

Analysis on The ASEAN-PAC Contribution to The ASEAN Community Vision

Mikael Vidiananta Hermanto, Adrianita Putri Damaiyanti, Muhammad Dzaky Putra Sani,
Paramesti Safa Ardiningrum

Sebelas Maret University

Surakarta Indonesia

vidimikael@student.uns.ac.id, adrianitapd@student.uns.ac.id,
mdzakyps@student.uns.ac.id, paramesti.safa@student.uns.ac.id

Article Information

Submitted : 22 May
2023

Accepted :

Keywords :

ASEAN Community,
ASEAN-PAC, Corruption,
Neo-liberal
institutionalism

Abstract

ASEAN members bear visions to participate in the fight against corruption, as encompassed in one of the three ASEAN Community Pillars: the ASEAN Political-Security Community (APSC). We lay our research question whether the making of ASEAN-PAC seems in line and contribute to realizing the visions of ASEAN Community. We use Neo-liberal Institutionalism theory to analyze how beneficial is the making of ASEAN-PAC for the continuity of ASEAN Community and its countries inside that institution. As our main research method, we use a qualitative approach which is literature review. It utilizes a simple but thorough reading on any journal articles or books. The ASEAN mutual consensus to combat corruption was then improved in the ASEAN Parties Against Corruption (ASEAN-PAC), which was established so as to strengthen the bond among ASEAN members as well as accommodating Mutual Legal Assistance (MLA) in tackling transnational corruption. Nevertheless, there has yet to be a solid framework from ASEAN PAC to acquire the noble vision. Apart from this delay, the ASEAN Community seems to be observing the EU as an institutional role model with what efforts it made to follow in the latter's footsteps.

INTRODUCTION

The scholars realized that even in the midst of an anarchical international system and conflicting states, the probability of an identical, or at least similar objectives is always there. While the neorealists are skeptics to the idea of a cooperation due to mutual suspicion and security dilemma of states, the neoliberalists bear a more positive and bright outlook. The neoliberalists are convinced that cooperation among states, organizations, and institutions have the essentials that would help achieve world peace and harmony. These cooperative organizations and institutions, they believe, held functions to channel the states' perceptions and objectives so that they could assist each other in an orderly manner as they had initially agreed upon.

As the time went by, the aforementioned cooperation between countries, and also organizations or institutions also reshaped themselves to suit the current situation at hand. That being said, these cooperation and synergy are not established to merely achieve additional benefits or possessions per se, but they are also created to formulate strategic solutions to an issue whether it is occurring in the present time, or in the future. It is due to the fact that in order to survive, one must not only rely on resources to sustain them, instead, they also need to create establishments or environments that are ideal and functional.

The "shrinking world" enabled by the globalization phenomena, further escalates the need to unify the countries in mutual cooperation. As globalization has notably

exterminated geographical barriers among countries in the world, such a phenomenon brings about both positive as well as negative outcomes. The most notable negative side of it is the escalating scope of disasters upon the world, one of them being the crimes committed. Nowadays, crimes are committed on an even broader scale than before. Hence, crime is no longer regarded as just a local, or national -level felony, and instead it has developed into transnational crime. Such an increase in the area of activity of a crime is followed by also an increase in the quantity of its victims. The case is especially so when the transnational crime is committed by politicians and/or elites. The crimes committed by such actors are generally known as the “white collar crime”. When it comes to white collar crime, the highly committed crime would be corruption, owing to the fact that the perpetrators possess the malused power, status, and authority to do so.

The word “Corruption,” derived by the English speakers from the Latin word “Corruptio / Corruptere” gives meanings to corrupt, destroy, depravity, rot, bribe, and many others of the same nuance (Putra, 2022). Corruption has various definitions, but the essential meaning is generally the same. The United Nations Convention Against Corruption (UNCAC) provided a list of illegal acts that counts as corruption offences, which consists of Bribery in the public and private sectors; Embezzlement in the public and private sectors; Trading in influence; Abuse of functions; Illicit enrichment; Money-laundering; Concealment and Obstruction of justice (United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, 2004). It is clear that corruption comes in more than just a few forms, but all corruption is a shady business behind closed doors.

Corruption offences ultimately are one of the highly malicious forms of crime and its number is growing rapidly in the present era. Corruption offences do not only cause damage to a country itself (internally), but can also cause losses on a wholly wider scale, precisely like a domino effect. Losses caused by

the acts of corruption offences may even negatively impact many other countries due to the extra-territorial activities of the offending criminals and actors. Therefore, corruption is included in the category of trans-national crimes as it does not rule out the possibility of corruption involving more than merely one country.

Currently, corruption offences rates are still alarmingly high. Thus, it goes without saying that it must be seriously regarded as a common priority concern of the global community. Commitments to eradicate corruption have also been massively carried out throughout the years. This common, grand commitment was marked by the birth of the anti-corruption convention in 2003 through the UNCAC (Amrullah & Natamiharja, 2019). There are as many as 186 countries that have ratified UNCAC including ASEAN member countries (Amrullah & Natamiharja, 2019). In this regard, it is safe to say that ASEAN countries are also struggling to eradicate sporadic corruption.

Handling of corruption especially in the current era needs to be done not only within the country, but also involving other international actors due to its area of activity. One thing that can be done is to form international cooperation with the aim of complementing the limitations possessed by a country in dealing with and eradicating corruption. Southeast Asia, especially the ASEAN member states, as one of the regions that also often faces corruption cases, seeks to increase integration between themselves by establishing the ASEAN Community in 2015 (Amalino, 2016). The ASEAN Community vision is centered on three components that correspondingly are the pillars of this community, which are politics and security, economy, and social-culture. In addition, the need for campaigns in order to increase awareness of abuse of authority as a matter related to corruption will be easier if it is carried out through the institutionalizations of moral values and good governance (Nuh & Sriboonnark, 2015). The establishment of the ASEAN Community is expected to be a forum

for solving various problems experienced by ASEAN members, including corruption in its political and security pillars.

In order to further enhance its capability on combating corruption on the regional level, ASEAN member states decided that it would be better to establish a regional body that specializes only in combating corruption. Therefore, in 2002 ASEAN Parties Against Corruption (ASEAN-PAC) was established. The ASEAN-PAC provides the ASEAN member states a platform for cooperation between each of their own Anti Corruption institutions. The cooperation ranges from exchanges of information and employee to enhance each other's Anti Corruption institutions' effectiveness as well as efficacy on combating their own cases of corruption to establish mutual legal assistance (MLA) which would provide each of ASEAN member states direct legal assistance that are mutually beneficial in handling corruption cases that involve two or more ASEAN member states. This article noted that the establishment of ASEAN-PAC as an integrated anti corruption body contains similarities to ASEAN Community' vision and will attempt to further explain the correlation between them.

RESEARCH METHOD AND THEORY

To analyze this particular case, we use some methods and a theory so that it can easily solve the issue and the frameworks. We use a qualitative approach which is literature review as our main research method. It utilizes a simple but thorough reading on any journal articles or books. It will help us to implement evidence based on the case and have the capability to engage new ideas on getting the main problems and its solution. This approach focuses on particular issues or events to discover particular scientific facts (Gerring, 2017, p. 15-36). Qualitative is also ideal for exploratory research since it suggests many potential mechanisms that may be seen and tested. literature review helps the writer to build a strong foundation to facilitate theory development (Snyder, 2019, p. 333-339). It is also a perfect way to provide empirical evidence and help to uncover the case. The

type of literature review that we use is systematic review and meta-analysis which is a proper method to combine results from different studies and references, then comparing and identifying their patterns, pros and cons, and the relationship between them (Snyder, 2019, 333-339). In the analysis stage, this method helps to ensure if it is appropriate to answer the research question. All of these are aimed to improve the quality of the findings and conclusion.

We use 'neo-liberal institutionalism' theory because it fits with the theme and topics we discuss --which is about international institutions. Similar to realism theory, this concept accepts the assumptions that the international system is based on anarchy, the behavior of every state in international politics is forced by rationality and precise calculations of their own national interest, and the behavior is analyzed through verifying the disperse international system. The difference is that neo-liberal institutionalism features a long-lasting and beneficial form of cooperation, even under the anarchy situation. Neo-realism theorists take that assumption as the opposite and all states will always be under the conditions of 'conflict and war'. By doing so, the goal of global governance can be achieved. More broadly, its norms, rules, and institutions can be adjusted according to their consensus, also potentially limit the possibility of violence acts by states in order to pursue their interests. International institutions are the key role in this theory. Frequent interactions and practices can develop a long-term cooperation which can tackle any dispute both internal and external. Increasing its responsiveness, sharing-information, transparency, and decreasing uncertainty can support the cooperation more effectively and inflict common interest. Any rules and norms can affect every state's action involved in the cooperation. In this case, ASEAN is one good example of international institutions in international politics and it can be used in the theory. There is also one major key characteristic in this theory which is complex interdependence, which means that

relationships between the states have similar certain issues and produce a mutual gain. The theory implies that there is no effect on the state's role of power since it uses the liberal perspective. This theory analyzes how beneficial is the making of ASEAN-PAC for the continuity of the ASEAN Community and its countries inside that institution. Furthermore, this can also be analyzed on the strength of the institution to combat particular cases—in this topic it's about corruption. ASEAN as an institution shaped by various countries in South East Asia with similar outlook and goals become the binding basis as one of the characteristics in the theory.

RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

Asean Community

To realize all ASEAN member state's goals and objectives, the organization established the ASEAN Community on December 31, 2015. It is a form of commitment to all members to bring their political matter, economies, and societal needs into three main pillars; ASEAN Political-Security Community (APSC), ASEAN Economic Community (AEC), and ASEAN Socio-cultural Community (ASCC). These pillars are reflected by the need of the member states to make the conflict management mechanism easier and integrate all economical and socio-cultural aspects so that they can get more benefit with each other member and shape a common identity of ASEAN (The Habibie Center, 2016, p. 2-8). The formation of this community was followed by few considerations and historical backgrounds. The spirit of democratization and human rights wave which occurred after the 90's in the Southeast Asia region embraces a new mindset to all states for better governance and peaceful nations. The 2003 Declaration of ASEAN Concord II, ASEAN Charter, Roadmap of ASEAN Community, and 2007 Cebu Declaration were a pivotal role model to begin to construct the community. The ASEAN Community has a primary vision which is to produce a peaceful, stable, and resilient community with enhanced capacity to respond effectively to the challenges, maintain a centrality of the community, build a sustainable and highly integrated economies, and constitute a good capability to take opportunities and challenges in the coming decade (ASEAN Secretariat, 2016). The conflict management approach is

shaped by a combination of formal and informal procedures, non-official dialogue, that makes it called the ASEAN Way (ASEAN Secretariat, 2016). Apart from that, the community also has a motto that is "One Vision, One Identity, One Community. The ASEAN Economic Community, as mentioned in its blueprint, was formed with four main elements, consisting of a single market and production foundation, an immensely competitive economic region, a region of fair economic development, and a fully-integrated region into the global economy (ASEAN Secretariat, 2016).

Based on our main topic, the ASEAN Political Security Community or APSC is one of the pillars we should pay attention to. This is because the community also mainly handles the corruption problem. The APSC focuses on enhancing cooperation in political and security sectors to construct peaceful nations in the Southeast Asia region, also upholding Human Rights and democracy (Sari, 2019, p. 24-65). The formation of this community is based on the Treaty of Amity and Cooperation in Southeast Asia or TAC—a consensus pact to create political and security stability which contains various mechanisms of conflict management between the member states—in 1979 by five head of states who are also the founding fathers of ASEAN (Sari, 2019, p. 24-65). Zone of Peace, Freedom and Neutrality (ZOPFAN) signed in Kuala Lumpur on November 27, 1971 and Southeast Asia Nuclear Weapon-Free Zone (SEANWFZ) in 1995 are also the foundations to establish the community. The community has achieved some progress, even not much, such as good handling on illegal drug trafficking and counter-terrorism (Phong, 2022, 133-137). But, when it comes to the cons, the community has it significantly huge especially on the efforts to tackle corruption and promote good governance. First, the case in Myanmar has drawn many criticisms from the international community to ASEAN for its inaction to that matter ("Challenges and Opportunities; Lessons for ASEAN Post 50," 2019, p. 239-247). What happened in Myanmar also affected a certain member's contribution, where Malaysia expresses its disagreement to separate from the joint statement. Second, the presence of great powers, especially China, made the ASEAN member states divided in terms of their action to anticipate ("Challenges and Opportunities; Lessons for ASEAN Post 50," 2019, p. 240). This can be seen from the

experiences of the past territorial disputes in the region and the 'non-interference' principle that makes ASEAN unable to apply regional order in all disputes, both in terms of conflict management and conflict resolution (Putra et al., 2019, p. 33-49). In combating corruption, the community doesn't have a proper and strong mechanism, apart from the blueprint. Some member states do not have a Mutual Legal Assistance Treaty (MLAT) with other states, such as Indonesia as it still struggles to make an extradition deal with Singapore (Setiawan, 2018, p. 69-89). ASEAN also formed an exclusive bureau to fight against corruption called ASEAN-PAC or ASEAN Parties Against Corruption (previously named SEA-PAC).

Corruption in Southeast Asia

Since South East Asia has been hit by a massive financial crisis in the late twentieth century, a lot of countries have been focusing on the notion of reformation. In this context reformation means a total restructuring of how the governments and the laws work. A lot of South-East Asian countries then have an autocratic ruler and a low transparency of government. This characteristic of South-East Asian countries' governments allows corruption to run rampant. Government officials often use their position of power to gain personal benefits, such as to grow their businesses massively and to receive special treatment for themselves or their relatives, and to establish a dynasty. The perfect example of this can be found in the President Soeharto's regime in Indonesia which through his long and powerful period of leadership, he has been successful in compiling massive amounts of wealth for his childrens and relatives. Despite the obvious abuse of power in the South-East Asian nations then, there are very few government officials that have been held accountable for their actions. That is why impunity from the countries' law has been one of the main characteristics of South-East Asian nations' government officials.

After a lot of chaos in South-East Asian nations during the 1990s financial crisis due to massive protests held by students and workers, many countries finally took the problem of corruption seriously. This phenomena can be noticed by the changing trend of countries' leader candidates' campaign themes that shifted from economic growth to reformation and plans to tackle corruption. Moreover, we can also see the rise of stable and independent

anti corruption agencies and establishment of anti corruption legislations in a lot of South-East Asian countries during the post financial crisis era. This shift of trend and development of anti corruption measures lead to the increase of government officials that were held accountable for their abuse of power and reduction of their impunity of law. However, even though we have seen the rise of anti-corruption measures and an increase in the number of prosecuted government officials, the corruption rate in the South-East Asian countries is still far from low (Hodess, 2001, p. 23).

According to the Corruption Perception Index (CPI) made by Transparency International, from a scale of 0 to 100 (where 0 stands for most corrupt and 100 stands for most clean), in 2021 the majority of South-East Asian countries score below 50 points. There are only three countries that have a score above 50: Singapore, Brunei Darussalam, and Malaysia (Transparency International, 2021). This data shows that corruption is still a very big problem in most South-East Asian countries, even though it is not as big as it was before the financial crisis. Although corruption levels in most South-East Asian countries can still be regarded as high, a lot of countries have shown promising trajectories of their CPI. From 2012 to 2021, on average, South-East Asian countries have become less corrupt every year (Transparency International, 2012). This positive trajectory shows that South-East Asian countries are committed to creating a more stable government and a more just environment for all of its citizens.

If the South-East Asian countries were to continue to combat the rampant corruption inside it, the establishment of anti corruption agencies and anti corruption laws in individual countries is not going to be enough to boost the effectiveness of anti corruption measures. Nowadays, corruptors are generally a lot smarter to hide their illicit transactions and wash their hands from the deeds that they have done. Every year, more sophisticated mechanisms of corruption are continually developed by the perpetrators to avoid inspections by anti corruption agencies. This sophisticated mechanism often involves numerous countries for laundering money and escaping a country's jurisdiction. To combat this increasingly sophisticated mechanism of corruption, countries also need to develop more sophisticated counter measures. Nowadays, countries need to establish a good

relationship and communication with other countries to combat corruption more effectively. Currently there are two form of bilateral anti corruption cooperation that is: 1) Direct cooperation of anti corruption agencies, where the agencies of the two countries involved interact based on a Memorandum of Understanding, and 2) Mutual Legal Assistance (MLA), where two countries can provide a direct legal assistance when dealing with a certain case.

Apart from bilateral anti corruption cooperation, countries nowadays also need a multilateral anti corruption agreement to widen its reach to even more information and agreements. In the case of South-East Asian countries, a regional anti-corruption body needs to be made to strengthen its countries' commitment and flow of information. Through a regional body, South-East Asian countries can band together on a forum to discuss the steps needed to enhance individual country's anti corruption measures such as the exchange of information, establishment of cooperations, and enhancement of commitment between countries. The presence of an effective anti corruption regional body will surely impact every countries' anti corruption endeavor positively.

ASEAN-PAC

Initially, the formation of an organization aimed at fighting corruption cases in the Southeast Asian region was The Southeast Asia Parties Against Corruption (SEA-PAC). The establishment of this organization began with the signing by anti-corruption agencies from Brunei, Indonesia, Malaysia and Singapore on December 15, 2004 through an MoU known as the "Memorandum of Understanding on Cooperation for Prevention and Combat Corruption Between the Anti-Corruption Bureau of Brunei Darussalam, The Corruption Eradication Commission of the Republic of Indonesia, the Malaysian Anti-Corruption Agency, and the Corruption Practices Bureau of Investigation of the Republic of Singapore" (Background, 2014). SEA-PAC had also been suggested to change their name to ASEAN as a reflection of the Southeast Asia regional group of anti-corruption entities at the third Principals meeting, but this failed because not all of ASEAN member countries became parties to the MoU. The name change of SEA-PAC to ASEAN Parties Against Corruption

(ASEAN-PAC) according to the suggestions previously given was finally agreed upon at the 15th Principal meeting to reflect that ASEAN member countries can build a relationship especially in the context of fighting corruption (Background, 2014).

The change in the name of the organization to ASEAN-PAC is intended so that ASEAN member countries can work together in the context of eradicating corruption cases that are currently rife. This is stated in the ASEAN-PAC slogan, namely 'Together Against Corruption' which means working together to combat corruption. The slogan contains the phrase 'against corruption' which means rejecting corruption crimes and the word 'together' which also means ASEAN member countries do not have to fight corruption cases that are rife at this time all alone (Slogan & Logo, 2014). The establishment of the ASEAN-PAC is expected to help countries in the Southeast Asian region jointly eradicate corruption through various activities that can be carried out such as joint discussions in forums and cooperation with other member countries.

In accordance with the MoU on Corruption Prevention and Eradication Cooperation that has been agreed upon, the establishment of the ASEAN-PAC aims to build and intensify anti-corruption efforts in ASEAN member countries, as well as build competence and anti-corruption institutions. This can be seen from the various forms of cooperation that have been carried out by ASEAN-PAC in the context of eradicating corruption as a crime that often occurs, especially in the modern era. The memorandum also explains that the collaboration includes several strategies, such as sharing information related to anti-corruption cases, working together in training and developing professional skills, exchanging expertise and personnel in the field of anti-corruption, hosting and participating in meetings, forums, workshops and conferences as well as providing technical assistance in operational activities (MoU, 2014). Cooperation in the form of training as has become the ASEAN-PAC strategy in the context of eradicating corruption cases in the Southeast Asian region has also been carried out between the Anti-Corruption Bureau of Brunei Darussalam (ACB) and the United Kingdom National Crime Agency (NCA) on 1-3 March 2022 Two City of London Police trainers lead sessions on bribery, money laundering, procurement fraud, business structuring,

offshore banking and overseas evidence gathering (ACB of Brunei Darussalam, 2022).

Looking back at the slogan that ASEAN-PAC has, namely 'Together Against Corruption' which emphasizes that countries in the Southeast Asian region often work together in the context of eradicating corruption which was recently carried out by the Chair of the Myanmar Anti-Corruption Commission (ACC), U Than Swe, who attended the 18th Meeting of the Heads of ASEAN Parties Against Corruption (ASEAN-PAC) on 22 November (18th ASEAN-PAC Heads' Meeting Held, 2022). During the meeting, the ACC Chair signed a MoU with ASEAN-PAC and Cambodia. At the conference, the two countries shared information on corruption prevention activities such as surveys, corruption risk assessments, promoting integrity, and opening technology-assisted professional courses (ASEAN Affairs: 18th Heads' Meeting of ASEAN-PAC Concludes, 2022).

Not only Myanmar, cooperation between ASEAN member countries in the context of eradicating corruption as a crime that has been happening for a long time and is developing is also carried out by Indonesia, represented by the Chair of the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK), Firli Bahuri conveyed a number of intervention points, including the need to increase international partnerships to eradicating corruption in all its forms. What is emphasized and far more important is whether it can be done jointly through cooperation or not, especially in investigating, tracing and returning assets of suspected corruptors, as well as assisting other ASEAN member countries in the extradition of suspected corruptors. Firli also explained that eradicating corruption was not only mandated by the UNCAC regarding international cooperation, but also in accordance with internationally recognized standards and norms such as the FATF (Financial Action Action) which had also been completed (Ernowo, 2022).

Handling corruption cases that occur especially in the Southeast Asian region together and not letting ASEAN member countries eradicate this crime on their own is something that is always carried out in the ASEAN-PAC tagline. Several examples of cooperation that have been carried out by ASEAN-PAC can be said to be quite helpful for countries in the Southeast Asian region to be able to find solutions and prevent acts of corruption that are rife in the modern era as it

is today. ASEAN-PAC also often holds meetings and provides training programs which of course are guided by professionals with the hope that the public will become more aware of corruption and know how to fight it. Through the steps taken by ASEAN-PAC so far, significant results can be seen, for example in the process of dealing with corruption in Vietnam for the 2019-2020 period, where tens of thousands of people were reprimanded, including 92 high-ranking officials -cadres in public and military courts, as well as the successful handling of crimes against hundreds of high-ranking persons, including six former ministers or higher (Government Inspectorate of Vietnam, n.d.).

What Needs to be Improved

The ASEAN-PAC can be categorized as a young regional anti-corruption body in South-East Asia. Although the basis of the regional anti-corruption body has been established since 2004, it has only included the whole ASEAN member countries in 2017 (ASEAN-PAC, 2022). Due to its young age, ASEAN-PAC still has much to learn from other regional anti-corruption bodies in the world. There is a lot of uncertainty surrounding the purpose and forms of cooperation in the ASEAN-PAC. A lot of this uncertainty is caused by the lack of information and publication regarding the body's activities. Judging from the lack of coverage from national media and the scarcity of information that has been given from the body itself, it can be said that the public awareness of ASEAN-PAC is still very low. In order to effectively combat corruption, public awareness about information regarding the regional body needs to be enhanced even more.

One of the example of a regional anti-corruption body that has a good flow of information can be found in the Regional Anti-corruption Initiative (RAI), a South-East Europe anti-corruption body with nine member state that is: Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Moldova, Montenegro, North Macedonia, Romania and Serbia. Just from a quick glance of their website, we can already see numerous pieces of information regarding the basis of the body,

list of agreements, and activities that have been conducted by the body. Apart from that, RAI also made a specific page for its many publications. The basis of the establishment of RAI and ASEAN-PAC are practically the same, that is a regional anti-corruption body that has a main function as a forum for exchanges of information and numerous other cooperation regarding corruption of their member countries. One of the big differences between two of this regional body is that RAI is also focusing on how to ensure the safety of whistleblowers that made handling a corruption case easier while ASEAN-PAC does not (RAI, 2022).

In the context of eradicating corruption, especially in the Southeast Asian region, ASEAN-PAC often holds meetings with the aim of continuing to build good and positive relations between ASEAN member countries. Corruption cases are the main focus of ASEAN-PAC which is also one of the most common crime cases in today's modern era. Various collaborations through the MoU have also been carried out by ASEAN member countries with the aim of fighting corruption cases together. However, ASEAN-PAC also often does not publish the results of the forums that have been conducted so that people might struggle to find out more about corruption in ASEAN countries. It also affects the difficulty of doing research about it since the issue lacks references as mentioned above, especially from the ASEAN-PAC itself. At present there is indeed a lot of information on corruption prevention and training on corruption and bribery prevention, but this is not enough if the ASEAN-PAC has not published significant results that have been achieved.

We have few suggestions to ASEAN-PAC so that the transparency and publications remain available to the public. First, we suggest that after a forum has been concluded, the organization makes a report so that we can track the progress on how the corruption handling has been taken care of so far. We also wait for the publication of the ASEAN-PAC Action Plan 2020-2022 to be issued since we couldn't find any on the

internet. Second, ASEAN-PAC can make better regulation or legislation since the current one is still based on each member state's domestic regulation. The organization should make a common, one-and-only legislation so that it can be effectively and easily applied to all members. Third, the principle of 'non-interference' must have a re-adjustment so that some particular aspects or actions can be excluded and the operational mechanism can be easier to conduct.

CONCLUSION

The existence of ASEAN Community and ASEAN-PAC does seem promising for Southeast Asian people. But, in terms of the process and its journey to combat corruption, it is still implicit. The official website of ASEAN-PAC does show some publications, but many of the topics did not correlate to any action plan or even the report of it. By analyzing from the Neo Liberal-Institutionalism perspective, those institutions do give certain benefits, but still not enough. The legislation is still dependent on each member state's domestic rules and norms. It doesn't fulfill the characteristics of the perspective since it needs long-term cooperation and consensus to make the operation occur. There is an urgent need to re-adjust these issues. The regulations must be in common and based on the unity of all member states so that the operational applications can be effective. Also, by enhancing the transparency, the society can know the progress of anti-corruption action which is conducted by ASEAN-PAC.

References

- [1.] *About Us - Regional Anti-Corruption Initiative*. (n.d.). Regional Anti-Corruption Initiative. Retrieved December 12, 2022, from <https://rai-see.org/who-we-are/about-us/>
- [2.] ACB of Brunei Darussalam. (2022, March 1). *ASEAN-Parties Against Corruption and National Crime Agency "Bribery and Corruption Training", 1-3 March 2022 (online)*. IAACA Newsletter. https://www.icac.org.hk/icac/post/iaaca2/common/pdf/3_acb.pdf

- [3.] Amalino, A. J. (2016, October). Kepentingan Indonesia dalam Pemberantasan Korupsi melalui Apsc (ASEAN Political-security Community). *Jurnal Online Mahasiswa FISIP Universitas Riau*, 3(2). <https://www.neliti.com/publications/206405/kepentingan-indonesia-dalam-pemberantasan-korupsi-melalui-apsc-asean-political-s>
- [4.] Amrullah, R., & Natamiharja, R. (2019, November 14). *Asset Recovery in the Criminal Act of Corruption in ASEAN*. LPPM UNILA - Institutional Repository. http://repository.lppm.unila.ac.id/15949/1/Full%20paper_Rinaldy%20Amrullah_Rudi%20Natamiharja_final.pdf
- [5.] ASEAN 2025: CHALLENGES IN THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE ASEAN IDENTITY. (2020). In M. Jamilah, P. E. Nasir, & A. Halim (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 1st International Conference on ASEAN (IC-ASEAN) "Towards a Better ASEAN", September 5-6, 2019; Padang, West Sumatra, Indonesia* (pp. 479-485). Sciendo. 10.1515/9783110678666-064
- [6.] *ASEAN Affairs: 18th Heads' Meeting of ASEAN-PAC concludes*. (2022, November 24). Myanmar International TV. <https://www.myanmaritv.com/news/asean-affairs-18th-heads%E2%80%99-meeting-asean-pac-concludes>
- [7.] ASEAN Secretariat. (2016). *ASEAN 2025: Forging Ahead Together*. ASEAN Secretariat.
- [8.] *Background*. (n.d.). ASEAN-PAC. Retrieved December 12, 2022, from https://www.asean-pac.org/?page_id=4223
- [9.] *Background*. (2014). ASEAN-PAC. http://www.asean-pac.org/?page_id=4223
- [10.] Challenges and Opportunities; Lessons for ASEAN Post 50. (2019). In A. Idris & N. Kamaruddin (Eds.), *ASEAN Post-50: Emerging Issues and Challenges* (pp. 239-247). Palgrave Macmillan. doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-8043-3_12
- [11.] *Corruption Definition & Meaning*. (n.d.). Merriam-Webster. Retrieved November 7, 2022, from <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/corruption>
- [12.] *CORRUPTION | English meaning - Cambridge Dictionary*. (2022, November 2). Cambridge Dictionary. Retrieved November 7, 2022, from <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/corruption>
- [13.] *18th ASEAN-PAC Heads' Meeting Held*. (2022, November 23). Information sheet. <https://infosheet.org/node/3700>
- [14.] Ernowo, P. Y. (2022, November 25). *Dalam Forum ASEAN-PAC, Indonesia Tegaskan Komitmen Dukung Pemberantasan Korupsi Lintas Negara*. InfoPublik. <https://infopublik.id/kategori/nasional-politik-hukum/688899/dalam-forum-asean-pac-indonesia-tegaskan-komitmen-dukung-pemberantasan-korupsi-lintas-negara>
- [15.] Gerring, J. (2017, May). Qualitative Methods. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 20, 15-36. 10.1146/annurev-polisci-092415-024158
- [16.] Government Inspectorate of Vietnam. (n.d.). *ANTI-CORRUPTION PROGRESS IN VIETNAM (2019-2020)*. ASEAN-PAC. <http://www.asean-pac.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/20.-GIV-Viet-Nam.pdf>
- [17.] The Habibie Center. (2016, January). ASEAN Community, Quo Vadis? *ASEAN Briefs*, 3(3), 2-8. <http://www.habibiecenter.or.id/img/publication/96d2a174b4503f8a15c8e34ca418ffbc.pdf>
- [18.] Hodess, R. (2001). *Global Corruption Report 2001*. Transparency International. https://images.transparencycdn.org/images/2001_GCR_Inaugural_EN.pdf
- [19.] Indrawan, J. (2016). ASEAN Socio-Cultural Community (ASCC) in Conflict Prevention: the Role of Civil Society Organizations (CSOs). *Journal of ASEAN Studies*, 4(2), 142-155. 10.21512/jas.v4i2.1787

- [20.] MoU. (2014). ASEAN-PAC. http://www.asean-pac.org/?page_id=4018
- [21.] Nuh, M., & Sriboonnark, N. (2015). The issues of anti-corruption and good governance in Southeast Asia: As a working agenda of Asean Community. *Journal of Politics, Administration and Law*, 7(3). <https://opac1.lib.buu.ac.th/medias3/politic7n3p453-472.pdf>
- [22.] Panjaitan, M., & Rajagukguk, J. (2021). Kemiskinan, Korupsi Dan Terorisme Dalam Pendekatan Kausalitas. *Jurnal Ilmu Sosial dan Politik*, 1(1), 96-103. doi.org/10.51622/jispol.v1i1.331
- [23.] Phong, N. Q. (2022). ASEAN COMMUNITY - ISSUES AND PROSPECTS. *International Journal of Humanities and Natural Sciences*, 1-3(64), 133-137. 10.24412/2500-1000-2022-1-3-133-137
- [24.] Putra, B. A., Darwis, & Burhanuddin. (2019, February). ASEAN POLITICAL-SECURITY COMMUNITY: CHALLENGES OF ESTABLISHING REGIONAL SECURITY IN THE SOUTHEAST ASIA. *JOURNAL OF INTERNATIONAL STUDIES*, 12(1), 33-49. 10.14254/2071-8330.2019/12-1/2
- [25.] Putra, F.A. S. (2022, October 21). *Menjaga Stabilitas Pelayanan Publik Akibat Penetapan Tersangka Kasus Korupsi Kepala Daerah di Papua*. Ombudsman RI. Retrieved November 7, 2022, from <https://ombudsman.go.id/perwakilan/news/r/pwkinternal--menjaga-stabilitas-pelayanan-publik-akibat-penetapan-tersangka-kasus-korupsi-kepala-daerah-di-papua>
- [26.] Sari, S. (2019, August). PERAN INDONESIA DALAM IMPLEMENTASI ASEAN POLITICAL SECURITY COMMUNITY. *Jurnal Dinamika Global*, 4(1), 24-65. 10.36859/jdg.v4i01.100
- [27.] Setiawan, A. (2018, April 23). ASEAN 'Political-Security' Community: Mekanisme Kerjasama Multilateral dan Mutual Legal Assistance dalam Menangani Kasus Money Laundering di Asia Tenggara. *INTEGRITAS*, 2(1), 69-89. 10.32697/integritas.v2i1.125
- [28.] *Slogan & Logo*. (2014). ASEAN-PAC. http://www.asean-pac.org/?page_id=4028
- [29.] Snyder, H. (2019, August 1). Literature review as a research methodology: An overview and guidelines. *Journal of Business Research*, 104, 333-339. 10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.07.039
- [30.] *2012 Corruptions Perceptions Index - Explore the... - Transparency.org*. (2012, December 6). Transparency International. Retrieved December 12, 2022, from <https://www.transparency.org/en/cpi/2012>
- [31.] *2021 Corruption Perceptions Index - Explore the... - Transparency.org*. (2021). Transparency International. Retrieved December 12, 2022, from <https://www.transparency.org/en/cpi/2021>
- [32.] United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime. (n.d.). *Anti-Corruption Module 1 Key Issues: Corruption - Baseline Definition*. UNODC. Retrieved November 7, 2022, from <https://www.unodc.org/e4j/en/anti-corruption/module-1/key-issues/corruption--baseline-definition.html>
- [33.] United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime. (2004). *United Nations Convention Against Corruption*. United Nations. https://www.unodc.org/documents/treaties/UNCAC/Publications/Convention/08-50026_E.pdf