Sources A, B and E support the hypothesis that the **ASEAN Way helped to keep the ASEAN member-states united** during the period 1967-1997. While sources D and C contradicts the hypothesis.

Source A support the hypothesis for it points out that ASEAN **did not see a conflict that is severe between the member states and that it has managed to solve the problems** between them due to the ASEAN way, **highlighting the relative success of the ASEAN Way** in uniting the members. This is **similar to the view of Source E**, as **I cross referenced to Source E**, it also indicates that the **ASEAN members have enjoyed a substantial period of peace and no conflict** has **broke out between member states despite there being issues unresolved**, implying that the **ASEAN way of avoiding difficult issues and transcending them has kept ASEAN united**. **Both of these views have been supported by my contextual knowledge** as in accordance with the view that the **ASEAN way of ensuring cooperation despite issues have helped prevent ASEAN from splitting during its early years of formation.** This was seen during **March 1968**, where the **Corregidor Affairs** which has led to the **survival of Sabah dispute** and **suspension of ASEAN meetings for 8 months** did not cause **ASEAN to break up**, as **Philippines and Malaysia decided to normalise relations in 1969 at the 3rd ASEAN ministerial meeting**, therefore ensuring the unity of the fledgling organization, thus my contextual knowledge supports both Sources A and E.

Source B also **supports** the hypothesis as it **highlights that ASEAN despite facing many threats to its unity was able to get over them due to the characteristics of the ASEAN way**, which include practicing consensus and respect. This would indicate that ASEAN way has been instrumental in the forging of unity between the member states. This is supported by my contextual knowledge, **which states that despite the conflict between Indonesia and Singapore over the execution of Osman and Harun, Indonesian marines that bombed Macdonald House, despite appeals by Indonesian leader Sukarno and Tengku Abdul Rahman, in October 1968,** ASEAN activities were not affected and continued due to the avoidance of the sensitive issue, keeping to unite the ASEAN members, thus my knowledge supports Source B.

Source D **contradicts the hypothesis as it states that despite the ASEAN states ostensible desire to cooperate in terms of the economy; they act as competitors due to their economic structures,** showing that the ASEAN way of non-interference approach has led to grid lock and disunity between member states. This is supported by my contextual knowledge, which states that **ASEAN countries did not want to cooperate economically, which was enabled by the ASEAN way, in the 1970s, as they were all shifting to manufacturing and thus had competitive economies.** Therefore, this resulted in **intra-ASEAN** trade during the **1968-1974** to rise by only **194.9%** as compared to the **ASEAN foreign trade’s increase by 322.3%**, thus my contextual knowledge supports Source D.

Source C contradicts the hypothesis as it states that **what is keeping ASEAN divided is it lack of common economic and political interest.** Although ASEAN has its ASEAN way, it has impeded the growth of the structure due to its restrictions like intervening in the affairs of Member states. Hence, it has inevitably cause a divided ASEAN. According to my contextual knowledge, there was a **lack of common economic interest** due to **exacerbated nationalism** among the member states, which **led to poor economic cooperation in the 1990s**. Moreover, there was a lack of faith between the member states, as seen from the **veto of Singapore’s diesel engine programme** in **1977** and also **Singapore’s 1% token contribution to Indonesia’s Pusri urea** project **estimated at $250 million**, in the Therefore, my contextual knowledge supports Source C which contradicts the hypothesis that the ASEAN way kept ASEAN united.

In conclusion, **Sources A to E contradicts the view that the ASEAN way helped to keep ASEAN member states united.** **Sources B and E are not reliable enough as they are both from the Prime Minister Mahathir and the secretary general of ASEAN**, both of which **are intimately involved in making the organization a success** and therefore **would paint an overly positive** view of the ASEAN way. **Source A is not to be preferred**, as it highlight that the ASEAN has allowed it to tackle the **issue of mutual conflicts and economic cooperation.** This is partly untrue, as there is **hardly any substantial economic plan** such as the **ASEAN concord 1 and the goal of free trade liberalisation which is brought up in February 1976 in the Bali Summit never materialised until 1992** with the **ASEAN free trade agreement** as states were locked in **competition for export manufacturing.** **Source D and C** on the other hand, are to be preferred as both are **made by respected academics on Southeast Asia** who would be expected to have **studied the ASEAN way in dept and make informed comments.** Also, Source C is also correct in making an assertion **that ASEAN does not have a real institutionalisation due to the ASEAN way** as it is a fact that the **Secretariat that was based in Jakarta, was set weak to prevent him from being too powerful,** and therefore, **its power is often subverted by the national secretaries, indicating new institutionalisation to united ASEAN fails due to the ASEAN way.**