

Chapter I

FROM SETTLEMENTS TO SOUTHEAST ASIA TO REGIONALISM

Pre-colonial Political Units in Southeast Asia

The concept Southeast Asia has a history that brings us to the knowledge of patchwork but continuous settlements where inhabitants lived from about 2000 B.C. to the development of early political systems which were perceivable to people of more developed states such as India and China. Historians caution about the ease people may use it in looking at how the isolated settlements in forests and river deltas developed into more coherent organizations. Scholars such as O.W. Wolters¹ identified no less than three hundred settlements with artifacts from the seventh and eighth centuries A.D. in Thailand and many Khmer centers in the same period in present-day Cambodia with modern names of villages identifiable in early written records. To use care in looking at reasons for the growth of the pre-historic settlements, Wolters says that "every centre was a centre in its own right as far as the inhabitants were concerned and it was surrounded by its own group of neighbors."²

Wolters has suggested that extensive contacts among the scattered settlements could not have been due to language communication although major language families have been identified by linguists. The Austroasiatic family of languages in early times was found in the settlements from Burma to northern Vietnam and southern China as the Mon-Khmer language with mixtures of Thai

¹ O.W. Wolters, *History, Culture, and Region in Southeast Asian Perspectives* (Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, 1982), as quoted in O.W. Wolters, "Early Southeast Asian Political Systems" in K.S. Sandhu, Sharon Siddique, Chandran Jeshurun, Ananda Rajah, Joseph L. H. Tan and Pushpa Thambipillai. *The ASEAN Reader* (Singapore: ISEAS, 1992), p. 5.

² Wolters, "Early Southeast Asian Political Systems," *ibid.* p. 6.

and Burman languages. However, it was very possible that the major family languages were represented by many local and isolated speech variations.³

Wolters therefore identified other cultural features for developing relationships in this vast geographical area. One factor is the social organization which contained several features. Anthropologists refer to "cognatic kinship" which defined descent to be reckoned equally through males and females, both of which are able to enjoy equal inheritance rights.⁴ This feature of equality of sexes is found in Southeast Asia, such as in the unisex of gods in Javanese iconography. Cognitive kinship also degraded the importance of lineage based on claims to status. Instead, kinship ties were the mode of social relations, disregarding generational lines, and emphasizing personal accomplishments and superior attributes and personal loyalty.

In his study, Wolters says that pre-historians of Southeast Asia deny the development of statehood in the earliest known settlements where there were no fixed boundaries, no rules of succession, and no bureaucratic structures. Indian and Chinese chronologists saw a "state of Funan" whose rulers had built temples according to the Indian view of a true state with "strategy of monumental self-validation" and according "to Indian strategies of temple-founding, inscription-raising and support for brahmanic royal cults." Thus, with an "acquired" Indian influence Funan "moved" from settlement to a state.

Likewise, the Western idea of "incipient state formation" followed "fairly extensive trade relations", wet rice culture, iron technology, probable increasing population density, and political centralization in alluvial plains. In other words, economic development would be accompanied by the appearance of more complex political systems.

Wolters and other historians deny this theory of passage to statehood due to the use of criteria found in theories with economic bias and from Chinese conventions that were transferred to Southeast Asia where people had no knowledge of such. In fact there is no evidence in the area to prove that religions and social behavior

could affect activities to create changes that would delineate protohistory from prehistory. Up to historical times when rulers could exercise political influence, services, as in prehistory, were seen in terms of reward, honor or posts of responsibility, altogether valued by recipients who believed that they had participated in the donor's "spiritual authority." In Vietnam, according to Chinese statistics, households increased rather than the total population, showing kinship characteristics.

Wolters, in his study, cited many scholars who wrote to illustrate the various terms for "soul-stuff," a complex system of personal relations, rather than the concept of state, personal loyalties, and titles to refer to home territories.⁵ But he made his point clear that scholarship has not yet really shown the continuities in the passage from prehistory to historical times.

Altogether, Wolters expresses his desire to see more investigation on the passage of Southeast Asia from settlements to political systems in terms of continuities rather than of discontinuities. However, he offered his study to provide the "appropriate background" to later tendencies in Southeast Asian intra-regional relations.⁶

Southeast Asia as a Concept

It was the Europeans who perceived a region of the geographical area which is today known as South-east Asia, South-East Asia or Southeast Asia. Donald G. McCloud states that before the colonial period, some writers from China, Arabia, Egypt, Rome, and Greece had identified the area due to the "role played by Southeast Asian states in the international trading systems."⁶ Having seen earlier that in pre-colonial times some states had already acquired identity with states external to the region, he shows how these came to be.

China as the Middle Kingdom viewed the world as "barbarians" according to distance and direction of the compass. Thus, the region of the Southern seas was called Nanyang. In the third century B.C., China referred to the islands in the southern seas and

³ Ibid, p. 6.

⁴ Ibid, p. 7.

⁵ Ibid., pp. 8-11.

⁶ Donald G. McCloud, "Southeast Asia As A Regional Unit," in Sandhu, et. al., *The Asean Reader*, ibid., p. 12.

Laos, and emperor rule in Vietnam and Cambodia. Interstate wars brought out superior cultures and relegated to near oblivion the weaker ones. However, at various times these latter ones also became active again. Today this is called ethnicity. Economic features such as wet rice culture, coconut as a way of life, spices, fish and fowl as foods, trading without cash and without face to face exchanges, boat as transportation, betel nut as a socio-economic product, and flowers as socio-religious instruments were common to all Southeast Asian states.

All economic, social, and political intra-state exchanges were ongoing before the colonial powers arrived in Southeast Asia. But colonization also brought in new territorial boundaries which cut across ethnic groups resulting in redistribution of peoples and development of new areas.

The formal use of the concept Southeast Asia has an interesting history because its beginnings were almost always in terms of theaters of war for the Second World War.

Before the Second World War, the Institute of Pacific Relations in the United States made studies on the social, economic, and political problems of Southeast Asia. In 1940, William L. Holland arranged the series of reports which appeared in 1941 and 1942 with "Southeast Asia" in their titles.¹²

K.M. Panikkar, an Indian writer on sea power who later became a diplomat, used the term Southeast Asia instead of Further India to acknowledge the rising tide of nationalism in Southeast Asia and avoid embarrassment to Prime Minister Nehru of India.

The forerunner of the concept of Southeast Asia was the identification of the region in terms of military and political by President Franklin D. Roosevelt and Prime Minister Winston Churchill with the creation of the "Supreme Allied Command in Southeast Asia", in August 1943. The subjects of the discussions were its geographical extent, command arrangements and relationships and associated matters. Should French Indo-China be in the Command? Should Thailand be in the China Theatre of War? Finally, the "South-

east Asia Command" was established embracing Burma, Thailand, Malaya, Singapore, and Sumatra. French Indo-China remained in the China Theatre of Gen. Chiang Kai-shek. The rest of Southeast Asia fell under the Southwest Pacific Area of General Douglas MacArthur.

Admiral Lord Louis Mountbatten, Supreme Allied Commander of the South East Asia Command (SEAC), explained years later that he and his colleagues did not know how to call the area that was being overrun by the Japanese as the ABDACOM (American, British, Dutch, Australian Command) had collapsed. In the course of their discussion the geographical area was referred to as "South-East Asia".

In August 1945, the changing of the boundaries of the SEAC was made by the British and the Americans. The new boundaries included all Southeast Asia except the Philippines, northern Indo-China, and Timor. Historian R. Fifield said that they had military implications for the war as well as political implication for peace.

The Pentagon Papers of 1971 showed that since 1941, American officials in Washington D.C. saw Southeast Asia as more than a collection of colonial territories. Even by May 1945, US policy was not sure of how to handle Indo-China because of the view that it should not be returned to France and because of the European dependencies in Southeast Asia which were being handled by the Office of European Affairs. On May 25, 1945, the US State Department arranged its jurisdictions appropriately and made the Division of Southeast Asian Affairs.

British contribution to the concept of Southeast Asia was based on the careful study of two things, first is the factor of waging war against the Japanese, and the other, the economic and political problems brought about by administering occupied territories. In addition, the problems of territories outside of Burma, Malaya, and British Borneo should have to be studied carefully. Altogether, scholars remember Mountbatten's use of "Southeast Asia" for his South East Asia Command.

Fifield points out that the perception of Southeast Asia as a region in military and political terms during the Second World War derived from the Japanese conquest of the entire area, destroying the colonial partition of Southeast Asia by Western powers and ne-

¹² Russell Fifield is one of the earliest historians and geopolitical writers. The information in this part of the study is taken from "The Southeast Asia Command," an abridged version from *Southeast Asian SPECTRUM* 4, No. 1 (October 1975) pp. 42-51, as found in *The ASEAN Reader*, op.cit., pp. 20-23.

cessitating a unified allied approach for the defeat of the Japanese.¹³ Therewith the South East Asia Command (SEAC) under Mountbatten was created.

The Concept of and Experiences in International Organizations

International organization as a concept was a product of the history of international cooperation among states and people which began in the ancient empires in the Near East as people travelled and traded. Occasionally, wars arose and the destructive ones were perceived as the result of irrational behavior. During those times plans were made for different ways of organizing the world.¹⁴ Organizations of states were mostly originally for peace and conflict resolution.

Writings on the earliest conceptions of world peace through world organizations are those on the then existing Delian Amphictyony, the Achaean League, the Peloponnesian League, the Tribute Lists of the Delian League, the Assyrian Government of Dependencies, Federal Communities in the Greece of the Cities, Internationalism in Ancient Greece, the Greek Commonwealth of Fifth Century Athens, and Alexander the Great on the Unity of Mankind.

In China, Confucius wrote on the Grand Commonwealth of Nations. There were also other concepts of unity in ancient China.

During the Middle Ages, the histories of the Holy Roman Empire and the Medieval Catholic Church led to many works on the peace negotiations of the Avignon Popes, medieval diplomacy, medieval world unity, international law for world peace and a society of nations as written in the thirteenth century.

Commercial leagues led to the idea of functionalism for world cooperation. The Hanseatic League was a trading group. After the Hansa's decline, the idea of regionalism arose. Internationalism such as international cooperation, international law, international pur-

suit of peace and supranational world government find their roots in the ancient and medieval times.

After the decline of the influence of the Papacy and the Holy Roman Empire, the nation-state came to existence in Europe but this was soon followed by inter-state wars. Many proposals to remedy these conditions of war were made by philosophers, scholars, political leaders, and even by slaves.

However, political thought on world government and world peace antedated the rise of modern states. Aristotle (384-322 B.C.) had written on a Commonwealth of Nations. Confucius from China (6th century B.C.) wrote of a Grand Commonwealth of Nations. Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274) had the idea of a world state. Dante Alighieri (1265-1321) wrote *De Monarchia*. Pierre Dubois (1250-1312) was known as a "medieval pacifist" although he sounded modern in his time. Hugo Grotius (1583-1645), the Father of International Law, wrote on the Law of War and Peace and of international society.

Immanuel Kant (1724-1804) advocated a universal and perpetual peace through world government and his moral and political writings inspired the creation of the League of Nations after the First World War and the ideology of the United Nations Charter in 1945, after the Second World War.

From the memoirs of the Duke of Sully, Prime Minister to King Henry the Great (Henry IV) of England, were ideas of this King for a Grand Design for a League of Nations or a Commonwealth of Nations.

The Abbe de Saint-Pierre (1658-1743) wrote on a project for perpetual peace through a society of nations. Jean Jacques Rousseau wrote "Project for Perpetual Peace", advocating a strong central system of government for Europe. Similarly, John Locke (1632-1704) wrote on war and peace.

In modern China, K'ang Yu-wei, (1858-1927) wrote his *One World Philosophy*.

There are many books on philosophic proposals for international organizations. Some of them are: 1) John E. Harley, "From Achaean League to United Nations: Summary of Proposals and Efforts for International Cooperation and Peace."¹⁵ Sylvester Hemleben,

¹³ Fifield in *The ASEAN Reader*, p. 23.

¹⁴ Michael Haas, *International Organization, An Interdisciplinary Bibliography*, (Stanford University: Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace, 1979). All succeeding information is taken from this book.

¹⁵ *World Affairs Quarterly*, XIII (October 1942) 336-56.

Plans for World Peace Through Six Centuries.¹⁶ Emile M. Guerry, *Popes and World Government*.¹⁷ Oscar Jaszi, "World Organization for Durable Peace."¹⁸ Frank M. Russell, "The Growth of the Idea of World Organization" in *Contemporary World Politics*.¹⁹

Quincy Wright wrote "Empires and World Government Before 1918".²⁰

In the nineteenth century, the Napoleonic Wars were concluded by the Congress of Vienna which met to make a Treaty of Peace. Motivated by Tsar Alexander I's idea of a Holy Alliance, the Congress of Vienna established a directorate of great powers to keep harmony and peace by dictating policy to the small powers.

In modern times, the First World War (1914-1918) ended and the League of Nations was created to prevent wars in the future. Simultaneously, there were many peace proposals and peace movements such as those started by Andrew Carnegie in his Endowment for Peace, the Quakers' Peace Movement, Alfred Nobel's prizes for peace endeavors, the World Peace Foundation, and others. Twentieth century thought included Bertran Russel's advocacy of total surrender of sovereignty by nations to one strong world government. John Strachey proposed a kind of condominium of two superpowers, America and Russia.

Private organizations also worked for peace. Among them were the Red Cross, Inter-Parliamentary Union and Chambers of Commerce.

Violations of the provisions of the League of Nations (January 10, 1920) led to the Sino-Japanese War of 1933 (undeclared war). In Europe, the inability of defeated Germany to pay war reparations to the victorious Allied Powers led to the election of Adolf Hitler to head the German government. As such, he mobilized the Germans with the help of his ideology of the superiority of the Aryan race. He created employment by road-building and industrial projects. He

also implemented a policy to eliminate the Jewish race. Hitler then went on to conquer the neighboring states, Poland, France, Austria-Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and others. All these continuous wars led to the alignment of threatened countries - Britain, France, United States, and China against the Fascist Powers of Hitler, Mussolini and later Japan. The Allies were joined by the Soviet Union which ordered all communist parties all over the world to make a "united front" with all anti-fascist groups with the end in view of capturing power in coalition with other political parties in elections of those states at the end of the Second World War. This was how the countries of Eastern Europe came to be ruled by communist parties. The end of communist party rule came with the collapse of the Berlin Wall separating East and West Germany and with the collapse of the Soviet Union after the "perestroika" and "glasnost" reforms in the Soviet Union Communist Party under President Mikhail Gorbachev in 1991.

Going back to the victory of the Allied Powers (American, British, China, Dutch or ABCD) in 1945, it is important to acknowledge the preparations for a durable peace in the world.

The United Nations Organization was set up by a Charter on June 26, 1945 by Representatives of Governments, expressing the determination of the members "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, equality of rights of men and women and of nations large and small, and to unite the strength to maintain international peace and security." The UN structure and specialized agencies are engaged in peace-building, peace-keeping, and peace-making to achieve UN objectives.

Some philosophical underpinnings strengthen the role of regional arrangements. It seems that the philosophers' dream of a universal and perpetual peace cannot be achieved by a world government or a United Nations Organization. It is more rational to look at universal peace starting from small areas of peace such as regional arrangements that would end up in world peace.

Confucius said that the Universal or Grand Commonwealth based on morality may be achieved as by ever-growing circles or ripples of peace like small waves of water when a stone or object is thrown into a body of water. The ever-growing circles of water, from ripples, represent growing areas of peace in a Commonwealth of Nations until the widest possible area of peace is attained.

¹⁶ Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1943.

¹⁷ Baltimore: Helicon, 1964.

¹⁸ Louis Finklestein, Harold D. Lasswell and R.M. MacIver, (eds.) *Foundations of World Organization* (New York: Harper, 1950).

¹⁹ Francis Brown, Charles Hodges and Joseph S. Roucek (eds.) New York: Wiley, 1939.

²⁰ *Current History*, New Series XXXIX (August 1960).

Professor Joseph Nye of Harvard University wrote a book entitled "Peace by Parts" which is self-explanatory.

A paper titled "Towards a Divisible and Graduated Peace" showed the growth of divisible peace into universal peace.²¹ This is to approach peace from the bottom of the ladder of international relations rather than from the top. Peace-building and conflict-resolution or peace-making by the associated states themselves can lead to decisions that are legitimate because they will be more in accordance with their prevailing cultures or values and should be more acceptable to the people than decisions by outside agents of peace. Moreover, regional decisions can exclude extraneous interests. Regional associations for international peace is the core of this paradigm.

The UN Charter has also provided for regional arrangements.²²

In Chapter VIII, Article 52 provides that:

1. Regional arrangements or agencies may deal with such matters relating to the maintenance of international peace and security as are appropriate for regional action as long as these are consistent with the purposes and principles of the UN.
2. Such regional arrangements shall make every effort to achieve pacific settlement of local disputes before referring them to the Security Council.
3. The Security Council shall encourage the development of pacific settlement of local disputes through such regional arrangements.

Article 53 provides that:

1. The Security Council shall, where appropriate, utilize such regional arrangements or agencies for enforcement action under its authority. But no enforcement action shall be taken by regional arrangements or regional agencies without the authorization of the Security Council.

²¹ Estrella D. Solidum, "Towards a Divisible and Graduated Peace", in Solidum, *The Small State: Security and World Peace* (Manila: Kalikasan Press, 1991).

²² For complete provisions, please read Chapter VIII: Articles 52, 53, and 54 of the United Nations Charter.

Article 54 says that the Security Council shall at all times be kept fully informed of activities undertaken or in contemplation under regional arrangements or regional agencies.

The various regional arrangements in Southeast Asia find legitimacy and validity of their existence in the above Articles of the UN Charter. There have been many such regional arrangements and agencies in Southeast Asia since 1945. A study of their structures and activities leads one to understand the concept of regionalism.

The tendency of states and people towards regionalism in Southeast Asia has been spurred by the motivation of group survival in all its aspects, from the need to manage difficult problems for sheer survival, the increase in the quality of life, the establishment of political stability, the increase of economic capabilities, the establishment of harmonious relations with neighboring states through cooperation, the achievement of regional peace and security, and in accordance with UN purposes, to maintain international peace and security.

Definitions of Concepts

1. "Regionalism" is the thought or theory that underlies the behavior of states to group themselves together or to be identified by an outsider to behave as such, for some common good.
2. "Region" is an analytic concept created by the selection of features relevant to the interest of the student or to the problem at hand. "Region" applies not only to the area under consideration but also to the number and kind of phenomena which will be included. The region is homogeneous only in terms of the applied criteria. Homogeneity implies similarity rather than identity because units are hardly ever identical.²³
3. A "regional association" is an arrangement wherein several states group themselves together to engage in mutual cooperation for the attainment of some common good. Although not strictly a geographic entity, a region is composed of countries which are drawn together due to simi-

²³ Roger Minshull, *Regional Geography*, (Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., 1967), p. 122.

larity of interests: What holds them together is the political will to cooperate in a rational way rather than to engage in destructive competition. The structure of a regional association varies from flexibility and preservation of the members' sovereignty to the transfer of some aspects of sovereignty to a central structure²⁴ or a supra national body, and from accommodation of heterogeneous value systems to legalistic prescriptions of behavior or code of conduct.

4. "Peace" is a situation or condition where the parts of a unit or a social organization are in harmonious relationships over a reasonable period of time.²⁵ There are different kinds of peace. St. Augustine has said in his book *The City of God*. All societies aim at peace. There is peace of the dungeon when prisoners have food and bed, the peace of conspirators when they hie to a den or safehouse after their criminal operations, and the peace of the family when the members give prompt obedience to the father. The peace of the body consists in the duly proportioned arrangements of its parts as when the nobler part controls the baser parts. Peace of the rational soul is harmony of knowledge and action. Peace of all things is tranquility in the order of the universe. Peace between man and man is well-ordered concord.

But there is also the communist peace, when there is no more capitalist country standing. American peace is absence of war but this is fallacious because there are other conditions that are not "peace" if there is no war. A definition cannot be made by stating what is absent but by stating the conditions that are present by which the thing being defined, is. Hitler's peace was the rule by the "superior Aryan race". Every advocate of peace has his own implicit order of things.

5. "Cooperation" is the act of working together by certain units toward a common end. There are some ways by which cooperation is done in increasing degrees, these are listening, responding positively, and acting together toward a common end. Without a common end, units acting together are only acting with each toward each unit's own reward. This is called interaction, it is not cooperation.

²⁴ Crane Brinton, *From Many One* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1948).

²⁵ Solidum, *ibid*.

Development of Regional Organizations in Asia²⁶

a. The Asian Relations Conference, (March 28 - April 2, 1947, New Delhi)

Representatives from 18 countries from Asia and Africa met in New Delhi in 1947 under the sponsorship of the Indian Council of World Affairs to give the first expression of the idea of regional cooperation that had been in the minds of some Asian leaders for some time. Among the Asian states present were Afghanistan, Bhutan, Burma, Ceylon, China, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Korea, Malaya, Nepal, Mongolia, Iran, the Philippines, Thailand, Tibet, Turkey, Vietnam, Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Kirghizstan, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan, Australia, and New Zealand, and included Palestinian Arabs and Jews. Indian Prime Minister Nehru stressed the need for Asian unity and for regional cooperation. Nehru explained that in that conference there would be no leaders and no followers, neither was it a Pan Asia movement directed against Europe or America. The ideal was One World.

During the Conference, the competition for leadership between China and India became sharp while the smaller Asian nations expressed fear of these two powerful neighbors. A Burmese delegate was supposed to have said, "It was terrible to be ruled by a Western power, but it is even more so to be ruled by an Asian power."

The success of the Conference lay in its having been held and in having the problems of regional cooperation exposed. The Conference agreed to promote Asian studies, greater cooperation, freedom for colonial areas, lifting the status of women in Asia, inter-Asian communication, and economic progress. Other topics discussed were national freedom movements, racial problems and interracial migration, labor problems, and cultural affairs.

b. New Delhi Conference (January 20, 1949)

The second attempt towards Asian cooperation was called by India on January 20, 1949 to consider the Dutch invasion of Indonesia on December 18, 1948. This Conference was an official meeting of Asian governments. The participating countries agreed, among

²⁶ Most of the data on this section were taken from the manuscript of Estrella D. Solidum, *Philippine Policy for Regional Cooperation, 1947-1998* 1997.

others, "to consult among themselves to explore ways and means of promoting consultation and cooperation within the framework of the United Nations."

The New Delhi Conference acted to see how it could help the United Nations Security Council bring about a peaceful solution to the conflict. The NDC asked that Indonesia be given complete authority over its entire area by 1 January 1950.

c. Asia-Pacific Union (4 July 1949)

This was the first attempt of the Philippines to create an organization for cooperation among states in Asia. President Elpidio Quirino had in mind the preservation of the sovereignty of states in Asia and the Pacific and identified Communism as the biggest threat to sovereignty. The Asia-Pacific Union would act as a potential third force in international affairs. Preferring not to be involved in the Cold War, most Asian states did not want to participate in the proposed Union. For India and the United States, both believed that the time was not ripe for an Asian Pact.

d. Baguio Conference (26-30 May 1950)

Undaunted by the failure of the Asia-Pacific Union, President Quirino organized the Baguio Conference of 1950, the first gathering of fully independent states of Southeast Asia and the Western Pacific on a governmental level. China and North Korea were not invited because the presence of these two would break the anti-communist nature of the conference.

Discussions in the meetings revealed many similarities in vision among the delegates. Ceylon's delegate Senenayake said that even as Asians strengthened their spiritual foundation, they should also seek benefits from materialism to ameliorate the social and economic conditions of the people.

e. Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO, September 1954)

SEATO was established in 1954 by eight countries, three of which were Asian states namely the Philippines, Thailand, and Pakistan. The other countries were the USA, Britain, France, Australia, and New Zealand.

Conceived as a military organization similar to NATO and purposed to prevent communism from taking over the Southeast Asian states, it was a response to the Geneva Agreements of 1954 which gave temporary cessation of military hostilities in Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia. Although the military conflicts were temporarily ended, the established governments were slowly overtaken by communist activities through coalition governments, guerrilla warfare, or subversion. The infamous domino theory, although not a theory in the right sense but a speculative wisdom stated that if the US did not maintain a military presence in the region, all the Southeast Asian states would fall like dominoes, especially if the states were neutralist such as Indonesia under President Sukarno, Cambodia under Prince Norodom Sihanouk, and Burma under U Nu.

Although the organization was to help Laos, Cambodia, and Vietnam, called the "Protocol States" fight communism militarily, SEATO failed to help these states because the Western partners feared retaliation from China and the Soviet Union. Thus, SEATO was called a paper tiger. Pakistan opted out because it could not get military arms with which to fight India, an idea which was not within the purview of SEATO. Its weak points were soon losing the trust of Thailand and the Philippines.

Meanwhile, political events changed the strategic landscape in Southeast Asia. By the Paris Agreements of 1973, the US withdrew militarily from Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia. In 1975 the communist parties took power to rule in each of those three states. At the same time neutralism had grown stronger as Asian and African states maintained a policy of distancing from the bipolarism of the Cold War. ASEAN states focused on real issues of economic, social, and political development and of establishing relations with China and the new socialist states of Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia. Thailand and the Philippines agreed to end SEATO in 1977.

f. Asian-African Conference (Bandung Conference, 18-24 April 1955)

The Asian-African Conference was proposed by the Prime Ministers of Burma, Ceylon, India, Indonesia, and Pakistan. Twenty-five countries were invited to be represented at the ministerial level, by Prime Ministers or Foreign Ministers.

The objectives included 1) to promote goodwill and cooperation among the nations of Asia and Africa and to advance their

mutual and common interests, 2) to consider social, economic, and cultural problems, 3) to consider special problems like national sovereignty, racialism, and colonialism and 4) to promote world peace and cooperation. However, the more dominant view was that it was a response to SEATO.

The Bandung Conference laid out its principles, namely, 1) mutual respect for each other's territorial integrity and sovereignty, 2) mutual non-aggression, 3) mutual non-interference in each other's internal affairs, 4) equality, 5) mutual benefits, 6) peaceful coexistence, 7) disarmament and prohibition of nuclear weapons, and 8) respect for human rights.

The Bandung Conference took a position of being the third force in the Cold War, not siding with any bloc (non-alignment) and yet able to act on international issues without the influence of other countries.

In subsequent years, after the end of the Cold War in the 1990s, the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) evolved from this Bandung Conference and the new objectives were for economic development.

g. Association of Southeast Asia (ASA, 31 July 1961)

The first purely Southeast Asian states organization on government level, ASA was established by the Prime Minister of Malaya, the Foreign Minister of Thailand, and the President of the Philippines in 1961. Three plans for ASA, namely the Rahman Plan, the Khoman Plan, and the Garcia Plan, spelled out the desires of the three leaders to uphold the ideals of peace, freedom, social justice, and economic well-being through active cooperation. Malaya wanted to include as many states in Southeast Asia as possible but most of the states begged off due to lack of sympathy for a formal organization, suspicion of a Western hand in the plan, and the preference for bilateral cooperation.

The final agreement on ASA was very conducive to regional cooperation. The projects were very practical and useful for the mutual development of knowledge and understanding. These projects included promotion of Southeast Asian studies, exchange of youth and women leaders, an ASA airline, waiver of visa requirements for certain categories, an ASA coach service from Singapore to Bangkok, cooperation on shipping, and tourism and trade, and common positions in international bodies. All these projects were

ongoing until the Maphilindo conflict put them in suspension, then later were to be taken over by ASEAN in 1967.

Much goodwill was generated by the wide areas of practical cooperation. This goodwill enabled the states to place their problems at a very low key, to show sincerity by giving and taking of their material and spiritual resources, to provide self-restraint and mutual consultation, to strengthen the faith and determination of members to continue regional cooperation, to use Asian solution for Asian problems, and to preserve sovereignty, good neighborliness, and minimum administrative machinery.

ASA refused to identify threats to the member states thereby paving the way for greater cooperation in the social, cultural, and economic fields. Long-existing mutual suspicions among the members were reduced and provocations from its neighbors were avoided.

ASA cooperation was temporarily suspended when the problem of the creation of Malaysia was challenged by Indonesia and the Philippines in 1963. However, ASA's projects were adopted by ASEAN in 1967 resulting in a shorter preparation time for ASEAN cooperation.

h. MAPHILINDO (5 August 1963)

The British-sponsored Federation of Malaysia in 1961 composed of Malaya, Singapore, North Borneo (Sabah), Brunei, and Sarawak was opposed by President Sukarno of Indonesia and President Diosdado Macapagal of the Philippines, while Brunei decided not to join Malaysia.

Sukarno perceived that the concept of Malaysia was neo-colonialist because the British would still be responsible for security in Southeast Asia. The Philippines opposed the Malaysia Plan because it incorporated Sabah which was claimed to be Philippine territory. Indonesia sent armed men to Sarawak and Singapore as part of Indonesian *Konfrontasi*. In a meeting of the three Heads of Government they agreed to resolve their differences in the MAPHILINDO which was to be created.

The proposal for the formation of a Greater Malayan Confederation of States called MAPHILINDO was made by President Macapagal in July 1962. It would bring together 40 million Malay people, a unity forged by the Malays themselves, in reaction to the

British Plan for Malaysia. This was the long-term goal. The short-term goal was the establishment of a machinery for frequent consultations or consensus-making or *mushawarah*, and the settlement of the Borneo claim based on the results of a UN-sponsored plebiscite. The principle of Asian solution for Asian problems was also agreed on but ironically the Konfrontasi and the dispute over Sabah involved much foreign intervention.

Maphilindo was set up in 1963 by the Manila Agreements.

MAPHILINDO broke up before it could function. The disparity in the leaders' perceptions of security was brought about by the interest of each of them, such as Indonesia's rejection of neo-colonialism, the Philippines' claim to Sabah, and Malaysia's stake in its formation. There was also the difficulty of communication because of the "Communism Problem" since Indonesia had joined the People's Republic of China to eliminate NECOLIM, the Philippines became a member of SEATO to fight communism, and there was difficulty of reading correctly each other's perceptions due to "strange alliances."

By 1965, Indonesia ended Sukarno's rule but Konfrontasi continued. Philippine claim to Sabah remained. *Mushawarah* never had the chance to bring about cultural, economic, and social exchanges because the political problems were sapping the goodwill and vigor of the three states.

But MAPHILINDO provided lessons for future cooperation. In the succeeding efforts to cooperate which led to ASEAN, the countries had learned that political and military matters should not be allowed during the formative years of learning cooperation, that unity comes from goodwill and trust and that Asian solution for Asian problems should always be used to preserve peace in the region. MAPHILINDO's lessons and its principles of *mushawarah* and the temporariness of foreign bases in the region were adopted by ASEAN in 1967.

Chapter II

FORMATION OF ASEAN

The Bangkok Declaration of 1967

At the end of World War II, states and colonies in Asia of European countries tried to end their separation from one another and tried to develop contacts with the neighboring countries. Japan's short-lived victory in and rule over Southeast Asian colonies contributed to the peoples' demand for freedom and independence. Japan had given "independence" within its Greater Southeast Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere to Thailand, Indonesia, Burma, and the Philippines, giving the idea to the Southeast Asian peoples that they could rule themselves and thereby quickening the spirit of nationalism.

Thailand as the only uncolonized nation in Southeast Asia tried to show the way to new relationships in the region. Thai diplomats and statesmen advocated independence for every nation and the formation of regional cooperation. But as has been shown earlier, the time in the years soon after the war was not ripe for it. Indonesia still had its war with the Dutch. Singapore and Malaya were not yet getting independence. Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia still had to fight the French for their freedom. Burma was still to negotiate with the British for its independence.

Even as African and Asian leaders sought to bring themselves into a conference in 1947, the perceptions among them of the conditions, goals, and problems were different. Moreover, the Cold War paralyzed some nations into fear of communism and having no resources to protect themselves, they re-established defense relationships with their colonial masters. The idea that they could still be responsible for the security of Southeast Asia was called by Indonesian leader Sukarno as neo-colonialism. On the other hand, some states in the region were now thinking of a third force in the bipolar world as created by the Cold War, between the democratic

states led by the United States and the Marxist Socialist States led by the Soviet Union. The Third Force was not going to be a regional bloc. It was going to be a moral Third Force. The Bandung Conference of 1955 declared this. Indonesia, Burma, and Cambodia adopted a neutralist stance, the ability of every state to determine what is right and just for itself, without influence from either blocs but without cutting off relations with those states. Thus the neutralist principles were formed: cooperation for economic, social and cultural development, non-interference in domestic affairs, mutual respect for national sovereignty, disarmament and prohibition of nuclear weapons, respect for human rights, and respect for the right of self-defense "singly or collectively" in conformity with the UN Charter.

During the attempts to form regional groups, other factors created problems. Besides the Cold War, there were territorial disputes and disturbing political developments such as the "Gestapu Affair" of Indonesia in 1965 which helped to precipitate the establishment of ASEAN.

In the 1965 coup in Indonesia, President Sukarno was replaced by General Suharto who became President after several months to give due respect to Sukarno who was placed under house arrest. Indonesia needed to have a new image among its neighbors especially with Malaysia against which it had launched a Konfrontasi.

Indonesian Deputy Prime Minister and Foreign Minister Adam Malik went to the neighboring states "to mend fences". While in Thailand, he met with Foreign Minister Thanat Khoman who was helping to reconcile Malaysia, Indonesia, and the Philippines which had been trying to settle the problem generated by the formation of Malaysia. Thanat proposed to Malik the idea of another organization for regional cooperation to include more members. Malik agreed to it and after clearing it with his government, he invited to Jakarta Philippine Foreign Affairs Secretary Narciso Ramos for discussions on an expanded membership for a new regional association for cooperation. While Malik himself went to Malaysia to explore possibilities for the idea, he sent Foreign Ministry Officer Anwar Sani to the Philippines to seek assistance in persuading Thailand to "make some gracious gesture" so that Cambodia would join the proposed cooperation plan, after Malik had confirmed that Thailand had no objection to Cambodia's participation. President Suharto followed this up with a letter to Prince Norodom Sihanouk. He and his Prime Minister Son Sann declined due to their perceptions of intrigues.

Burma was also invited but it preferred to protect its neutralist policy which Burmese officials said would be broken if the country would join any bloc. South Vietnam wanted to join but its enormous problems arising from its war with North Vietnam were seen as overwhelming for a newly starting association.

Three countries of the original ASEAN Five made proposals for how the new association would be. The Thai draft wanted a loose association for cooperation and good neighborliness. Indonesia needed to see that *mushawarah* or consensus-making would be the process and that foreign military bases should be temporary in nature and would not be used against any member state. The Philippines rejected the proposal on the military bases as it was hosting the US military in Philippine bases. The Philippines also wanted a legalistic charter to formally bind the members. This idea came naturally to the Philippines due to the legacies of Spain and the US on legalism. Of course Malaysia would reject proposals from the Philippines with the Sabah conflict still simmering. Indonesia also supported Thailand's idea of a loose community of nations.

On 8 August 1967, the Bangkok Declaration announced the establishment of the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN, the acronym that Adam Malik gave to it).

Each of the five original members had a real stake in membership. Indonesia needed to project a good image to its neighbors after the recent "Konfrontasi" and "Gestapu" affair. The Konfrontasi was the confrontation that President Sukarno made against Malaysia which was in reality a creation of England to bring together Malaya, Singapore, Sabah, and Sarawak in 1963. England would be responsible for the security of the new Federation of Malaysia. Sukarno rejected this idea saying that Asians should be responsible for their security. This kind of set up, Sukarno said, was neo-colonialism by England. Sukarno also supported the Philippine opposition to the creation of Malaysia because it had included the Philippine territory of Sabah. He sent Indonesian paramilitary troops to Malaya and Singapore. The situation continued until a coup (Gestapu Affair) by the military to prevent a communist party takeover was effected in 1965, placing Sukarno under house arrest. The military had great difficulty living under Sukarno's policy of giving the Partai Komunis Indonesia (PKI) equal participation in government, knowing that the ultimate objective of the PKI was to finally take control of the country. The military made the pre-empted strike to immediately cut down the PKI and remove the latter's source

of strength for its activities who was Sukarno himself. After this, Indonesia had to redeem its original image with Asian neighbors as it needed acceptance and legitimation by its neighbors.

Singapore was the newest state, having been expelled by Malaysia in 1965 from the Federation and needing to find strength from friends in the region. Thailand had always wanted an environment of good neighbors with which it could have mutual support. Thailand had experienced disappointment with SEATO over its failure to fulfill its promises of protection to the Protocol states. It would be best for Thailand to engage neighbors in mutual support rather than to depend on foreign powers. The Philippines was just beginning to find friendship with its Southeast Asian neighbors as it was distancing itself from the US. In 1984, Brunei Darussalam became independent and joined ASEAN.

The ASEAN Declaration referred to Southeast Asian Nations in its provisions. The original idea was to have all states in the region to be members but Burma was isolationist and Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia had their own wars and in fact rejected ASEAN as a Western creation.

In 1973, the US military withdrew from Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia under the Paris Peace Treaty. In 1975, the communist party in each state took control over the government. ASEAN decided to extend its hand of friendship to the three states in spite of their political and economic differences. The underlying principle that was made was that it was better to create amity rather than enmity.

But the interstate problems grew worse. China and the Soviet Union had really been the patrons of the wars and proxy governments, because Cambodia under the Khmer Rouge and Pol Pot (of killing fields) was supported by China, while Vietnam which had control over Laos had signed a treaty with the Soviet Union making Danang and Camranh Bay to serve as Russian military bases. This arrangement undercut China's need to control access to the three states. To make this situation clear, it must be understood that China and the Soviet Union were competing fiercely for control over the communist party-ruled states. This was the Sino-Soviet conflict which started in 1957. But Vietnam's great leader President Ho Chi Minh left his "Testament" instructing his people to unify the socialist (Marxist) camp of China and the Soviet Union but not to side with either of the two. Ho Chi Minh was a strategist. China was threatening on Vietnam's northern borders while the Soviet Union was the source of military and economic assistance but was far away.

When President Mikhail Gorbachev of the Soviet Union instituted "glasnost" (transparency) and "perestroika" (restructuring) in 1986, he also withdrew Soviet support from Vietnam and recognized Laos and Cambodia as separate states, in effect destroying Vietnam's "flexible hegemony"¹ over Laos and Cambodia. Gorbachev also had proposed a detente with China which the latter accepted.

As a result, Vietnam was isolated from its partners, the Soviet Union and the COMECON in East Europe. By 1990s the Marxist Socialist governments in Europe collapsed. Vietnam had lost its patrons. Vietnam worked to restore relations with its neighbors, first with each state and later with ASEAN itself. On the other hand, ASEAN had used confidence-building measures on Vietnam.

ASEAN From Six to Ten

Before Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, and Myanmar became members of ASEAN, they were first invited as Guest or Observer in the ASEAN Ministerial Meetings (AMM).

In July 1992 (Manila), the Foreign Ministers of the Lao People's Democratic Republic and the Socialist Republic of Vietnam attended the 25th AMM as Guests. This AMM agreed that their applications for Observer status in ASEAN be approved upon the submission of their respective instruments of accession to the TAC. In this 25th AMM, the Instruments of Accession of Laos and Vietnam to the Treaty of Amity and Cooperation in Southeast Asia (TAC) were accepted. In July 1993 (Singapore) Laos and Vietnam became Observers for the first time. In 1994 (Bangkok) Laos and Vietnam attended the 27th AMM as Observers. They also participated in the First ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF). On 17 October 1994, Vietnam applied for membership in ASEAN.

On 28 July 1995 (Bandar Seri Begawan), Vietnam was admitted into ASEAN as the seventh member.

At the 28th AMM Laos attended as Observer. There the Foreign Minister of Laos announced the wish of his country to join ASEAN

¹ Flexible hegemony was a concept of Estrella D. Solidum to indicate the tightening and loosening of Vietnamese control over Laos and Cambodia to suit Vietnamese interest.

in two years' time, that is, at the 30th AMM in Kuala Lumpur coinciding with ASEAN's 30th anniversary.

In accordance with the decision of ASEAN Heads of Government at the First Informal Summit in Jakarta on 30 November 1996, which "reaffirmed their strong commitment to the speedy realization of an ASEAN comprising all ten Southeast Asian countries they agreed that Cambodia, Laos, and Myanmar (CLM) be admitted as ASEAN members simultaneously . . ."

Before this First Informal Summit in 1996, Cambodia and Myanmar had also taken action to become members of ASEAN.²

Cambodia was a Guest of the Host Government during the 26th AMM (Singapore) in July 1993 and the 27th AMM (Bangkok) in July 1994. Cambodia acceded to the TAC in January 1995. At the 28th AMM in Bandar Seri Begawan, Cambodia was granted Observer Status. She applied for membership in a letter by the Minister for Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation on 23 March 1996.

Myanmar was Guest of the Host Government at the 27th AMM (Bangkok) in July 1994 and of the 28th AMM (Bandar Seri Begawan) in July 1995 when she also acceded to the TAC. Myanmar became an Observer in ASEAN at the 29th AMM in Jakarta in July 1996. The Foreign Minister of Myanmar also participated in the Third ARF. In August 1996, Myanmar applied for ASEAN membership.

At the Fifth ASEAN Summit in Bangkok on 15 December 1995, the ASEAN Heads of Government held an informal meeting with the heads from Cambodia, Laos, and Myanmar (CLM countries). It was the first meeting of all Leaders of Southeast Asian countries. At that momentous meeting, the Heads of Government of the 10 Southeast Asia countries signed the Treaty on the Southeast Asia Nuclear Weapon-Free Zone. In their Summit Declaration, the ASEAN Heads announced that "ASEAN shall work towards the speedy realization of an ASEAN comprising all Southeast Asian countries as it enters the 21st century . . ."

This commitment was reiterated by the Heads of Government in Jakarta on 30 November 1996 during the First ASEAN Informal

² http://www.aseansec.org/history/asn_his2.htm pp. 5-8.

Summit. They agreed to admit Cambodia, Laos and Myanmar simultaneously. They agreed to request the relevant ASEAN bodies to continue with the necessary technical and procedural steps. The actual timing of admission could be announced in due time.

At the Special Meeting of ASEAN Foreign Ministers in Kuala Lumpur on 31 May 1997, the Secretary-General of ASEAN reported that the CLM countries had given satisfactory undertakings to fulfill all obligations and commitments under the various ASEAN agreements that they would have to accede to as new members. Based on the Report, the ASEAN Foreign Ministers agreed that Cambodia, Laos, and Myanmar could be admitted in late July 1997.

Due to the political problems in Cambodia, the ASEAN Foreign Ministers held a Special Meeting in Kuala Lumpur on 10 July 1997 to assess the situation in the country. Cambodia's admission was moved to a later date.

Laos and Myanmar were admitted to ASEAN on 23 July 1997, a day before the start of the 30th AMM in Kuala Lumpur.

Cambodia was admitted to membership in ASEAN on 30 April 1999 at a special ceremony in Hanoi in accordance with the decision of the Sixth ASEAN Summit.

ASEAN's goal to achieve regional cohesion was realized with the completion of ASEAN 10.³

Organizational Structure⁴

ASEAN Heads of Government

The highest authority of ASEAN is the Meeting of the ASEAN Heads of Government, the ASEAN Summit. In 1992, the Fourth ASEAN Summit in Singapore decided that the ASEAN Heads of Government would meet formally every three years and informally at least once in between to lay down directions and initiatives for ASEAN activities. In 1995, the Fifth ASEAN Summit in Bangkok decided to hold annual Informal Summits in between the formal

³ Ibid., pp. 5-9.

⁴ http://www.aseansec.org/history_str2.htm. The document is reproduced in order to preserve accuracy of data.

ASEAN Summits which take place every three years. The Two Informal Summits have been held in Jakarta in December 1996 and in Kuala Lumpur in December 1997. The Sixth ASEAN Summit was convened in Hanoi in December 1998.

ASEAN Ministerial Meeting (AMM)

The ASEAN Foreign Ministers meet annually during the AMM. The AMM, established by the 1967 Bangkok Declaration, is responsible for the formulation of policy guidelines and coordination of ASEAN activities. At the 1977 Kuala Lumpur Summit, the ASEAN Heads of Government agreed that the AMM could include other relevant Ministers as and when necessary. During an ASEAN Summit, the AMM and AEM report jointly to the ASEAN Heads of Government.

ASEAN Economic Ministers (AEM)

The AEM meets formally or informally to direct ASEAN economic cooperation. The AEM was institutionalized at the 1977 Kuala Lumpur Summit. Like the AMM, the AEM also meets annually. The AFTA Council was established by the Fourth Summit to supervise, coordinate, and review the implementation of the CEPT Scheme for AFTA. The AEM and AMM report jointly to the ASEAN Heads of Government during an ASEAN Summit.

Sectoral Ministers Meeting

Ministers for specific sectors of economic cooperation meet as and when necessary to give guidance on ASEAN cooperation. These are meetings of Ministers on Energy, Ministers on Agriculture and Forestry, Ministers on Tourism, and Ministers on Transport. The sectoral Economic Ministers report to the AEM. The ASEAN Finance Ministers have also agreed to meet regularly. Their first meeting was held in Phuket in February 1997.

Other Non-Economic ASEAN Ministerial Meetings

Meetings of Ministers in other fields of ASEAN cooperation, such as Health, Environment, Labour, Rural Development, Poverty Alleviation, Social Welfare, Education, Science and Technology, Information, Justice/Law and Transnational Crimes, are held regu-

larly. While there is coordination between meetings of other Ministers and the AMM, each meeting of Ministers may report directly to the Heads of Government.

Joint Ministerial Meeting (JMM)

The JMM, established by the 1987 Manila Summit, meets as and when necessary to facilitate the cross-sectoral coordination of and consultation on ASEAN activities. The JMM comprises the ASEAN Foreign Ministers and Economic Ministers under the joint chairmanship of the AMM and AEM chairmen. Such a joint meeting can be initiated either by the Foreign Ministers or the Economic Ministers. The JMM usually meets prior to the Summit.

Secretary-General of ASEAN

The Secretary-General is appointed on merit by the ASEAN Heads of Government with the recommendation of the AMM. He is accorded ministerial status with the mandate to initiate, advise, coordinate and implement ASEAN activities. The Protocol Amending the Agreement on the Establishment of the ASEAN Secretariat, signed in Manila on 22 July 1992, provides that the Secretary-General is responsible to the Heads of Government Meeting and to all Meetings of ASEAN Ministers when they are in session and to the chairman of the ASC. He also chairs all meetings of the ASC on behalf of the ASC Chairman, except the first and the last.

ASEAN Standing Committee (ASC)

The ASC is the policy arm and organ of coordination of ASEAN between the AMM. The ASC, which reports directly to the AMM, comprises the Chairman who is the Foreign Minister of the country hosting the AMM, the Secretary-General of ASEAN and the Directors-General of the ASEAN National Secretariats. As an advisory body to the Permanent Committees, the ASC reviews the work of Committees with a view to implementing policy guidelines set by the AMM.

Senior Officials Meeting (SOM)

The SOM was formally institutionalized as part of the ASEAN machinery at the 1987 Manila Summit. Responsible for ASEAN

political cooperation, the SOM meets when necessary and reports directly to the AMM. SOM consists of heads of the Foreign Ministries of the ASEAN Member Countries.

Senior Economic Officials Meeting (SEOM)

The SEOM was also established as part of the ASEAN machinery at the Manila Summit and comprises the heads of trade, industry, finance and commerce of the ASEAN Member Countries. The Fourth ASEAN Summit agreed that the five ASEAN Economic Committees on Finance and Banking (COFAB); Food, Agriculture and Forestry (COFAF); Industry, Minerals, and Energy (COIME); Transportation and Communications (COTAC); and Trade and Tourism (COTT) be dissolved and SEOM be tasked to handle all aspects of ASEAN economic cooperation. The SEOM meets regularly and reports directly to the AEM.

Other ASEAN Senior Officials Meeting

Other ASEAN Senior Officials Meetings comprise the ASEAN Senior Officials on the Environment (ASOEN) and ASEAN Senior Officials on Drug Matters (ASOD) as well as ASEAN Committees such as Committee on Social Development (COSD), Committee on Science and Technology (COST), ASEAN Conference on Civil Service Matters (ACCSM), and Committee on Culture and Information (COCI). These bodies report to the ASC and to the relevant meetings of Ministers.

Joint Consultative Meeting (JCM)

The JCM, set up at the 1987 Manila Summit, comprises the Secretary-General of ASEAN, SOM, SEOM, and the ASEAN Directors-General. It facilitates the intersectoral coordination of ASEAN activities at the officials level. The Secretary-General reports the results of the Meeting directly to the AMM and AEM.

ASEAN National Secretariats

Each ASEAN country has a National Secretariat in the Foreign Ministry which organises and implements ASEAN-related activities at the country level. At the head of each National Secretariat is a Director-General.

ASEAN Committees in Third Countries

ASEAN has established committees in its Dialogue Partner countries to handle ASEAN's external relations with these countries and international organizations. These committees comprise the heads of diplomatic missions of the ASEAN Member Countries in the host country. They conduct consultative meetings with their host governments. Presently, there are fifteen ASEAN Committees in third countries, namely: Beijing, Bonn, Brussels, Canberra, Geneva, Islamabad, London, Moscow, New Delhi, Ottawa, Paris, Seoul, Tokyo, Washington, and Wellington. The Chairmen of the ASEAN Committees in Third Countries submit progress reports to the ASC on the activities of the Committees and seek guidance as needed from the ASC.

ASEAN Secretariat

The ASEAN Secretariat was established by an Agreement signed by the ASEAN Foreign Ministers during the 1976 Bali Summit to enhance coordination and implementation of policies, projects, and activities of the various ASEAN bodies.

The 1992 Singapore Summit agreed to strengthen the ASEAN Secretariat so that it would effectively support the Summit's initiatives. The Protocol Amending the Agreement on the Establishment of the ASEAN Secretariat, signed at the 25th AMM in Manila in 1992, provided the Secretariat with a new structure. The Protocol vested the Secretariat with an expanded set of functions and responsibilities to initiate, coordinate, and implement ASEAN activities.

The Special Meeting of the ASEAN Foreign Ministers in Kuala Lumpur in May 1997 agreed to the creation of an additional post of Deputy Secretary-General at the ASEAN Secretariat. One Deputy Secretary-General will assist the Secretary-General on AFTA and Economic Cooperation while the others will assist in Functional Cooperation, ASEAN Cooperation and Dialogue Relations and Administration, Finance and Personnel. The Deputy Secretaries-General are appointed based on nominations by the governments of ASEAN member countries.

Staffing of the Secretariat has moved from national nomination to open recruitment. A total of 35 professional staff have been recruited, more than double the size of the previous professional staff of 14 before the reorganization.

The ASEAN Secretariat adopted a Mission Statement which reflects the spirit and goals of the Fourth Summit, "Towards strengthening and intensifying intra-ASEAN cooperation". The work of the Secretariat is guided by this Mission Statement in order to provide responsive support to the tasks of the various ASEAN bodies.

The Secretariat has four Bureaus. The AFTA Bureau, in addition to handling the implementation and monitoring of AFTA, also handles other related issues such as the elimination of non-tariff barriers, the harmonising of tariff nomenclature, the issue of standards and conformance, and customs valuation and procedures. Apart from the meetings of the AFTA Council of Ministers, the AEM and SEOM, the Bureau also fully services the meeting of the ASEAN Directors-General of Customs and the ASEAN Consultative Committee on Standards and Quality.

The Bureau of Economic Cooperation handles such matters as investment, services, finance, banking, intellectual property, food, agriculture, transportation, and energy. The Bureau is also responsible for issues related to industrial cooperation and, generally, non-AFTA issues, including those involving the private sector. In addition to the AEM, the Bureau services the meetings of the Ministers of Agriculture, Energy, Finance, Transport, and Communications and Tourism, as well as that of their respective officials.

The Bureau of Functional Cooperation has been actively engaged in drawing up and coordinating the implementation of the Action Plans for Science and Technology, Environment, Culture and Information, Social Development, and Drug Abuse Control. In addition to this, the Bureau has also, among others, taken the initiative which resulted in the establishment of the ASEAN University Network and its Charter. The Bureau services the meeting of the Ministers and Senior Officials responsible for the respective sectors mentioned above and also services fully the five Committees on Functional Cooperation, their sub-committees and working groups.

The Bureau for ASEAN Cooperation and Dialogue Relations is responsible for the operationalisation of the project appraisal system adopted by the ASEAN Standing Committee. Under this system, project appraisal, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation procedures have been set up and the Bureau provides advisory services to the various ASEAN bodies on these procedures and in project formulation and design. The Bureau also identifies funding sources and assists Member Countries by preparing papers on development cooperation policies and strategies which are used as a basis for discussions with Dialogue Partners.

COUNTRY PROFILE OF BRUNEI DARUSSALAM (as of 29 June 1999)

POPULATION	: 315,292
POPULATION DENSITY	: 142 per sq. mi.
URBAN	: 70%
ETHNIC GROUPS	: Malay 64%, Chinese 20%
PRINCIPAL LANGUAGES	: Malay (official), English Chinese
CHIEF RELIGIONS	: Muslim (official) 63%, Buddhist 14%, Christian 8%
AREA	: 2,228 sq. mi.
LOCATION	: in South East Asia, on the North coast of the island of Borneo; it is surrounded on its landward side by the Malaysian state of Sarawak
CAPITAL	: Bandar Seri Begawan
TYPE	: Independent Sultanate
HEAD OF GOVERNMENT	: Sultan Sir Muda Hassanal Bolkiah Mu'izzadin Waddaulah b. July 15, 1946; in office: Jan. 1, 1984