Commission (KPU) as the organizer, which was established by the civilian government. Dissatisfied with the decision, the army led by Min Aung Hlaing declared a coup and claimed leadership of the government for a year. Nothing but to edit article No. 417 and justified Min Aung Hlaing 's coup . The people of Myanmar did not remain silent, they did not accept a military coup that threatened their democratic rights. So the protests have been going on since February last year. Until now the coup still threatens the fate of those who want true democracy.

In the face of these protests, the military did not hesitate to use violence. The number of civilian deaths so far has reached 128 people ("BBC Indonesia. (2021, March 4). 38 Myanmar Demonstrators Killed, UN: Bloodiest Day Since Coup," 2021). If we go back to history first. Myanmar does have a dark military history. After independence from British rule in 1948, Myanmar was not yet ready to form a strong and unified government. This is due to the division of territory when Britain was colonized and military forces finally took over forcibly.

The Myanmar army does not appear to have a good reputation among people all over the world. In 2017, the military made the treatment of the Rohingya inhumane. The treatment of human rights violations has concluded that this is genocidal violence according to the UN international organization. If we look at the reaction of the international community to this incident, of course it is very diverse. There are those who unite the people of Myanmar and keep them in power. There are also those who only see the incident as karma from the Myanmar people who supported the military during the 2017 ethnic cleansing.

Democracy in Myanmar is less than 10 years old. This tragedy has become a black record for the power that is always contested by national leaders. Since the handover of power to the military, every aspect of the life of the Myanmar people has been taken over by the military in terms of politics, governance and economy. This opinion was expressed by Davis I. Steinberg, who chose Myanmar as the most monolithic place of military control in the world. This is due to the situation of the Myanmar government which has been under strong military control since 1962 (Reuters, 2021).

Ne Win 's military policy in the implementation of his government tends to be closed to foreign political parties based on the isolation policy imposed in Myanmar. The military has also adopted the Burmese term for socialism, a socialist ideal that underlies the political and economic system. In addition, the government removed all opposition parties across the country, recognizing only the existence of parties such as the Burma Socialist Program Party (BSPP) and Lenzin.

In the elections of 27 May 1990 also the Myanmar military asserted full control over various kinds of political activities. The elections are organized by the

Myanmar government. So to quell the protest, on 15 August 1988, the leader of democratization in Myanmar sent a message as a pro figure for the implementation of democracy. From there, Aung San Suu Kyi and other pro-democracy figures then formed a party called the *National League for Democracy* (NLD). They campaigned to support Burma who wanted to change the political system. As a result, the NLD party won 80.82% of the vote and won a landslide victory against the *State Law and Order Restoration Council* (SLORC).

The military ignored the election results and instead detained Aung San Suu Kyi and several other democracy supporters. They are rebels and are believed to be a source of political instability in Myanmar. The Burmese -led coup against private government led by Aung San Suu Kyi has been criticized by the United Nations (UN), the European Union, the United States, and even the United States, as well as the international community such as the ASEAN organization which is the regional organization of Southeast Asia. They call the move a crime against human rights or humanity, and the United Nations has called on the Burmese army to regain control of civilians and release Aung San Suu Kyi, the country's leader.

Not only the Myanmar military and the coup government opposed the coup, including elected members of Myanmar who announced the formation of the National Unity Government (NUG) who last week asked for a letter of invitation to attend the meeting in Jakarta. This gave the two governments the legal right to "duel" rather than use force inside Burma. However, ASEAN parties who have asked Min Aung Hlaing, who incidentally is not a representative of the Myanmar National Unity Government (NUG), can also be called a gesture to intervene and acknowledge the "incompatibility" of the meeting. This is a decisive decision to follow and should act as a vehicle or motivation for positive change for Myanmar.

After all, the biggest obstacle to action is not the principle of non-intervention, but the ASEAN consensus building structure. If Member States do not agree, then the final result of the meeting cannot be continued and no conclusion can be found. This structure has proven to be a barrier to action on past events in the region, such as when Cambodia blocked certain resolutions in the South China Sea. It emphasizes that this consensus-based approach is a way to open communication and promote what is known as "constructive engagement" among Member States. However, in the end, ASEAN's efforts to engage the Myanmar military on this basis unfortunately did not bear fruit. ASEAN's structural shortcomings are not the only obstacle to that. Most of its members have little interest in challenging the Tatmadaw's claims to legitimacy.

In fact, the incumbent Prime Minister himself was a product of the 2014 coup, and since the Cold War (1947-1991) international law has not taken a strong stance against coups. At that time, coups often took place between the two blocs, namely the different western and eastern bloc countries with the support of each block. Both blocs see themselves as democratic forces. However, after the end of the Cold War, international law changed, and in particular the view that the legitimacy of a government must fulfill democratic principles through elections was

adopted. But in practice, the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) is not sure whether the coup violated international law or not. The UN Security Council does not know the reason for the coup, but assesses whether it will affect international peace and security.

Basically, in this case, the Charter of the United Nations (UN) regulates various principles related to international affairs, including equality and non-intervention. This principle emphasizes that all countries are equally subject to international law (Ramcharan, 2000). Therefore, no country can unilaterally decide whether or not a country's democratic life is good. No country can judge whether or not another country's political system is good. Indeed, the issue of the coup was discussed in the United Nations General Assembly's High Declaration on the *Rule of Law* at the national and international levels. In the discussion of the Declaration, developed countries stated that they wanted to apply the *rule of law* to all countries. However, developing countries have announced that they will find themselves in a compromise because they do not like the wind of developed countries and do not prohibit unconstitutional changes of government.

5. ASEAN's Efforts

The Myanmar military is still killing dozens of its own citizens. People's battles against the regime have flared up again in Myanmar, and even the country's civilians are taking up arms in self-defense. But Senior General Min Aung Hlaing, who seized power in a February 1 coup, insists the military known as the Tatmadaw is the only thing that unites Myanmar. "No one can deny that the Tatmadaw has been trying to prevent the country's disintegration," he said in March. But so far ASEAN has not been able to do much, even some experts say ASEAN is not really serious about resolving this conflict. This is due to the principle of non-interference owned by ASEAN, where ASEAN cannot intervene in the internal affairs of member countries (Ramcharan, 2000).

Since Myanmar's military, the Tatmadaw, staged a coup against the country's civilian government on February 1, leading to a seemingly intolerable popular uprising, foreign policy experts have continued to search for potential international solutions to the deteriorating situation. With major Western powers such as the United States having limited influence over the Tatmadaw, and China and Russia blocking a strong international response (AsianPolyGlotView, 2021), many are looking to the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) to play a more significant role. .

The governments that formed ASEAN, which met in Jakarta, Indonesia, some time ago to discuss the crisis, are neighbors of Myanmar (also ASEAN member countries). They have a strong interest in avoiding the country's fall into complete chaos. So the expectation that they might feel compelled to act isn't completely unwarranted, but it's misplaced. ASEAN is not designed to solve problems, especially internal problems that are not as complicated as the riots in Myanmar. Its consensus-based decision-making structure discourages decisive

action. It is not even clear whether all of ASEAN's leaders were aware of the magnitude of the political divisions the coup had created.

As a result, few of any concrete actions will emerge from the recent summit results. In contrast, ASEAN leaders tend to pursue a mixture of diplomatic expressions of "concern" and vague proposals for "engagement." Several regional leaders have floated the possibility of sending humanitarian aid, a move typical of ASEAN. On the surface, it did seem like a reasonable response. After all, the Myanmar people are suffering, and they can certainly use aid, as they did after a devastating typhoon killed tens of thousands of people in 2008. In that sense, ASEAN helped persuade the Tatmadaw generals to finally allow international humanitarian assistance.

But the current crisis is not a natural disaster; this is man made. The suffering has a clearly identifiable cause: the Tatmadaw , which has killed hundreds, imprisoned thousands more, and brought the economy to a halt over the past few months through heavy-handed repression and large-scale communications blackouts. This situation requires a political resolution, and humanitarian aid will be a ribbon aid, even if it does make it to the people at all. ASEAN took similar action, after the Tatmadaw genocidal operation in Rakhine state drove hundreds of thousands of Rohingya Muslims to Bangladesh in 2016 and 2017. Strong public pressure, especially on the Muslim-majority Indonesian and Malaysian governments, led the organization to raise the issue for discussion at the regular meeting. But ASEAN's most concrete response to the still-unresolved crisis is to offer humanitarian assistance and push for the speedy repatriation of Rohingya refugees, something rights groups have warned, and most of the Rohingya themselves.

As an example of how serious ASEAN is in addressing the root causes of the current crisis, coup leader Min Aung Hlaing has been invited to attend a meeting in Jakarta as Myanmar's representative. ASEAN leaders will no doubt claim that this decision is in line with their principle of "non-interference", which prohibits involvement in the "internal affairs" of member states (Ramcharan, 2000). But what constitutes unallowed "interference" has always been an opportunist calculation on the part of regional leaders, who are generally happy to promote economic integration while keeping human rights issues off the agenda. And it should be underlined: Inviting Min Aung Hlaing (as the mastermind of the coup that took place in Myanmar) to the indirectly meeting, is a form of intervention in Myanmar's internal affairs (Times, 2021).

Tatmadaw and its coup government dubbed the State Administration Council are not the only opponents of the coup, including Myanmar's elected members of parliament, announcing the formation of the National Unity Government (NUG) last week and demanding an invitation to a meeting in Jakarta. That leaves the two governments with legitimacy claims to 'duel', not with the use of force inside Myanmar's territory. By inviting Min Aung Hlaing and not a representative of the Government of National Unity (NUG), ASEAN has instead

made the choice to intervene and recognize the 'less legitimate' of the two namely a decisive decision with the meeting's ability to act as an intermediary or force for positive change (RRI, 2021).

In the end, it is not the principle of non-interference that is the biggest barrier to action, but the ASEAN consensus-based decision-making structure. If any member countries object, then in the end the proposal cannot be continued. This structure has proven to be a barrier to action on cases in the region in the past, for example when Cambodia thwarted several resolutions in the South China Sea. This consensus approach emphasizes that it is a way of keeping lines of communication open and promoting so-called 'constructive engagement' among member states. In the end, however, ASEAN's efforts to involve the Tatmadaw on this basis did not bear fruit.

While Indonesia has reportedly pushed for this particular summit (Tempo, 2021), and officials in Malaysia, the Philippines, and Singapore seem at least nominally concerned about the situation, these other members have dragged their feet. Thailand's prime minister chose not to attend alone, signaling that the only ASEAN member with a long land border with Myanmar and significant influence over the Tatmadaw has made the crisis a second priority. Together with Laos and Vietnam. ASEAN's structural shortcomings are not the only things holding it back. Many of its members have little interest in challenging the Tatmadaw's claims to legitimacy. Going down that road might be a little too close to offending a neighboring country. In fact, Thailand's current prime minister is himself a product of the 2014 coup. If ASEAN leaders are to play a constructive role in resolving the Myanmar crisis, they must recognize the Tatmadaw for what it is: a brutal and ruthless occupying power with no political legitimacy that shows no reluctance to destroy the country to rule even to its ruins.

The UN General Assembly agreed that the issue of the multilateral coup was unclear. This applies to the situation of the ASEAN organization, seeing that ASEAN has been tested many times and has adhered to the principle of non-interference since its establishment as a regional organization. In principle, the ASEAN Charter emphasizes that ASEAN member states must abide by the rule of law, democratic principles, good governance and the constitution (Times, 2021). However, the ASEAN Charter does not provide sanctions against members who violate these principles. In terms of complex issues affecting member states, the ASEAN Charter stipulates that in the event of a breach or significant violation, the matter can be resolved by an ASEAN Summit. However, the problem is there are no clear provisions regarding this serious violation. Again it should be noted that there is no formal mechanism for determining how serious violations are determined.

ASEAN's response to the conflict experienced by Myanmar is considered very weak. ASEAN did not go any further and called for Myanmar, which was seen as dangerous because it could only be asked or urged. ASEAN's overly lenient approach bypasses the Myanmar government. In addition, each Member State displays a different attitude. Thai Deputy Prime Minister Prawit Wong said the coup

was an internal matter for Myanmar. Philippine Foreign Secretary Theodoro Roxin II sees the Myanmar case as a possible means of protecting the country's democracy. Cambodian leader Hun Sen also considered it an internal matter and declined to comment. Meanwhile, Indonesia, Malaysia and Singapore expressed concern over the situation in Myanmar and called on all parties to speak up (Times, 2021).

As a regional organization, ASEAN recognizes the development of this conflict and hopes to play a more active role in restoring Myanmar's democracy and civil status. How ASEAN should take a stand and be able to meet the expectations of the international community by trying to understand the political direction desired by the military through a coup as a multilateral organization. This understanding can be the basis for considering the steps taken by ASEAN, including Indonesia. Indonesia has never claimed to be a leader in ASEAN, but in fact, other political parties have the largest economies in the region and automatically make up the majority of the population. Recognizing Indonesia as a leader in ASEAN.

Indeed, the mission of the Constitution is to demand Indonesia to maintain and maintain world peace. Therefore, it can be understood that Indonesia is the most interested party in restoring democracy in Myanmar. Therefore, it is very important for the Indonesian government to play an active role in resolving the issue of the Myanmar military coup. This agreement was reached through the ASEAN forum with participation in the conflict in Myanmar. Seeing the Myanmar coup, it may actually violate the principles of the ASEAN Charter. However, solving this problem is not easy, it seems that it will be more possible if it is through a political settlement mechanism than through a law because it is more flexible and accepted by all parties.

ASEAN's long-term efforts to accommodate and mediate the Myanmar government are also an important consideration. ASEAN prioritized Myanmar's access in 1997 for "constructive engagement", allowing the government to be more open to people's aspirations and compromise with Suki. Political reforms under Prime Minister Thein Sein, the release of Aung San Suu Kyi, and paving the way for the NLD to regain its role in Myanmar politics are inseparable from ASEAN's efforts since Myanmar's accession. It should also be noted that Myanmar is willing to participate in ASEAN election observers in the 2012 presidential election.

Finally, the latest news from ASEAN countries was during the *ASEAN Leaders' Meeting*. ASEAN will discuss the issue of the conflict in Myanmar on February 1, 2021. The ASEAN Summit will be hosted by the organizers on 24 April 2021 in Jakarta, Indonesia. The conference, which is named the Emergency Meeting for ASEAN Concerns will be attended by countries in Southeast Asia, including Myanmar, and will be attended by Min Aung Hlaing as Myanmar's Military Commander. Despite the uncertainties acknowledged by the controversial military chief Min Aung Hlaing and representing his country Myanmar, Indonesia as the host country treats all customers equally. Indonesia and ASEAN member countries need

to take advantage of is Myanmar's military presence. His presence is an opportunity to resolve Myanmar's political and security crisis.

Member countries at that time certainly reaffirmed ASEAN's goals and asked Myanmar to implement democracy properly. Domestic issues in Myanmar, especially those related to refugees and human rights. This is because Southeast Asia is currently receiving international attention. We anticipate regional conflicts so as not to threaten the peace of other countries in the region, including Indonesia. Indonesia's diplomatic prowess should not only be demonstrated by Myanmar's national interests, but also by its continued support for regional reconciliation.

ASEAN leaders also asked the Myanmar government to open humanitarian access. We know that many Burmese have difficulty returning to their homeland. The author considers that the situation requires international intervention, and ASEAN should be able to work with the Human Rights Council and the UN Security Council to immediately send a delegation to Myanmar to follow up on the situation. Help prevent violence and build democratic negotiations. For the author, this is because efforts to meet with leaders of ASEAN countries at the ASEAN Summit failed to guarantee or bring about significant changes in Myanmar's political coup.

If ASEAN is more flexible in the principle of non-intervention, the opportunities that can be taken can be used to pressure the Myanmar military regime. If this pressure is applied collectively, the democratic process in Myanmar is expected to be back on track even though it must heed the principle of non-intervention. The doctrine of non-intervention is no longer relevant and seems to be an obstacle to the development of participatory democracy and the protection of basic rights of the ASEAN people today. If ASEAN considers its image a violation of the Charter of Human Rights, it must adhere to the principle of non-intervention and take a more constructive approach and prioritize this very important participation.

6. Responses from Myanmar's Parties

a) The Military Junta

If we look at the development of this political coup, it seems that it is indeed quite difficult for ASEAN to provide a solution to the problems of a country that is considered to be on the verge of failure. This can be seen from the ways in which ASEAN has so far generated various responses from various parties who actually experience differences of opinion. One of them is that we see from the side of the Myanmar military, which is considered only one eye on the steps taken by ASEAN countries, however, as reported by *online news sites*. said that Myanmar's military junta responded that it would heed ASEAN's pleas for a halt to the violence, but they stated some conditions.

Myanmar's military junta said it only wanted to stop the violence when the country, which was considered to be still hit by the coup, had stabilized. The intention of the Myanmar military junta's intention is that they want to be facilitated

by ASEAN regarding the five *roadmaps of the* junta and serve the interests of the country after Myanmar's stability returns. The statement seems likely to lower expectations of a dialogue process calling on the military to release detained Aung San Suu Kyi and other civilian leaders and establish democratic negotiations, or even in this case change plans to hold new elections in early 2022, following a period of emergency rule. for a year.

b) Burmese People

While on the other hand, from the side of the Myanmar community, including those who are members of human rights groups, they know that Ming Aung Hlaing, who will fly to Jakarta to attend the ASEAN Summit and meet with leaders of countries in the Asian region, tends to respond more to his disappointment and even criticizes the results obtained. of the meeting. They said that the meeting was beyond our expectations, did not reflect any party and could not at all heal the wounds of the victims who had been persecuted, killed and terrorized by the Myanmar military, which if counted, the victims had taken a sizable number of 748 people. However, they hope that there will be a more concrete firm stance taken by ASEAN to help restore Myanmar's democracy. Even at the ASEAN Summit meeting, it was seen that these countries had forgotten the values of the ASEAN charter, including the imposition of strict sanctions on the Myanmar military. So what is the power of pressure without any consequences.

7. International Strict Attitude

In this crisis, international support is really needed to resolve the Myanmar conflict. A number of international organizations and even countries such as America have also issued condemnation and firm statements to condemn the actions of the military junta which have gone beyond the limits and do not uphold human values. Like the United States, which issued financial sanctions against the Myanmar military and froze assets owned by the armed forces worth 1 billion US dollars. In addition, Canada, New Zealand, and the UK have also participated in imposing sanctions on the Myanmar military and *travel bans* or temporarily prohibit the entry of immigrants on behalf of the Myanmar military from entering their country.

Furthermore, European Union countries have also planned economic sanctions and condemned to end violence related to *military-owned companies* to terminate the business relationship of any sector. Some responses from countries and international organizations seem to be more assertive in giving strict sanctions to the Myanmar military or what is commonly known as the Tatmadaw . However, the United Nations as the world's security council should also impose sanctions such as an arms embargo that might limit the Myanmar military from sharpening its actions. This comprehensive arms embargo to impose *targeted sanctions* and financial sanctions targeted at the Myanmar military or the Tatmadaw can paralyze

the Myanmar military, in addition to other ways such as severing business relations with world companies related to the Myanmar military, this is also one big step to be able to immediately adopted by the United Nations.

8. Seeing Problem Solving Opportunities

If dialogue and reconciliation have been carried out but have not found a bright spot, then it needs to be other efforts that can restore peace and stability to the Myanmar state, especially from a political perspective. First, it seems that countries within ASEAN need to share perceptions to increase the impetus for resolving conflicts, because it is clear that the leaders of these countries have not been able to accept clear similarities in terms of resolving the Myanmar political coup conflict. Second, ASEAN countries may also be able to create a special task force to support and facilitate this dispute collectively until it finds a bright spot. Third, there is a clear agreement between ASEAN countries on paper such as an agreement that has clear sanctions, so that ASEAN's position is not only for dialogue and reconciliation but also acting as a court.

9. Conclusion

Myanmar itself is known as a country with a political and military background. Myanmar is currently gaining international attention after the defeat of the Tatmadaw Federal Union and Development Party in the November 2020 Myanmar election. The military coup led to clashes between Burmese citizens and the military. Myanmar's political crisis has become ASEAN's concern, at least reflected in the informal meeting of the leaders of ASEAN countries in early March. At that time, Indonesian Foreign Minister Retno Marsudi said that the principles and values embodied such as the principle of non-intervention as regulated in the ASEAN Charter must be fully implemented.

As a democracy and a member of ASEAN, Indonesia is seen as capable of playing a role in helping Myanmar in this crisis, and has tried to support Myanmar and other countries through the approach of the ASEAN Summit meeting yesterday. The situation above also shows that the principle of non-intervention of ASEAN member countries does not change the situation in Myanmar. Myanmar's military coup and political life that is not able to respect human rights and democracy seem to show that this is an internal problem in Myanmar that does not require the intervention of other countries. At the same time, ASEAN's participation is very limited and ASEAN currently believes that the Myanmar crisis will not have a significant impact on regional stability, but this is homework that needs to be addressed.

Bibliography

AsianPolyGlotView. (2021). Myanmar Coup Latest: 8 Countries Including China Send Reps to Miliraty Parade, accessed on 14 June 2021

- Barany, Z. (2018). Burma: Suu Kyi's Missteps. *Journal of Democracy*, 29(1), 5-19.
- BBC Indonesia. (2021, March 4). 38 Myanmar Demonstrators Killed, UN: Bloodiest Day Since Coup. (2021). Retrieved June 10.
- Dewi, I. (2005). The Burmese Military Experience: A Historical-Political Analysis. *Istoria Journal of Education and History*, 1(1), 1689–1699.
- Heywood, A. (2011). *Global Politics* (1st ed.). London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Maksum, A. (2017). Regionalism and Complexity of the South China Sea. *Journal of Social Politics*, 3(1). <https://doi.org/10.22219/sospol.v3i1.4398>
- Ramcharan, R. (2000). ASEAN and Non-interference: A Principle Maintained. *Contemporary Southeast Asia* Accessed June 12, 2021 22(1), 60-88
- Reuters. (2021). Opponents of Myanmar Coup Form Unity Government, Aim for Federal Democracy , accessed 13 June 2021.
- RRI. (2021). ASEAN Urged to Also Act on a Government of Myanmar Unity , accessed on 13 June 2021
- Tempo. (2021). Meeting in Jakarta, ASEAN Leaders Achieve 5 Consensus Points for Myanmar.
- Times, I. (2021). Attending ASEAN Summit 2021, Myanmar Coup Brain Arrives in Indonesia. retrieved on 12 June 2021 from: *coup-myanmar-sudden-in-indonesia*.