

philippine studies

Ateneo de Manila University • Loyola Heights, Quezon City • 1108 Philippines

Towards A Southeast Asian Community

Review Author: Susan Evangelista

Philippine Studies vol. 25, no. 4 (1977) 496–498

Copyright © Ateneo de Manila University

Philippine Studies is published by the Ateneo de Manila University. Contents may not be copied or sent via email or other means to multiple sites and posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's written permission. Users may download and print articles for individual, noncommercial use only. However, unless prior permission has been obtained, you may not download an entire issue of a journal, or download multiple copies of articles.

Please contact the publisher for any further use of this work at philstudies@admu.edu.ph.

<http://www.philippinestudies.net>
Fri June 27 13:30:20 2008

alternately by Francisco A. Romualdez and Feliciano Jover Ledesma; to look backward or forward from the moment at hand to wax nostalgic or prophetic; to comment or to whisper asides, as one who lived a memory feels entitled to do.

Father Bernad is obviously writing about the Ateneo for Ateneans and friends. Unlike the scholar, Father Bernad's Atenean reader will not quibble over the fact that some footnotes are missing from places where scholarship would expect them to be; and will not be bothered by the fact that the list of abbreviations does not include *WL* (a search through footnotes later reveals this to be short for *Woodstock Letters*). Father Bernad's audience will reminisce with him, appreciate his comments and asides, and keep the book to show their grandchildren the parts they played in Ateneo dramatics of an era now gone.

The book is personal rather than scholarly, memoir rather than history, but from it can be gleaned material for history, and data to support further study.

Doreen G. Fernandez

TOWARDS A SOUTHEAST ASIAN COMMUNITY. By Estrella D. Solidum. Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press, 1974. 267 pages.

For all the non-politicians of the world today, government decision-making is a process shrouded in mystery. With every controversial government policy there is, at least among the more sophisticated laymen, widespread speculation: whose decision was it? On what basis was the decision made? What is the long-term purpose of the policy? It is our curiosity about such matters that leads us to books such as Ms. Estrella D. Solidum's *Towards a Southeast Asian Community*. This book is a study of decision-making in the five ASEAN countries over the ten-year period from 1959 to 1969, during which these nations tried out three different forms of regional cooperation: ASA (Thailand, Malaysia, Philippines); Maphilindo (Indonesia, Malaysia, Philippines); ASEAN (Thailand, Indonesia, Malaysia, Singapore, Philippines). It is a fascinating account of the trials these countries went through in their attempt to learn to cooperate to solve the problems that they shared — underdevelopment, poverty, colonial economies, internal subversion — and the problems that existed between them — Thai-Malaysian border troubles, the Philippines' claim to Sabah, the Indonesian policy of *Konfrontasi* against Malaysia.

Ms. Solidum uses as her framework a group of three hypotheses on how people learn to cooperate — i.e., by experiencing rewards for such activities before being asked to make sacrifices to further the joint interest. She then sets up five variables that were important in the group-cooperation efforts of

the countries involved: (1) external threat, (2) internal stability, (3) economic development, (4) the strategy of change to be used in broadening the concept of national interest to a more regional orientation, and (5) previous and present integrative experiences of the member states. She then measures these on a complex scale of converging and diverging attitudes as they show up in a thematic analysis of statements made by the political elite (i.e., policy makers) of the five countries, in and out of regional meetings, in the media, and in private interviews with the author. Through these statements (the "universe under examination") Ms. Solidum traces the slow growth of cooperative attitudes, which seem, incidentally, to have culminated recently in President Marcos' relinquishment of the Philippines' Sabah claim. The book is a very rich source of documentation for the growth of the "cooperative attitude" among the ASEAN nations, and this documentation is neatly coherent within Ms. Solidum's tight analytical framework.

But it is partly the very neatness of the framework that may lead one to wonder whether perhaps something got left out somewhere. Two questions arise. The first is whether knowing what a politician *says*, particularly to the press, is enough to know what he *thinks*, or *why*. Perhaps Ms. Solidum is wise to deal only with what can be actually established — i.e., with what people *say* — but a lingering doubt remains. However, the second question is more serious: one would like to know whether restricting the "universe under examination" to public *statements* does not, in effect, leave out some very important variables in the decision-making process. Speeches make things sound pretty easy, and even when people are talking about conflicts, they may leave out the real roots of the trouble.

For clarification we might look into other studies of decision-making and Asian efforts at regionalism. And Sussman's framework is not quite so neat nor Maphilindo: A Case Study of Philippine Foreign Policy Decision-Making" (M.A. thesis, Philippine Center for Advanced Studies, University of the Philippines, 1975). Mr. Sussman's work covers a shorter time-span — approximately three years to Ms. Solidum's ten — and it deals with only one of the Southeast Asian efforts at regionalism. And Sussman's framework isn't quite so neat nor so easily quantified, perhaps precisely because it is considerably broader: Sussman analyses decision-making in relation to "political, cultural, historical, economic, institutional, psychological, and systemic factors." He includes the information, for instance, that when President Macapagal was pushing the Sabah Claim, he was doing so in the face of considerable pressure — the "restraining influences of vested interests" (p. 302), including a hostile press, which interpreted the Sabah Claim as anti-American and pro-Communist (because of its connection with Sukarno and the Indonesian policy of *Konfrontasi*), and strong American pressure, which varied from "diplomatic warnings to diminishing loans, aid, or quota allocations" (p. 311). The main issue for the Americans was apparently Philippine nonrecognition of the

newly-created Malaysia, which of course included Sabah. On 20 September 1963, Macapagal received an Aide-Memoire from American President Kennedy pressuring him both to recognize Malaysia and to condemn Indonesian violence against the new state — with a none-too-subtly veiled threat of an American aid cut-off (p. 79–80). Men like Vice-President Emmanuel Pelaez and Ambassador Salvador Lopez, and presumably Macapagal himself, resented such threats greatly; but eventually Macapagal was forced to give way to these multiple pressures, including those applied by vested interests within the country, and the Sabah Claim was shelved.

No one — least of all Mr. Sussman — would want to imply that Maphilindo was not an honest effort at regionalism, by Asians and on behalf of Asians. Neither would one want to make such a statement about ASEAN; it is most certainly Asian in origin, intent, and, as Ms. Solidum effectively points out, in mode of operation. On the other hand it seems strange to ignore the fact of outside interference, and even of the interference of internal interest-groups. The making of foreign policy decisions is indeed a more complicated process than the statements that issue from the mouths of politicians in the end would lead one to believe.

Ms. Solidum is extremely optimistic about the growth of regionalism as shown in ASEAN, and she has every reason to be so, especially in the light of recent developments, for ASEAN does show a pronounced growth in positive attitudes toward cooperation. And from this point of view, the book is successful; it does, after all, do what it sets out to do, and it does it well. But in the final evaluation of ASEAN, we cannot afford to ignore outside pressures. ASEAN is with us, and it is Asian, but as Alejandro Lichauco recently pointed out in a symposium in the University of the Philippines, on ASEAN and the Philippine National Interest, it is an organization peculiarly open to outside manipulation. And as long as it sets its sights on pleasing multinational corporations, as it seems to be doing at present, it will be even more vulnerable to foreign pressures. Future scholars will find it necessary to take these pressures into consideration.

Susan Evangelista

MANDATE IN MOROLAND: THE AMERICAN GOVERNMENT OF MUSLIM FILIPINOS 1899–1920. By Peter Gordon Gowing. Quezon City: Philippine Center for Advanced Studies, 1977. xix, 411 pages.

Mandate in Moroland: The American Government of Muslim Filipinos is an encyclopedic treatment of the first two decades of American presence in the Philippines (1899–1920). It comprehends the entire period of military rule (1899–1913) and the initial years of civil government in Moroland (1913–1920). The military period involves the administration of three famous