SURVIVAL IN DIVERSITY

Leadership, Polity and Society in Southeast Asia

By Hong Soon-il *****

May 1978

* The author, a 1977-1978 Fellow, was senior editorial writer at *The Hankook Ilbo*, a vernacular daily published in Seoul, Korea, at the time of his affiliation with the CFIA. He previously served as managing editor of *The Korea Times* and, as of 2001, is working as an independent journalist/columnist. He can be reached at *ssiihong@kornet.net.*

Contents *

* Four tables were included in the original paper, one in Chapter II and three in Chapter III, as noted in the text. But, they are missing in this Web site version due to technical reasons.

Preface

Twenty years have elapsed since I wrote this paper during my sojourn at the Center for International Affairs (CFIA), Harvard University, as a Fellow during the 1977-1978 academic year. The year I spent in Cambridge, Massachusetts, was one of the most fruitful and enjoyable of my life. Freed from the burden of working at a daily newspaper, a journalistic career that began in 1954 when I joined the *Korea Times* as a young reporter, I could indulge in the pursuit of my research interests by taking advantage of the liberal academic environment of Harvard.

My interest in Southeast Asia dates back to 1961 when I first visited the region on a reportorial assignment. Then, in the autumn of 1974 or about half a year before the fall of Saigon and Vietnam's subsequent unification, I made an extensive tour through the region, conducting a round of exclusive interviews with top government leaders of the then five member countries of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) and the three Indochinese states, as well as of Taiwan and Japan.[1] This experience prompted me to further my study, journalistic rather than academic, of the rapidly changing region, and my residence at Harvard availed me to write this paper.

After the passage of two decades, the situation in Southeast Asia is quite different from what is written here. For one thing, ASEAN membership has increased from five in 1978 to nine, including Vietnam, the country the original members dreaded for so long. Many countries in the region have achieved remarkable economic development, well beyond their expectations in the 1970s, although they are presently beset by currency crises.

Notwithstanding, I have decided to reprint the paper in a bound edition for limited distribution with a hope that it may serve as a reference, despite its outdatedness, to students of Southeast Asia, an analysis that an Asian journalist made of the region's complex circumstances in the late 1970s. As I see it, many of the problems discussed in the paper, especially those involving the sociopolitical setting and leadership performance by power elites in a number of countries, still persist in various forms to hinder the further progress of each nation and the region as a whole. The paper's text, including facts and figures, is same as the original, except for minor copyreading corrections.

Taking this opportunity, I must acknowledge the tremendous assistance and guidance rendered to me by many professors and colleagues. First of all, I am ever grateful to Dr. Benjamin H. Brown, then CFIA Fellows Director, who made strenuous efforts on behalf of my fellowship for two years, especially

in connection with arranging financial support. In the course of writing the paper, I owed greatly to the precious advice and comments made by Harvard Professors Herbert Kelman, Benjamin I. Schwartz, Dwight H. Perkins, Jorge Dominguez (who became CFIA Director in 1996), Sidney Verba, Edward W. Wagner, Ezra Vogel (who interviewed me in Seoul during his business trip in 1977), and (the late) John K. Fairbank.

I also deeply appreciate the thoughtful comments made by my colleagues among the CFIA Fellows -- Professor Nancy Viviani (Australia); Ambassadors Samuel de Beauvais (France), Stephen Barrett (Britain) and Yoshio Karita (Japan); and General Dale Vesser (U.S. Army) -- with whom I occasionally had group discussions. Not to be forgotten is my longtime friend, George V. Liu, former editor-in-chief of the *Hong Kong Standard* and later senior information officer at the Asian Development Bank, whose insightful advice and assistance helped facilitate my interviews with the Southeast Asian leaders.

This reprinting was made possible by the kind efforts of Mr. Norman Ware, former copy editor at the Korea Foundation, who scanned the originally typewritten copy for word processing and for suitable copyreading. Finally, I thank my wife, Kum-soon (Kay), who among other things helped me finalize the typewritten copy, and my son, Yong-pyo, who endeavored to bring this reprint about.

Hong Soon-il

Seoul

September 1998

[1] The leaders, most of whom were authoritarian and who by 1998 had either resigned from public office or been ousted, include (in the order in which they were interviewed) Philippine President Ferdinand E. Marcos; Indonesian President Suharto; Singaporean Prime Minister Lee Kwan Yew; Malaysia's Acting Foreign Minister Ahmad Rithauddeen (in the absence of Prime Minister Abdul Razak); Thai Prime Minister Kukrit Pramoj; Sonnan Southichak, a Pathet Lao leader; Khmer (Cambodian) President Lon Nol; South Vietnamese President Nguyen Van Thieu; and Eisaku Sato, who had just resigned from the Japanese premiership.

I. Introduction

With the collapse of Saigon in the spring of 1975, the clamor of war in Indochina that had lasted for a quarter century was silenced as was the tumultuous world opinion that had accompanied the progress of the political-military confrontation in the peninsula.

The United States, once the dominant actor, rapidly retreated from the scene leaving behind a power vacuum. After its bitter experience in Vietnam, a diffident Washington is yet to present a clear coherent policy toward Southeast Asia -- a region that until three years ago preoccupied American society.

Notwithstanding this turn of events, Southeast Asia is engrossed in continuity and change involving intricate domestic and international problems, a situation that could have an impact on the world order no less significant than that of the Vietnam War, though it may not be as dramatic. The region, divided into Communist and non-Communist areas, bears the seeds not only of a possible conflict within the area but also of a clash between the major powers involved -- the United States, the Soviet Union, China and Japan. There are already signs of rivalry in the shifting balance of power in this geopolitically significant region.

Because of ethnic, religious and cultural diversity as well as differing colonial and post-independence foreign influences, the region still lacks a feeling of community among its component nations. Disputes between even the closest neighbors are recurrent: “Confrontation” in the mid-1960s between Indonesia and Malaysia is now succeeded by the bloodshed between the two Communist states of Vietnam and Cambodia -- despite the ideological alignments emerging in the region. This diversity, coupled with the trials and errors accompanying nation-building and fluidity in the regional environment, also gives rise to domestic unrest -- ranging from separatism and insurgency to communal strife and political instability -- in most countries of the region.

Endowed with rich natural resources and inhabited by about 350 million people, nearly one tenth of the world population, Southeast Asia has a strong potential for economic development and stands as a sizable trading partner with extraregional countries. Although the average annual economic growth rate of 6 percent recorded by non-Communist countries in recent years falls far short of meeting the "rising expectations" of the masses, there is already a disturbing tendency for the rich to get richer and the poor to get poorer in two ways -- within individual countries, creating problems of distribution and social

justice, and among the countries, hindering the progress of much-desired intraregional economic cooperation.

A survivor of numerous ephemeral regional organizations, the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), composed of five non-Communist nations, has recently begun to function as a cooperative entity -- largely at the impetus of the emergence of a Communist Indochina and consequent changes in the international climate. ASEAN nations are acutely concerned to chart a common political-security approach to cope with the new circumstances, in addition to advancing their avowed goal of economic collaboration. Yet, before it can develop a workable form of cooperation, ASEAN has to hurdle such obstacles as enduring conflicts of national interests and mutual distrust among its member nations, factors that had confined the organization to the cradle for nearly a decade after its birth in 1967.

Entwined with these problems are the pains of "political modernization" being experienced by the regional nations. While the Indochinese states are in the firm grip of totalitarian Communist regimes, authoritarianism is prevalent to varying degrees in the non-Communist states -- be it rule by military elites or one-party representative governments. Future political developments in these countries, including leadership succession crises in some cases, will have serious implications for domestic and regional political stability.

Nationalism and anticolonialism are still strong in Southeast Asia, although the ruling elites are attempting to translate the latter into a regionalist stance vis-à-vis outside powers. These rulers, who all experienced the colonial and semicolonial “yoke” of Western powers, insist that modernization of their nations should not be identical with Westernization.

“Don’t let us become a carbon copy nation,”[1] said Indonesian President Sukarno in the heyday of “guided democracy.” More than a decade later General Suharto, who had supplanted Sukarno, paraphrased his predecessor’s slogan by stating that a developing country should “refrain from simply borrowing stereotyped ideas and patterns” from advanced countries.[2] These identical views, also shared by other Southeast Asian leaders, illustrate their search for national independence and individuality.

With this complicated backdrop, a number of questions arise: What sorts of impacts have the diverse sociocultural traditions and colonial experiences had on the evolution and formation of indigenous elites in Southeast Asia? What are the traits and potentialities of the political leaders and governing elites of the region’s countries, and how can their political leadership be compared in terms of their internal and external roles? More specifically, how do these nations act towards neighboring states, intraregional

groups and extraregional powers and blocs? This paper primarily attempts to examine the conduct of external affairs of the nations, with these questions in mind.

Although Southeast Asia is generally defined as the arc of states stretching from Burma in the northwest to the Philippines in the northeast, the geographical extent of this study[3] is confined to the five ASEAN countries -- Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore and Thailand.[4] In this connection, the term “Southeast Asia” is often used in this paper to denote the ASEAN countries, unless otherwise specified or implied.

II. Quilt of Diversity: The Sociocultural Setting

Southeast Asia is destined to be the communications crossroads of Asia and thus is characterized by a great diversity and changes. Located along the sea lanes between the Pacific and Indian Oceans, the area from prehistoric days has seen consecutive migrations from north to south and from east to west, followed by large-scale emigrations during the colonial days; now, the region is a complex cluster of ethnic entities. While Southeast Asian countries each have distinct and separate traditions of their own, none has ethnolinguistic homogeneity. More than 150 languages and dialects exist in the region, most of which are mutually unintelligible. Diversities abound within each country, as several secluded communal groups live in close proximity to each other but are clearly demarcated by their distinct cultural heritage and sense of historical experience.

The geographical factor has also exposed the region to Asia's two high cultures, those of China and India, and later to Muslim and Christian merchant navigators who were followed by conquerors. Salient among the legacies of these outside influences is the presence of the world's major religions -- Buddhism, Islam, Christianity, Hinduism and Taoism in addition to all-pervading and basic animism -- a phenomenon unparalleled in other parts of the world.

Increasing these complexities in the region was the impact of yet another diversity in the Western colonial rules that framed the prevailing characteristics of contemporary Southeast Asian politics. The advent in the early sixteenth century of the Portuguese (Malacca) and Spaniards (the Philippines) was followed by the Dutch (Indonesia), the English (Burma, Malaysia, Singapore), the French (Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos) and the Americans (the Philippines), who began to recede only after World War II. Some of the imperialist powers, especially on the Southeast Asian mainland, drew up national frontiers often with scant regard for ethnic realities -- pre-existing economic and cultural patterns -- as they viewed the region largely in terms of its strategic position vis-à-vis India and China.

Because the cultural cleavages were so deep and traditional, persistent and powerful lines of self-identification and solidarity have developed within communal groups -- as has differentiation from other groups -- which undermine the integrity of the larger societies. This ethnic heterogeneity is a fertile source of domestic conflict that can unobtrusively become linked to interstate politics.

Ethnic Pluralism

Southeast Asian states are yet to fully develop national cohesion to go with their sovereign status, and the fragility of national identities is a major source of self-doubt among the elites, partly accounting for their intransigent nationalism. A major hindrance to the formation of much-needed national integrity is the ethnic diversity that afflicts every one of the nations with centrifugal forces ranging from political protest to open rebellion.

Despite the homogenizing pressures of modernization such as national political consolidation, mass media, market economy, industrialization and urbanization, ethnic problems -- coupled with diverse ethnolinguistic and religious compositions -- are ever persistent in the countries (see Table 1). The magnitude of this persistence is conjecturable as even more sophisticated and older Western nations are caught in frictions of the ethnic divisiveness -- some stricken with extreme separatist movements.

Ethnic problems were built into the Southeast Asian societies from the time of early migrations that date back to 2500 B.C. The earliest migrants, racially related to Malays, settled territories of Malaysia, Indonesia and the Philippines. They formed clusters of small solitary villages and lived a very circumscribed life, having tendency to be hostile toward people of other villages -- a pattern of life that can be found in rural Southeast Asia today. The second waves of migrants, coming from southern China, scattered across the mainland areas -- Burma, Thailand, Laos, Cambodia and Vietnam. Some of these peoples inhabited the lowlands while others settled, or pushed into, the less economically viable highlands -- a phenomenon that later became a source of conflict involving cultural and political centralism.

The last major migration began in the nineteenth century when colonial powers brought into the area a mass of Chinese immigrants, and Indians to lesser extent, as cheap labor forces for their tin mines and rubber plantations. These later migrants gradually settled in newly expanding urban commercial centers and filled the role of intermediary between Europeans and the local populace, creating another important source of racial friction. In addition to such purposeful immigration, colonial administrators employed various policies to tackle the ethnic diversity. Yet the policies often turned out -- deliberately or inadvertently -- to be a counterproductive form of “divide and rule.”

Following independence, national governments in the region have adopted their own ethnic homogenizing policies based on the generally accepted notion of legitimacy: that achievement of national integration, which can supersede ethnic cleavages, is the only way to ensure a state’s survival and growth. But the progress has been largely discouraging and time-consuming, because many of the policies were ill

conceived and, furthermore, the governments have been preoccupied with the impending task of building and sustaining the more basic structures of nation-states. A more fundamental factor is that these governments are erected on the foundations of the precolonial and colonial political and economic institutions, which unevenly distributed the skills and resources that affect the people's chances to influence or control central governments.[1]

The attempt to secure national unity, which transcends ethnic allegiances almost by definition, has often resulted in benefiting certain groups at the expense of, or more frequently than, others. Many central governments in the region are in fact ethnic themselves -- ethnic in their chief constituency, in their political and military recruiting patterns, in their perceptions of other groups in the nation, and in their discriminatory methods of distributing the benefits of economic development.[2]

This converse trend -- as well as the increasing need to concentrate power to meet complex domestic and international situations, and the emergence of sophisticated bureaucracies and mechanisms for planning -- paves the way for the centralization of political authority in national governments. With the consolidation of the state apparatuses, the central governments -- under the control of the largest or most dominant cultural groupings -- tend to extend their jurisdiction and control over smaller or peripheral cultural and ethnic groups, producing two contrasting reactions.

One result is that, owing to government policies aimed at a fair distribution of services and development benefits, even the resistant ethnic groups become cooperative as they find the need for access to and influence within the central government. The other result, when such policies do not exist or have failed, is intensified resistance. When the threatened subgroups have ties with dominant groupings in other countries, the conflict comes to have regional and even international implications as it can serve as a source of hostility between neighboring states. Such ties across the borders, for example, are reflected in the relations between the Malay minority in Thailand and Kuala Lumpur, and the Muslim insurgents in the southern Philippines and Kuala Lumpur over Sabah's role in their rebellion.

One ethnic problem of particular importance in terms of domestic, intraregional and extraregional politics is the sizable presence of overseas Chinese in every Southeast Asian country. The stark intensity of the Chinese problem was exemplified in 1965 when Malaysia terminated Singapore's participation in its federation because, among other reasons, the combination of the Chinese populace both in the island state and in the peninsula states of Malaya would be sufficient to place the Chinese in the majority. Other aspects of the problem are that the expatriate Chinese have certain cultural affinities with China, that they

have had relatively better access to education partly due to colonial policies, and that they still hold an enormous financial and commercial advantage despite vigorous "equalization" policies being pursued by local governments.[3] Although cultural affinity does not easily or automatically transform into political affinity, the envy and suspicion of Chinese communities within several countries have become mingled with fears of the People's Republic of China both as a great power and as a Communist country -- especially after the pro-Communist insurgency in Malaysia during the Emergency and after the Indonesian Communist Party was alleged to be behind an attempted coup in 1965.

Growing international economic interdependence also has a significant bearing on the region's ethnic issues. Although old forms of direct foreign interference are declining, indirect foreign influences are noticeable -- and likely to increase in the future -- in the conduct of development aid programs, investment and trade by foreign governments as well as by multilateral institutions and private enterprises. Whether intended or not, consequences bolstering certain ethnic and cultural groups tend to arise -- often intensifying ethnic friction -- even if the foreign institutions claim that they are only bolstering a national government or the national development plan. For, as Cynthia Encloe points out, the ethnic frictions in Southeast Asia should not be seen as mere disputes between allegedly rational central policymakers and certain parochial citizens but as the outcomes of significant differences between groups with dissimilar cultural values and different levels of economic and political power.

This is not to suggest that all communal conflicts in Southeast Asia will be violent ones or that they will be strong enough to topple a central government. In fact, the very diversity of the ethnic makeup will probably save most countries of the region from undergoing a polarizing conflict of the sort that has torn apart nations like Cyprus and Lebanon. The ethnic conflicts are not entirely unresolvable as they demonstrate a common feature that involves competition for the benefits of economic and social development -- an issue that can be managed by penetrating political measures and effective policy implementation on the part of the national governments. As yet, homogenizing efforts in most cases have proved to be sporadic and piecemeal, and the knotty ethnic problems remain to impinge on the ability of governments to marshal their national resources for effective development programs.

Religious Influence

Religion as an element in cultural pluralism is limited to the great world religions -- Islam, Buddhism, Hinduism and Christianity -- which offer not only a comprehensive worldview but also an all-embracing social identity, and all of them are deeply rooted in Southeast Asia. In most countries of the region, religion is a strong cohesive force, and its integrative power balances to some degree the disruptive consequences of rapid social change and modernization.

Historically, religion provided a basis for political organization in the traditional tribal societies as it played a substantial backup role for dominant outside cultures, which it helped in many cases to prevail in the region. Introduced first to the region largely through the spread of Hinduism and Buddhism, beginning in the fourth and fifth centuries A.D., were Indian concepts of government, which revolutionized the life patterns of most Southeast Asians. Chinese influence also penetrated throughout the region to lesser extent. The world of the indigenous had been confined to small communal units, closely knit by family or clan relations, and the hostility and violence between villages worked against the formation of larger political units and significant power centers.

With the new concepts of the nature of authority and man's relationship to his universe, which provided a justification for a ruling class, more complicated forms of government spread their roots in the region. The Hindu concept that the legitimacy of government has a divine basis also helped centralize authority around a "god king." Through this synthesizing process, Southeast Asian societies were divided between a ruling elite of a few who accepted more of the Hindu ideas embodying deterministic concepts of social status, and a mass population of peasants who favored Buddhism for its more individualistic basis of religious identity and salvation. The symbols of the monarchy were mainly derived from India as was the law from the early Indian legal code or the code of Manu.

Despite the influence of Indian culture, the Southeast Asian kingdoms -- Burma, Thailand, Cambodia, Laos and Indonesia -- did not become "little Indias." The Indian institutions and political philosophy were assimilated into the region without Indian colonial domination as the aspiring kings were able to reinforce their rule by these more sophisticated doctrines of legitimacy. Southeast Asians were also selective in adopting the foreign culture. For instance, except for the Balinese in Indonesia, they refused to retain the social caste system while accepting political features of Hinduism. Buddhism, on the other hand, was blended with many non-Buddhist indigenous features to provide a "complete" religion that answered a host of personal and social needs -- a factor that made Buddhism more popular among the population.

Islam underwent a similar transformation after its arrival in the fourteenth century. Although it turned the Indonesian and Malay states into Muslim sultanates, Islam had to compromise with the influences of Hinduism and Buddhism as well as of folk religions. The modification was also attributable to certain traits of Islam: that it is tolerant of other religions; that it is less a united cultural grouping; that it provides a single framework for political action; and that it lacks a formally invested and recognized religious hierarchy.

Although the Philippines saw its southern islands Islamized during the same period, the country as a whole had been left unaffected by any major outside culture until the arrival of Spaniards in the early sixteenth century. The subsequent Spanish colonial rule and influence transformed the Philippines into the only Christian country in Asia, providing it with a basic but clearly foreign cultural pattern in much the same way as the Indian-originated culture reshaped other Southeast Asian societies -- and as the Chinese influenced Vietnam.

Many features of the precolonial phase of Southeast Asian history are still to be found in the contemporary politics of the region. Lucian W. Pye defined this heritage in terms of four categories, which can be regrouped into three. First, Southeast Asian societies are still largely divided between an elite that is heavily influenced by foreign cultures and a mass populace that clings to more indigenous ways. Such class distinctions, reinforced by cultural differences, complicate the task of creating workable political systems today. Second, from the earliest times Southeast Asian political systems have heavily relied on the mystique of ideologies to bind their peoples together, and the governments have largely failed to establish a stable system of administration. A government was usually strong enough to discourage certain forms of secular life but not strong enough to change intentionally the life of the people in any fundamental way. Third, political life has largely been shaped by the activities of more or less autonomous groupings that form around the nucleus of one or more notable figures. Consequently, parochial loyalties have consistently dominated larger cultural or national loyalties.[4]

In many Southeast Asian societies today, religion remains a basic ingredient of social and national identity -- all the more so because of ethnolinguistic diversity -- although its impact on political life, especially on administrative elites, is waning. Religion's potential for political mobilization derives from its highly developed ritual and ceremonial practices, which serve as a constant reaffirmation of identity by reinforcing the sense of membership in a community; and from its elaborate symbolism, which provides a

basis for common perceptions and shared emotional reactions to real and imagined threats from the outside.

Islam, being political religion par excellence as demonstrated by its periodic contributions to state formation beginning with the Ottoman Empire and more recently to nationalist responses to colonial rule, is a basis for social cohesion for Indonesians and Malays. In much the same way, Buddhism plays an acculturating and socializing role for Thais -- and for that matter, for the neighboring Burmese, Cambodians and Laotians. The important influence that religion exercises over Southeast Asians is also backed up by the fact that the elaborate worldview of revealed religions has been more readily translated into political doctrines that can compete, or on occasion blend, with such modern secular creeds as nationalism, democracy and socialism.

Religion in Southeast Asia, especially Islam, also has intraregional and extraregional implications as exemplified by the support given to Filipino Muslim insurgents by Malay Muslims and by Libya. As for the impact of Muslim issues on regional cooperation, more specifically ASEAN, Seah Chee-meow cites two implications: First, the national governments cannot regard the Muslim issue as a purely domestic matter because of the common feelings of solidarity among Muslims worldwide and the emergence of Arab power in world politics; and second, ASEAN countries might use the Muslim issue for leverage in interstate relations in view of significant differences among themselves over their national interests.[5]

In the course of history, however, the once-dominant influence of religion on the ruling and administrative elites has declined because of past manipulation by Western colonists and because of the development of sophisticated statecraft and bureaucracy, which often find religious doctrines a hindrance in dealing with the complexities of contemporary politics, both domestic and international. The lessening influence is also attributable to some basic traits of religion, especially in cases of the benign, apolitical Theravada Buddhism and the tolerant Islam, which does not possess a formally invested hierarchy of its own.

In most Southeast Asian countries today, religion cannot readily act as an organized independent social force within society, although individuals are influenced by religious teachings and traditions. Only the Catholic Church in the Philippines provides a formal structure for a national society.

In Indonesia, the world's largest Muslim country where 90 percent of the people regard Islam as their religion, the Muslim Party stands as a junior political party partly due to the secularism that President Suharto has carried over from the nation's founder, Sukarno, in an attempt to check Islamic fanaticism.

Opposition to such a secular government policy is sizable and there are sporadic theocracy movements, sometimes generating fear of religious strife. But the Muslims are badly divided. There are two distinct Muslim groups -- devout *santri,* and lax *abangan,* which disregard ritual prescription and pious duty and continue to adhere to pre-Islamic beliefs.[6] The purists are further split between modernists and conservatives over the extent of compromise with modernization, and their infighting has undermined the organization of political parties and social associations. This phenomenon is also accountable for the relatively weak religious identities of Indonesian political elites.[7]

Similarly, the administrative elite of Malaysia, another Islamic country, holds a passive conception about religion. For this elite, religion exists much less to meet people's needs than to prevent them from engaging in the antisocial activities they are presumed to seek. Malaysian leaders see God as restraining the masses and preventing them from getting out of hand.[8] In the political sector, dominant Malay political organizations are eminently secular, and even a radical party that calls for a more rigorous application of the Islamic vocation of Malaysia is less a religious party per se than an aggressive Malay communal party.

Thai Buddhism has also become less social-action oriented, and its authority structure as a religious organization is rather loose. It does not assert the power of control in any forceful way and, by nature, it generally subordinates the affairs of the world to a concern with escaping from it. It "ascribes no particular merit to purposive, impersonal administrative organization and, at best, productive bureaucratic behavior is Buddhistically neutral and not highly meaningful."[9] This benevolent tolerance has given the Thai elite both a tendency to be diffusive in their roles and an impressive capacity for adaptation.

The Legacy of Colonial Rule

The argument over the impact of colonialism is acute in Southeast Asia, where all but one country, Thailand, were under Western colonial rule until two or three decades ago -- most of them having their own cultures and traditions that predated Western encroachment. Today some leaders of the region openly stress the need for de-Westernization in their national modernization schemes, underlining the magnitude of past Western influence.

The process of colonization in Southeast Asia began in the sixteenth century with the coming of the Portuguese and the Spanish followed by the Dutch, the English, the French and the Americans, although the effective colonial penetration of the region -- except the Spanish Philippines -- can be dated

from the nineteenth century. The blending process that has occurred since then is comparable to what followed the earlier diffusion of Hinduism, Buddhism, Islamism and Chinese influence, which by the time of the Western influx had long lost their stimulating force in regional life.

European-derived ideas and institutions -- initially brought in by Westerners as a means of protecting their trade interests and evangelism, and gradually strengthened for the extended exploitation of local resources -- stirred up the static Southeast Asian societies. Consequent changes affected a wide spectrum of regional life -- ranging from education and urbanization to economic systems and government forms -- and, inevitably, provoked a response in the form of nationalism. In this context, the most important aspect of the Western impact was perhaps the stimulus it created among the Southeast Asians -- the need for reappraisal of their changing life patterns and value systems, and the pursuit of a new modernity equipped with their own national and regional identity. The process of change -- adaptation and blending -- is still under way.

The greatest influence of the West in Southeast Asia was in the realm of government, and its traces can be found throughout the region's contemporary politics. The colonists provided the framework for the new national entities, and this also motivated many peoples to have their first feeling of belonging to some wider political system and of sharing an identity with others beyond their local community. In addition, the Dutch established the modern boundaries of Indonesia, embracing 3,000 islands, as did the Spanish in the Philippines.

Colonialism also encouraged the emergence of an administrative class, who served as functionaries and as petty officials for the colonial machinery. Whether they engaged in indirect rule or harsh rule by gunpoint, the colonial powers needed indigenous help to keep the vast area under control and overcome various obstacles that stem from ethnolinguistic and cultural diversity. Because of the impossibility of full cultural representation in formulating an indigenous administrative elite within a colony, the colonial rulers tended to favor one or two cultural groups that were more accessible and relatively enlightened.

Thus, while the Spanish hired more Tagalogs as helping hands, the Dutch turned to the Javanese, resulting in the often disputed overrepresentation of these ethnic groups in the contemporary Philippine and Indonesian governments. The British ingenuity of fostering a colonial civil service, as demonstrated in India, took an expedient form in Malaya until the 1930s. Mainly because of their desire to leave Islam untouched and the ready availability of Chinese and Indian subalterns, in addition to the abundant supply

of European cadres, the British felt relatively less urgency in educating Malays for administrative service, although they did train a modest number of Malay elites for selective services such as those performed by sultanates. This discrepancy in the British colonial policy -- though reversed later to give preference to the Malays -- gave rise to a highly politicized Chinese community, which in turn served as a sharp stimulus for pan-Malay anticolonial nationalism and caused protracted Malay-Chinese communal frictions that overshadow Malaysia even today.

The indigenous administrative force later became a cornerstone for independent governments of the region, but it lacked a basic ingredient essential to a sovereign government. Being an institution geared as a tool of colonial rule, the administrative elite -- regardless of its size and standard -- was not equipped with experience in public problem solving and decision making at the state level. Moreover, the model of government provided by colonial rulers was a misleading one. Because it functioned in the colonies subject to policy guidelines charted by the metropolitan state, the "government" emphasized the administrative over the political. The colonial government was not a responsible government in that it was not responsible to the people it ruled. The governor was responsible only to his home government.

There were some instances in which colonial powers introduced to their colonies certain examples of political institutions, such as legislatures, political parties and labor unions. The recipient countries include the Philippines, for which the United States, successor to the Spanish, scheduled independence in 1944, and Malaya, where the British proclaimed a constitutional structure in 1948 as a transitional step before granting independence a decade later. But the sociopolitical pains that these and other Southeast Asian countries have suffered since their independence underline the fallacy of the often heard claim that democracy was implanted in Southeast Asia by the West only to be trampled by indigenous rulers. Colonial rule in the region lasted long enough to disrupt traditional patterns of authority, but it made no serious efforts either to erect any equivalent new structures or to provide experiences essential to the smooth operation of what the colonists claimed to be a legacy of their prolonged presence -- democracy. And colonial rulers, even as they expanded public functions and strengthened the authority of government, remained firm in denying aspirations for national identity, for political equality, and for political participation. Of the three political requisites of modernization, the colonial system supplied at best one.[10]

Another notable aspect of Western colonialism in Southeast Asia is that the different policies pursued by the several colonial powers tremendously increased the diversity already existing in the region.

The diverse systems of colonialism have left two legacies, which are detrimental both to the much-sought regional cooperation and to integration: first, different patterns of contemporary political development as well as different economic and legal systems, and second, lack of intraregional communication and understanding, which has often contributed to distrust and animosity among neighboring countries. In fact, a generation after independence, elites of the region are often more familiar with current events in the homeland of their former colonial overlords than with the problems of their neighbors. This is largely attributable to the inertia dating back to the pre-independence days when colonial powers, frequently engaged in rivalry among themselves, institutionalized bilateral intercourse between colony and metropole while neglecting multilateral intercourse in the region.

In a review of political developments in the region, the Philippines stands out, as it was subjected to the direct Spanish colonial system for more than three centuries and then a half century of American dominion -- altogether much longer than any of its neighbors' colonial experience. Moreover, unlike most of its neighbors, the Philippines did not have a significant indigenous precolonial culture or a centralized kingdom. As they converted the Filipinos to Roman Catholicism, the Spaniards rooted in the islands their own version of a hierarchical colonial structure -- an extended *patrón* system that lives on to influence Philippine politics today, especially in interpersonal relations. The American interlude did not fundamentally alter these Hispanicized cultural parameters, but it provided a particular sequence of political development -- the introduction of certain American political ideas and institutions and an emphasis on public education. Being an extraordinary combination of Asian, Spanish and American traditions, the Philippines has displayed multifaceted political frameworks since its independence -- ranging from a much-praised "showroom" of Western democracy to a version of "authoritarian democracy."

Two other former colonial powers among the present ASEAN countries, Britain and the Netherlands, followed policies that were again radically different. They both colonized Islamic countries, Malaya and Indonesia, of similar ethnic origins -- first with classic methods of indirect rule and then with complex direct rule as their economic and commercial interests grew beginning in the nineteenth century. The British in Malaya, by way of precaution against Islamic repercussions, employed a complex government system for the various Malay sultanate states and the Straits Settlements, which included Singapore, and made efforts to preserve the Malay aristocracy by providing for the indigenous elite. They also trained a considerable number of Asians for administrative roles, although a relatively large

recruitment of Chinese and Indians in the initial stages invited Malay resistance. Such a double-edged British colonial policy left Malaya with many of its traditional symbols of authority protected, which was an important element in maintaining relative political stability after independence.

On the other hand, the Dutch in Indonesia asserted greater direct administrative control, without introducing a legal system and Westernized forms of government to the same degree as the British in Malaya. The Dutch sought to maintain many of the traditional Indonesian patterns of life and, in the process, they discouraged most Indonesians from becoming part of modern society. They did recruit indigenous peoples, largely Javanese, for administrative service dealing with Indonesians at large, but their system was far behind the British practice of establishing homegrown administrative machinery. The Dutch policy was often considered during its heyday to be a model of colonial rule because of its sympathy for the traditional life patterns of the indigenous people. However, it proved to be inadequate for the creation of a new state. For fear of the nationalist movement that later began to assume extreme proportions, the Dutch opposed the formation of a national cadre, the lack of which became one of the principal causes of the troubles that beset independent Indonesia.[11]

III. Potential and Disparity: Aspects of Socioeconomic Modernization

Modernization is a multifaceted process involving changes in all areas of human thought and activity. Discussing the principal aspects of modernization, Samuel P. Huntington has grouped those facets most relevant to politics into two categories: social mobilization and economic development. Social mobilization refers to changes in people's attitudes, values and expectations from those associated with the traditional world to those common to the modern world -- a consequence of literacy, education, communication, mass media exposure and urbanization. Economic development refers to the growth in the total economic activity and output of a society, which, involving capabilities of the societal components, can be measured by per capita gross national product, the level of industrialization and the level of individual welfare.[1] More recently, arguments about economic development have also turned on questions of the internal distribution of income, the vulnerability of economies to outside influences, and other issues related to national self-reliance.

Southeast Asian countries, when observed with these criteria in mind, offer a picture mixed with potential and disparity -- a picture that can be found in most developing nations. Yet it is a complex one in view of differences among the regional states not only in their physical features such as the size of territory and population and the abundance of natural resources but also in their diversity in terms of sociopolitical backgrounds, the performance of their political leadership, and the modernization patterns they have pursued.

The five ASEAN member states, in general, are in better socioeconomic shape than most of their neighbors in Indochina and the Indian subcontinent. The quintet's average per capita GNP of US$835 in 1975 outstrips by far the South Asian average of $133, the poorest in the world. But it lags behind Africa's $1,520 as well as the world average of $1,448. The ASEAN figures also show an enormous disparity among its member countries -- ranging from $215 for Indonesia, the world's fifth most populous country, which has undergone severe political upheavals since its independence that have undermined development programs, to $2,516 for Singapore, a booming city-state that has followed a process of industrialization under a consistently puritanical political leadership (see Table 2).

The ASEAN region is endowed with rich natural resources. It produces nearly 90 percent of the world's natural rubber, 70 percent of its copra, 65 percent of its palm oil and 50 percent of its tin; these commodities continue to make up a substantial portion of the regional states' badly needed foreign

currency earnings (see Table 3). Indonesia's oil bonanza was followed by Malaysia's oil operations; the recent discovery of offshore oil fields provides a source of anticipation for the Philippines and Thailand; and Singapore has fast become a major oil-refining center of the world. Yet many of the countries are uneasy because their economies, despite vigorous industrialization efforts, are still very much dependent on their natural resources -- a legacy of colonialism, which shaped these countries as suppliers of primary goods to the metropolitan markets. Fluctuations in world market prices of these commodities, together with the development of synthetics that can serve as substitutes for some of the natural products, make it all the more difficult for Southeast Asian economic planners to chart workable long-range development programs.

Despite large populations and high population growth rates, the region as a whole has the capacity to overcome food deficits, owing to its natural advantages and, moreover, to recent technological developments, which have brought great improvements in strains of rice and consequently higher yields. Some former food-importing countries in the region have now become self-sufficient. Yet this "green revolution" tends to create tension in some Southeast Asian societies as the gap increases between the richer and poorer peasants, a situation that calls for careful social innovations. The gap becomes obvious as the "miracle rice" requires extensive fertilizers and irrigation, both of which are more readily obtainable by richer and more advantageously located farmers. A fair distribution of food within each country is another difficult question in the absence of welfare policies or other adequate means of income distribution to give the poor access to their share of the available food. This problem also has interstate implications in that food distribution between exporting countries like Thailand and importing states like Indonesia may create occasional balance-of-payment issues.

An estimated 43 percent of the Southeast Asian population was under 15 years of age in 1976, compared to only 27 percent in the same age group in the United States and 24 percent in Europe.[2] By the end of the century these large numbers of youths, a great majority of whom will be literate, will be in their most productive years. If most of these people can be provided with employment in accordance with their capabilities, there could be a phenomenal upsurge in production and living standards. But can it be done? Or will these countries, now harboring "nonproductive children" and "troublemaking teenagers," become nations of vast unemployment? Statistics vary, but it is a known fact that economic development in the region is not progressing fast enough to provide full employment for rapidly growing numbers of young adults.

The social mobilization of the unemployed is bound to increase in the coming years, and the political consciousness of this class will broaden to constitute a political factor of immense potential significance. In this connection, militant and highly politicized student movements, one of most energetic elements of these societies, will remain a major threat to political stability in almost every country, as they have been since the 1960s. Aside from their prescribed political mottoes such as nationalism, democracy and anticorruption, the students are haunted by slim prospects of obtaining reasonable jobs upon graduation. Many of the regional governments have employed policies that alienate troublesome students, and the alienated activists often turn to sporadic violence -- as witnessed in recent years in Indonesia and Thailand, as well as in the United States, Western Europe and Japan -- to further complicate the situation.

With these and other contrasting circumstances notwithstanding, the ASEAN nations have managed their respective development programs reasonably well -- Singapore performing startlingly -- to maintain an average annual growth rate of 5 to 8 percent since the late 1960s. Three non-oil countries -- the Philippines, Singapore and Thailand -- have made a slow but steady recovery from the 1973 oil crisis despite a train of adverse developments on the international economic front: worldwide inflation and economic recession, sharp increases in oil prices and worsening terms of trade, most of which affected oil-producing Indonesia and Malaysia as well. The value of the five nations' aggregate exports in 1976 increased by an estimated 20.9 percent over the 1975 total of US$18,625 million, while their trade deficits decreased by 15.7 percent. Such a favorable trade performance was largely due to the economic recovery in many industrialized countries in the second half of 1975 and the first half of 1976 -- particularly in Japan and the United States, which together account for more than a half of ASEAN's trade. The region's recovery and growth can also be attributed to "the resilience and growing sense of self-reliance and economic discipline" among the nations, as the Asian Development Bank cited in its 1976 Annual Report, and to improvement in their economic management.

In most nations of the region, governments have assumed the major responsibility for economic development and have become deeply enmeshed not only in economic planning and decision making but also in other economic processes involving direct controls, public financial institutions and various state enterprises. However, with the exception of Singapore and more recently of Malaysia, the governments have performed poorly in efficiently pursuing a coherent, cohesive and lasting course. Government roles in these states often do not reflect a commitment to markets, competition and efficiency so much as they

reflect a preference for control and regulation of economic activities, enabling the pursuit of those national interests identified by the elites exercising power.

All ASEAN countries have been making sustained efforts toward industrialization, which offers the possibility of creating more jobs and diversifying development. While there have been some impressive achievements, such as in Singapore, these nations' attempts to break into industrial markets have often been held back by a vicious circle of underdevelopment: lack of capital, poor infrastructure, and a low level of education and know-how. Moreover, industrialization tends to follow a well-beaten path starting with textiles, then moving on to electronics and other industries involving semiskilled assembly jobs that rely on low labor costs -- resulting in keen competition among the regional countries. In order to avoid such overlapping and competition, the ASEAN states worked out a joint industrialization agreement in 1976 under which each of the five member countries agreed to establish a major industrial project, with no similar project being allowed in other states. The agreement is aimed at enabling each of the five projects to serve the whole region and evolve eventually into multinational enterprises, but the projects have so far made sluggish progress.

Governments in the region have all stated their commitment to improving the material circumstances of their populations, particularly the more disadvantaged sections of society, through economic advancement and egalitarian distribution of the benefits. But the rate of economic expansion has frequently fallen below expectations, and, furthermore, economic inequality has actually been increasing in most cases -- having implications in both the domestic and cross-national dimensions. For instance, the per capita incomes of Indonesia and Malaysia would double in about nine years -- to $430 and $1,522, respectively, by 1984 -- were the 1976 growth rates to remain constant and accepting the 1975 per capita incomes at face value. (Both figures quoted in Table 2 seem optimistic.) A per capita income of $430, as expected in Indonesia by the mid-1980s, is much lower than the expectations of Malaysians. The disparity between the two neighboring countries will not only place strains upon efforts toward regional collaboration but also create social tensions in Indonesia as the people, being subject to the psychological impact of "relative deprivation," will be irritated by their lesser fortune and become more demanding about their standard of living.

The more difficult question involves the maldistribution of wealth and development benefits within a society. According to the latest data available, the poorest 40 percent of the population in the ASEAN countries, excluding Singapore, generally receives less than 15 percent of the total national income, and

even in faster-growing countries the difference between the rich and the poor has remained intact or in some cases widened (see Table 4) This phenomenon opens the way to gross social disaffection, which merges with ethnic and ideological cleavages. The consequent social stresses tend to be aggravated by the fact that the countries are undergoing rapid economic development -- a process that, while creating possibilities for the future, often generates new social tensions as people become increasingly conscious of economic and social inequality.

IV. Aspiration and Reality: Political Development

"We have no other choice but to adopt Western parliamentary democracy. Democracy is democracy, and we cannot distinguish Western and Eastern democracy,"[1] said a determined Kukrit Pramoj upon the promulgation of a new Thai Constitution in October 1974, for which he had played a leading role as speaker of the Constituent Assembly. Less than half a year later, he became prime minister of a newly elected civilian government, a coalition of several parties none of which could maintain a majority force in parliament. In the spring of 1976, he was forced out of office amid worsening political bickering that entailed economic distress and social unrest, including violent clashes between left- and right-wing students who three years earlier had toppled a military regime. In two years since Kukrit's departure, the Thai government has changed hands four times, twice by military coup d'état, and another Constitution was drafted to become the tenth since the establishment of the constitutional monarchy in 1932. In fact, the Thais have had 41 governments in the past 46 years.

The vicious circle of developments in Thailand over the past several years may not be representative of Southeast Asian politics, and it has certainly been excessively dramatic even for the Thais. Yet it vividly tells of the enormous problems and obstacles, both actual and potential, that Southeast Asia faces in the process of political modernization. Many, if not all, of the leaders ruling the five ASEAN countries insist that parliamentary democracy is the ultimate form their governments will assume. But the actual performance of these leaders in most cases has betrayed this professed goal, either through their own political manipulation or because of the pressure of adverse developments, ranging from domestic social conflicts and economic crises to insurgent movements and menace from without -- or because of both factors working together. In fact, the leaders justify the courses they have taken in the name of economic progress and national security.

In the initial period of transition from colonialism to independent national existence, these countries, except Thailand, adopted the political heritage of colonialism -- democratic institutions with British, American and Dutch variants of representative government -- with considerable eagerness. However, for all of the countries in the region, characterized by tremendous diversity and engulfed in the vortex of international power politics, the cost of maintaining national integration with their short experience in administering national institutions was high -- civilian governments have been severely taxed and the better-organized military is dominant in Indonesia and Thailand; Malaysia has had to abrogate

parliamentary democracy and still maintains restrictive measures on many sensitive issues; Singapore has moved toward essentially one-party rule; and even in the Philippines, once regarded as an Asian model of American democracy, competitive democracy has given way to martial-law authoritarianism. In most of these countries, some institutions do not perform the particular functions that in the Western setting they were designed to perform. Elections have often been used as a means of mobilizing public support, or of reasserting the legitimacy of an incumbent regime, rather than as a device for selecting from among alternative candidates; political parties have been either transformed into a facade of the ruling elite or weakened, if not fragmented, to the extent that they have virtually lost their popular base; legislatures and courts have lost their authority and independence; and cabinets have frequently been transmitters of decisions made by power elites rather than decision-making bodies in their own right.

All of the five countries have experienced human rights problems of varying degrees. The situations range from Indonesia's prolonged detention of a large number of persons whom the government alleges were implicated in the 1965 coup attempt but lacks evidence to put on trial, to Singapore's abusive application of internal security legislation against political opposition. Freedom of the press has also been curtailed in such ways as the exercise of self-censorship by the media in the Philippines, which in effect means that they carry nothing critical of the government and are essentially controlled, or the licensing of the presses and publications under the 1948 Printing Press Ordinance in Malaysia. All of the countries have been classified in the "partly free" category by the U.S. Department of State in its annual Human Rights Reports to the Congress. In this respect, many government leaders of the region have claimed that a Western-style democracy is not appropriate to the needs of developing countries in Asia -- at least for the present. It is far better, they have argued, that the people are freed from hunger and provided with the increasing benefits of economic development with fewer worries about social disorder and external threat, than that they have freedom to express "irresponsible" opinions that may lead to public disruptions. Sukarno in the late 1950s, after subduing extensive rebellions in outlying areas of the Indonesian archipelago, advocated "guided democracy" by which Indonesia was to be ruled by the president and carefully selected spokesmen for various "functional interests" and communities in the country, rather than by popular elections and political parties. In the mid-1970s, Suharto expounded his "New Order" concept of democracy:

> The most ideal and feasible form of democracy in Asia is closely related to the national identity and characteristics as well as the degree of intelligence of the people concerned. In

> application of the democratic principle, or the majority rule, the people should be led to understand that they do not demand rights only … but fulfill their responsibilities. The rule of national consensus and mutual consent is important, and in Indonesia it is based on the five principle of *pancasila*.[2]

At about the same time, Cambridge-educated Prime Minister Lee Kuan Yew of Singapore said more straightforwardly in an interview:

> Western democracy does not suit every nation, especially in Asia where traditional background is so much different from the West. A successful operation of democracy in Asia requires certain basic elements such as a fair level of education, economic standard and social climate.[3]

Philippine President Ferdinand E. Marcos, who professes "constitutional authoritarianism," was blunt when he said:

> History of mankind indicates that whenever there is a serious crisis there is a tendency toward authoritarianism and our 1935 Constitution (adopted under the American dominion) allows authoritarianism. … Ours is a crisis government -- a more effective, efficient and expeditious government -- to undertake a democratic revolution … All forms of revolution are a manifestation of the democratic principle, seeking to reach its perfect form. But no government has ever been perfect, whether Western or Asian. Let no Westerners point to their government as a perfect form of democracy.[4]

Should these statements, which find concurrence from some other Asian leaders, be taken merely as a cover-up; as a plausible exculpation of the failure of their crisis management capacity to overcome political issues, social conflicts and economic crises; or even as concealment for personal or group ambitions? Should the widespread reversal to authoritarianism, in one form or another, be simply blamed on the "inability" of political elites -- or, for that matter, on that of the masses -- to digest the unfamiliar rules of the political game imported from the West? Above all, is Western democracy the only and most ideal form of government for all mankind? Many doubt, but even if it is so and if it is not feasible for the time being, what would be the recourse or expedient that would pave the way to the ultimate goal?

First of all, constitutional arrangements in most of the Southeast Asian countries were discarded, or temporarily shelved, not because they became unfashionable or unacceptable but because they have so far failed to work smoothly in indigenous settings. It would also be erroneous to assume, as did the American Declaration of Independence and other classic documents of the Western era of revolution, that free or representative institutions are somehow the "natural" form of government, which will spring up as soon as the restraints of tyranny or foreign rule are relinquished.[5]

In Europe and North America, political modernization has required a history, stretching over several centuries, of modernization in other related fields -- such as in the administrative, economic, social and educational sectors. According to Cyril Black's formulation, England, the first modernizer, took 183 years -- from 1649 to 1832 -- for the consolidation of modernizing leadership. For the second modernizer, the United States, the consolidation period lasted 89 years, from 1776 to 1865; and for 13 other countries, mostly in Western Europe, which entered the consolidation phase during the Napoleonic period (1789**1815), the average time required was 73 years. Black lists that Japan required 77 years, from 1868 to 1945, and China 44 years, from 1905 to 1949. For 21 of the 26 countries, including some of ASEAN nations, that began the consolidation process during first quarter of the twentieth century and had emerged as modern nations by the 1960s, the average time required for the process was only 29 years.[6]

Black's formulation, though subject to dispute with regard to the criteria selected for leadership consolidation and the determination of periods, provides a dramatic basis for examining the differences in the rate of change between early and late modernizers. Whereas Western democracies could deal with crises and other issues sequentially over a long span of time, developing nations have faced a simultaneous surge of new and complex problems -- ranging from centralization of authority, national integration and political participation to social mobilization, economic development and social welfare. The much faster rate of modernization, as compared to the earlier modernizing countries, has resulted in political instability, one of major factors undermining the smooth democratic growth of developing nations in Southeast Asia and elsewhere. For instance, the faster the enlightenment of the population, the more sophisticated the destabilizing behavior that results. Rapid economic growth often entails income inequalities, which, coupled with social mobilization, widens the gap between aspiration and expectation and disrupts traditional social groupings, creating circumstances conducive to revolutionary protest.[7]

Southeast Asia, in a sense, has been a melting pot of major ideologies, and the regional countries are in search of their own ideological identities. Religion's once-dominant cohesive power has waned, and the appeals of nationalism that were readily focused against the foreigner during the drives for national independence -- and for some time after independence -- have lost their fundamental force. Political leaders, thinkers and writers of these countries, in varying degrees, have been searching for the meaning of their societies and for the most effective approach to modernization -- and, for that matter, for the most ideal yet workable form of government. This is in large measure a reflection of the lack of consensus in these countries as they attempt to transform the traditional order into modern societies.

The five ASEAN countries have one common ground -- anticommunism. Although all of them rushed to establish diplomatic relations with Hanoi following the end of Vietnam War -- and, except Indonesia and Singapore, with Beijing -- every one of these countries has outlawed Communist parties at home. But Indonesia's Communist Party until 1965 was the largest outside the Communist world, and the other ASEAN countries are ever on alert against Communist insurgency. The emergence of Communist Indochina poses a serious menace, as a source of both overt and covert threat, to the ASEAN countries, especially Thailand and Malaysia -- and, in fact, the activities of the regional organization were vitalized by the fall of Saigon in 1975. What worries the ruling elites of the region is the fact that their countries were all exposed to communism, to varying extents, from the days of the anticolonialist struggle onward, and that roots of communism remain, though very much contained in recent years. Socialism, like Marxism, has lost much of its influence. But because it was an important ideological force immediately after independence, particularly in Sukarno's Indonesia, socialism still serves as an ideological facade for some of these countries; Singapore, for example, until 1976 remained a member of the Socialist International.

Diversity in the political heritage of colonialism --parliamentary democracy with different shades of British, American, Dutch and French influences -- also played a distracting role for indigenous political elites when they came to develop their own forms of government. In addition, democratic India and Communist China have provided two starkly different models of state building. Southeast Asian leaders tended to take note of the flaws resulting from actual operations of the colonial heritage in neighboring states as well as in their own lands, and, consequently, they became less enthusiastic to preserve inefficient political systems handed over by former colonial masters. Also not to be overlooked is the undercurrent of traditional Confucian concepts of statesmanship and of the relationship between the ruler

and the masses. Although neither articulated nor influential in most cases, the Confucian influence is felt among overseas Chinese, some of whose descendants have crept into the ruling hierarchies of many regional countries -- especially Singapore, which is often called a "Third China."[8]

With these and numerous other factors hindering the smooth growth of parliamentary democracy and causing so many difficulties, the region's leaders in power have tended to give priority to another pressing issue: "prosperity," or economic development. They cannot altogether shelve the political issue because of the growing popular aspirations and demands for political participation and social justice, which also involve problems related to the legitimacy of governments, and because prosperity is closely related to a stable political environment. In fact, many of the leaders, either willingly or reluctantly, have reiterated their promise to the people that "free democracy," or representative government, is the very goal at which they are aiming but which they have noted can be attained more smoothly through economic development in a climate of stability. At the same time, the ruling elites have stressed that the "democratic" system alone cannot ensure democracy, justifying their current course of action: expedient yet effective and efficient government.

Samuel Huntington and Joan Nelson have categorized the development patterns of contemporary developing countries into four models -- bourgeois, autocratic, populist and technocratic. In this respect, most, if not all, of the ASEAN countries appear to have adopted the technocratic model, which is characterized by low levels of political participation, high levels of investment (particularly foreign investment) and economic growth, and growing income inequalities. This model assumes that political participation must be held down, at least temporarily, in order to promote economic development, and that such development necessarily involves at least temporary increases in income inequality.[9]

In their efforts to sustain rapid economic progress and domestic security, the ASEAN countries have built up strong, centralized governments backed up by armies, which in some cases play the dominant role, and by bureaucracies that have grown in both size and sophistication. The importance of political parties as political actors has been overshadowed, if not dwarfed, by individual political leaders in many instances.

Gone from the ASEAN region are such charismatic leaders as Sukarno and Ramón Magsaysay -- and, for that matter, Abdul Rahman -- who championed the shaping of national identities and the coherence of their countries at a time when they were exposed to an extreme post-independence conflict of values. These and other "first-generation" nationalistic leaders have been replaced by more pragmatic

leaders who push programs rather than ideology, and who give priority to political tranquility and planned economic development rather than to the expansion of political participation. The shifting patterns of leadership in many Southeast Asian countries, in a sense, fits John Kautsky's hypotheses that in the post-revolutionary period ideologues are progressively displaced by bureaucrats, revolutionary modernizers by managerial modernizers, and specialists in ideas by specialists in control and coercion.[10] In a number of countries in the region, power resides in one-man personal leadership or in a military-civilian oligarchy, thus often raising questions as to the likelihood of a peaceful and orderly transition of power.

Political parties occupy a peculiar place in these countries. The first-generation leadership parties were often characterized by highly personalized organizations reflecting the personalities of leading figures, lacking deep roots within the society. Today, in many of the countries, there is little sign of multiparty systems, and the government parties, enjoying overwhelming dominance in legislature, are quasi-alliances or associations of functional and ethnic groupings. In the Philippines, the once dominant yet faction-ridden Nacionalista and Liberal Parties were disbanded by martial law in 1972, and their places were filled by the government-controlled New Society Movement, which swept the 1978 general elections -- the first in six years. In Indonesia, the military-led Golkar -- an outgrowth of the long-standing Indonesian tradition of relying on functional organizational movements, which was initiated by the Dutch and reintroduced by Sukarno in his program of "guided democracy" -- has proved itself an effective organ for enforcing and legitimizing the military domination of Indonesian politics. The moderate socialist People's Action Party of Singapore has become closely identified with the highly efficient government administration in the country's transformation into an essentially technocratic one-party state. Malaysia's governing National Front is a form of nationalist coalition party system, which since independence has sought to represent the country's ethnic groups and to bring them together in a cooperative effort for the national good.

As charismatic leaders left the scene and the role of political parties waned, military influence in politics grew more important. The military dominates the governments in Indonesia and Thailand -- the latter largely under the military's shadow ever since a 1932 coup. In the other countries, martial law in the Philippines has brought the army close to the center of government, racial tension and insurgency in Malaysia has boosted the role of military, and even in Singapore the government has shown indications that it understands the value of a loyal army for maintaining political stability. In addition to commonly accepted reasons for military intervention in politics -- such as the army's organized power, modernizing role and frustration over incompetent and weak civilian government -- the situation in Southeast Asia

contains some unique features. Many of the countries have built up relatively large military establishments because of the need to meet the threat of Communist insurgents and dissident groups since independence. As the army played an important part in Indonesia's independence movement and Thailand's reform to constitutional monarchy, military leaders in the two countries developed an early concern for the course of their nations' political development. Moreover, the prevalent fact that divisive forces in Southeast Asian countries have proved too strong for parliamentary institutions has opened the way for the disciplined military to provide a stopgap method of rule in otherwise undisciplined societies.

Whatever its ideological orientation may be, a government must rely on a civil bureaucracy whose role becomes more crucial in the management of economic development. All of the ASEAN countries have a shortage of competently trained civil servants, but since independence the size and capacity of their civil bureaucracies have vastly increased: They now provide a vital source of leadership and, in fact, have come to constitute the backbone of the states. The administrative bureaucracies, being elite bodies as they were under colonialism, retain their negative traits of formalism, inertia and corruption. However, with the enormous tasks they face in the process of carrying out the ambitious economic and social advancement plans of the political leadership, the bureaucracies have gradually developed and have acquired a high degree of competence, and consequently they now exercise great influence in decision making. The governments in Thailand and Indonesia in practice resemble alliances between the military and the civil bureaucracies, with the military as the senior partner but with the bureaucrats having influence and veto power over major policies. In spite of frequent coups and turbulence in the capital, Thailand has sustained a reasonable rate of economic growth, and the authority of the king's civil servants is recognized even in the most backward hamlets. In Indonesia, where the military presence in the government is conspicuous, there have been signs of a weak linkage between policymaking at the higher level and administrative operations.[11] But such a discrepancy has greatly diminished in recent years. In Malaysia, Singapore and the Philippines essentially cooperative relationships have existed between political leaders and those responsible for administrative operations -- largely due to the extensive training provided under colonialism according to preset schedules.

Among the major political actors briefly discussed, the steadily growing civil bureaucracy, coupled with the rise of technocracy, appears to be the only stable force -- common among the five ASEAN countries -- in terms of its role and impact on the performance of government: be it general administration, economic and social development, foreign relations or, to some extent, political

development. Of course, developing the civil administration is only a part of building the vast and complex system of modern institutions that are needed for maintaining all activities associated with contemporary nationhood, let alone political orientation. Furthermore, the bureaucrats, like political elites, are normally unsympathetic to the expansion of political participation -- unless they see such a development serving their benefit or cause. In this vein, economic development does not necessarily increase the levels of political participation. Yet, under prevailing circumstances in Southeast Asia, the civil administration constitutes a stabilizing factor in the conduct of economic development, which all ASEAN governments have upheld as their primary goal, and of foreign policies, although there always is the possibility of major setbacks or deviations resulting from significant domestic political turmoil. Reinforcing these stabilizing elements is the trend that, under the expanding and modernizing governmental mechanism and ruling hierarchy, political leaders have had to rely increasingly upon the bureaucracy and that in some of the countries the emergence of professional politicians or "politician technicians"[12] is noticeable. Although rapid social mobilization and growing popular demand for political participation and social justice provide dynamism and serve as constant reminders to political leaders of the need for evolutionary reforms in their ruling systems, the civil bureaucracy, or technocracy, is likely to enjoy ever-growing status as a vital -- sometimes superior -- partner of the political leadership in steering state affairs not only in the exercise of government authority but also in political decision making.

V. The Path to Survival: International Relations

For the first time since the Second World War, Southeast Asia is free from active warfare, either within the region or in the near vicinity. The protracted bloodshed of the Vietnam War ended in 1975, and the victorious Communists, although posing a potential threat to neighboring states and often implicated in sporadic guerrilla struggles, have stayed away from engaging in foreign military campaigns as feared earlier. One minor exception was a border clash between Vietnam and Cambodia in the communized Indochinese peninsula. The withdrawal of American military forces from Indochina and the emergence of a strong unified Vietnam marked the beginning of a new era in the region. But the cessation of hostilities and the absence of war is far short of being the herald of peace. It is rather a beginning clouded by uncertainties about the future roles of foreign powers in the region and by the ideology and disproportionate power that have come to differentiate Vietnam from much of the rest of Southeast Asia.

The rise of a potential Communist menace provided impetus to the five non-Communist countries of ASEAN to consolidate their association in their attempt to formulate joint countermeasures. The heads of the five governments met in summit talks for two consecutive years, in 1976 and 1977, even though no summits had been held during the first decade of ASEAN's existence, to expedite their collaboration -- ostensibly through economic cooperation but with much stress on security problems. They laid down broad principles by signing the Treaty of Amity and Cooperation and the Declaration of Concord at the Bali meeting in 1976. Although the progress of collaborative efforts has been sluggish largely due to the still conspicuous conflict of national interests, the five countries are gravely concerned as to the new balance of power being formed by four extraregional powers -- the United States, the Soviet Union, China and Japan. The Southeast Asians are aware of the fact that, although American influence has receded, their region still remains inextricably bound and influenced militarily, politically and economically by the great-power rivalry. However, they have been unable to chart the course of their own future policies because the moves made thus far by the major actors in the region have been of a largely preliminary nature.

The only power that has clearly manifested its interest and intentions is Japan. After taking part in the second ASEAN summit talks at Kuala Lumpur in August 1977, Japanese Prime Minister Takeo Fukuda announced the so-called "Fukuda Doctrine," in which he pledged US$1 billion credit in support of ASEAN economic projects, making it plain that Japan's interest in the four-power competition is

economic leadership in Southeast Asia. The Japanese action, endorsed by a United States still ambivalent about its security role, will reinforce Japan's economic presence in the region, which was initially facilitated by reparation programs but has more recently been less vigorous. Tokyo's stake in Southeast Asia is vital not only because of the region's strategic location in controlling Japan's lifeline (the oil sea lane) and its markets for Japanese commodities and services[1] but because of the region's abundant natural resources, which was one of major causes of the Pacific War. Although there are subdued fears in Southeast Asia that Japan may again become the master of another "Great East Asia Co-prosperity Sphere," the Fukuda Doctrine was welcomed by the ASEAN governments, which are badly in need of capital to promote their regional industrial projects.

The Japanese lead was followed by overtures by China and the United States in the first half of 1978. China, while reiterating its support of ASEAN, sent its vice premier, Li Hsien-nien, to the Philippines in March as a trailblazer for Beijing's new diplomatic offensive. It is noteworthy that the post-Mao Chinese leadership has directed its good-neighbor diplomacy first toward states on the Asian periphery, reflecting a perception that the time is ripe to check Soviet influence in Asia and a general acceptance of China's peaceful intentions in Asia. Beijing's gestures toward the non-Communist Southeast Asian countries remain very much rhetoric, although agreements on trade and cultural matters were concluded. The Chinese are apparently moving to gradually expand their present level of influence in the area, an approach that results primarily from the eagerness of vulnerable Southeast Asian governments to appease Beijing, which they see as another potential source of support for local insurgents. The Chinese also have in mind ways to build a possible balance, if not barrier, against the expansionism of Vietnam, where the Soviet Union's presence is more strongly felt than China's.

As the Vietnamese were celebrating the third anniversary of the "April 30 liberation" (or fall) of Saigon, U.S. Vice President Walter F. Mondale arrived in Manila promising the "continuity and constancy" of American policy in Southeast Asia. The purpose of his tour, which also took him to two other ASEAN states of Thailand and Indonesia, was officially described as an "assessment" of the post-Vietnam situation in order to chart guidelines for continued American "strategic and economic" presence in the area, safeguarding the "prosperity and security" of the regional countries.[2] Although former President Gerald R. Ford visited the area and announced a "Pacific Doctrine" on the eve of an election year, in December 1975, Mondale's trip was the first major effort by President Jimmy Carter's administration to reassure the Southeast Asians and other concerned parties of Washington's deep

interest in the region, short of another involvement in a ground war. The United States maintains a high defense stance in the Western Pacific, including strategic air and naval bases in the Philippines for which protracted negotiations have been under way, and it made initial attempts to normalize relations with Hanoi in 1977. Otherwise, the Carter administration, preoccupied with other priority issues and reflecting the diffident temper of the American public and Congress, has presented no clear American posture toward the region except for the oft-voiced rhetoric that the United States will remain a Pacific power. What the leaders of the ASEAN nations -- and, for that matter, of Japan and even China -- wish to see is the United States, even though it has abandoned a dominant, hegemonic role, remain in the region as a counterbalancing power, particularly vis-à-vis the Soviet Union.

In fact, the Russian leverage in Southeast Asia has been heightened largely due to the sizable assistance given to Hanoi during the Vietnam War. However, save for a vague and unreceptive proposal by Leonid Brezhnev in 1969 that called for an "Asian collective security arrangement" obviously aimed at containing China, Moscow has also remained rather noncommittal. In recent years, Soviet naval strength and fleet activities in both the Pacific and Indian Oceans have noticeably increased to the alarm of the West as well as of the ASEAN nations, but this should be seen in a global rather than a regional perspective. The Soviet Union, while scrutinizing overtures being made by other major powers toward Southeast Asia, has understandably kept a circumspect attitude in filling the vacuum created by the American withdrawal, lest any such precipitate action further complicate its relations with the other powers, especially China.

Aside from various elements of great-power politics, the timidity on the part of the four powers -- except an economy-oriented Japan -- is also attributable to the fact that all of them have been stung since the mid-1950s by the volatility of Southeast Asian politics. Most states in the region have proved in the long run not to be reliable political allies, and no commitments have been immune to sudden reversals. On the other hand, the diffidence of the major powers -- together with conflicts in their interests -- forced the ASEAN nations to shelve their 1971 joint proposal for a "Zone of Peace, Freedom and Neutrality" and another bid for nationalization of the Straits of Malacca, which would have to be guaranteed by great powers. China alone has indicated a favorable response to such proposals because among the big powers it may have the most to gain from regional neutralization if only to keep the area free of anti-Chinese influences.

A unified Vietnam, with a population of more than 45 million people, under Communist discipline and with enormous military might, stands as a medium-rank power and could become a twentieth-century Prussia in Southeast Asia if Hanoi's leaders harbor or develop such regional ambitions. In addition to the high level of inner strength, cohesion and self-assurance of the Vietnamese leadership and people, the country's actual military capability -- including the $1.6 billion worth of captured American weaponry -- decisively exceeds even the potential collective strength of its non-Communist Southeast Asian neighbors.[3] Although Hanoi has refrained from engaging in any overt military or subversive activities against its neighbors and indeed has established full diplomatic ties with all ASEAN members, the Vietnamese leaders have stubbornly refused to recognize ASEAN as an association and have made it known on numerous occasions that they are dedicated to the cause of revolution -- a worrisome reference for the ASEAN governments, which all have had enough bitter experiences with communism.

Under these precarious and menacing circumstances, what preoccupies all ASEAN leaders is how to steer their countries, ridden with problems ranging from ethnic issues to political entanglements, along a course of security and prosperity (i.e., economic development). Some of them hoped for an early rapprochement between the United States and Vietnam in expectation of American leverage, which, however insignificant in the initial stage, might check wayward actions by Hanoi and help the Vietnamese link increased economic interaction with its performance in the region. But other leaders doubt that outside powers will act on their behalf and, moreover, they are wary of the cost to national autonomy of continued dependence on extraregional powers for regional stability. Thus, these leaders are faced with the need to devise among themselves ways to prevent interventionary or destabilizing behavior within the region -- a task that they agree can be promoted through their existing association, ASEAN. Despite various setbacks and difficulties, the ASEAN governments are making efforts for strong regional cooperation, which they believe will offer the best chance for them to attain their ends -- greater autonomy, reduced dependence on and vulnerability to outside powers, regional stability, and resilient development.[4] This approach was well presented by Indonesian Foreign Minister Adam Malik, who stated:

> ASEAN can be seen as reflecting the growing political will of the nations of this region to take charge of their own future, to work out problems of their development, stability and security together and to prevent their region from continuing to remain the arena and the subject of major power rivalry and then conflict.[5]

These urges and needs revitalized ASEAN, which regional leaders hope will develop into an effective indigenous machinery for minimizing, if not settling, intraregional conflict; for facilitating regional economic collaboration; and for serving as a sturdy bulwark against threats and intervention from without. However, the organization faces numerous built-in obstacles, very much the same hurdles that crippled two of its forerunners in the early 1960s: the Association of Southeast Asia (ASA) and Maphilindo.[6] These stumbling blocks are rooted in the diversity of the member countries' traditional backgrounds, colonial experiences and geopolitical locations, factors that have affected post-independence nation-building and government performance as discussed in Chapter II.

Notable among the constraints is narrow nationalism, which has impeded regional cooperation because national interests have been jealously guarded. The discrepancy in national interests is highlighted by the fact that, although all the ASEAN countries agreed to the need for ameliorating relations with Asian Communist states, particularly Vietnam and China, Indonesia and Singapore have yet to set up diplomatic ties with Beijing whereas Malaysia undertook normalization in 1974 followed by Thailand and the Philippines in 1975. The economic disparity among the member countries is probably the most delicate and difficult problem involving national interests, although progress has been made in recent years to gradually break down some of barriers. For instance, while booming Singapore has taken the lead in promoting economic interaction and trade liberalization, Indonesia, with a lagging economy, has been reluctant to move away from protectionism.

Another major constraint is the differences in perception as to how regional cooperation should be improved in political, security and economic fields as well as in the structural aspects of ASEAN per se. These perceptions vary from those who advocate: a) fostering image-making rather than problem-solving roles; b) moving faster rather than too cautiously, as has been the case up to now; c) emphasizing security and military aspects rather than, or as much as, economic and nonmilitary cooperation; and d) having the association assume merely an administrative rather than a policy-oriented role.[7] There is also mutual distrust and suspicion involving the potential leadership ambitions of other members. Affecting these divergent perceptions and suspicions are different rates of economic development and varying sociopolitical situations, which sometimes drive governments to take intransigent external actions for domestic consumption. However, these differences have been gradually toned down to some extent since

the Indochina debacle, which made the ASEAN leaders think more in terms of regional rather than national interests.

How effective has ASEAN been and what has it achieved in promoting regional cooperation and integration, which the member states have professed are based on security and economic cooperation? As of the first half of 1978, the results of their cooperative efforts -- channeled through numerous ministerial and working-level talks, in addition to two summit meetings -- have been more substantive in the security area than in economic cooperation. True, in the economic field the association has produced two major agreements -- one on four major agro-industrial projects in 1976 and the other on preferential trading arrangements a year later. Under the first agreement, which is aimed at avoiding duplication of industrial production among the five countries, urea plants will be set up each in Indonesia and Malaysia, a soda ash plant in Thailand, a superphosphates project in the Philippines, and a diesel engine factory in Singapore. Although the agreement's original timetable called for setting up these projects "within three years," most of them were still under feasibility studies, and it may not be until 1982 that the plants can come into production. The second agreement provides, inter alia, for tariff reductions, the liberalization of nontariff barriers, and long-term commodity supply contracts. Yet its provisions are circumspect and its implementation is subject to a number of reservations. Although initial developments have been encouraging, economic cooperation will develop only very slowly in the coming years because the regional economies are not complementary and, moreover, the gap in development stages is so wide.

If one considers the achievements of ASEAN as a body, the first reference would have to be its contribution to closer cooperation and consultation among the member states against communism, in terms of both outside threats and internal insurgency. The countries have taken concerted steps toward the Communist states in their immediate neighborhood, Indochina, although relations with China have been left to the individual capitals. In combating Communist guerrillas, Malaysia and Thailand in recent years have conducted effective joint operations permitting the hot pursuit of insurgents by one party's troops into the other's territory. Malaysia also maintains informal cooperation of a lesser degree with Singapore, Indonesia and the Philippines, and similar bilateral or multilateral arrangements of exchanging information exist among other states. There have been sporadic debates on the need to conclude a security pact among the states. But such discussions have not developed because a military alliance, which after all would be ineffective, as proved by the now-dissolved Southeast Asia Treaty Organization

(SEATO), would only provoke considerable hostility from Communist neighbors, who would in turn increase their support for the insurgents within the ASEAN countries.

As a regional counterweight to Vietnam, Indonesia has often been mentioned as a potential medium-rank power enjoying certain regional leadership in view of its geopolitical location, large population and abundant natural resources -- and, moreover, its experience of having played a central role in the nonaligned bloc as well as in Southeast Asia during the Sukarno years. This idea was sometimes associated with a so-called "pan-Malay movement" and more recently with informal views held by some Washington policymaking circles that an enhanced role for countries like Indonesia, India, Iran, Brazil and Nigeria, which are expected to be friendly to the United States, could be a promising alternative in those areas from which the United States wishes to withdraw its direct presence without creating opportunities for Soviet gains in international influence and power. But President Suharto and his aides, pursuing pragmatic "New Order" diplomacy, have played down the prospect of claiming regional hegemony, which none of the other ASEAN members would endorse. For one thing, Indonesia can hardly afford to reallocate its scarce resources away from economic development toward regional domination.

VI. Rigidity and Flexibility: Leadership Performance

A social scientist once stated: "Government is always government by the few, whether in the name of the few, the one, or the many."[1] He was referring to the universal belief that there can be neither a government by all, or even by a majority, at least outside of small and isolated communities; nor a single ruler who can govern unassisted. If this definition holds true today, it certainly befits the countries of Southeast Asia as it does most other countries. But in attempting a cross-country comparative survey of leadership in a region with a setting as diverse as Southeast Asia's, the task encounters enormous difficulties -- regardless of the number of persons involved -- even in assessing a small portion of the leadership performance. According to one theorist, a scientific study of political leadership must strive to describe leadership behavior, to explain it in the past and present, to predict it in the future, to evaluate it in all circumstances, to assess political leadership performance, and to educate persons who will humanely study and interact with leaders, as well as become leaders themselves.[2]

This chapter considers a journalist's attempt, forgoing such academic directions, to look into some aspects of the leadership performance of ASEAN governments, with stress on their conduct of external affairs. Setting the focus on foreign affairs is largely due to the fact that these leaders' performance within this realm has come closer to their aspirations than that of domestic policies. The salient point of this approach is to see how such factors as sociocultural, economic, political and international elements affect the conduct of foreign relations in terms of its flexibility. It is evident that the terms used here -- flexibility and rigidity -- lie along the same continuum and are thus relative qualities that do not infer a value judgment in themselves. The meaning of flexibility may range from adaptability to inconsistency, whereas that of rigidity lies between immobility and consistency.

Most of the ASEAN nations, like countries in other parts of the world, have passed through an age of charismatic rule, and they are now ruled largely by institutionalized hierarchies -- whether the form of their governments be a one-party oligarchy or a military-civilian alliance and whether the ruling institutions be vulnerable or not to disputes about their legitimacy, cohesiveness and effectiveness. As discussed in Chapter V, the ASEAN governments are increasingly sustained by able bureaucracies or technocracies, especially in the realm of foreign affairs, although the level of institutionalization lags behind that of developed nations. Despite this trend, which has been expedited by rapid technological changes and the increasing degree of global interdependence, the role of personal leadership is dominant -- more

so in countries such as Singapore and the Philippines and less in those countries that are run by some form of oligarchy.

In a sense, Prime Minister Lee Kuan Yew of Singapore and President Ferdinand Marcos of the Philippines reveal certain charismatic traits -- either by way of position or behavior. Lee, besides being Singapore's national founder, is the uncontested leader in his one-party state; furthermore, he has displayed superb leadership, making his country the most prosperous in the region. Were he a ruler of similar status in a larger state, he might have been better rated as a charismatic leader. Marcos, on the other hand, has carried out numerous diplomatic feats, partly to tide over the uncertainty of international developments first created by the détente in Sino-American relations and later magnified by the Communist conquest of Indochina and its aftermath, and partly to distract the public from domestic troubles. Many of his diplomatic undertakings have been accompanied by pyrotechnics in such a way as they appeared to be the most vociferous -- and sometimes venturesome -- in the region, clearly demonstrating a charisma in diplomacy.[3] Yet, as Max Weber put it, charisma must be institutionalized, or "routinized," if the legitimacy of the regime is to outlive its leader's initial success,[4] and both Singapore and the Philippines are bolstered by relatively well-organized hierarchies, although the problems of succession remain unresolved.

Whether governmental performance rests on personal or collective leadership, it involves human actors who are affected by their background in terms of their personality, capacity, perceptions and behavioral styles. Relevant factors may include, among others, family origin, education, career, age (extent of exposure to colonialism), religion and ethnic affiliation. How these characteristics affect policy performance becomes quite another question depending on the position one holds in the hierarchy, the type of government, the nature of the issue at hand, and prevailing domestic and international circumstances. It is also risky to attempt any generalization of the correlations between personal background and policy performance. But it would be worthwhile to take note of some illustrative examples.

In Malaysia, where political institutions have developed relatively smoothly out of the colonial experience, many political leaders -- including all three of the country's prime ministers including the incumbent, Hussein bin Onn -- have been lawyers who received their education in Britain. Reflecting these common characteristics, their conduct of foreign policy has been orderly, realistic and consistent. Despite the flurries in neighboring Thailand and the Philippines to reassess and divert their pro-American

policies to a nonaligned position following the Saigon debacle, Malaysia along with Singapore maintained a calm posture. Malaysia could afford such composure because it had already established full diplomatic relations with People's Republic of China, and was in fact the first ASEAN nation to do so. In fact, during the rule of former Prime Minister Abdul Razak (1970-1976), Malaysian diplomacy was dynamic and flexible, yet without fanfare. It was Malaysia that initiated and strenuously promoted the ASEAN proposal for the neutralization of Southeast Asia, which, though presently shelved, helped ASEAN retain some cohesiveness up until the 1975 "revitalization."

Modern Indonesia encompasses three political generations, the so-called "Generations of 1928, 1945 and 1966,"[5] and there are distinct differences among the age groups in their perceptions of the Indonesian people and Indonesia's role in external affairs. According to a survey of the Indonesian foreign policy elite, most of the 1928 Generation leaders viewed Indonesians as afflicted with an inferiority complex in terms of their relations with foreigners, especially Westerners, whereas younger leaders have been either resistant to such attitudes or reluctant to admit such feelings. The generation gap is reflected also in differing perceptions of foreign policy issues. In answer to a question about whether Indonesia should take a leading role in Southeast Asia, the same survey shows that an overwhelming majority of the 1945 Generation, presently making up the largest portion of the foreign policy elite, gave an affirmative response -- 60 percent saying "now" and 34 percent "eventually." The 1928 Generation held more conservative views, with 22 percent saying that such a leading role is "unimportant." A similar trend was found in another question as to whether Indonesia should seek a major role in world politics. Of the 1945 Generation, 69 percent replied it is "important to do so," whereas 11 percent responded that it would be "better to concentrate on Southeast Asia for the time being" and the rest favored a "turn inward." In the case of the 1928 Generation, 55 percent was for a "turn inward" and rest said that it is "important to do so."[6] If the survey's first finding regarding the 1928 Generation's inferiority complex holds true, this could serve as a basis for understanding Sukarno's militant diplomacy directed against colonialism, neocolonialism and imperialism as a means to preserve Indonesia's national independence and territorial integration. His "independent and active" policy -- at least in its initial stages -- could be seen as a manifestation of his efforts to regain the Indonesian people's self-confidence, which he viewed as having been destroyed by colonialism.

In an overview of the performances of ASEAN governments, economic issues stand as the biggest stumbling block to speedier and effective regional cooperation, and they have been a source of

rigidity in the diplomacy of the ASEAN countries as far as moves toward a regional economy are concerned. Because of the evident disparity in and divergent levels of economic development among the member countries and the sensitivity of economic issues vis-à-vis national interests, a median course for regional cooperation is hard to set, and, even if one is found, it would require a considerable length of time and perseverance to achieve a consensus. “Have” nations are impatient and “have-nots” are reluctant and sometimes suspicious about shifts in policy, but each side exercises prudence and restraint in order not to offend or irritate the other.

Indonesia, for instance, despite its strong verbal commitment to regional cooperation, has been most reluctant to expedite economic cooperation because of its low level of development. It has been and remains conservative with respect to trade liberalization and tariff reductions. On the other hand, Singapore and the Philippines, impatient with the slow pace of economic cooperation and desiring to see some positive results, have chosen an expedient course; instead of challenging Indonesia, they concluded a bilateral agreement in January 1977 for a 10 percent across-the-board tariff cut on all their trade. Thailand followed suit the next month by agreeing to a 10 percent tariff reduction with Singapore on the basis of selective commodities. These step-by-step moves eventually resulted in a compromise among all ASEAN nations in the form of a preferential trading agreement, but only after prolonged negotiations and hard bargaining -- much more than might have been expected in view of their common pledge to speed up economic cooperation. These circumspect attitudes on the part of the member countries reflect the constraints that they face with regard to their primary commitment to preserving the ASEAN structure for joint security, avoiding any drastic action that might undermine the Association. This prudence, in fact, stems from the grim prospect that the stress generated by cross-national inequalities is likely to worsen, as some members will benefit -- at least in the short run -- relatively more than others from such steps as trade liberalization. There are already feelings that the relatively less developed states are considered a brake on regional economic development, and the comparatively advanced countries are sometimes seen as exploiters.

However, rigidity is not a factor in the extraregional economic diplomacy of the ASEAN countries. On North-South issues, for example, they have actively lined up behind the South’s confrontation with the North for obvious economic interests buttressed by a uniform image of colonial and neocolonial “exploitation.” None of the ASEAN countries has pretended to be a champion among the militant group of the Southern bloc, but they do support the list of Southern demands for identical

reasons: peer-group pressure, the need perceived by the ASEAN leaders to nurture their images as nationalists, and the minimal risk of loss and possibility of significant gain from participation in the bloc as the new trading and monetary systems evolve. Underlying these reasons is the fact that the region's political leaders are relatively free to articulate foreign economic policies without much domestic dissension, and that they can mobilize internal support for them with nationalistic slogans.

Conflicting national interests among the ASEAN countries, which involve differing geopolitical and economic factors among others, are also noticeable in their divergent perceptions and interpretations of regional security, the main theme of their grouping today, although they are all anti-Communist and West-oriented regardless of their claims of pursuing a nonaligned course. Malaysia upholds its proposal for the neutralization of Southeast Asia, which it views as an effective means of lessening, if not removing, the rivalry of major powers in the region, who in turn it is hoped would become guarantors of regional neutrality. Behind the Malaysian proposal is the recognition that the region's strategic value and potential economic resources -- both of which Malaysia has in abundance -- have been targets for exploitation and would become areas of great-power rivalry. On the other hand, Singapore, which scarcely has any natural resources and which lies in the shadow of neighboring states, favors the presence of big powers in the region -- in a balanced way. Indonesia's perception is again different. Being the most powerful country in the ASEAN region in terms of the size of its population and territory, its military strength, and its natural resources, Indonesia stresses regional resilience based on national resilience: that is, national military self-reliance and economic development. Pragmatic Thailand, bordering the Communist Indochinese states, has been interested in any form of regional cooperation that will ensure its survival. The Thai government, particularly under military rule, has explicitly advocated the need for closer military cooperation among the ASEAN nations, which have by and large hesitated to add an outright military component to their Association. The offshore Philippines, which is ambivalent about its security dependence on the United States, is more interested in pursuing economic cooperation than security matters with fellow ASEAN members. These differing security perceptions, mostly framed in the early 1970s, have maintained their basic configurations -- despite changes of government (in Thailand and Malaysia) and stepped-up consultations through ASEAN channels -- to serve as guidelines for the respective governments' foreign policies.

In considerations of geopolitical impact on foreign policy, Singapore stands out as an example. Despite its dynamic economy and disciplined government led by highly competent elites, Singapore has

opted for a rigid, low-profile diplomacy because of its geopolitical location, the small size of the nation and its limited natural resources, and its mixed ethnic composition. The island country is sandwiched between two big Islamic and ethnically Malay countries, Malaysia and Indonesia, which both hold traditionally deep resentment and suspicion of the Chinese who make up the overwhelming ethnic majority and dominate the politics of Singapore, the "Third China." The country's thriving economy, presently boosted by advanced industries, was initially based on the island's role as a principal trading center and entrepôt in Southeast Asia. In the eyes of Indonesians and Malaysians, whose economies still very much depend on primary products, Singapore's economic prosperity has been attained largely at their expense. These factors, among many others, generate enough strain for Singapore to avoid challenging and irritating its immediate neighbors. Singapore's position in such a precarious situation was reflected in its abstention on a United Nations resolution condemning Indonesia's military action in East Timor in 1975 -- in contrast with most other ASEAN nations, which voted against the resolution. This served as a clear indication that Singapore is afraid of being "Timorized" by Indonesia or Malaysia. Another constraint for Singapore comes from China. Because of the dominance of ethnic Chinese in the country, the Singaporean government cannot afford to antagonize Beijing. But neither can it take positive action to approach China lest any such moves imply that Singapore could eventually become a Chinese satellite.

In the face of these stark realities, Prime Minister Lee has followed a discreet policy often reflecting the Confucian influence he has inherited. While maintaining a low-key diplomacy vis-à-vis Indonesia and Malaysia, he has been devoted to accelerating the economic growth that will provide his nation's real voice. As for relations with Beijing, Lee has repeatedly made it known that Singapore will be the last ASEAN country to enter full diplomatic ties with China: That is, it will follow Indonesia. But Lee visited Beijing in 1976 to become one of the last foreign leaders to meet with Mao Zedong before the latter's death -- a visit that confirmed de facto recognition between the two countries. Lee has exerted his government's efforts to forge a new "Singaporean identity." Singapore has four working languages -- English, Chinese, Malay and Tamil -- and Lee seldom uses the Chinese language on public occasions.

Many ASEAN government leaders have attempted -- and to some extent succeeded -- to use major domestic crises or political instability as an impetus to undertake new diplomatic initiatives. This trend, also found among leaders of both advanced and developing countries in other regions, is aimed at "killing two birds with one stone." That is, by way of external gestures, the leaders hope to settle certain

domestic issues, which often have interstate or international implications, and, at the same time, to ease domestic tension, if not arouse internal support for their leadership. There are pitfalls, too. Some overambitious and self-centered leaders, like Sukarno, have emphasized idiosyncratic factors, undertaking a foreign policy irrelevant to the real needs of their countries, only to undermine their own leadership.

Ethnic problems, which in several countries have tended to develop into explosive situations, can well represent those domestic crises that leaders have attempted to settle by resorting to diplomatic means. One of the key motives of Malaysia's early approach for diplomatic relations with China was to seek Beijing's understanding of its "Malay preference" policy, which was much resented by the Chinese minority in Malaysia, and also to gain Beijing's promise that China would not support insurgents operating in Malaysia. The Philippines has taken a similar diplomatic approach to the Arab world. Fearing that failure to reach a compromise with its insurgent Muslims would endanger oil supplies from the Middle East, the Manila government held long negotiations with the Mindanao Muslims, recruiting Libyan President Muammar Gaddafi as mediator. Another purpose underlying Manila's Muslim diplomacy was to win Arab consent, if not support, for its place in the growing nonaligned bloc, which has been unsuccessful because of the presence of American bases in the Philippines.

Likewise, political instability within a country does not necessarily constrain its diplomacy. In fact, some countries in these political situations have developed an active and flexible style of diplomacy not only to meet external challenges and settle pending issues but also, as an alternative means, to distract people's attention from domestic issues and to seek breakthroughs in handling internal problems.

Here, the case of Thailand, which has suffered since 1932 from the constant swing of the pendulum between civilian and military leadership and consequent chronic political instability, is interesting. Displaying the diplomatic flexibility and pragmatism that saved the monarchy from becoming a Western colony, the Thais following World War II lured many United Nations specialized agencies and other international organizations to establish their regional headquarters in Bangkok, making the city a diplomatic center in Southeast Asia. In the mid-1970s, despite intensified political unrest at home, successive short-lived civilian and military governments managed to overcome the ill effects of the Vietnam War -- a situation that was more acute for them than for other ASEAN countries because Thailand borders two Indochinese Communist states, Cambodia and Laos, both regarded as sanctuaries for Thai insurgents. The Thais hurriedly set up diplomatic relations with Beijing and Hanoi and negotiated

the closure of American military bases in Thailand, while fighting frequent border clashes with the Indochinese states and pro-Communist guerrillas at home. For Thailand, the swift change from a staunch pro-American to a nonaligned policy was an inevitable but painful choice for survival, involving the nation's security under uncertain international circumstances and the menace of the Communist neighbors.

In this connection, it is noteworthy that Thailand's drastic change in foreign policy was initiated by resourceful civilian political leaders, including Kukrit Pramoj. Unlike their military predecessors, who were identified by their close pro-American stance, the civilians -- though all pro-Western conservatives -- felt fewer obligations and greater justification in disengaging Thailand from its total dependence on the American support that was in any case waning. This does not mean that all civilian leaders are flexible and the military generals rigid. In fact, one of the reasons cited for overthrowing Thanin Kraivichien's civic government (though under the military umbrella) by a military coup in November 1977 was that the civilian premier had adopted a hard-line anti-Communist policy. The new military premier, General Kriangsak Chamanand, has instilled more flexibility in his policies -- partly taking into account the growing liberal elements among young military officers and students as well as civilian politicians. He visited Beijing in early 1978 to receive a warm welcome from the Chinese, who, after carefully evaluating the skillful Thai handling of Indochinese politics, apparently regard Thailand as a possible barrier against Vietnamese expansionism.

An analogy may be drawn between Thailand and the Philippines. President Marcos, who has conducted five national referendums since 1972 in order to reaffirm the legitimacy of his martial law government, has been equally busy leading the Philippines away from nearly total dependence on the United States to an independent course to ensure his nation's survival. Besides making journeys to Beijing and other capitals, Marcos has sent his wife, Imelda, to Moscow, Cairo and numerous other global political centers to counter the pro-American image of his country and broaden its base in the international community. The Philippines has also hosted a number of international events, ranging from a beauty contest to a monetary conference. Since 1975 the Philippines has been engaged in protracted bargaining with the United States over the two American military bases, the Clark airbase and Subic Bay naval station, which have become the remaining American strategic footholds in Southeast Asia. For the renegotiation of existing base agreements (which expire in 1991), Manila has employed two-pronged tactics. While at the conference table the Filipinos have pressed the United States hard to place the bases under a Philippine commander (sovereignty) and pay rental in a form similar to what it has provided for

base rights in Spain, or in the form of stepped-up military and economic assistance, Marcos has made public statements questioning the value of the bases to the Philippines and doubting the American treaty commitment to the security of the Philippines -- sometimes with veiled anti-American sentiment. The Marcos diplomacy -- whether it can be regarded as quasi-charismatic and whatever its underlying intent may be with regard to the president's domestic politics -- is another example of ASEAN leaders' efforts to find ways to ensure the security and socioeconomic advancement of their countries.

Rigid or flexible, the leaders of the five ASEAN countries share an important characteristic in their conduct of external affairs today -- pragmatism. Uncertainties in international circumstances -- and, for that matter, in domestic developments to some extent -- have dictated this pragmatism, and the countries have significantly adapted themselves to meet the call of the times. They have learned well from Sukarno's example: that diplomacy for a disproportionately grandiose and venturesome goal can do one's nation a great disservice and may eventually cost one's political life. These countries, regardless of the size of their populations and potential for development, have come to realize their relative weakness in terms of the strength that can be mobilized to ensure their continued existence as independent states. More importantly, they also realize how vast and substantial is their potential and how enormous and painful is the task to mobilize this asset in their political and socioeconomic development. Such a balanced awareness is the very source of dynamism of the Southeast Asian countries, which they must harness in their pursuit of a new modernity and prosperity reinforced with their own national and regional identity.

Notes

Chapter 1

[1] Sukarno, cited in *Ideologies of the Developing Nations,* ed. Paul Sigmund (Praeger, 1963), pp. 61 ff.

[2] Suharto, interview with the author, Jakarta, September 28, 1974.

[3] Some of the information that the author acquired during his interviews with leaders of Southeast Asian countries conducted in September-October, 1974, for *Hankook Ilbo/Korea Times,* is used in the paper.

[4] The other Southeast Asian countries are Brunei, Burma, Cambodia, Laos and Vietnam.

Chapter 2

[1] For instance, in Indonesia the better-educated and more Westernized Javanese are dominant in the government and the military, which following the 1965 coup has vastly increased its influence over the administrative and economic sectors, and there is a strong tendency of distrust among the peoples of Sumatra, Bali and Celebes against the Javanese. Although the capital of Jakarta lies in the Sundanese region in West Java, ethnic Javanese are strongly represented in the city; and of the total 645 ministerial-level posts held from 1945 to 1970, 61 percent were held by Javanese, who constitute 45 percent of population. See Crawford Young, *The Politics of Cultural Pluralism* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1976), pp. 328-333.

[2] In Malaysia, the delicate equilibrium that has been established between the Malay majority and the Chinese and Indian groups affects almost all aspects of political life. While certain minor cabinet portfolios are traditionally handed to non-Malays, key positions and sectors such as the higher civil service, army and police are largely staffed by Malays. Furthermore, the Second Malaysia Plan of 1971-1975 called for the preference for Malays in the distribution of development awards, although the 1976-1980 Third Malaysia Plan appears to reduce such specific government commitments. See Cynthia H. Encloe, "Ethnic Diversity: The Potential for Conflict," in *Diversity and Development in Southeast Asia: The Coming Decade* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1977), pp. 145-146, 162-165.

[3] A "self-image" survey conducted among Malay and Chinese schoolchildren in the predominantly Chinese city-state of Singapore shows that 36.2 percent of the interviewed Malay children and 80.2 percent of Chinese children each feel their own group "superior," while 46.2 percent of Malays and 19.8 percent of Chinese feel their own group "equal." See Peter A. Busch, "Political Unity and Ethnic Diversity: A Case

Study of Singapore" (Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 1972), p. 209; cited in Young, *The Politics of Cultural Pluralism,* p. 124.

[4] Pye, *Southeast Asia's Political Systems,* pp. 21-24.

[5] Seah Chee-meow, "The Muslim Issue and Implications for ASEAN," *Pacific Community* (October 1974), pp. 154-155.

[6] Suharto, himself a Muslim, took legislative action in early 1978 that gave official recognition to the existence of mystical beliefs, such as practicing pre-Islamic supernatural cults and paying reverence to occultists, and ordered them to be taught in schools. This action deeply offended devout Muslims. See *New York Times,* April 30, 1978, p. E-3.

[7] According to a cross-ethnic and cross-religious survey of Indonesian administrators and legislators (65 percent Javanese and 90 percent Muslim), more than 60 percent of the Muslims indicated that their religious affiliation is "weak" -- a response that was three times more common than among non-Muslims. See Donald K. Emmerson, *Indonesia's Elite: Political Culture and Cultural Politics* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1976), pp. 137**142.

[8] James C. Scott, *Political Ideology in Malaysia: Reality and the Beliefs of an Elite* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1968), p. 75.

[9] William J. Stiffin, *Thai Bureaucracy: Institutional Change and Development* (Honolulu: East-West Center Press, 1966), p. 242.

[10] Dankwart A. Rustow, *A World of Nations: Problems of Political Modernization* (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution, 1967), p. 241.

[11] Indonesians were systematically refused senior posts not only in the government service but in industries, even if they held suitable qualifications, and this trend was extended to education. On the eve of the outbreak of World War II, the Western primary schools -- the first link in the chain of Western education for any career -- had only ten times as many Indonesian pupils as Europeans, and in the secondary schools, Indonesians were outnumbered two to one by Europeans. At the university level, these numbers were far less favorable to Indonesians. See S. Tas, *Indonesia: The Underdeveloped Freedom,* trans. Derek S. Jordan (New York: Pegasus, 1974), p. 100.

Chapter 3

[1] Samuel P. Huntington, *Political Order in Changing Societies* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1968), pp. 32-34.

[2] Guy J. Pauker, "National Politics and Regional Powers," in *Diversity and Development in Southeast Asia: The Coming Decade* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1977), p. 30.

Chapter 4

[1] *Korea Times,* October 9, 1974.

[2] *Hankook Ilbo/Korea Times,* October 1, 1974. *Pancasila* principles include, among others, "just and civilized" humanity, democracy "wisely led by the wisdom of deliberation" among representatives, and social justice for all the people.

[3] *Hankook Ilbo,* October 6, 1974.

[4] *Hankook Ilbo,* September 28, 1974.

[5] Rustow, *A World of Nations,* p. 227.

[6] Cyril E. Black, *The Dynamics of Modernization* (New York: Harper and Row, 1966), pp. 90-94. Black lists leadership consolidation periods for the Philippines as 47 years (1899-1946); Indonesia, 27 years (1922-1949); and three other ASEAN countries as ongoing at the time of publication -- Thailand since 1932, Malaysia since 1963 and Singapore since 1965. The period for Korea was 36 years (1910-1946).

[7] Huntington, *Political Order,* pp. 46-58.

[8] Besides Singapore, where Chinese are dominant in the hierarchy from the prime minister down, and Malaysia, where a certain number of cabinet portfolios are traditionally reserved for the Chinese ethnic group, prominent politicians of Chinese descent in other countries include Thanom Kittikachorn, former prime minister, and Thanat Khoman, former foreign minister, of Thailand; Ne Win of Burma; and José Rizal, a Philippine national hero, who was a mestizo. See Toshio Kawabe, *Tonan Ajia* (Southeast Asia), vol. 18 of *World History* (Tokyo: Kawade Shobo, 1974), pp. 213-214.

[9] Samuel P. Huntington and Joan M. Nelson, *No Easy Choice: Political Participation in Developing Countries* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1976), pp. 21-23.

[10] John H. Kautsky, "Revolutionary and Managerial Elites in Modernizing Regimes," *Comparative Politics,* no. 1 (July 1969), pp. 441-467.

[11] In the 23-man cabinet of President Suharto, formed in 1978 following his election to a third consecutive term in office, ten portfolios were occupied by military generals. Generals also serve as governors in most of the country's 27 provinces and run the majority of more than 100 state-run enterprises. Of the 920 members of the most recent National People's Congress, 165 held general ranks and many more were officers of lower station. As many as 15,000 officers are estimated to serve in normally civilian jobs. See *New York Times,* April 30, 1978, p. E-3.

[12] Robert D. Putnam, *The Comparative Study of Political Elites* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1976), p. 214.

Chapter 5

[1] The five ASEAN countries exported goods worth US$6,877 million to Japan (28.4 percent of their total exports) and imported $5,516 million from Japan (26.1 percent) in 1974 to make Japan ASEAN's largest trade partner, followed by the United States (International Monetary Fund, *Direction of Trade, 1970-1974*). According to *Japan's Economic Cooperation with Southeast Asia* (Tokyo: Foreign Ministry, June 1977), Japan's total trade with ASEAN in 1976 was US$14 billion, or 11 percent of the country's total, and the ASEAN nations accounted for 48 percent of Japan's bilateral official development assistance in 1976.

[2] Zbigniew Brzezinski, speech before the Japan Society, New York, April 27, 1978.

[3] According to the 1976 estimates of the International Institute for Strategic Studies in London, Vietnam's armed forces (not including former South Vietnamese military) stand at 615,000 troops in regular services, plus 50,000 in armed security forces and an armed militia of about 1.5 million; the total military manpower of the five ASEAN states, in contrast, stands at 627,300.

[4] Catherine Gwin, "Southeast Asia in the 1980s," in *Diversity and Development in Southeast Asia: The Coming Decade* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1977), p. 9.

[5] *ASEAN* (Jakarta: ASEAN National Secretariat of Indonesia, Department of Foreign Affairs, June 1975), p. 65.

[6] The ASA, formed in 1961 by Malaysia, the Philippines and Thailand, collapsed mainly because of the dispute between Malaysia and the Philippines over territorial claims to Sabah. Maphilindo was proposed in 1963 but was never institutionalized because of Sukarno's confrontation policy toward Malaysia (1963-1965).

[7] Shee Poon-Kim, "A Decade of ASEAN, 1967-1977," *Asian Survey*, vol. 17, no. 8 (August 1977), pp. 764-765.

Chapter 6

[1] "The Elite Concept," in *The Comparative Study of Elites*, ed. H. D. Lasswell, D. Lerner and C. E. Rothwell, Hoover Institute Studies, series B, no. 1 (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1952), p. 7.

[2] Glenn D. Paige, *The Scientific Study of Political Leadership* (New York: Free Press, 1977), p. 7.

[3] Rustow, *A World of Nations*, p. 166

[4] M. Rheinstein, ed., *Max Weber on Law in Economy and Society* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1954), p. xl.

[5] "Generation 1928" was so named because of its identification with the "youth oath" of 1928 and the commitment to a unified, independent Indonesia. Its members were born prior to 1910 and played vital roles

in the independence campaigns under colonialism and in the Sukarno government. Members of "Generation 1945," most active in Indonesia today and occupying most key positions in the government and the military, came of age politically during the "independence revolution" between 1945 and 1949. "Generation 1966" is associated with the downfall of the Sukarno regime; its members, born after 1935, are too young to occupy key positions in the government.

[6] Franklin B. Weinstein, *Indonesian Foreign Policy and the Dilemma of Dependence: From Sukarno to Soeharto* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1976), pp. 190-196, 357. The author claims that the elite he interviewed was made up of individuals "rated most influential" on foreign policy matters, ranging from foreign ministry officials and army officers to political party leaders.

[end of the paper]