

Editor's Note

Our August 1993 issue (JAS 52.3:684) carried an exchange of letters about Michael Leifer's review in our February issue (JAS 52.1:216–18) of two recent books by Michael Haas. At issue were Leifer's and Haas's different interpretations of ASEAN's November 1971 declaration to create a Zone of Peace, Freedom, and Neutrality in Southeast Asia (ZOPFAN). Haas accented the concept of neutrality in his interpretation; Leifer saw a plan for broader and more complex kinds of regional cooperation in the language of the communique.

Leifer's review questioned Haas's understanding of this 1971 declaration, and his letter in the August issue expressed doubts about the accuracy of Haas's quotation of the 1971 ZOPFAN declaration. In a second round of letters, Haas provided the full text of the 1971 ASEAN declaration he quoted, while Leifer responded by sending three almost identical versions of the 1971 ZOPFAN declaration, all of which differ from the version Haas cited.

So, indeed, they might honestly dispute the document's meaning, for there are varying versions in print. For our readers, and to reassure both scholars that they each accurately quoted a version of the 1971 ZOPFAN declaration, the two principal variants are given below.

The version used by Haas, emphasizing neutrality, as published in *Basic Documents of Asian Regional Organizations* (Dobbs Ferry, New York: Oceana Publications, 1974), pp. 1282–83, reads:

That Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore and Thailand are determined to exert efforts to secure the recognition and respect for *the neutrality of* Southeast Asia as a zone of peace, freedom, and neutrality, free from any form or manner of interference by outside powers;

The italicized words “the neutrality of” in this version do not appear in the versions cited by Leifer, and the capitalization differs in the key words “Zone of Peace, Freedom, and Neutrality.” This version, released by the Philippine Ministry of Foreign Affairs in December 1971, can support Haas's interpretation stressing how the 1971 communique was an effort to make Southeast Asia a neutral region in the Cold War. Leifer's versions come from *Foreign Affairs Malaysia*, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Malaysia, Volume 4.4 (December 1971):57–59; *ASEAN Document Series, 1967–85*, ASEAN Secretariat, Jakarta, 1985, pp. 21–22; and K. S. Sandu, ed., *The ASEAN Reader*, Singapore: Institute of South-East Asian Studies, Documentation section, pp. 4–5, and read:

That Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore and Thailand are determined to exert *initially necessary* efforts to secure the recognition of, and respect for, Southeast Asia as a Zone of Peace, Freedom and Neutrality, free from any form or manner of interference by outside powers.

The italicized words “initially necessary” have been dropped from the version cited by Haas. Leifer’s interpretation also derives from an official government text—Malaysia, in this instance—published shortly after the communique was issued from Kuala Lumpur in November 1971. Moreover, it supports his interpretation that ZOPFAN encompassed conceptions quite beyond the standard meaning of neutrality. For ASEAN documents, the best policy would seem to be “caveat lector.”

Communication to the Editor

TO THE EDITOR:

In my article titled “Sui Yangdi and the Building of Sui-Tang Luoyang” (*JAS* 52.1 [February 1993]:66–89), I identify Sui Yangdi’s mother as of Xianbei origin (pp. 78 and 81). This assertion is wrong. Dugu, the parental family name of Yangdi’s mother, Empress Wenxian, indicates that she was of Xiongnu ancestry. (Yao Weiyuan, “Dugu ji Tuge kao” [Dugu and Tuge are of identical origin], in Lin Gan, ed., *Xiongnu shi lunwen xuanji* [Selected articles on Xiongnu history], Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1983:69–74.)

Also, my mention of Yangdi’s reign of less than thirteen years should read “less than fourteen years” (p. 72).

VICTOR CUNRUI XIONG
Western Michigan University