

## **Development of Regional Human Rights Regime in Asia: Defining the Challenges**

**Saber Ahmed Chowdhury<sup>1</sup>, Md. Zarif Rahman<sup>2</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>Department of Peace and Conflict Studies, University of Dhaka, Bangladesh

<sup>2</sup>Institute of Informatics and Development (IID), Bangladesh

Corresponding Author E-mail: [saber.pacs@du.ac.bd](mailto:saber.pacs@du.ac.bd)

### **Abstract**

This study analyses the progress made toward establishing a cohesive regional human rights framework in Asia while identifying key obstacles that hinder its evolution. It also explores the intricate nature of constructing a unified structure for human rights in the region through a comprehensive examination of historical, cultural, political, and economic elements. The examination of current mechanisms such as the ASEAN Intergovernmental Commission on Human Rights (AICHR) and the ASEAN (Association of Southeast Asian Nations) Asian Human Rights Declaration highlights both the constraints and potential avenues for advancement. The study posits that a collaborative approach, involving regional organizations, civil society, and international collaboration, is crucial despite historical legacies, cultural differences, and economic paradoxes. The significance of addressing these challenges is highlighted by the potential advantages of establishing a unified human rights regime, which encompasses regional stability and the safeguarding of individual rights. The imperative of promoting a transformative human rights framework in Asia necessitates the maintenance of an inclusive dialogue among stakeholders moving forward.

Keywords: Regionalism, Regional human rights regime, Asia, ASEAN, Asian Values

### **Abstrak**

Studi ini menganalisis kemajuan yang dicapai dalam pembentukan kerangka hak asasi manusia regional yang kohesif di Asia sambil mengidentifikasi hambatan-hambatan utama yang menghambat evolusinya. Bab ini juga mengeksplorasi kerumitan dalam membangun struktur terpadu hak asasi manusia di kawasan melalui kajian komprehensif terhadap elemen sejarah, budaya, politik, dan ekonomi. Pemeriksaan terhadap mekanisme yang ada saat ini seperti Komisi Antarpemerintah untuk Hak Asasi Manusia ASEAN (AICHR) dan Deklarasi Hak Asasi Manusia Asia ASEAN (Perhimpunan Bangsa-Bangsa Asia Tenggara) menyoroti hambatan dan peluang kemajuan. Studi ini berpendapat bahwa pendekatan kolaboratif, yang melibatkan organisasi regional, masyarakat sipil, dan kolaborasi internasional, sangatlah penting meskipun terdapat warisan sejarah, perbedaan budaya, dan paradoks ekonomi. Pentingnya mengatasi tantangan-tantangan ini terlihat dari potensi keuntungan dari pembentukan rezim hak asasi manusia yang terpadu, yang mencakup stabilitas regional dan perlindungan hak-hak individu. Pentingnya mendorong kerangka hak asasi manusia yang transformatif di Asia memerlukan pemeliharaan dialog inklusif di antara para pemangku kepentingan di masa depan.

Kata Kunci: Regionalisme, Rezim Hak Asasi Manusia Regional, Asia, ASEAN, Nilai-Nilai Asia

---

## **INTRODUCTION**

The term 'International Human Rights Regime' refers to a collection of international instruments, standards, decision-making bodies, and implementing mechanisms that are involved in the protection and promotion of human rights on a global scale (Anaya Muñoz, 2017). This framework collectively governs the safeguarding and advancement of human rights at a global level. Despite the underlying basis of human rights principles, a complex and varied reality has led to the emergence of multiple distinct human rights

\* Copyright (c) 2023 **Saber Ahmed Chowdhury and Md. Zarif Rahman**

This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/).

Received: September 9, 2023; Revised: October 6, 2023; Accepted: December 12, 2023

regimes. These political systems can be classified according to various factors, including the specific types of rights they focus on - such as civil and political rights versus economic, social, and cultural rights. It also can be classified in terms of particular groups they aim to safeguard, such as women, children, and migrant workers and the international organizations that serve as their originators or hosts, such as the United Nations, Council of Europe, Organization of American States, and African Union (Donnelly, 1986). The aforementioned categorization not only serves as a representation of well-established methodologies but also emphasizes the substantial impact exerted by international organizations in the promotion of human rights on a global scale. Furthermore, these organizations have played a pivotal role in shaping the regulatory and institutional framework of the international system.

The fundamental justification for the establishment of regional regimes is rooted in their capacity to express and establish human rights in a manner better suited to the distinctive cultural, legal, and political circumstances of a given region. This enhances their responsiveness and legitimacy, working in conjunction with the UN system and constitutional frameworks. The process of establishing regional human rights is a constantly evolving phenomenon that shapes the fundamental attributes of a given "region" over time. The three recognized human rights regimes, namely the European, Inter-American, and African, are considered "imagined communities" that are demarcated by the workings of human rights law (Çalı et al., 2018).

Despite the challenges presented by different geographical extents, these regimes are strengthened by the existence of acknowledged regional human rights laws. An example of this can be seen in the European Court of Human Rights, which serves to consolidate the European identity, and the Inter-American Human Rights Court, which promotes cohesion among member states that share Spanish and Portuguese as their primary languages. The African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights and the African Court on Human and Peoples' Rights serve as foundational frameworks that foster a shared understanding and commitment among member states of the African Union (Çalı et al., 2018). In addition to the aforementioned established systems, the current human rights landscape is further enriched by the emergence of sub-regional and cross-regional frameworks such as those operating within ASEAN, OIC, and LAS. These frameworks play a significant role in shaping the intricate network of human rights regimes (Dhaliwal, 2016).

The establishment of a unified human rights framework in the Asian region encounters a diverse range of significant obstacles. In contrast to numerous other global regions, Asia has exhibited a relatively sluggish pace in embracing international human rights norms, characterized by limited rates of treaty ratification and frequent reliance on reservations (DeLaet, 2018). The presence of discrepancies between treaty obligations and the practical implementation of human rights is apparent, as exemplified by the evaluation procedures of the Human Rights Council. Asian nations have also exhibited opposition to the monitoring efforts of the Special Rapporteur. Notably, the absence of comprehensive regional norms and mechanisms stands out, as there is a lack of an overarching human rights treaty or commission (Rathgeber, 2014). The presence of various sub-regional divisions within Asia adds complexity to the task of defining a unified geographical and cultural boundary, thereby raising doubts about the practicality of establishing a shared regional identity. Despite the limited advancements in the development of sub-regional institutions, it is crucial to carefully analyse the potential emergence of a nascent human rights regime in Asia in order to identify its distinguishing characteristics in comparison to other regions (Mayer, 2013).

Against this backdrop, this study examines the advancements in terms of developing a unified regional human rights regime in Asia and identifies key challenges that could impede its progress. The study's significance is rooted in its examination of the potential establishment of a cohesive regional

human rights framework for Asia, aimed at addressing the existing fragmentation within the region. The study's findings have the prospect of providing insights into the transformative impact of a well-established human rights regime on Asian countries, paralleling Western nations' development achieved through cohesive efforts. The study proposes that by promoting shared human rights principles, it is possible to foster unity and address disparities within the region. This, in turn, can contribute to the promotion of democratic values and ultimately lead to the growth, stability, and peace of the region. By offering insights into the challenges and opportunities associated with establishing such a regime, these findings have important implications for policymakers, scholars, and advocates interested in promoting a more unified and prosperous future for Asia.

## **RESEARCH METHOD**

This study adopts a qualitative research methodology, solely depending on secondary data obtained from pre-existing academic literature. The primary sources of data for this study consist of scholarly articles, books, reports, and other pertinent publications that discuss the development and difficulties faced by human rights systems in Asian circumstances. An extensive search was carried out through academic databases, libraries, and online repositories to locate relevant literature. The data-gathering process for this study entailed a comprehensive exploration of academic databases, libraries, and online repositories to locate pertinent articles that examine the historical, cultural, political, and economic dimensions of human rights regimes throughout Asia. The collected secondary data was subjected to thematic analysis. This procedure involved a thorough analysis of the literary works, where pertinent extracts were coded according to emerging themes about the creation and obstacles of a unified human rights structure in Asia. After doing thematic analysis, the coded data was subjected to a sorting procedure in order to establish links and identify the underlying trends.

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

### **Exploring Obstacles to a Robust Human Rights Regime in Asia and Proposing Pathways for Improvement**

A number of literatures offer distinct insights into the role of the human rights regime in global governance, with a focus on normative expectations and the institutional liberal perspective. For example, Whitman (2009) emphasizes the significance of the human rights regime in influencing global governance by establishing normative expectations and defining responsibilities. Moravcsik (1998) argues that weak democracies tend to prioritize enforceable human rights obligations as a means to address domestic political uncertainty from an institutional liberal perspective. This perspective contrasts with prevailing realist and ideational viewpoints.

Contemporary research frequently explores the universal relevance of human rights and proposes transformative criteria, while highlighting the influence of regional factors on treaty effectiveness in the Asia-Pacific context. For instance, Mende (2021) examines the concept of human rights from a universal perspective, acknowledging the assertions made by Western societies while also recognizing the growing body of evidence suggesting its relevance beyond Western contexts. The article presents a set of criteria for establishing a transformative framework for human rights. These criteria include dynamic pluralism, awareness of power dynamics, contextual universalism, and open normativity. Conversely, Ahdanisa &

Rothman (2020) argue that various factors, such as political capacity, economic development, regional mechanisms, and the strength of civil society, play a critical role in determining the effectiveness of treaties within the Asia-Pacific region. Significantly, this geographical area poses unique difficulties, encompassing intricate security environments and cultural discrepancies.

Hashimoto (2015) has conducted a comprehensive analysis of the challenges encountered in the establishment of a regional mechanism for implementing human rights in East Asia. These obstacles, as identified by the author, encompass a range of factors such as political apathy, contrasting economic systems, historical animosities, and the contentious notion of "Asian Values." According to Rathgeber (2014), the ASEAN Charter aims to strengthen the safeguarding of human rights and governance. However, the implementation of these goals encounters discrepancies among member states, revealing a gap between the commitments made and the actual level of protection provided. In the context of the human rights regime theory framework, Hara (2019) examines the role of the ASEAN Intergovernmental Commission on Human Rights (AICHR). The declaratory measures of the ASEAN Intergovernmental Commission on Human Rights (AICHR) are compared to those of the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights, highlighting the necessity for increased advocacy efforts to strengthen the effectiveness of AICHR.

These literatures primarily highlight Western and Asian contexts, with a notable absence of research on the key factors that contribute to the lack of a strong human rights regime in Asia. The primary objective of the current study is to fill this void by examining the complex dynamics of the region and investigating the distinct obstacles that impede the development of a robust human rights framework in Asia. Through this action, it aims to make a valuable contribution to the broader conversation surrounding the governance of global human rights. Additionally, it aims to provide insights into possible approaches for improving the protection and implementation of human rights in this intricate geographical area.

### **Emergence and Growth of Regionalism in Asia**

The emergence and progression of regionalism in Asia have significantly influenced the establishment and structure of a cohesive human rights regime across the continent (Dhaliwal, 2016). It is imperative to comprehend this phenomenon of regionalism as it lays the foundation for collaboration across diverse domains, including economics, politics, and norms, encompassing the domain of human rights. The development of regionalism in Asia can be categorized into two distinct phases (Wunderlich, 2016). During the period from the Second World War to the 1980s, a significant development occurred in Europe with the establishment of supranational regional entities, namely the European Economic Community (EEC) and the European Union (EU). These organizations effectively limited the autonomous decision-making power of their member nations. In contrast, the subsequent phase, commonly referred to as "the new regionalism," placed significant emphasis on national sovereignty and the establishment of consensus among member states (Dash, 2008).

Consequently, the result was the establishment of regional organizations that were devoid of supranational authority and whose resolutions did not have binding force over member states. The lack of regionalism in Asia has garnered criticism from scholars and analysts. However, it is crucial to recognize that the impetus for regionalism can be traced back to the Asian Relations Conference held in New Delhi in 1947 (Hashimoto, 2015). Regrettably, the conference, which sought to delve into the notion of Asian regionalism, did not yield any tangible results due to conflicts between India and China. Following this, a series of conferences and meetings were organized in Asia with the aim of promoting regional cooperation. Two significant instances are the Colombo Conference in Sri Lanka in 1954, which recognized common

interests between African and Asian regions, and the Bandung Conference in Indonesia in 1955, which served as a precursor to the Non-Aligned Movement (Dhaliwal, 2016b).

The Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), established in 1967, as a regional organization encompassing Southeast Asian countries (Hashimoto, 2015), was formed in light of apprehensions regarding the proliferation of communism within the region and the imperative for cooperative endeavours among neighbouring nations. The Bangkok Declaration, which serves as the bedrock of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), did not explicitly incorporate human rights considerations. Nonetheless, ASEAN has undergone significant development and has emerged as a well-established regional organization with a primary emphasis on fostering economic cooperation and promoting regional cohesion. The framework of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) encompasses the Heads of Government of its Member Nations, who serve as the highest authority responsible for making decisions (Baik, 2012).

Moreover, the ASEAN Ministerial Meeting assumes the role of the primary decision-making entity, while the ASEAN Economic Meeting convenes economic ministers hailing from all member states. The Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) is committed to upholding the principle of non-intervention and employs the "ASEAN Way" approach, which emphasizes decision-making through majority voting as a means to mitigate potential conflicts. The Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) has additionally formed the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF) in order to advance human rights endeavours within the region (Wunderlich, 2016).

The emergence of regionalism in South Asia can be attributed to the Asian Economic Planners Conference held in 1961. The sluggish advancement of regionalism can be ascribed to a multitude of factors, encompassing colonial subjugation, the Partition of India, the communist regime in China, the Cold War, and the liberation war of Bangladesh in 1971 (Dash, 2008). The concept of regional cooperation was initially proposed by President Ziaur Rahman of Bangladesh in 1977, and subsequently endorsed by King Birendra of Nepal in 1978. In the year 1980, President Rahman presented an initial proposition for fostering regional cooperation in the South Asian region. In the subsequent year, the foreign secretaries representing seven South Asian nations collectively identified five fundamental areas of collaboration, which subsequently paved the way for the establishment of the Integrated Programme of Action.

In 1983, a notable achievement in South Asian regionalism occurred through the establishment of the South Asian Regional Cooperation (SARC). Subsequently, the organization underwent a name change to SAARC following the adoption of the Delhi Declaration. The year 1985 marked the occurrence of the first SAARC Summit, during which the SAARC Charter was introduced. The charter emphasized the objective of enhancing the welfare of the South Asian population and fostering collaboration in international forums regarding common issues. The highest governing body of the South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC) is the Meeting of Heads of State or Government (Dhaliwal, 2016a). The following section presents a discussion of how these initiatives shaped the human rights mechanism in the region.

### **Existing Human Rights Mechanism in Asia and its Limitations**

Unlike Europe, a common regional framework for the promotion of human rights across Asia is absent. However, it is worth noting that regional institutions and organizations have the potential to make substantial contributions to the advancement of human rights and foster cooperative endeavours. The ASEAN Intergovernmental Commission on Human Rights (AICHR), which was established in 2009, is a notable regional entity that has been assigned the responsibility of safeguarding and promoting human

rights within the ASEAN region (Ahdanisa & Rothman, 2020). The scope of AICHR is limited to the promotion and protection of human rights within the ASEAN region. However, it has the potential to play a crucial role in enhancing cooperative efforts to address human rights issues (Ciorciari, 2012).

In a comparable manner, the nations of Southeast Asia collaboratively established the ASEAN Human Rights Declaration (AHRD), a significant charter for the promotion and protection of human rights within the region. This declaration highlights the region's dedication not only to economic, cultural, and social rights, which have been long-standing areas of emphasis for ASEAN but also to civil and political rights (Davies, 2014). The inclusion of various member perspectives within the Declaration represents an acknowledgment of the importance of human rights and their incorporation into the region's developmental agenda. Unfortunately, the document has been criticised for excluding civil society from the formation process, which is seen as a major "disappointment" by certain researchers (Renshaw, 2013).

In addition, it has been contended by the U.S. administration that the declaration is deficient in meeting international norms and has the potential to function as a protective measure against Western criticisms regarding ongoing human rights violations in the area (Baer, 2012). The declaration also underscores the re-emergence of Asian Values, placing emphasis on the contextual nature of human rights implementation, which is contingent upon various factors such as distinct political, economic, legal, social, cultural, historical, and religious contexts (ASEAN, 2012). Moreover, it can be argued that the declaration is burdened by inherent limitations and is devoid of any punitive measures (Davies, 2014).

Furthermore, the convention encompasses two noteworthy discretionary provisions pertaining to the jurisdiction of the Court of Human Rights and the individual's entitlement to petition the commission. These provisions serve to promote increased involvement with civil society by broadening the court's jurisdiction and affording individuals the opportunity to present their cases before the Court (Mower, 1976). The absence of a formal mechanism for receiving complaints related to human rights violations is a notable deficiency within AICHR, as it hinders the commission's ability to establish a meaningful connection with civil society and individuals in addressing such abuses (Muntarbhorn, 2012). This constraint hampers the regional human rights organization's ability to gain a comprehensive understanding of human rights conditions at the grassroots level, consequently hindering its capacity to effectively monitor treaty implementation

## **Challenges in Establishing a Unified Human Rights Framework in Asia**

### ***Historical Antecedents and Political Impediments in the Establishment of a Unified Human Rights Regime in the Asian Context***

The historical ramifications of colonisation, together with the widespread existence of authoritarian governments, present significant obstacles to the establishment of a unified human rights framework in Asia. This heritage has exerted a substantial influence on the political, social, and economic framework of the region (Dhaliwal, 2008). The enduring impact of colonialism has posed obstacles to fostering trust across nations and within communities, so impeding the establishment of a unified framework for human rights throughout Asia (Singh & Sugandh, 2019). For instance, Japan's historical record of colonisation and aggression during World War II still has a lasting impact on its relationships with surrounding countries, notably China and Korea (Hundt & Bleiker, 2007). Similarly, India's political and economic structures have been significantly influenced by its history of British occupation, which has also played a role in the current tensions with Pakistan (Singh & Sugandh, 2019).

The enduring impact of colonisation has also resulted in the establishment of autocratic governments in numerous nations, which exhibit strong opposition towards the establishment of human rights standards and institutions (Manan, 1999). These authoritarian governments may perceive human rights as a challenge to their authority and credibility, causing them to oppose global initiatives aimed at advancing these principles. For example, China's one-party system is distinguished by limitations on freedom of speech and assembly, along with the oppression of dissidents and minority groups (Richardson, 2020). Likewise, the government of North Korea is notorious for its violations of human rights, such as the exploitation of labour and the imprisonment of political dissidents.

In addition, even in nations that are not expressly autocratic, their endorsement of other autocratic governments and failure to condemn severe human rights abuses serve to stifle the principles of a universal human rights framework. A poignant illustration of this phenomenon is evident in the protracted conflict in Myanmar, marked by pervasive human rights violations including the targeted persecution of minority populations and severe restrictions on freedom of expression and association (Thamrin, 2018). This crisis has burgeoned into one of the most severe humanitarian predicaments globally, compelling Bangladesh to host an excess of one million Rohingya individuals, now widely acknowledged as the most marginalized community on the planet. Regrettably, regional powers such as China and India appear indifferent to this dire situation, opting to prioritize their geopolitical interests at the expense of human rights considerations. This complicity exacerbates the prevalence of human rights abuses. In light of such egregious instances, the realization of a cohesive and universally embraced human rights framework remains an elusive and formidable objective.

### ***Challenges Pertaining to Culture and Philosophy in the Establishment of a Human Rights Regime in Asia***

The complex interaction between cultural and philosophical disparities between Western and Asian countries significantly shapes the perception and implementation of human rights in the region. This phenomenon poses considerable difficulties in building a unified structure for human rights (Jacobsen, 2000). Divergent values between Asian cultures and Western societies are conspicuously manifested in the pronounced emphasis on collectivism, group harmony, and social obligations within the former—commonly referred to as Asian values. This emphasis contrasts sharply with the Western focus on individual rights and freedoms, engendering palpable tension between these two perspectives (Ghai, 1993). This tension is particularly pronounced in nations such as China, where Confucian values underscore a heightened commitment to maintaining social order and deference to authority, often at the expense of prioritizing individual rights (Sim, 2013). This tension is particularly pronounced in nations such as China, where Confucian values underscore a heightened commitment to maintaining social order and deference to authority, often at the expense of prioritizing individual rights (Jacobsen, 2000). In India, the conceptualization of human rights is often influenced by religious and cultural traditions, including the Hindu concept of "dharma" or duty, adding layers of complexity to the task of forging a shared understanding of human rights in the region (Mehta, 2011).

The diverse manifestation of human rights across Asian countries reflects the cultural and social disparities between Western and Asian societies. A case in point is Japan, where an emphasis on group harmony and social consensus occasionally infringes upon individual rights (Beer, 1981). In contrast, South Korea and Taiwan have come to view human rights as integral to processes of democratization and modernization (Keum & Campbell, 2018). Such divergent perspectives present a significant obstacle to the establishment of a cohesive human rights regime in the region, particularly when compared to the

more homogeneous perspective on human rights in Europe. These divergences have the potential to spark conflicts among various stakeholders, including governments, civil society organizations, and international entities. Balancing Western human rights principles with the intricate cultural and philosophical dimensions specific to Asian societies is a central challenge faced by these actors. To foster a comprehensive understanding of human rights that accommodates diverse viewpoints, it is imperative to grasp these distinctions with nuance. Recognition and proactive engagement with these obstacles can facilitate enhanced cooperation and collaboration among individuals and organizations involved in the promotion of human rights within the Asian region.

### **The Conundrum of Economic Progress in Promoting a Unified Human Rights Regime in Asia**

The rapid economic growth in many Asian countries has presented a paradox, simultaneously yielding beneficial outcomes such as poverty reduction and enhanced living standards, while also generating challenges like labour exploitation, environmental deterioration, and income inequality that potentially compromise the advancement of human rights. For instance, a prominent concern is the increasing demand for cheap labour in the manufacturing and service sectors. This demand has led to substandard working conditions and low wages, particularly affecting women and migrant workers (Cingir, 2022). Additionally, rapid industrialization and urbanization have resulted in significant environmental degradation, which, in turn, has negatively impacted the health of local communities and violations of their right to a healthy environment (Chandra Voumik & Sultana, 2022). Moreover, economic growth has exacerbated income inequality, particularly in countries such as China and India, which has hindered marginalized communities' access to essential human rights such as education and healthcare (OECD, 2014).

In this vein, economic development can also create obstacles to the development of a common human rights regime in Asia. The pursuit of economic growth often leads to a prioritization of short-term profits at the expense of long-term social and environmental sustainability. This emphasis on economic gains can result in the side-lining of human rights concerns, particularly when they are perceived as a threat to economic growth. For example, in some countries, there are weak labour laws and a lack of implementation mechanisms, leading to workers' exploitation, particularly in sectors that rely on low-skilled labour, such as garment and textile production, electronics, and mining. The lack of transparency and accountability among corporations, particularly multinational corporations, can also contribute to human rights violations, as they may prioritize their economic interests over social and environmental concerns (Cingir, 2022). The example of Myanmar is still relevant here, as the powerful countries in this region still remain silent regarding the Rohingya persecution which points out their preference for financial gain over human rights (Thamrin, 2018). In essence, while economic development has brought significant benefits to the Asian region, it has also presented new challenges for human rights.

### **CONCLUSION**

The journey towards establishing a unified regional human rights regime in Asia is intricate, characterized by the intricate interplay of historical legacies, cultural distinctions, and economic complexities. Regional organisations such as the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) have undertaken initiatives to tackle human rights issues within their respective regions. However, the effectiveness of these efforts is constrained by the lack of a comprehensive and obligatory framework. The challenges in establishing a comprehensive human rights framework in Asia can be attributed to various



factors, including the historical ramifications of colonisation, the prevalence of authoritarian regimes, and the impact of cultural and philosophical disparities. The trajectory of economic development has yielded diverse positive and negative consequences. However, it has also given rise to a set of new challenges, including labour exploitation, environmental degradation, and income inequality.

Existing human rights mechanisms in Asia, exemplified by entities like the ASEAN Intergovernmental Commission on Human Rights (AICHR) and the ASEAN Human Rights Declaration possess certain limitations pertaining to their scope, mechanisms for enforcement, and interaction with civil society. The complexities surrounding the development of a cohesive human rights framework in the region are exacerbated by the conflicts between individual rights and collective values, as well as the varying interpretations of human rights within cultural and philosophical contexts.

In addressing these challenges, a nuanced and collaborative approach is imperative that duly acknowledges the diverse range of perspectives prevalent within the Asian region. The pursuit of a regional human rights framework necessitates a comprehensive consideration of the historical, cultural, and economic factors shaping the region. Simultaneously, the crucial task of reconciling disparities between Western human rights principles and the prevalent cultural value in Asia demands attention. Enhancing the capabilities of regional organizations, enhancing the levels of transparency and accountability within governments and corporations, and actively involving civil society are crucial measures in promoting a more comprehensive and efficient human rights framework in Asia.

The overarching objective in establishing a unified human rights regime in Asia remains the cultivation of regional unity, stability, and peace. The overall development and progress of Asian countries can be enhanced through the establishment of a robust human rights regime, which encompasses the resolution of disparities, protection of individual rights, and promotion of democratic values. Nevertheless, it is crucial to acknowledge that the obstacles at hand are substantial, necessitating a continuous and dedicated commitment from various stakeholders, including governments, regional entities, civil society, and the global community at large.

## REFERENCES

- Ahdanisa, D. S., & Rothman, S. B. (2020). Revisiting International Human Rights Treaties: Comparing Asian and Western efforts to improve human rights. *SN Social Sciences*, 1(1), Article 1. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s43545-020-00018-0>
- Anaya Muñoz, A. (2017). *International Human Rights Regimes* (SSRN Scholarly Paper 3106700). <https://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=3106700>
- ASEAN. (2012, November 19). *ASEAN Human Rights Declaration*. ASEAN Main Portal. <https://asean.org/asean-human-rights-declaration/>
- Baer, D. (2012). *Keynote Address to the U.S.-ASEAN Symposium on the ASEAN Human Rights Declaration*. U.S. Department of State. //2009-2017.state.gov/j/drl/rls/rm/2012/201210.htm
- Baik, T.-U. (Ed.). (2012). Emerging Regional Human Rights Systems in Asia. In *Emerging Regional Human Rights Systems in Asia* (pp. i-ii). Cambridge University Press. <https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/emerging-regional-human-rights-systems-in-asia/emerging-regional-human-rights-systems-in-asia/F845C6B8DF61A882EC17F8BA4872D5A4>
- Beer, L. W. (1981). Group Rights and Individual Rights in Japan. *Asian Survey*, 21(4), 437-453. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2643933>

- Çalı, B., Rask Madsen, M., & Viljoen, F. (2018). Comparative Regional Human Rights Regimes: Defining a Research Agenda. *International Journal of Constitutional Law*, 16(1), 128–135. <https://doi.org/10.1093/icon/moy008>
- Chandra Voumik, L., & Sultana, T. (2022). Impact of Urbanization, Industrialization, Electrification and Renewable Energy on the Environment in BRICS: Fresh Evidence from Novel CS-ARDL Model. *Heliyon*, 8(11), e11457. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2022.e11457>
- Cingir, O. (2022). *Violations of the Human Rights of Migrant Workers in Southeast Asia* (pp. 31–48). <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003331858-4>
- Ciorciari, J. (2012). *Institutionalizing Human Rights in Southeast Asia* (SSRN Scholarly Paper 2270642). <https://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=2270642>
- Dash, K. C. (2008). *Regionalism in South Asia: Negotiating Cooperation, Institutional Structures* (1st edition). Routledge.
- Davies, M. (2014). An Agreement to Disagree: The ASEAN Human Rights Declaration and the Absence of Regional Identity in Southeast Asia. *Journal of Current Southeast Asian Affairs*, 33(3), 107–129. <https://doi.org/10.1177/186810341403300305>
- DeLaet, D. L. (2018). *An Emerging Asian Human Rights Regime as a Tool for Protecting the Vulnerable in Asia?* Routledge Handbooks Online. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315720180-3>
- Dhaliwal, S. (2008). Development of South Asian Human Rights Culture: The Role of South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (saarc). *The Indian Journal of Political Science*, 69(3), 565–575.
- Dhaliwal, S. (2016). *Human Rights Mechanism in South Asia*. Taylor & Francis.
- Donnelly, J. (1986). International Human Rights: A Regime Analysis. *International Organization*, 40(3), 599–642.
- Ghai, Y. (1993). Asian Perspectives on Human Rights. *Hong Kong Law Journal*, 23, 342.
- Hara, A. E. (2019). The Struggle to Uphold a Regional Human Rights Regime: The Winding Role of ASEAN Intergovernmental Commission on Human Rights (AICHR). *Revista Brasileira de Política Internacional*, 62, e011. <https://doi.org/10.1590/0034-7329201900111>
- Hashimoto, H. (2015). *The Prospects for a Regional Human Rights Mechanism in East Asia (RLE Modern East and South East Asia)*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315697796>
- Hundt, D., & Bleiker, R. (2007). Reconciling Colonial Memories in Korea and Japan. *Asian Perspective*, 31(1), 61–91.
- Jacobsen, O. B., Michael. (2000). *Human Rights and Asian Values: Contesting National Identities and Cultural Representations in Asia*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203393352>
- Keum, H., & Campbell, J. (2018). Perils of Transition: Korea and Taiwan Democratization Compared. *The Korean Journal of International Studies*, 16, 29–55. <https://doi.org/10.14731/kjis.2018.04.16.1.29>
- Manan, W. A. (1999). A Nation in Distress: Human Rights, Authoritarianism, and Asian Values in Malaysia. *Sojourn: Journal of Social Issues in Southeast Asia*, 14(2), 359–381.
- Mayer, B. (2013). Emerging Regional Human Rights Systems in Asia by Professor Tae-Ung Baik. *Journal of East Asia and International Law*, 6, 315.
- Mehta, P. B. (2011). Hinduism and the Politics of Rights in India. In T. Banchoff & R. Wuthnow (Eds.), *Religion and the Global Politics of Human Rights* (p. 0). Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195343397.003.0008>
- Mende, J. (2021). Are Human Rights Western—And Why Does it Matter? A Perspective from International Political Theory. *Journal of International Political Theory*, 17(1), 38–57. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1755088219832992>
- Moravcsik, A. (1998). *Explaining the Emergence of Human Rights Regimes*.
- OECD. (2014). *Trends in Income Inequality and its Impact on Economic Growth* (OECD Social, Employment and Migration Working Papers 163; OECD Social, Employment and Migration Working Papers, Vol. 163). <https://doi.org/10.1787/5jxrjncwvx6j-en>

- Rathgeber, T. (2014). Documentation: International Legal Human Rights Framework: Human Rights and the Institutionalisation of ASEAN: An Ambiguous Relationship. *Journal of Current Southeast Asian Affairs*, 33, 131–165. <https://doi.org/10.1177/186810341403300306>
- Renshaw, C. S. (2013). The ASEAN Human Rights Declaration 2012. *Human Rights Law Review*, 13(3), 557–579. <https://doi.org/10.1093/hrlr/ngt016>
- Richardson, S. (2020, September 14). China's Influence on the Global Human Rights System. *Human Rights Watch*. <https://www.hrw.org/news/2020/09/14/chinas-influence-global-human-rights-system>
- Sim, M. (2013). Confucian Values and Human Rights. *The Review of Metaphysics*, 67(1), 3–27.
- Singh, A. P. & Sugandh, V. (2019, January 25). *Colonial Legacy: An Impediment to Regional Integration in South Asia*. <https://www.vifindia.org/article/2019/january/25/colonial-legacy-an-impediment-to-regional-integration-in-south-asia>
- Thamrin, D. H. (2018). *Rohingya-Myanmar Crisis: How Is ASEAN Intergovernmental Commission on Human Rights?*
- Whitman, J. (2009). *The Fundamentals of Global Governance*. Palgrave Macmillan UK. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230234338>
- Wunderlich, J.-U. (2016). *Regionalism, Globalisation and International Order: Europe and Southeast Asia*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315604459>